



CHEL TENHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Notice of a meeting of Council

Monday, 18 November 2013

6.00 pm

Council Chamber, Municipal Offices

Membership	
Councillors:	Wendy Flynn (Chair), Simon Wheeler (Vice-Chair), Andrew Chard, Garth Barnes, Ian Bickerton, Nigel Britter, Chris Coleman, Barbara Driver, Bernard Fisher, Jacky Fletcher, Rob Garnham, Les Godwin, Colin Hay, Penny Hall, Tim Harman, Rowena Hay, Diane Hibbert, Sandra Holliday, Peter Jeffries, Steve Jordan, Andrew Lansley, Paul Massey, Helena McCloskey, Andrew McKinlay, Paul McLain, David Prince, John Rawson, Anne Regan, Rob Reid, Chris Ryder, Diggory Seacome, Duncan Smith, Malcolm Stennett, Charles Stewart, Klara Sudbury, Pat Thornton, Jon Walklett, Andrew Wall, Roger Whyborn and Suzanne Williams

Agenda

1.	APOLOGIES	
2.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
3.	RECORDING OF THE MEETING To consider under Council procedure rule 16.1 a request from Mr A Lilywhite to record the meeting	
4.	MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING 7 October 2013	(Pages 1 - 16)
5.	COMMUNICATIONS BY THE MAYOR	
6.	COMMUNICATIONS BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL	
7.	PUBLIC QUESTIONS These must be received no later than 12 noon on Tuesday 12 November and must relate to the business for which this meeting was convened	
8.	MEMBER QUESTIONS These must be received no later than 12 noon on Tuesday 12 November and must relate to the business for which this meeting was	

	convened	
9.	PETITION RECEIVED ON THE CHELTENHAM TRANSPORT PLAN A debate on a petition received on 23 August 2013 (deferred from 7 October meeting)	(Pages 17 - 22)
10.	CHELTENHAM TRANSPORT PLAN-CONSULTATION REPORT Report of the Cabinet Member Built Environment	(Pages 23 - 50)
11.	NOTICES OF MOTION	
12.	TO RECEIVE PETITIONS	
13.	ANY OTHER ITEM THE MAYOR DETERMINES AS URGENT AND WHICH REQUIRES A DECISION	
14.	<p>LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 -EXEMPT INFORMATION The Council is recommended to approve the following resolution:-</p> <p>“That in accordance with Section 100A(4) Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the remaining agenda items as it is likely that, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, if members of the public are present there will be disclosed to them exempt information as defined in paragraphs 3 and 5, Part (1) Schedule (12A) Local Government Act 1972, namely:</p> <p>Paragraph 3; Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)</p> <p>Paragraph 5; Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings</p>	
15.	EXEMPT MINUTES Exempt Minutes of the meeting held on 7 October 2013	(Pages 51 - 60)

Contact Officer: Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager, 01242 774937
Email: democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk

Andrew North
Chief Executive

Council

Monday, 7th October, 2013

2.30 - 4.43 pm

Attendees	
Councillors:	Wendy Flynn (Chair), Colin Hay, Andrew Chard, Garth Barnes, Ian Bickerton, Nigel Britter, Chris Coleman, Barbara Driver, Bernard Fisher, Jacky Fletcher, Rob Garnham, Les Godwin, Penny Hall, Rowena Hay, Peter Jeffries, Steve Jordan, Paul Massey, Helena McCloskey, Andrew McKinlay, Paul McLain, John Rawson, Anne Regan, Rob Reid, Chris Ryder, Diggory Seacome, Duncan Smith, Klara Sudbury, Pat Thornton, Jon Walklett, Simon Wheeler (Vice-Chair), Roger Whyborn and Suzanne Williams

Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies had been received from Councillors Harman, Hibbert, Holliday, Lansley, Stennett, Stewart and Wall.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors C Hay, Driver, Smith and Williams declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda item 13 as CBH Board members.

Councillor Massey declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as a member of the CESG Listed Advisor Scheme'

3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 September 2013 were approved and signed as a correct record.

4. COMMUNICATIONS BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor informed members that she had attended the opening of the refurbished gym at Leisure@. She then informed Members that she had attended the launch of the new Art Gallery and Museum "The Wilson" and paid tribute to the hard work of Jane Lilystone, the Museum and Arts Manager and Councillor Rowena Hay, Cabinet Member Sport and Culture. This was now a very impressive art gallery and museum and something which Cheltenham should be proud of. The Wilson had received 1600 visitors on Saturday with 500 coming through its doors on both Sunday and Monday. The Heritage Lottery Fund had thanked the Council for its excellent bid and its spectacular building. The Chair of the Arts Council for England had also been very impressed with the Wilson. This was positive news for the town.

Later in the Council proceedings the Mayor asked Councillors to stand for a moments silence in memory of Honorary Alderman Les Freeman who had recently passed away.

5. COMMUNICATIONS BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

The Leader of the Council reiterated the thanks already expressed to those who had contributed to “The Wilson” which was a great asset to the town.

Members were informed that the Leisure and Culture Trust was now looking for 11 trustees, 2 of which would be members of council. A no obligation drop-in session would take place on 16 October for those interested to obtain further information.

The Leader paid tribute to the excellent floral displays in the town this year.

Reference was made to the LGA’s “Rewiring Public Services” document and members were informed that the LGA would be hosting a seminar on this on 12 November in Taunton. He would be sending the invitation to the event to group leaders. He believed an all party approach to this was essential as it concerned local government’s response to central government with regard to the local government finance settlement.

The Leader also referred to a recent erroneous article in the Echo stating that the Police would be having a presence in the Municipal Offices on the Promenade. The council had received an apology from the Police & Crime Commissioner as this was not the case. The Council was keen to work with the police on accommodation but consideration would need to be given with regards to timing and location issues.

The Leader reported that the council had received an unqualified opinion for the Statement of Accounts and the Audit Committee had complimented the GO partnership for the work it had done on its behalf.

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None received.

7. MEMBER QUESTIONS

1.	Question from Councillor Jacky Fletcher to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Steve Jordan
	In an article to do with Council IT, Councillor Simon Wheeler was quoted recently in the Echo as saying, <i>“But some of the more elderly councillors may struggle with the new technology. There will be one or two members who won't be able to get their head around it. They struggle with modern technology,”</i> In my view this is insulting to senior councillors who have served this council for many years and do try and understand IT. Does the Leader agree with Councillor Wheeler's offensive remarks and will he apologise on his behalf?
	Response from Councillor Jordan
	I would caution Cllr Fletcher against believing everything she reads in the press, but assume she feels the comments quoted in the article refer to her. If any other councillors feel the comments apply to them please let me know and I'm sure Cllr Wheeler will be happy to discuss it with them.

	<p>In a supplementary question Cllr Fletcher asked whether the Deputy Mayor would retract his remarks and asked why it had not been rebutted in the press if it was not factually correct.</p> <p>In response the Leader of the Council said it was not necessarily factually inaccurate but suggested that the Councillor concerned spoke directly to the Deputy Mayor.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Rob Garnham to Cabinet Member Corporate Services, Councillor Jon Walklett</p>
	<p>We have recently had two IT failures caused by equipment in the Server Room switching itself off at night due to overheating when the air conditioning failed. The system was subsequently not available until staff came into work the following morning. I understand that there is no overnight or out of hours technical service available. Could the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services explain why he has allowed this Council to get into such a state that there is no IT out of hours support available?</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p>
	<p>To my knowledge, the council has never had formal out of hours cover for ICT. However, staff have responded to issues out of hours when problems have been identified and contact has been made with one of the ICT team. The need for a more formal out of hours cover was identified by both staff and officers recently, partially as a result of the increasing number of system failures resulting from the lack of investment in ICT over very many years and this is now being addressed.</p> <p>The terms and conditions for staff employed by Cheltenham Borough Council were such that finding a workable solution which recompensed staff appropriately would have had significant cost implications across the council as a result of single status. The use of a private contractor would also add cost for a very limited service.</p> <p>However, now that staff have transferred to the Forest of Dean District council and the shared service is undergoing a restructure, we have an opportunity to address this issue without significant cost. In addition, FOD use software which will be applied to upgraded infrastructure at Cheltenham which alerts staff if systems and infrastructure fail. This is about to be applied to the new citrix infrastructure.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Cllr Garnham asked when councillors could expect a fully compliant, robust IT system in place.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member Corporate Services said there were no specific dates but explained that when Council had approved the Forest of Dean and CBC shared service in February 2013 it had also agreed to a 2-3 year infrastructure investment project. It was acknowledged that there had been some hiccups and hurdles to overcome during the initial implementation period. Staffing remained an issue as did the heavy workload for IT management. The ICT service desk responses were good and improving. The infrastructure issues affecting the delivery of Citrix were now a priority in conjunction with the roll out of wifi and ipads. He reiterated his offer to make a regular statement at Council on progress.</p>

3.	Question from Councillor Barbara Driver to Cabinet Member Corporate Services, Councillor Jon Walklett
	<p>Can the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services please tell me what has happened to the scrutiny task group set up to look into Town Centre Deprivation.</p> <p>It had to be explained to one Cabinet member at the first meeting this is an O&S working group not a Cabinet Member working group. Then the last meeting was hijacked by another Cabinet Member who asked to be there as an observer.</p>
	Response from Councillor Walklett
	<p>I personally am unaware of any problems or issues connected with the Town Centre Deprivation scrutiny task force and I would suggest to Councillor Driver that she should initially inform her colleague Cllr Duncan Smith in his role as Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny of any such connected concerns.</p> <p>I have been present at all meetings held by this particular task group as an observer and have been very pleased to note that CBC officers summoned to meetings have been well prepared with relevant data covering the geographical areas covered by the Town Centre remit. I believe officers comprehensive knowledge of the part of St Paul's ward included is largely due to that wards local councillors efforts in campaigning for increased monitoring of multi occupancy housing. Certainly my observer status allows me to voice an opinion when sought by members and / or officers at the meetings and I believe the published minutes of the Town Centre Deprivation task force reflect that fact.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Driver asked why the correct map featuring St Pauls was only passed to officers at the end of the meeting and why the Cabinet Member had held two meetings prior to the task group meeting.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member Corporate Services explained that the correct map did appear at the end of the meeting but he had held no discussions prior to this meeting with the planning department. He maintained observer status at this meeting and had not added to the agenda in any way. He suggested that Councillor Driver take up this issue directly with the officers concerned.</p>
4.	Question from Councillor Chard to Cabinet Member Sustainability, Councillor Roger Whyborn
	<p>Can the Cabinet Member for Sustainability tell this Council how much progress he has made regarding each of the 7 recommendations agreed by Ubico Scrutiny Task Group that reported back to Scrutiny in March of this year and to Cabinet in April this year?</p>
	Response from Councillor Whyborn
	<p><i>1. Review decision not to nominate any borough councillors to the [Ubico] Board...</i></p> <p>This matter remains under review.</p>

	<p><i>2. Review the customer service arrangements at an appropriate time ... and consider whether delivery of this service should return to the depot.</i></p> <p>A comprehensive review of customer service arrangements has taken place, including bad weather arrangements. A systems thinking review has been undertaken looking at the processes within both CBC and Ubico and this is expected to yield improvements. However no advantage can be demonstrated from moving the call centre back into Ubico at the depot.</p> <p><i>3. Review internal and external communication strategies.....</i></p> <p>The review referred to above includes communications. Ubico have also looked at the way in which they communicate with their own teams.</p> <p><i>4. Review the emptying frequency timetable for the bring site facilities.....</i></p> <p>So far only minor changes have been identified as necessary, pending other work streams which are now complete. I can report on this subject in more detail if required.</p> <p><i>5. Consider the adoption of waste and recycling literature (bin tags) which include information including collection dates, bin information and key messages</i></p> <p>This was reviewed but it was considered that this was a not a cost effective means of getting messages to the public. Instead there will be more targeted communications for those who are not recycling.</p> <p><i>6. At the end of the season (April 2013) assess the overall impact of the decision by the senior football league to cease coordination of their sports pitch bookings and if this has had a largely negative impact on resources within the customer services team ask the senior football league to reconsider their decision.....</i></p> <p>The problem which had been highlighted during the review has now been addressed and the processes for pitch bookings has been improved.</p> <p><i>7. Consider providing additional marketing resource on an invest to save basis for the promotion of the trade waste service.....</i></p> <p>An evaluation has been completed, with a recommendation based on modest growth to the service, with appropriate marketing investment. This was brought to the Cabinet member working group on Waste on 28th Sept. and will be further evaluated by cabinet.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Chard asked whether the Cabinet Member intended to publish the review and whether all members would receive it. In response the Cabinet Member said that some of the work was ongoing but a report could be produced.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Chard to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</p>
	<p>Can the Leader of the Council please reassure me that members of his</p>

	group do not discuss as a group planning applications prior to meetings of the Planning Committee and, like the Conservative members of that committee, that there is no 'agreed' line on any applications of any nature at Planning Committee.
	Response from Councillor Steve Jordan
	Yes I can.
6.	Question from Councillor Ryder to Cabinet Member Corporate Services Councillor Jon Walklett
	<p>As a councillor it is important that not only do we serve the public but we can be seen to be serving the public. Previously when I was here as a councillor, residents could see the questions and comments I was making on their behalf, as my name would be mentioned in the minutes of Council and the various committees I served on. Now that I have returned, I note that is no longer happening, especially during debates and the time at Council set aside for questions.</p> <p>Can I ask the Cabinet Member if they will review the current practice of minute taking so that, as happens with Planning Committee, all councillors are named in the minutes.</p>
	Response from Councillor Walklett
	<p>Currently I believe the minutes to be in accordance with best practice, in that the purpose of the minutes is to provide context for the decisions that are taken and which enable the reader to understand the discussion which was related to that decision.</p> <p>The published guidance on this matter confirms:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) to establish an accurate record of the decisions taken; b) to comply with legal requirements; and where minutes are used as the vehicle to bring committee proposals before the full assembly, the need also: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c1) to ensure that the record is sufficiently self-explanatory to enable the council to make a decision in full possession of the relevant facts; c2) to provide adequate information about the authority's business for press and public." <p>The same guidance Law & Practice of Local Authority Meetings by Raymond Knowles also suggests that the "minutes should record the tenor of the discussion on a particular item of business but not attribute views to individual members." Instead it is suggested to use words like "the following points were raised in discussion" and then list them.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Ryder asked whether OneLegal could look into this further and she looked forward to a valid reply in due course.</p>

	In response the Cabinet Member Corporate Services clarified that there had been legal input into the written answer. He suggested that the way Planning Committee was minuted was very different to Cabinet and Council. He would however ask OneLegal to provide a fuller explanation to his response.
7.	Question from Councillor Regan to the Leader Councillor Steve Jordan
	What is this administration doing now to prevent 795 homes being built on Greenbelt land on the Up Hatherley Way" ?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>We are encouraging everyone to take part in the planned consultation of the proposals in the Joint Core Strategy starting on 15th October. The site mentioned by Cllr Regan is currently included as a potential development site in order to meet the assessed need for housing across the JCS area. We will ensure that the method of calculating the assessed need is reviewed to make it is as accurate as possible and that the data used is kept up to date. By the final version of the JCS we will work to ensure that the housing numbers allocated for Cheltenham match the need rather than exceed it as in the current version.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Regan asked whether the Leader had held any meetings with Tewkesbury Borough Council since the last Council meeting in order to remove the proposed development on Greenbelt Land on Up Hatherley Way.</p> <p>In response the Leader of the Council clarified that he was not aware of any meetings taking place. He clarified that it was only when the consultation had finished that changes would be made to the proposals, not at this point.</p>
8.	Question from Councillor Seacome to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	Recently we have had meetings of Overview and Scrutiny cancelled. Earlier this year there was a proposal to cancel a full Council meeting, and it was only held after the Conservative Group demanded its reinstatement. The agenda for the meeting today has now had a major item removed which leaves us with nothing to discuss but one confidential item. How can the Leader of the Council be confident that the citizens of Cheltenham, who pay for this council, are being properly served, given the complete lack of accountability and transparency that is a reflection of the way his Party is trying to run the Council, and by extension, the town?
	Response from Councillor Jordan
	<p>Councillor Seacome should talk to Councillor Smith if he is concerned about scheduling of Overview & Scrutiny meetings, as it not something I have any control over. However, my understanding is that the 3rd October Overview & Scrutiny meeting was only scheduled if required and turned out not to be.</p> <p>Since there was a special council meeting to discuss the JCS last month</p>

<p>and another special council meeting to discuss the Cheltenham Transport Plan next month, Cllr Seacome's claim that there is a lack of items to discuss would appear ludicrous.</p> <p>The Conservative group is of course free to use the 'Notice of Motion' item on the council agenda to discuss any issue they feel necessary. It is instructive to note that they have not put forward a single motion in the last year.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Seacome made reference to the fact that there were only 2 items on the agenda of this meeting and asked whether other decisions were being taken behind closed doors.</p> <p>In response the Leader of the Council said he failed to understand what Councillor Seacome was referring to and suggested that if he had issues then these should be raised as a notice of motion at Council.</p>
--

8. PETITION RECEIVED ON THE CHELTENHAM TRANSPORT PLAN

Members noted that the discussion on the petition regarding the Cheltenham Transport Plan had been postponed to the special meeting of Council to be held on Monday 18 November at the request of the petitioners.

9. NOTICES OF MOTION

None received.

10. TO RECEIVE PETITIONS

None received.

11. ANY OTHER ITEM THE MAYOR DETERMINES AS URGENT AND WHICH REQUIRES A DECISION

The Mayor informed Members that she had agreed to take an item as urgent business as it was deemed to be sufficiently significant to the Authority's operations so as to justify its consideration as an urgent item of business at the meeting. This would be discussed in exempt session as Agenda Item 14.

12. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 -EXEMPT INFORMATION RESOLVED

"That in accordance with Section 100A(4) Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the remaining agenda items as it is likely that, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, if members of the public are present there will be disclosed to them exempt information as defined in paragraph 3, Part (1) Schedule (12A) Local Government Act 1972, namely:

Paragraph 3; Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

Paragraph 5; Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings

13. ST PAUL'S PHASE TWO

Having declared personal and prejudicial interests in this item Councillors Driver, C Hay, Smith and Williams left the room and did not participate in the debate.

The Cabinet Member Housing and Safety introduced the report and explained that this constituted the last strand of work in the St Paul's regeneration project. Prior to the construction phase commencing, this report concerned funding allocations and approval required, including loan arrangements.

In terms of overall project loan finance, CBC would apply for this via the Public Works Loan Board and then advance these funds with the appropriate agreements in place to CBH. Repayment of this finance would be met from the net rental income over the longer term.

The Cabinet Member Housing and Safety referred to concerns previously expressed by Members relating to the risk of losing the HCA grant. He reported that this risk remained until the project was complete. This was due to the fact that there was a different mechanism for paying the grant. He reassured Members that all possible factors that could result in delays had been identified and were being monitored via robust project management.

The Cabinet Member paid tribute to the hard work being undertaken by CBH officers on this project and made reference to the award CBH had received at a national housing awards ceremony. He also highlighted the fact that CBH had obtained finance of nearly £4 million in a very difficult financial climate.

In response to a question the Cabinet Member Housing and Safety clarified that the term of the loan period was 40 years.

A member paid tribute to the work CBH had done in levering in funding and suggested that CBH be involved in the JCS policy to raise more affordable housing in the town. In response the Cabinet Member Housing and Safety explained that CBH was currently looking at its whole strategy to add to its housing stock.

RESOLVED THAT

- 1. The use of £100,000 from usable capital receipts arising from HRA asset disposals that the Council has previously resolved to apply to the provision of affordable housing be approved. This subsidy is to be used to support the affordable housing build element of the St Paul's Phase two development**
- 2. The Authority sourcing loan finance of up to £2.3m from the Public Works Loan Board be approved and that the sums be advanced to CBH to be used for the construction of the affordable housing units to be comprised within the St Paul's phase two development. And that a payment guarantee be authorised to the contractor in respect of the building contract.**
- 3. A loan agreement be entered into with CBH to a maximum of**

£2.3m, repayable from the net rental stream from the affordable housing properties

- 4. The use of an additional £50,000 be approved from usable capital receipts arising from HRA asset disposals that the Council has previously resolved to apply to the provision of affordable housing for the site assembly, thus increasing the associated budget from £450,000 to £500,000**
- 5. Authority be delegated to the Director of Resources in consultation with the Borough Solicitor to agree the terms of the loan agreement between the Council and CBH and financial contractual agreements between the Council, CBH and the contractor.**

14. ICT NETWORK ISSUE

The Mayor confirmed to Members that she was of the opinion that the ICT network issue relating to the council's PSN submission was sufficiently significant to the authority's operations so as to justify its consideration as an urgent item of business at the meeting. It was agreed that Members could speak more than once in the debate.

The Cabinet Member Corporate Services introduced the report and updated Members on the current position regarding PSN compliance. He explained that an extensive note had been separately issued which alerted public sector organisations to resourcing issues in the Cabinet Office. This note referred to 300+ organisations which needed extensive support to achieve compliance and that there was no immediate risk to suspension of PSN where there was genuine appetite and realistic plans to achieve compliance.

The Cabinet Member then highlighted the following:

- Access to the PSN allowed emails to be received and transmitted via the Government Connect Secure Extranet (GCSX). It was a requirement of the government that access should only be allowed if users completed an annual compliance assessment
- The PSN rules required users to be compliant with a range of standards and criteria, when they are, they can use the GCSX to send and receive emails within an encrypted framework.
- The authority had been using GCSX as a method to transfer restricted data electronically since April 2009 and completed two previous assessments without issue.
- ICT Shared Service had been working on the current compliance submission and associated infrastructure work since April of this year with the compliance team for the Cabinet Office. Despite this, the Cabinet Office still issued formal warning letters to remind councils of deadlines.
- The management of the PSN compliance process and evidential requirements have changed substantially since last year which meant that the council had to provide significantly more evidence that the same ICT infrastructure, which had previously complied, still complied.

- The goalposts were moving on a continual basis with new guidance being provided on unmanaged end point devices as late as August 2013 which ICT responded to by amending its processes and guidance to remote workers connecting in to the council.
- He explained that this had therefore been a challenging process and had highlighted some key concerns for both officers and members and that there was a need to ensure that there was earlier engagement with the compliance team to address issues well ahead of the deadlines. He was confident that the new ICT shared service would ensure this happened.
- The Cabinet Member noted that that this had been a particularly challenging year for the ICT team and the more complex and stringent process had been adhered to despite dealing with a significant number of other pressures including the creation of the ICT shared service, a virus, the failure of some key infrastructure and systems due to age and lack of investment. In addition the team had created reciprocal disaster recovery arrangements in the Forest of Dean and had supported some major projects including significant ICT input into the newly opened Art Gallery and Museum as well as commencing the infrastructure upgrade which would deliver a stable citrix environment, wifi for councillors and support for the ipad trials. This had been achieved despite losing some key personnel within the team.
- The Cabinet Member acknowledged that the authority had not kept up to speed in its investment in ICT infrastructure and the service over very many years but reminded members that in February 2013 Council allocated £1.3 million to improve this.

The Cabinet Member referred Members to the recommendations in the report and proposed a further recommendation:

“That Council notes the significant effort made by the ICT team in dealing with the compliance process and refers to the Scrutiny ICT members working group a request to follow up this issue and make any future recommendations to Cabinet in relation to the future compliance process”.

The Mayor invited Members to ask questions on the issue and the following points were raised :

- Comments were made on the amount of technical jargon contained in the report.
- In response to a question as to what contingency was in place should GCSX be disconnected and what effect this would have on those receiving benefits, the Cabinet Member Corporate Services stated that from the outset a contingency plan had been put in place and this was confirmed by the Director Resources as being with Forest of Dean Council. Following the submission at the end of August a conversation had taken place at senior management level on how the ICT Team would work with the Cabinet Office’s technical compliance team.
- When asked whether a conversation had taken place with the Leader or the Chief Executive of the Forest of Dean to run CBC systems which were non compliant, the Director Resources stated that discussions had taken place about using the FoD infrastructure.

- The Cabinet Member Corporate Services believed that he had a sufficient understanding of the technical detail in the report. Members questioned why the matter was being dealt with in exempt session. The Chief Executive responded that it was not appropriate to discuss any live issues of IT security in open session. It was confirmed by the Cabinet Member Corporate Services that once formal confirmation had been received there was no reason why the debate could not be made public. The Head of Legal Services informed Members that Council could pass a resolution to go into open session but in his view there appeared to be a reasonable basis to continue to debate the issue in closed session at this stage. Having heard this, the Mayor decided to continue in exempt session.
- A technical explanation was also requested on how routing through the FoD infrastructure could solve the issue and this was addressed by the ICT Manager. When asked whether FoD had gone through the same process with the Cabinet Office the Cabinet Member confirmed that the timing of their submission was ahead of CBC. In response to a question on why CBC had not shared information and understanding with the FoD about this process for common input, the Cabinet Member explained that the FoD submission had been different to CBCs and since then the goalposts had changed in terms of the detailed information required.
- A member made reference to the recommendation that the ICT scrutiny working group had made when examining the virus issue regarding the need for a second firewall and the Head of ICT Shared Services addressed this point.
- A member asked why there was no up to date risk assessment with the report and in response the Corporate Governance Officer explained that 3 risks had been identified and how these had been managed.
- When asked at what point members would have been made aware of the issue had Cllr Garnham not requested it to come to Council as an urgent item, the Cabinet Member Corporate Services explained that immediately on receipt of the Cabinet Office letter the Chief Executive had arranged for a report to be prepared for Audit Committee.
- In response to a question as to what mechanism would be in place should standards change again to avoid the recurrence of this situation the Head of ICT Shared Services explained that there was a code of connections and the strategy was to start to prepare six months in advance and with the engagement of external consultants.
- A member queried why, in the context of the risk assessment, the impact was only scored as a 3 since the risk to the reputation of the council could be severe. In her view the actions proposed did nothing to mitigate against the damage to the councils reputation. The Corporate Governance Officer confirmed that a risk assessment had been made on the Thursday prior to this meeting and as the final submission had met the standards the risk was assessed as lower. Some members believed that the risk should be reassessed as the very fact that the council could have to transfer operations to the FoD would be a high impact in terms of reputation, customers and benefits payments. The Cabinet Member confirmed that the risk factor accurately reflected the most up to date situation.

- When asked whether those in receipt of benefits would be unaffected the next day, the Cabinet Member Corporate Services explained that benefits would be paid as normal.
- A member asked when exactly matters had been brought to the attention of the Cabinet and when they had been discussed. In response the Cabinet Member Corporate Services confirmed that Cabinet had been informed on 19 September at an informal meeting but in advance of which the Leader had been informed via the Chair of Audit Committee.

There being no further questions the Mayor moved to the debate.

In response to some of the questions that had been raised by members, the Leader of the Council stated that he felt that it was appropriate for the report to be an exempt item and that the debate should not be held in public. Although he was confident that the systems were now compliant, formal clarification had yet to be received from the Cabinet Office. He was confident that the ICT shared service was doing all that it could to resolve the matter.

A member stated their concern that it appeared that no one was taking responsibility for the matter and that others were being blamed for the situation. They wanted to know how the council had arrived at a situation where services were threatened and wanted to understand what solutions were being proposed.

There was a brief discussion as to whether during debates on exempt items, mobile phones and mobile devices should be switched off, but it was recognised that some members may require them to be switched on for emergency contact or to access their council papers.

Members expressed their concerns that if access to the network had been compromised then it would have been the most vulnerable people in society who would have felt the impacts. There was a suggestion that the Cabinet Office should be questioned as to whether they had fully thought through the consequences of disconnection. It was noted that the Cabinet had raised the issue of the impacts on vulnerable people when the matter had been brought to the meeting of the informal cabinet. The Chief Executive indicated that he would be writing to the Cabinet Office and would raise members concerns.

Members also raised concern that this was yet another ICT issue and that the service was not robust. They noted that other councils do not seem to have similar issues with their ICT.

Councillor Garnham, leader of the conservative group, stated that having read the report and listened to the answers to members' questions, he believed that his request to ask for the urgent item had been the right one. This was a serious matter and he wanted reassurances from the Cabinet as to what they were doing to address the matter. Given that the council had been advised earlier in the year as to the potential risk of disconnection he wanted to know what the Cabinet had done about the issue and how they had worked with officers to resolve the matter. He questioned whether members would ever have been told about the matter had he not requested the item be brought to council. It was the first time in all of his service as a councillor that he had ever

requested an urgent agenda item. He recognised that there had been a lack of investment in the ICT service and infrastructure but in his opinion the blame lay with the administration.

In response a member reminded the council, that the administration had earmarked £1.3m ICT investment at the last budget, and that the disinvestment in ICT had started in a conservative administration. He did acknowledge that there were problems with the ICT system particularly citrix. He also acknowledged that it was important that the council was prepared to deal with the PSN submission in future years so that a similar situation did not arise. It was inevitable with the growth of cyber crime that the security restrictions would increase and the council needed to be fully prepared. However he felt that the process was restrictive and that the Cabinet Office needed to provide a proportionate response so that the council is not classed as dealing with the same type of secure information which is held by national security agencies.

A couple of members indicated that they felt that the debate had been useful but felt that the comments made by the leader of the opposition were unhelpful in securing an appropriate debate and response to this serious matter.

The way in which the risk assessment accompanying the report had been scored, was a concern for several members who felt that the impact score was insufficient given the reputation risks and the risks that any service interruption would impact on vulnerable individuals. It was also pointed out that ICT currently provides services for other partner organisations and therefore there could also have been an impact on their operations and this was not mentioned in the report. There was a general consensus amongst those members who spoke on the issue of the risk assessment that there may be a requirement to revisit the risk process and ensure that council officers are reminded about the scoring mechanism and have a good understanding about the differences between impact and a likelihood score. It was recognised that the risk register was an important tool for both the executive and overview and scrutiny committee and members need confidence in the risk management process.

Members also commented that the overview and scrutiny committee had set up a task group looking at ICT and they had made a number of recommendations relating to security following the virus earlier in the year. They would be disappointed if these recommendations had not been taken on board and actioned. It was also noted that there had been an internal audit report setting out security risks and one member questioned whether the Cabinet Member Corporate Services had been proactive in ensuring that the matter was dealt with appropriately, and whether the cabinet had made sufficient effort to prioritise this work. They went on to say that it was inappropriate to cast blame at the Cabinet Office.

Concern was raised again about the item being taken as an exempt item particularly as the Echo was aware of the matter. There was a call for when the matter will be made public, given that there was nothing within the debate which warranted such an exemption. The Chief Executive advised members that the Echo had contacted him and therefore he had to respond.

In summing up the Cabinet Member Corporate Services said that he had listened to the debate with interest. He acknowledged that this was a serious

matter, which warranted debate. He advised members that as soon as the letter from the Cabinet Office was received that a report was prepared for the Audit Committee, and that ICT had worked hard to prepare a resubmission which could demonstrate that the council was compliant. He reminded members that he had offered in the past to brief council on a regular basis about ICT if they so wish, and restated that he was happy to do this to future meetings if so wished by members. He reminded members of the proposed addition to the recommendations:

- That Council notes the significant effort made by the ICT team in dealing with the compliance process and refers to the ICT Scrutiny task group a request to follow up this issue and make any future recommendations to Cabinet in relation to the future compliance process

Councillor Garnham proposed an additional amendment

- That all Councillors be sent a copy of the final confirmation email with regards to compliance along with advice as to when the matter can be made public.

This additional recommendation was approved by members.

On moving to the vote it was

RESOLVED THAT

- 1. the communication from the Cabinet Office regarding PSN compliance authorisation, the Chief Executive's response, the actions taken by the authority and the up to date position be noted**
- 2. the significant effort made by the ICT team be noted and that the matter is referred to the ICT Scrutiny task group for further consideration and for them to make any recommendations to cabinet on compliance issues.**
- 3. Councillors be sent a copy of the final confirmation email with regards to compliance along with advice as to when the matter can be made public.**

Voting : For : 27, Against : 1; Abstentions:1

Wendy Flynn
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 16

**Cheltenham Borough Council
Council – 18 November, 2013
Cheltenham Transport Plan – Petition**

Accountable member	Councillor Andrew McKinlay – Cabinet Member for Built Environment
Accountable officer	Mike Redman – Director Built Environment
Ward(s) affected	All
Significant Decision	Yes
Executive summary	
	<p>This report:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ has been prepared in response to the receipt of a petition which has triggered a Council debate because it includes more than 750 signatories; ▪ was postponed from the last meeting of Council (7th October, 2013) at the request of the petitioners, so that both the petition and the Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) Cheltenham Transport Plan Consultation report could be considered at the same meeting; ▪ needs to be read in the context of the next item which is the formal consultation report from GCC in respect of the Cheltenham Transport Plan.
Recommendation	That Council, having considered the petition in accordance with the procedure set out in Appendix 1, resolves to note the concerns of certain sections of the public and consider them within the context of the Cheltenham Transport Plan Consultation Report.

Financial implications	None arising specifically from this report. Contact officer: Mark Sheldon, Director of Resources, mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264123
Legal implications	The petition falls to be considered under the Authority's Petition Scheme. Contact officer: Peter Lewis (OneLegal), peter.lewis@teWKesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272012
HR implications (including learning and organisational development)	There are no direct HR implications arising from the content of this report. Contact officer: Julie McCarthy, GO Shared Service Human Resources Manager (West), julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264355
Key risks	See risk assessment attached as Appendix 2 to this report.
Corporate and community plan Implications	None arising specifically from this report.
Environmental and climate change implications	None arising specifically from this report.
Property/Asset Implications	None arising specifically from this report. Contact officer: David Roberts, Head of Property & Asset Management, david.roberts@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264151

1. Content of petition received

- 1.1** The Council has received a petition under the heading 'NO to Cheltenham Transport Plan and Boots Corner partial closure'.
- 1.2** The petition (a copy of which has been made available in the Members' room) includes 217 e-mail names and 910 signatures. As such, it contains more than the 750 signatories required to trigger a Cheltenham Council debate, but is below the threshold of 5,000 signatories required for a debate by GCC.
- 1.3** There is some duplication between names appearing on both signature and e-mail lists, as verified by postal address and postcodes.
- 1.4** The e-mail list pre-dates the formal consultation process by nearly 3 months, with names appearing from April 2013.
- 1.5** The statement within the petition states:-

'We the undersigned DO NOT SUPPORT the Cheltenham Transport Plan. We urge both Gloucestershire County Council and Cheltenham Borough Council not to proceed with the proposals as laid out in the consultation running between July 1st and September 1st 2013.

We are particularly concerned with the proposed partial closure of Boots Corner. Reducing the number of vehicles will only offer a small improvement in the public realm quality at Boots Corner but the associated increase in displaced traffic which will have a severe impact on

residential roads, for example College Road, St Luke's Road, old bath road, St George's Street, Hewlett Road, All Saints Road and Gloucester Road.

*We urge the County Council not to implement the partial closure of Boots Corner as part of the Cheltenham Transport plan. **WE condemn this proposal (and) ask that each signature in this petition is counted as a NO vote in the consultation.***

2. Background to receipt of the petition

- 2.1** Please refer to the Gloucestershire County Council document 'Cheltenham Transport Plan Consultation Report' which sets out the comprehensive background relating to the consultation process which has triggered this petition. A CBC paper prepared for the meeting of 7th October 2013 when this item was originally to be considered is an appendix within the GCC Consultation Report. This CBC 7th October 2013 report was postponed and not formally considered by Councillors at the request of the petition organisers.
- 2.2** This appendix A of the GCC Consultation Report sets out the nature and approach to the formal consultation exercise which was led by GCC on behalf of CBC and with support from the Cheltenham Development Task Force.
- 2.3** It should also be noted that GCC has employed Opinion Research Services Ltd (ORS), an independent social research organisation to assist with the coding of written comments and the analysis of the results. ORS is a Market Research Society Company and is fully compliant with the MRS Code of Conduct. ORS is also a member of the Consultation Institute and its research activities and systems are fully accredited to BS ISO 9001:2008 and BS ISO 20252.

Report author	Contact officer: Mike Redman, Director Built Environment, mike.redman@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264160
----------------------	---

Process for dealing with petitions at Council

The following is the recommended process to be followed for the debate of a petition at the Council meeting in accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme. The Council Procedure Rules shall be suspended in so far as necessary to facilitate this process.

1. The Mayor will remind members of the procedure to be followed

2. Statement by the petition organiser

The Mayor will invite the petitioner organiser or their representative to come to the microphone and speak for up to 5 minutes on the petition.

There will be no questions and the petition organiser/their representative will take no further part in the proceedings.

3. Clarification on the background information in the officer's report

Members will be invited to ask any questions for clarification as to the facts in the officer's report.

4. Statement by the relevant Cabinet Member

The Cabinet Member whose portfolio is most relevant to the petition will be invited by the Mayor to speak for a maximum of 5 minutes on the subject of the petition. They may wish to refer to the background report from officers circulated with the papers for the meeting.

They may also wish to propose a motion at this point; if so, the motion must be seconded.

5. Debate by members

Where a member has proposed a motion (which is seconded), the usual Rules of Debate (Rule 13) will apply.

If there is no motion, the Mayor will invite any member who wishes to speak on the petition to address Council for up to a maximum of 3 minutes.

When the 15 minutes set aside for the debate (as laid down in the Council's Petition Scheme) is up, the Mayor may decide to extend the time allowed for the debate but will bring it to a close when they feel sufficient time has been allowed.

6. Conclusion of Debate

The debate should conclude with one or more decisions taken pursuant to the Petition Scheme as follows:

- taking the action requested in the petition (provided the matter is reserved to full council for decision)
- referring the matter to Cabinet or an Appropriate Cabinet Member or Committee (including Overview and Scrutiny) for further consideration
- holding an inquiry into the matter
- undertaking research into the matter
- holding a public meeting
- holding a consultation
- holding a meeting with petitioners
- calling a referendum
- writing to the petition organiser setting out our views about the request in the petition
- taking no further action on the matter

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-5	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
	If the Council considers the petition in the absence of the wider consultation results, any resultant decision would not be fully informed with the views of the wider public and is likely to be unsound	Mike Redman	01/11/13	4	4	16	Reduce	Council report recommendations			
	If the Council does not take the concerns raised in the petition into consideration, it has the potential to undermine confidence in the local democratic process	Mike Redman	01/11/13	3	4	12	Reduce	Council report recommendations			
Explanatory notes											
<p>Impact – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-5 (1 being least impact and 5 being major or critical)</p> <p>Likelihood – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6 (1 being almost impossible, 2 is very low, 3 is low, 4 significant, 5 high and 6 a very high probability)</p> <p>Control - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close</p>											

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 22

Cheltenham Borough Council

Council – 18 November 2013

Cheltenham Transport Plan – Consultation Report

Accountable member	Councillor Andrew McKinlay – Cabinet Member for Built Environment
Accountable officer	Mike Redman – Director Built Environment
Ward(s) affected	All
Significant Decision	Yes
Executive summary	<p>This report:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has been prepared in response to the receipt of the Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) Cheltenham Transport Plan Consultation Report, a report that contains detailed analysis of responses undertaken independently by Opinion Research Services (ORS) and thereby provides reassurance over the validity of the analysis. ORS is a Market Research Society Company and is fully compliant with the MRS Code of Conduct. ORS is also a member of the Consultation Institute and its research activities and systems are fully accredited to BS ISO 9001:2008 and BS ISO 20252. ▪ Provides background information on the lengthy journey, in partnership with GCC, which has led CBC to this point in the process. ▪ Provides a comprehensive analysis of the outcomes of the consultation process and additionally, provides an initial assessment of concerns and how these may be addressed <p>In considering this report Council should take account of the concerns raised by certain sections of the public in the Cheltenham Transport Plan-Petition report.</p>
Recommendations	<p>That Council:</p> <p>i) considers the GCC ‘Cheltenham Transport Plan Consultation Report’, along with the initial suggestions for dealing with the concerns raised; and</p> <p>ii) supports GCC in continuing to progress to the next stage of concern resolution and subsequently, implementation of the Cheltenham Transport Plan (traffic regulation order process) in order to maintain the economic vibrancy and long term sustainability of the town.</p>

Financial implications	None arising specifically from this report. Contact officer: Mark Sheldon, Director of Resources, mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264123
Legal implications	None arising specifically from this report. Contact officer: Peter Lewis (OneLegal), peter.lewis@teWKesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272012
HR implications (including learning and organisational development)	There are no direct HR implications arising from the content of this report. Contact officer: Julie McCarthy, GO Shared Service Human Resources Manager (West), julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264355
Key risks	See risk assessment attached as Appendix 3 to this report.
Corporate and community plan Implications	Supporting the delivery of key projects aimed to consolidate the long term economic performance of the town
Environmental and climate change implications	Improve the town centre by minimising traffic impacts and in the long term assist in air quality management
Property/Asset Implications	None arising specifically from this report. Contact officer: David Roberts, Head of Property & Asset Management, david.roberts@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264151

1. Report received

- 1.1 The Council has received a GCC "Cheltenham Transport Plan Consultation Report" as an outcome of the consultation process undertaken this summer. That report is reproduced in full at Appendix 1.
- 1.2 The GCC Consultation Report report, at Appendix A, sets out the journey from 2001 to the present and the debate over the future of traffic within the town centre, although many would contend that this very same debate was on-going for several decades prior to 2001. It also maps the evidence considered by other towns when dealing with challenging road network issues.
- 1.3 The report provides details of the comprehensive approach taken to the consultation exercise, including the delivery of 16,000 questionnaire leaflets; various exhibitions and events; specific consultations and widespread media coverage.
- 1.4 Additionally, it provides an explanation of how the traffic modelling process has evolved with ever increasing levels of sophistication, through Department for Transport approved modelling tools.
- 1.5 Importantly, the report identifies that the proposed road network changes are part of a much wider package which is supported by the successful Department for Transport Local Sustainable Transport bid

2. Key outcomes

- 2.1 The report includes a comprehensive analysis undertaken independently by ORS which allows for

the responses to be analysed through the voluntary data supplied by respondents. This is important, as it demonstrates that responses were obtained across a wide age demographic (although disappointingly no under 17's); individuals with a declared disability; residents, workers or visitors to Gloucestershire; respondents in terms of their preferred method of travel around Cheltenham, and also by Cheltenham declared home postcode areas.

- 2.2 When asked whether or not they support the package of measures contained in the Cheltenham Transport Plan, 44% said yes, 28% said yes, but with reservations and 27% said no, they do not support the plan.
- 2.3 The detailed analysis identifies that respondents with the following characteristics are more likely than average to support the Cheltenham Transport Plan – aged 17-34; female; travel on foot around Cheltenham; live in Central or North area of Cheltenham.
- 2.4 The characteristics of the respondents significantly more likely than average to say no, they do not support the Transport Plan are – aged 75 or over; prefer to travel by car; and live in the South area of Cheltenham.
- 2.5 However, the exercise was not a simple referendum and thus, much more detail and understanding can also be extracted from the detailed commentaries provided. These are analysed by category (by ORS) and have been comprehensively considered in a separate GCC report covering concerns and mitigations
- 2.6 The document does not consider the petition submitted to Cheltenham Borough Council, as it was not part of the formal consultation process.
- 2.7 An additional document, set out as appendix 2, provides further detail to the 'summary of common themes' from consultation questionnaire responses, noted in section 5.3 and section 5.4 of the core report. This appendix notes the issues raised, the initial response of the highway team and critically, suggestions for how such issues could be addressed. It is recognised that this is an initial analysis and further work will be required to further explore the proposals, especially zones where there are identified concerns, such as St. Lukes and St. Pauls.
- 2.8 The GCC post implementation review of enacted measures is essential and CBC is committed to work with GCC in the delivery of any further identified mitigation required. The timeframe for this monitoring and review process will reflect the impact of changes to the highway network and these should be apparent within six months.
- 2.9 The Borough Council has also received support for the process from the Cheltenham Development Task Force which considered the outcomes at a meeting on 5th November, 2013 and noted the following:

“The Cheltenham Development Task Force has considered the reports and appendices prepared by GCC concerning the Cheltenham Transport Plan. Having considered the documents, the Task Force:

- welcomes the consultation process;
- notes the generally favourable public response;
- recognises the concerns raised;
- welcomes the commitment of CBC and GCC to work in partnership to deliver;
- responds to the concerns raised as appropriate.

The Task Force considers that this, along with other commercial developments and public realm improvements will assist in maintaining the long term vibrancy of Cheltenham town centre.”

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 The Cheltenham Transport Plan Consultation Report clearly supports a conclusion that the proposals have generally been positively received by the public. Additionally, with appropriate mitigation, as set out in the separate report, it would appear that many of the concerns raised can be tackled.
- 3.2 The issues raised by the petition appear to have also been raised through the formal consultation process, so it is fair to assume that whilst the same number of petitioners did not formally register their concerns, the nature of the concerns are reflected in the outcomes of the formal process.

Report author	Contact officer: Mike Redman, Director Built Environment, mike.redman@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264160
----------------------	---

Appendix 1 GCC Cheltenham Transport Plan Consultation Report 2013 including appendices

Available on the GCC website using the following link

<http://gloucestershire-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/trp/travel/ctp/ctp>

Summary of comments from consultation questionnaire responses.

List of Abbreviations:

- GCC – Gloucestershire County Council
- CBC – Cheltenham Borough Council
- CTP – Cheltenham Transport Plan
- LSTF – Local Sustainable Transport Fund
- GH – Gloucestershire Highways

No.	Issue	What they told us	Our Comments	Suggestion
1	Safety	Concern about buses, taxis, deliveries, cyclists within the pedestrianised area.	<p>Should the work proceed the initial phase of implementation will see limited, if any, alterations to the environment at Boots Corner. The footway/carriageway layout will remain as existing until such time as CBC have an agreed design of how to safely accommodate buses, taxis, deliveries, cyclists and pedestrians within an urban realm improvement.</p> <p>These proposals will be subject to scrutiny by the Highway Authority, Road Safety Auditors and various groups already engaged in discussions about best design principles that include a disabled forum, Integrated Transport unit and cycling groups.</p> <p>The experience in the area of High Street between Primark and Bennington Street has encouraged authorities that careful design coupled with reasonable enforcement can produce an environment where pedestrian and vehicles can be accommodated.</p>	<p>Permit buses, taxis, deliveries and cycles through core area in traffic management proposals.</p> <p>Monitor behaviour during period of implementing prohibition of driving and public realm enhancements.</p> <p>Revisit exemptions before implementation of permanent urban realm enhancements.</p> <p>Ensure enhancements cater for permitted vehicles and pedestrians in design principles.</p>
2	Inconvenience	Concern over Post Office Lane becoming one-way.	<p>If vehicles are permitted to use Post Office Lane in a Northbound direction the mandatory right turn at the Clarence St junction will force all vehicles through the prohibition of driving.</p> <p>Access to Post Office Lane needs be maintained at all times due to the nature of businesses that access it.</p>	<p>Post Office Lane needs to become one way southbound for vehicular traffic to enable the prohibition of driving.</p> <p>Contra-flow cycling could be considered prior to TRO advertisements although better</p>

3	Safety	Keep pelican crossing in Royal Well.	<p>The pelican crossing in Royal Well Road is currently a well used facility due to the traffic volume/pedestrian flow/width of road.</p> <p>The prohibition of driving in Clarence Street will mean that the traffic flow around the current pelican location will be much reduced. In addition to this it is the intention to bring clarity to the new no entry restriction in a southbound direction, from Clarence Parade into Royal Well Road, by significantly narrowing the carriageway.</p> <p>Because of the reasoning above it was the position that a signalised crossing point was no longer required at this location. However from discussions at the exhibitions and from the consultation questionnaires received there is clearly a perception that a controlled crossing is required. In light of this it is recommended that along with the alterations to the footway width it would be reasonable to install a zebra crossing to replace the outdated pelican installation.</p>	<p>adjacent routes exist for cyclists.</p> <p>Include zebra crossing in existing pelican location in addition to kerb line alterations.</p>
4	Safety	Concern over removal of pedestrian crossings.	<p>The only facilities that are identified for removal are where either; amended traffic flow indicates a different facility more appropriate is replacing it (i.e. zebra or island) or the traffic flow is anticipated to become such that a pedestrian crossing would hardly ever be used and the site would no longer meet the requirements for a facility.</p> <p>All designs would be subject to road safety audits as the design proceeds, before works are undertaken on site and once again following site completion.</p>	<p>Submit designs for safety/mobility audits as design progresses.</p>
5	Safety	Pedestrian crossing needed from Montpellier Gardens.	<p>The scheme proposals are unlikely to have a significant effect to traffic or pedestrian flow in the area around Montpellier Gardens.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
6	Safety	Stop traffic from Rodney Road entering the High Street.	<p>The consultation proposals did not include any restriction to driving through the route Rodney Road – High Street – Winchcombe Street.</p> <p>There is a current requirement for vehicles to use this route for deliveries, access to shops, access to P&D</p>	<p>Impose no restriction at this time. Monitor traffic flow/speed/behaviour and address accordingly should prohibition at Boots Corner proceed.</p>

			<p>parking and for access to disabled parking. It has long been apparent to the project team for the potential for this route to become busier with traffic following implementation of any prohibition of driving at Boots Corner.</p> <p>Although it is recognised that any increase in traffic in this area, particularly through the High Street, is undesirable it is felt that restricting through traffic would be difficult to enforce given the numerous exemptions that would be required.</p>	<p>Over 80% of passengers use bus services for which the GCC does not provide any financial support; i.e. the bus companies provide them as part of their normal business. Therefore it is important for them that income covers the costs of running services.</p> <p>Where income is insufficient to cover costs then the GCC can provide financial support to run a service. Decisions about how public funds are spent have to be prioritised alongside other services provided by GCC. Furthermore, any decision taken to provide funding for bus or community transport routes will consider how many users will be affected and access to essential services such as employment, education, non-emergency health services, such as GP surgeries, and essential shopping.</p> <p>GCC's Integrated Transport team work with public transport providers to seek to improve services in cases where it is both affordable and feasible.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
8	Accessibility	More park and ride sites are required.	<p>Construction of a new park and ride site at Elmbridge is about to be submitted for planning application with the intention of starting construction in 2015.</p> <p>Park and ride sites at Brockworth/Shurdington, West of Gloucester and Uckington are included within Local Transport Plan 3 for development during the plan period up to 2026. However, no sites have yet been identified, nor has funding been secured.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	

9	Accessibility	Park and ride services are too far for some people.	It is understood that park and ride facilities cannot always be positioned so that they can serve absolutely everybody. Sites are considered for implementation where they can meet a suitable level of demand.	None required.
10	Accessibility	Make buses cheaper.	<p>As set out in the response to comment 7, well over 80% of passengers use bus services that do not receive funding from GCC. There are many factors that influence fares charged including: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wages and costs of employment such as national insurance and pensions – not only for drivers but maintenance teams, cleaners, supervisors and managers. • Staff training, including driver training. An enhanced driving test and Certificate of Professional Competence is required • Purchasing buses – a brand new single deck bus costs well over £135,000 • Ticketing equipment • Maintenance parts and costs of repairs, including accidents and vandalism • Fuel, oil etc and tyres • Insurances – public liability and vehicle • Licences • Depot costs <p>Having said that there are a number of lower fare initiatives provided by bus companies, for example Stagecoach Megariders that allow 7 days unlimited travel in an area such as Cheltenham Town or throughout Gloucestershire. GCC is currently looking to introduce a range of tickets and passes that will be available for use on most bus companies' services with the intention of making bus travel more attractive.</p> <p>GCC also administers the statutory concessionary bus pass scheme whereby Gloucestershire residents, both</p>	None required.

			male and female, over the pensionable age of a woman can travel without charge between 9.30am and 11pm on Mondays to Fridays and any time at weekends. Concessionary bus passes are also available to those Gloucestershire residents that may be eligible on grounds of their disability and for which evidence is required.	
11	Accessibility	Make bus services more regular and reliable.	A quality bus service is an important prerequisite of achieving modal shift and encouraging more people to use public transport. Measures are being taken under the wider LSTF scheme to make improvements to services. These include provision of a new real time passenger information system giving people access to information from on street and mobile devices. The new system will also be linked to traffic signals to reduce delays to buses and ensure services are more reliable. A large element of the purpose of the CTP concerns offsetting future expected congestion increases which would be likely to damage bus service reliability.	Measures to improve bus services are in progress. Intervention in predicted increasing congestion levels can aid quality of bus service.
12	Accessibility	Improve bus map and information.	A new multi-operator bus map has been produced for Cheltenham that shows all the most frequent bus services in the town. This has been popular with local people contacted by travel advisors and wider distribution is planned.	New bus map available, distributed to a more widespread audience.
13	Accessibility	Improve the bus station.	CBC intends to redevelop the site of the existing Royal Well Bus station. However, they will retain provision for buses to access the area, and bus stops/laybys will be provided as part of the new development.	CBC to progress with consideration of improvements to bus station.
14	Accessibility	Promote other forms of transport.	General modal shift is being addressed by the wider LSTF project, measures include travel advisors speaking with local residents about journey options, promotional campaigns with local businesses and working with local schools to promote cycling.	LSTF encouraging modal shift through listed measures.
15	Accessibility	Review and improve car parks.	Car parks around the Town are owned either privately or by the Borough Council..	Improve signing to car parks.

			<p>Improvements are however proposed to the signing of car parks around the Town. In addition changes to the one way system will improve access to Beechwood Arcade, Town Centre East, Rodney Road and Regents Arcade car parks. The new multi storey car park given development permission at North Place will improve the quality of car parking provision.</p> <p>As above, however it should be noted that car parking pricing strategies are developed on a competitive basis. Overpriced car parks which lead to under usage are not in the interest of the facility operator.</p> <p>Many factors effect where people choose to shop. Removing the through traffic from the town centre enables the implementation of a pedestrian focussed public space design improving the shopper and visitor experience of Cheltenham and therefore securing the economic viability.</p> <p>Cheltenham town centre has a generous allocation of car parks. Currently 14 off street car parks are located within half a kilometre of the Municipal Offices. In addition numerous pay and display bays exist on surrounding streets. There are also locations where free, limited waiting on street parking can be found.</p> <p>Surveys have concluded that the car parks around the town operate well under capacity, particularly Grosvenor Terrace, Sherbourne Place and St Georges Road. A new car park signing scheme offering more information about car park type and location is to be introduced within the CTP proposals to offer a more cohesive signing strategy.</p>	
16	Accessibility	Reduce the cost of car parks.		For CBC to consider.
17	Accessibility	Car parking costs cause people to shop out of town.		Remove through traffic and increase public realm quality to promote town centre shopping.
18	Accessibility	More car parks are needed on the outskirts of town.		Implement car park signing strategy.
19		LEFT BLANK		
20	Modal Shift	Improve the cycle network.	<p>One of the primary objects of the CTP is to reduce congestion by encouraging alternative transport choices. Improvements to the cycle network are an important factor within this. Encouraging cycling is a Government objective, indeed it was announced in August that 8 Cities in England were to share £77m to spend on cycle</p>	<p>Include improvements to permeability in the roads listed. Continue to engage with cycle groups to achieve best practice.</p>

			<p>promotion schemes. The CTP consultation has engaged with local cycling advisory groups. Although broadly supportive these groups felt that the plan could go further to implement measures to improve cycling access to the town centre. As a result of this, GCC proposes further provisions to those already within the consultation proposal which include; Bath Road, Albion Street, Oriol Road and Imperial Square. Improved cycle linkages including two way cycling will be investigated for The Promenade, Clarence St, High St, Pittville St, Imperial Circus, Winchcombe St, Rodney Road, Grosvenor Place, Wellington St and Grosvenor St. The Government proposes alterations to legislation to enable Highway Authorities to make provisions for cyclists easier to implement. Although the CTP will seek to address improvements in the roads listed above under the current proposals it may be that some of the roads are treated once the changes to legislation are made. GCC is committed to encouraging cycling and better permeability wherever it is deemed safe and achievable. See 20 above. See 20 above.</p>
21	Safety	Provide more cycle paths.	See 20 above.
22	Modal Shift	Allow two-way cycling in one way streets.	See 20 above.
23	Safety	Create separate cycle paths through pedestrian areas.	<p>During the consultation events it was apparent there was a view, albeit anecdotal, that cycling through the pedestrian areas was the cause of accidents. Although it is difficult to find any tangible evidence of this the project team acknowledges this is a widely held view and therefore a difficult issue to balance given the commitment to cycling and modal shift. Through the Pittville Street, Imperial Circus and Boots Corner area to be treated under the urban enhancement phase of the project, the issue of a segregated cycle/pedestrian facility is easier to resolve than it is further along the Western area which was previously</p> <p>Make provision for two way un-segregated cycleway through the High Street to connect with additional cycling provisions in no 20.</p>

			pedestrianised. Evidence from other areas suggest that segregated cycleways within a pedestrian area are frequently unobserved as access is required to adjacent shops, destinations and routes. The difficulty of cyclist enforcement in addition to the detrimental appearance on the environment combine to suggest cycle routes should be un-segregated.	
24	Accessibility	Support the introduction of trams.	The move towards a meaningful tram network would require levels of funding and alterations not within the scope of this project.	None required.
25	Non-specific	General support for the plan to improve the town centre environment.	From the consultation results there appears to be a general level of support for the project with only 27% of respondents entirely unresponsive of the proposed changes.	None required.
26	Non-specific	Plans are a waste of money.	See 25 above.	See 25 above.
27	Non-specific	Improve shops and town centre area.	Securing the economic viability of Cheltenham is an important part of the proposals. Indications from developers are that, by improving the town centre for people, further investment in retail outlets within the town centre are likely to be achieved.	Expectation that this will occur as a result of implementation of the improvements.
28	Non-specific	Lower the rent for shops.	The issue of shop rental rates is outside of the remit of this project.	None required.
29	Non-specific	Spend the money on more important things.	In 2012 the County Council made a successful bid to the Department for Transport for funding in relation to the LSTF project. The bid made specific reference for how and on what the money would be spent. This now stipulates the parameters of the project, which DfT monitors to ensure compliance.	The money being spent on the CTP is ring fenced for this purpose.
30	Non-specific	Repair potholes and resurface instead.	See 29 above.	See 29 above.
31	Non-specific	Support for tree planting	Of the 1,159 people who replied to the question; Which of the public space options would you support for boots corner if traffic is restricted? 51% supported tree planting, 28% supported water feature, 17% supported an event space and 5%	Results to be considered by CBC as part of ongoing design.

32	Non-specific	supported a centrepiece sculpture. See 31 above.	See 31 above.
33	Safety	<p>supported a centrepiece sculpture. See 31 above.</p> <p>One of the primary aims of the CTP is to offset the effect of the predicted worsening congestion around the town. The traffic model GCC has used suggests that the effect of the CTP and wider LSTF project will reduce area wide traffic volume within the modelled road network (approx 3/4 mile radius of town centre) by 5-6% against predicted volume levels in 2026.</p> <p>The traffic modelling report details which roads will feature higher traffic volumes and which will feature reduced volumes. This report was made available during the consultation period and is still available for review on the website.</p> <p>Gaining an understanding of the public view towards 'providing an enhanced town centre environment with associated economic benefits plus the intervention into worsening congestion verses the increase in traffic volume on some surrounding roads' has been the main motive of the consultation.</p> <p>From the headline results of the wide reaching consultation it would seem there is a public mandate to proceed with the proposals, albeit with some alterations. The design team recognises that some residents have genuine and understandable concerns about increased traffic volume on certain roads. While acknowledging the democratic mandate to proceed with the proposals the following measures are proposed by way of mitigation in addition to others outlined in this report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20mph zone on St Pauls Rd and surrounding area. • Amendments to taxi rank outside The Municipal Offices. • Investigate parking on All Saints Road. • Undertake further liaison with Cheltenham Ladies College around issues raised. • Upgrade Sandford Road crossing. 	<p>Concern about increased traffic congestion on surrounding routes.</p>
<p>Proceed with development of suggested measures.</p>			

34	Safety	Keep two lanes in Bath Rd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake VAS assessment at Thirlestaine Road. • Investigate Christowe Lane zebra position. • Offer School Travel Plan assistance to Cheltenham College Junior School. • Make amendments to signalised junction timings as necessary around Town. <p>The suggested measures above do not currently include proposals for some of the roads highlighted within the petition. Gloucester Road is to benefit from traffic signal works currently in progress and St Georges Street junction will form part of the St Margarets Rd corridor optimisation review (see 57). Should CBC be minded to proceed with the scheme it is proposed the project team should open a dialogue with representatives from St Lukes, College Rd, Old Bath Rd, Hewlett Rd and All Saints Rd to identify what measures could be added to the list above.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>
			<p>Reducing the length of Bath Road to one lane between the High Street and Oriel Road has been an aspiration for some time to increase safety and reduce speeds. It also gives us the opportunity to address a number of other issues.</p> <p><i>Issue:</i> Poor air quality in the area around The Strand.</p> <p><i>Proposal:</i> Remove traffic signals.</p> <p><i>Issue:</i> Evening cruisers using the Bath Road as part of 'the circuit'.</p> <p><i>Proposal:</i> restrict opportunity for speeding.</p> <p><i>Issue:</i> Difficulty crossing Bath Road.</p> <p><i>Proposal:</i> Narrower carriageway widths aided with introduction of safe informal crossing points.</p> <p><i>Issue:</i> Alteration of Oriel Road to two-way would require a new signalised junction at Bath Road if two lanes</p>	<p>Develop proposals for Bath Road with the general principle of a reduction in number of running lanes.</p>

35	Safety	Concern about removal of traffic signals.	<p>existed on Bath Road.</p> <p><i>Proposal:</i> Install give way junction.</p> <p>GCC and GH often receive comments about the number of traffic signals in and around Cheltenham. The removal of traffic signals under these proposals have only been considered where the altered traffic management and prohibitions of driving will lead to a significant change to traffic flows leaving the existing signals superfluous and the cause of unnecessary delay or congestion. The proposal in the Town centre seeks to avoid the use of signalised junctions unless essential for traffic management or road safety reasons.</p>	Remove signals where appropriate.
36	Inconvenience	Concerns over access once changes have been made.	<p>Access arrangements will clearly be different under the proposals.</p> <p>Access to Rodney Road and Regent Street as well as Grosvenor Place car park and the Beechwood shopping centre will become easier as part of the revocations of some of the one way traffic orders.</p> <p>The prohibition of driving through Boots Corner will mean that it will not be possible to drive through Clarence Street/North Street or Pittville Street/Imperial Circus.</p> <p>It is important to note that access arrangements and routes for buses will not change.</p> <p>In order to enable access easier it has been decided to exempt hackney carriages from the prohibition of driving during the day as well as the evening hours.</p> <p>This is not a suggestion that has been considered lightly given the concern about vehicles within the pedestrian area generally, as outlined in number 1. It is intended that this would be on a basis of constant review to ensure standards of considerate driving meet the level required for the area.</p>	Permit hackney carriages into core restricted area throughout day and evening.
37	Inconvenience	Access and pick up for elderly and disabled drivers may be difficult.	See 36 above.	See 36 above.
38	Inconvenience	New access routes will confuse	Should the decision to proceed with the proposals be	Further consideration at detailed

		local people and visitors – need clear information.	made, the next phase of the process will be to begin a detailed design of the scheme. At this point we will examine how the work should be sequenced for the lowest impact and also how it can be made clear to road users that access and flow arrangements have been altered. The scheme features a review of all road signing within the town centre with the intention of making adjustments for clarity and de-cluttering.	design phase. Implement signing review and alterations.
39	Inconvenience	No consideration has been made of traffic from future development sites.	In the 2016 future year traffic modelling, the forecast traffic growth included all housing, employment and retail developments with existing planning permission, as well as all committed and allocated developments in the Cheltenham Local Plan period, with all programmed highway network improvements also included. For the forecast period 2016 to 2026, growth factors were extracted from TEMPRO and applied for 'car drivers' in the Cheltenham area (TEMPRO is a DfT database which provides estimates for the growth of population, employment and trip ends for a series of future years, and takes account of all strategic development allocations on an area-wide basis). As TEMPRO does not cover Light Goods and Heavy Goods Vehicles, growth factors for these were derived from the DfT's long term National Transport Model (NTEM). Therefore, all land use developments with planning permissions at the time when the future year traffic forecasts were derived were included in the traffic assessment exercise	None required.
40	Inconvenience	Concern about Oriel Rd (and Imperial Lane, Albion St) becoming two way.	The alteration of these roads from one-way to two-way is with the intention of increasing ease of accessibility and to enable a reduction in the distance vehicles need to drive to get to their destination. It also presents the opportunity for greater permeability for cycling which advice suggests is one of the main barriers preventing increases to numbers of cyclists.	Acknowledge concerns but increased accessibility important to reducing congestion.
41	Information	Concern about insufficient	The public consultation of the CTP attempted to use all	None required.

		avenues to reach as many residents and stakeholders as possible while providing plenty of time to seek additional information where it was desired. Some examples of how we tried to achieve this were; delivered consultation packs to 16,000 residents, undertook 10 exhibitions initially adding another 3 in August following requests, responded to emails for further information, developed an area of the website to house additional information and added to it as further information became available, identified effected stakeholders and offered meetings where appropriate, enabled residents to respond directly to the consultation online. In order to ensure the consultation achieved the highest levels of best practice, GCC asked The Consultation Institute to quality assure the CTP consultation and a transport consultation expert was appointed by them for this role. The Consultation Institute will be reporting their findings in due course and their report will be made available on GCC's website www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/cheltenhamtp	
42	Safety	Reduce the speed limit at Boots Corner.	Urban realm scheme to be designed to only enable appropriate vehicle speeds.
43	Inconvenience	Reduce the number of traffic signals.	Traffic signals removed within scope of project wherever feasible.
44	Inconvenience	Changes to town centre access will deter visitors to town.	None required.

			that access to the town is not being reduced but the use of the town centre as a through route is. Difficulty in negotiating the one way system as well as problems finding car parks will be addressed by including additional two-way traffic flows and a new signing strategy. The improvement to the environment at Boots Corner is set to enhance the experience for visitors as well as encouraging further investment in shopping and leisure all of which is expected to lead to more visitors rather than fewer.	
45	Inconvenience	Oppose plans as they will increase traffic problem.	The traffic modelling report identifies that the current proposals reduce levels of traffic volume congestion by 5-6% against predictions for 2026. Although it is clear that some routes are likely to see an increase in traffic volume as a direct result of the alterations there are plans in place to mitigate the effect of this (see no.33).	Consider mitigation measures as no. 33.
46	Safety	Pedestrianisation will lead to more crime and safety issues at night.	It is understandable that the sense of having a higher level of passing surveillance from vehicles using Clarence Street could increase the perception of personal safety. Although the volume of traffic is to be reduced by the proposed prohibition of driving there is a balance associated with the increase in safety of separating night time revellers from through traffic. During the hours of the night-time economy there is potential for pedestrians to be less aware of traffic through being distracted or under the influence of alcohol.	None required.
47	Modal Shift	Provide more cycle parking.	The LSTF project is funding a scheme to increase the cycle parking provision in Cheltenham. The scheme is set to install provision for another 52 bicycles and will be completed by mid November 2013.	None required.
48		LEFT BLANK		
49	Safety	Concern about new access routes affecting schools, colleges, ambulances and hospitals.	The prohibition of driving through Clarence Street and Pittville Street will not affect access to town centre schools, colleges, hospitals.	Alterations either unlikely to cause significant effect or localised mitigation to be considered as no.33.

			<p>Emergency vehicles will be exempt from any traffic order that will be implemented. Some local amenities are situated on roads that are likely to see an increase in traffic flow. Where this is the case the increase is either; minimal to the extent that significant effect is unlikely to be experienced, or local mitigation to increase pedestrian safety is being considered.</p>
--	--	--	---

Summary of Comments from Stakeholders.

List of Abbreviations:

- GCC – Gloucestershire County Council
- CBC – Cheltenham Borough Council
- CTP – Cheltenham Transport Plan
- LSTF – Local Sustainable Transport Fund
- GH – Gloucestershire Highways

Stakeholder	No.	Issue	What they told us	Our Comments	Suggestion
Disability Forum.	50	Inconvenience	Concern over loss of blue badge parking in Pittville St.	In order that the prohibition of driving in Pittville Street is workable and enforceable it will not be possible to retain the blue badge parking in Pittville Street. Alternative provision could be investigated in Winchcombe Street, The Promenade, Regent Street and other roads in order to achieve a parking balance.	Alternative spaces to be investigated.
	51	Safety	How will buses, delivery vehicles and cyclists be accommodated within the Boots Corner enhancement design.	This is the subject of ongoing design development by our colleagues at CBC with input from GCC. Clearly managing this interaction in a safe manner is critical to the success of the	Urban enhancement scheme proposals to be subject to road safety audits during development, also gain input from local disability groups.

	<p>design. CBC have created a design group with representatives of the disability forum to ensure a workable solution is achieved.</p> <p>The scheme design is at an early stage so it is far too early to advise on this level of detail.</p> <p>It is noted that these are important issues and will be discussed through the design forum as design development proceeds.</p>	<p>To be advised when details become clear.</p>
<p>52</p> <p>Safety</p>	<p>What will be the method of construction and how will the programme of working areas be communicated.</p>	<p>Following the implementation of the schemes forming the Cheltenham Transport Plan there will commence a period of monitoring and observation in order to evaluate the impact of the changes that have been introduced. As the changes will lead to a large number of existing journeys being re-routed there will be an initial period of time over two to three months where traffic levels will experience high levels of variation. It is also likely that additional changes to traffic signals junction timings will need to be made to respond to these changes.</p> <p>Therefore a six month period after the completion of the works would be required before any meaningful monitoring and evaluation could begin. The exact timing of 'after' surveys would depend on the time of year and would need to be carried out in neutral months for traffic surveys. The following traffic data would be gathered to monitor the effects of the scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicle flow • Junction turning counts • Vehicle speed surveys • Queue length surveys
<p>Stakeholder – C5 Parish Council Group</p>	<p>53</p> <p>Information</p> <p>How will the scheme be monitored post implementation.</p>	<p>Undertake monitoring as suggested.</p>

<p>Stakeholder – Chelt Civic Society.</p>	<p>54</p>	<p>Safety</p>	<p>Whether it would be better to remove all vehicles from Boots Corner.</p>	<p>In addition to traffic data further surveys would be undertaken to establish other impacts of the scheme and these would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian footfall in the town centre • Attitudinal surveys amongst key groups which would include, businesses, people with mobility issues, taxi and bus operators. <p>The survey information would be used to complete an evaluation report that would provide Cheltenham Borough Council with evidence of the impact of the scheme, the views of stakeholders and other groups. This could then be used to either retain the changes in their implemented state or propose alterations to the scheme. There may also be evidence that supports carrying out additional work in surrounding areas to address and mitigate any unforeseen changes in areas away from the scheme.</p> <p>A number of consultation respondents suggested that the Boots Corner area would be further enhanced if the area were entirely vehicle free.</p> <p>GCC is committed to enabling a high quality bus service that promotes use wherever possible. It seems clear that preventing buses access to the heart of the town centre is not consistent with this position.</p> <p>Many of the shops and outlets in this area need access to continue to receive deliveries, preventing this would inevitably</p>	<p>Include exemptions as no 1.</p>
---	-----------	---------------	---	---	------------------------------------

			lead to closures and empty units which is not in accordance with the goal of economic progression		
55	Inconvenience	The impact of displaced vehicles on the surrounding road network.	Increase in traffic caused by housing developments.	See no. 33.	See no. 33.
56	Inconvenience	Efficiency of the traffic signals along the St Margaret's Road corridor.	Increase in traffic caused by housing developments.	See no. 39.	See no. 39.
57	Inconvenience	Efficiency of the traffic signals along the St Margaret's Road corridor.	Increase in traffic caused by housing developments.	See no. 39.	See no. 39.
58	Modal Shift	Importance of promoting alternative transport solution and whether the railway station could form a more important strategic link.	Efficiency of the traffic signals along the St Margaret's Road corridor.	See no. 39.	See no. 39.
59	Inconvenience	Should Imperial Sq convert to two way traffic and Oriel Road	Efficiency of the traffic signals along the St Margaret's Road corridor.	See no. 39.	See no. 39.

		stay as existing.	could be: Reduction in accessibility from Regent Street to South East Cheltenham. Increase in traffic on Imperial Sq (East), Montpellier Spa Road and Montpellier Drive. Remove the possibility of a future bus route from The Promenade directly to the A46 corridor.	
60	Inconvenience	Importance of improving access to car parks.	Agreed. Measures to make car park accessibility easier and clearer are to be achieved through adjustments to one way system and an improved signing strategy.	None Required.
61	Non-specific	That it was necessary to re-examine the town signing strategy and declutter wherever possible.	Agreed. Proposals in signing review will reduce the number of signs where possible or remove redundant signs.	None Required.
62	Inconvenience	Taxi drivers wish to be included within the daytime bus exemption.	See no. 36.	See no. 36.
63	Non-specific	Would like to have a taxi bay in Regent St.	Parking arrangements in Regent Street are to be reviewed to investigate disabled provision. Potential for a taxi bay will be investigated at the same time.	Investigate under Regent Street review.
64	Non-specific	Re-open Ormond Place to traffic or just taxis.	Ormond Place was closed as an access to The Promenade some time ago. Given the way the area currently operates (bus stops etc.) there are no plans to reverse this closure.	None Required.
65	Non-specific	Require same provisions and restrictions to that made for hackney carriages.	At present the proposal is to be amended to include an exemption for prohibition of driving through Clarence Street/Pittville Street for hackney carriages. It is not currently planned to exempt private hire taxis for the following reasons: There are a large number of registered private hire vehicles in Cheltenham and the surrounding area which is not considered to	Prohibit private hire vehicles as previously proposed.
Stakeholder – Hackney Carriage Assoc.				Page 5
Stakeholder – Private Hire Representatives.				

				be in keeping with the intention for the area. Previous experience of traffic order camera enforcement elsewhere suggests that maintaining a record of approved private hire vehicles quickly becomes unworkable.	
66	Non-specific	Clarity of the Town Centre provision of taxi ranks and pick up/set down bays.	Request for additional enforcement of the single yellow line in the Montpellier Walk area.	The project team is unsure of which particular bays lack clarity. Contact to be made through the CBC licensing team to investigate if some of the issues can be resolved within the scope of this project.	Request CBC licensing team to contact regarding identification and clarification.
67	Information	A review of strategic signing routes requested.	Request for additional enforcement of the single yellow line in the Montpellier Walk area.	As previously described a review of the signing around the town is to be included within the scope of this project.	Review signing.
68	Non-specific	Requirement for loading area adjacent to the Oriel Rd entrance, similar to that already in place.	Request for additional enforcement of the single yellow line in the Montpellier Walk area.	Enforcement of traffic regulation orders is outside of the responsibility of this project, however contact will be made with partnering authorities to advise of this request.	Request to be sent to appropriate authority.
69	Inconvenience	Concerns around the proposal to reverse the one-way system in the North end of Sherbourne Place.	Requirement for loading area adjacent to the Oriel Rd entrance, similar to that already in place.	The preliminary design discussed at the initial engagement meeting is under review and will be amended to accommodate. Further meeting with Playhouse is planned.	Amend design.
70	Safety	If TRO enforcement is required consider via cameras rather than physical means to block the carriageway.	Concerns around the proposal to reverse the one-way system in the North end of Sherbourne Place.	Following the consultation meeting with representatives of Bence Builders Merchants the proposal should be amended to retain the current arrangements in Sherbourne Street as existing.	Sherbourne Street to remain as existing.
71	Safety	Support the scheme in principle. Acknowledgement that current situation is not sustainable and must address current	Request for additional enforcement of the single yellow line in the Montpellier Walk area.	The current proposal for enforcement is via Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras rather than other means (rising bollard etc.) due to difficulty managing exemptions.	Proceed with proposal for ANPR cameras.
72	General	Support the scheme in principle. Acknowledgement that current situation is not sustainable and must address current	Request for additional enforcement of the single yellow line in the Montpellier Walk area.	Acknowledge Chamber support for proposals and understand that the Chamber has requested certain elements are also investigated.	Continue investigating requests for other amendments.

Stakeholder - English Heritage	73	General	<p>traffic problems.</p> <p>Thank you for consulting us on the draft transport plan for the town centre.</p> <p>English Heritage welcomes this positive initiative that includes a series of interventions in the public realm which if appropriately designed and executed will have a positive impact on the towns historic environment and setting of important landmark buildings in particular.</p> <p>We would endorse the principle of 'less is more' and the consideration of guidance in Manual for Streets (I&II) and Streets for All. Limiting road markings (painted signs on tarmac); avoiding the use of guardrails and excessive intrusive signs are all to be encouraged.</p>	<p>Acknowledge English Heritage support and will encourage and implement design principles wherever practicable.</p>	Acknowledged support.
Stakeholder - Supergroup (Superdry, Clarence St)	74	General	<p>Confirmation "that supergroup is extremely supportive of the proposed plans to upgrade the streetscape and re-direct traffic opposite our store".</p>	<p>Acknowledge support.</p>	Acknowledged support.
Stakeholder - Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycle Campaign	75	Modal Shift	<p>Welcomes general principles of project.</p> <p>Would like to see improvement in permeability – permit 2-way cycling in one way roads.</p>	<p>Further alterations to improve cycle permeability proposed. See note 20.</p>	See no 20.
Stakeholder -	76	General	<p>Broad support for scheme,</p>	<p>Acknowledge support.</p>	Acknowledged support.

Stagecoach			identifies issues with "obsession with public realm at the expense of practicalities and pragmatism".		
Stakeholder – Regent Arcade	77	General	"Fully support the proposals"	Acknowledge support.	Acknowledge support.
Stakeholder – Martin Commercial Prop.Brewery Management.	78	General	Writing on behalf of the owners and tenants..to express support for the Cheltenham Transport Plan proposals.	Acknowledge support.	

The risk			Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk					
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-5	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
	If the Council considers the report without recognising concerns of the separate petition, any resultant decision may not be fully informed and is likely to be unsound	Mike Redman	01/11/13	4	4	16	Reduce	Consider report and petition at same meeting and ensure concerns are reflected in decision making process			
Explanatory notes											
Impact – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-5 (1 being least impact and 5 being major or critical)											
Likelihood – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6 (1 being almost impossible, 2 is very low, 3 is low, 4 significant, 5 high and 6 a very high probability)											
Control - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close											

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 50

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 60