



# CHELTENHAM

## BOROUGH COUNCIL

### Notice of a meeting of Overview & Scrutiny Committee

**Monday, 26 October 2015**  
**6.00 pm**  
**Pittville Room - Municipal Offices**

<b>Membership</b>	
<b>Councillors:</b>	Tim Harman (Chair), Colin Hay (Vice-Chair), Nigel Britter, Chris Mason, Sandra Holliday, Helena McCloskey, Dan Murch, John Payne, Chris Ryder and Max Wilkinson

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

### Agenda

<b>1.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b> Councillor Murch	
<b>2.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING</b> 21 September 2015	(Pages 3 - 12)
<b>4.</b>	<b>PUBLIC AND MEMBER QUESTIONS, CALLS FOR ACTIONS AND PETITIONS</b>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE</b>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED</b> None of the county scrutiny groups have met since the last meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (21 September)	
<b>7.</b>	<b>CABINET BRIEFING</b> An update from the Cabinet on key issues for Cabinet Members which may be of interest to Overview and Scrutiny and may inform the O&S workplan	
<b>8.</b>	<b>GROWING PLACES - ALLOTMENT STRATEGY</b> Discussion paper of the Allotments Officer (no decision required)	(Pages 13 - 36)
<b>9.</b>	<b>CHELTENHAM SPA RAILWAY STATION SCRUTINY</b>	(Pages

		<b>TASK GROUP REPORT</b> Report of the Cheltenham Spa Railway Station scrutiny task group, to be presented by Councillor Roger Whyborn as Chairman of the task group (see recommendations)	37 - 58)
10.		<b>CYCLING &amp; WALKING SCRUTINY TASK GROUP REPORT</b> Report of the Cycling and Walking scrutiny task group, to be presented by Councillor Max Wilkinson as Chairman of the task group (see recommendations)	(Pages 59 - 86)
11.		<b>UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS</b> DRAFT Devolution STG one page strategy (for approval) DRAFT Broadband STG one page strategy (to follow)	(Pages 87 - 90)
12.		<b>REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN</b>	(Pages 91 - 94)
13.		<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b> 30 November 2015	

**Contact Officer:** Saira Malin, Democracy Officer, 01242 775153

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

### Overview & Scrutiny Committee

**Monday, 21st September, 2015**

**6.00 - 8.15 pm**

<b>Attendees</b>	
<b>Councillors:</b>	Tim Harman (Chair), Colin Hay (Vice-Chair), Chris Mason, Dan Murch, John Payne, Chris Ryder, Garth Barnes (Reserve) and Rob Reid (Reserve)
<b>Also in attendance:</b>	Councillor Klara Sudbury, Saira Malin and Councillor Matt Babbage, Councillor Steve Jordan (Leader), Paul Evans, Paul Dennison, Wayne Ellis (Severn Trent), Rob Bell (Ubico) and Scott Williams, Andrew North (Chief Executive), David Neudegg (2020 Vision programme), Councillor Bryan Robinson (Forest of Dean District Council), Councillor Klara Sudbury and Shirin Wotherspoon

### Minutes

**1. APOLOGIES**

Councillors McCloskey, Wilkinson, Britter and Holliday had given their apologies. Councillors Reid and Barnes substituted for Councillors McCloskey and Wilkinson respectively.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No interests were declared.

**3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

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

Upon a vote it was unanimously

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on the 29 June be agreed and signed as an accurate record.**

**4. PUBLIC AND MEMBER QUESTIONS, CALLS FOR ACTIONS AND PETITIONS**

None had been received.

**5. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE**

No matters had been referred to the committee.

**6. FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED**

Councillor McCloskey had given her apologies and as such, an update on the Police and Crime Panel had been circulated with the agenda.

A written update on the Economic Development and Health and Care scrutiny committees had been provided by Councillor Clucas and circulated with the agenda.

Members were asked to contact the relevant member with any queries or comments.

### **7. CABINET BRIEFING**

The Leader hoped that all members would be aware that a Gloucestershire devolution bid had been submitted on the 4 September 2015. This had involved a lot of work throughout August and resulted in a detailed 66 page document, which had been circulated to all members. It was now a case of waiting for Government's decision about who would be in the first stage. The themed groups that were set up to look at different aspects of the bid were ongoing and were now starting to look at the 'bottom lines' for all districts. He suggested that a task group should be set –up to look at the 'bottom line' for Cheltenham and having had a discussion with Mark Hawthorne, Leader of Gloucestershire County Council, he agreed that a unilateral discussion between CBC and the County would be useful.

### **8. SEVERN TRENT**

Wayne Ellis, Paul Dennison and Paul Evans from Severn Trent introduced a PowerPoint presentation (attached at Appendix 1).

The following responses were given to member questions;

- Severn Trent tended only to engage with the Environment Agency (EA) when undertaking works and were not aware of the EA setting up any groups to look at particular issues.
- Severn Trent were not aware of any businesses in the Suffolks that were dissatisfied with the compensation they had received and would be interested to have specific details if this was the case.

Members made the following comments;

- In Prestbury ward, Severn Trent had needed to cut a trench through the entire length of the allotment site and having canvassed residents there had not been a single complaint, but almost a year on, the compensation claim had still not been settled. Severn Trent would raise this with the relevant department.
- Thank you to Severn Trent and Ubico for the considerable assistance they offered to the elderly residents in her ward during the works.
- Having heard nothing but positive feedback from residents, a member hoped that Severn Trent recognised the benefits of engaging communities. Severn Trent should be proud and other utilities companies could learn from their approach.

The Chairman thanked the representatives of Severn Trent for their attendance and congratulated them on a job well done.

No decision was required.

**9. RECYCLING BULKING AND SALES - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Managing Director of Ubico, Project Sponsor and Richard Coole, the Project Manager, introduced the update as circulated with the agenda. The committee had reviewed the Project Initiation Document (PID) earlier in the year and in summary the project objectives were to bring the material bulking operation under Ubico on behalf of CBC and delegate the material marketing/sales responsibilities to the Joint Waste Team at Shire Hall. The Lead Officers on both streams of the project were reporting that the project was on track and there were no issues which would impact on project delivery.

The following responses were given to member questions;

- The market had always been volatile and could be affected by a number of things including the price of raw materials, emerging markets and the price of oil, though this impacted some materials and not others. This was a risk that the council had always and would always have to carry. The collection method used by Cheltenham resulted in a good quality material and this in turn meant that even when the market had crashed in the past, Cheltenham had always been successful in marketing its material.
- The traffic light system was not meant to mislead members, actions that were not yet completed were marked as green because they were on track and there was every confidence that they would be delivered on time.
- All partners had a different approach to waste, it was more expensive to collect waste that had been segregated at source but this resulted in a higher sale value and not segregating at source meant that it was cheaper to collect but would command a lower sale price. There were interesting arguments for both approaches.
- Income stream was a key output for the project and a strategic benefit. A long term aspiration would be to go out to market with waste from other partners, not just Cheltenham, although it was important that the highest quality was maintained.

A member commented that the move to sell the material as a commodity would put us in a better position than being tied into a contract at a less favourable rate.

The chairman thanked the Project Sponsor and Project Manager for their attendance and looked forward to the next update.

No decision was required.

**10. 2020 VISION**

The Chairman advised that he was minded to allow councillors in attendance but not on the O&S Committee, to ask questions at the appropriate stage. The committee were comfortable with this.

Andrew North first explained that at the Member Seminar held the previous week, members had commented that they did not feel that David Neudegg, Interim Managing Director for 2020 vision, was as visible as they felt he could

## Page 6

be and with this in mind he had invited David Neudegg to attend, as well a range of Officers to who would provide expert advice if required.

Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) was incredibly ambitious for the town and always striving for Cheltenham to be as good as it could be; something which was acknowledged by the Peer Review Team and reflected in their report addressed later on the Committee agenda. CBC did not keep large reserves, instead spending money to benefit the town and as a council it was prepared to borrow to fund such improvements. There were three elements which were key to enabling the council to deliver these ambitions; (1) the REST (Regulatory and Environmental Services Transformation) services which shaped the town's present and future (Planning, Licensing, Public Protection, etc); (2) key to place shaping was the Cheltenham Development Task Force which worked to develop sites across Cheltenham, not solely CBC sites; (3) the Engagement Team. Each of these three required a high degree of influence and control by Councillors and he could appreciate therefore, why Councillors did not want these services undermined.

The overarching ambition for 2020 Vision was "a number of councils, retaining their independence and identities, but working together and sharing resources to maximise benefit leading to more efficient, effective delivery of local services". The MTFS currently identified a funding gap over the next 4 years of £1.5m and he suggested that this was more likely to grow rather than reduce in the short term, meaning that in 5 years the council would either need to be spending £1.5m less or have increased revenues by this amount. The shared services which had been entered into to date had proved successful, not only in monetary terms, having saved the council £2.73m, but also in creating teams with a wider pool of expertise and greater capacity it had built resilience and offered staff increased career opportunities. The business case for 2020 identified annual savings to this council of £581k, with further savings of £227k which could potentially be achieved through the establishment of a local authority company and therefore have a significant role to play in closing the council's MTFS funding gap in the short to medium term. He stressed that the services being considered for sharing were not those place shaping functions earlier described, but support services such as customer services, revenues and benefits (including council tax collection) and property services, services which needed to be done well but not necessarily directly by this council.

The paper which had been circulated with the agenda outlined four options which ranged from full commitment (option 1) to full withdrawal (option 4) and as a council the decision should be based on; "how can we reap all of the benefits without losing our identity." Option 1 was for full membership of the 2020 Vision Joint Committee and Officer advice was that they were content to see this council sign-up to this model. It was important to note that Officers advised against Option 4, questioning how the council would be able to place shape effectively when financially it would operating with lack of money for future plans and investment. Options 2 and 3 were for consideration. Option 2, the "Arms-Length" option would see the council as a customer of the partnership venture and therefore likely to achieve less than the £581k and £227k savings discussed earlier. Option 3 and second in order of preference of Officers, was the "Preferred Partner" option and would see the council assume Observer status on the Joint Committee. Further, were the circumstances right,

rights would be sought to sign-up to the Teckal company and the governance arrangements that went with it.

David Neudegg thanked the committee for inviting him along and assured members that he would be available if they wished to extend future invitations. He explained that he was here in his role as Interim Managing Director of the 2020 Vision programme and was therefore representing all four partner authorities, including CBC. The individual councils had each, already undertaken sharing of services and at Cheltenham this included a diverse range of arrangements including the Cheltenham Trust, Ubico, Cheltenham Borough Homes and Go Shared Services (where the role of lead employer had been passed to Cotswold District Council). In 2014 the 2020 Vision Programme Board commissioned Activist to develop a strategic business case and at that time all partners were clear that they wanted to maintain their democratic mandate and have a minimal impact on councillors and customers. Two options were outlined in the Activist report; the first for a Joint Committee and the second for a Teckal company. The second option was the preferred one for three of the four partners and therefore the suggestion was that a Joint Committee would be created, before moving to a Teckal company after 18 months. These joint proposals were set out to the Member Governance Board (MGB) in June, at which stage Cheltenham asked that the link between trusted advisors and local authorities be strengthened. CIPFA carried out a quality assurance review of the business case, finding it to be robust and noted their belief that more substantial savings could be achieved from a deeper collaboration.

David Neudegg suggested that at a strategic level, councillors would have three questions; (1) does the Joint Committee adversely impact CBC. He assured members that the Joint Committee would be responsible for the on-going strategic delivery and governance to the required standards set out in the s101 Agreement(s) of all partners and not individual partners. This was clearly defined in the Terms of Reference for the Joint Committee; (2) the risk of organisation failure. As part of a collective this would mean four failures across the four partner organisations and there would be member oversight across all councils to ensure that this did not happen; (3) Impact on staff. A positive approach to staff engagement had been adopted at all four partner councils and staff workshops had been organised. At the start of the meeting he had circulated a joint statement (Appendix 2) from the other three partners (Cotswold, West Oxfordshire and Forest of Dean District Councils) in response to the four options that Cheltenham would be considering. The three partners urged Cheltenham members to support the recommendations of the MGB and join them as a full and welcome partner of the 2020 Partnership. Were Cheltenham to decide upon any of the other options, they would respect this decision and would hope to maintain a positive relationship. The alternative options being considered by Cheltenham had not been evaluated in great detail by the other partners at this stage, however, they were willing to undertake an independent review of the options, if necessary. The statement suggested that fears about decisions being taken that would adversely affect one partner were ill-founded, with no evidence of this having occurred over the established history of partnership working (GO Shared Services, Ubico or the 2020 Vision partnership). David Neudegg felt that the worse scenario for partners and staff was a hesitant partner; instead wanting partners who were positive and fully engaged.

The Chairman referred members to the paper which asked that the committee form a view on whether Cabinet should consider alternative options for sharing with the 2020 Vision partner councils.

Andrew North and David Neudegg gave the following responses to questions from members of the committee, as well as non-members who were in attendance;

- Engagement with members had been consistent at all partner councils, though debate at Cheltenham's Cabinet and recent Member Seminar had differed from those at other partners given the discussions about alternative options, which had not been repeated elsewhere.
- The other partners have confirmed that they would be willing to undertake an independent review of the options, however, this would not be as in-depth as the previous review and they had been clear that they do not want to delay the timescales any further.
- Full details of the functions and activities delegated to the Joint Committee were outlined in the draft constitution and included HR policies and procedure, finance and procurement rules and ICT network infrastructure. The constitution defined the powers that this council would delegate to the Joint Committee, who would in turn appoint David Neudegg to carry out those functions. Cheltenham Borough Council would have its own lead Director for retained functions.
- David Neudegg currently spends 3 days a week in the role of Interim Managing Director of 2020 Vision and spreads his time between all four partner sites.
- The role of Interim Managing Director was interim until 2017 as the MD role may not be required if a Teckal company is formed.
- A suggestion which would probably be welcomed by other partner councils would be that of forming a Member Liaison Group which would allow non-Cabinet Members to have a role in formally monitoring the Joint Committee.
- Staff and Trade Unions had been briefed throughout the process and feedback had been positive. Staff saw this as an opportunity not just for savings but for resilience and an opportunity to be part of first class services in the future.
- Cheltenham were open to establishing a Teckal company from the outset and it would have been possible to extend the existing arrangements but other partners were more comfortable with a Joint Committee in the first instance. This should be seen as a stepping stone to a Teckal company as the move from one to the other was reasonably straightforward.
- In spite of the savings that 2020 vision would generate, there would still be a budget gap over the course of the MTFs and the Section 151 Officer had worked over the weekend to identify means of bridging the gap. Whilst it was not appropriate for him to divulge the detail to this committee at this stage, members could be assured that there was a plan. This was not to say that there would be no need for further savings in the future.
- It was agreed that as a council we needed to think about how we would scrutinise shared services going forward. There was an extent to which



joint scrutiny could be undertaken and though this had not been fully considered it would likely be very valuable and something that officers would like to see happen.

- The formation of a Teckal company would see existing staff continue with their Local Government pension, whilst all new staff would be offered a stakeholder pension.
- Option 3 would allow Cheltenham to build in certain rights with observer status and at a point in the future, once it was comfortable, have an option to sign-up in the future. This would be subject to negotiation with the partner councils. This would undoubtedly require more time and effort, including having to get CIPFA back and would ultimately result in fewer savings. Officers appreciated that some members had concerns about governance and considered Option 3 to be a compromise but notwithstanding this, Officers were still recommending Option 1; full membership.
- As a full partner Cheltenham would still have the right to say which services it wanted to share and which it did not and if it was important to Cheltenham to keep REST back indefinitely then it could legitimately do so.

Councillor Bryan Robinson, Deputy Leader from Forest of Dean District Council was in attendance and accepted an invitation from the Chairman to share his thoughts on the Options being considered. He was of the opinion that existing shared services such as GO and ICT had proved effective and demonstrated potential to continue and build upon successes to do more. He would very much like to see Cheltenham choose Option 1 and felt that it would be a disservice to Cheltenham for them to be anything other than a full partner.

A member voiced support for Option 1 which he considered to be the right decision for Cheltenham. GO shared services had generated greater savings than originally expected and had resulted in a more resilient service which could retain staff and use systems that alone, it would have been unable to afford. He felt that at this stage, members needed to be clear and honest about their concerns.

The Chairman was of the view that Option 1 best served the interests of Cheltenham, its residents and staff and members agreed that this, the unanimous view of the committee, should be passed to Cabinet. The Chairman would attend Cabinet on the 13 October to present the views of this committee.

The Chairman thanked the Officers and members who had attended the meeting.

### **11. LGA PEER REVIEW - ACTION PLAN UPDATE**

The Chief Executive introduced the report as circulated with the agenda. He was pleased with the huge amount of progress that had been made since the LGA Peer Review in September 2014 and asked the committee to consider whether, given the progress that had been made, there was any value in having the Peer Review Team back to look at progress. He had formed part of two Peer Review Teams in the past and suggested that follow-up visits were often requested by councils to have their achievements recognised and commended rather than in the expectation that more recommendations would be made. Notwithstanding the organisation and cost associated with such a visit, officers

were so stretched at the moment that they would unlikely be able to accommodate a return review and therefore he had to recommend that the Peer Team were not invited to return.

The Chairman was satisfied that progress was being made and suggested that it was the role of this committee to ensure that progress continues to be made.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

**RESOLVED that;**

1. **Progress, as set out on the LGA Peer Review action plan update, be noted.**
2. **There would be little value to inviting the Peer Review Team to undertake a follow-up, given the progress that has been made and instead the committee would review progress again in another 6 months.**

**12. SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2014-15**

The Chairman introduced the scrutiny annual report 2014-15 as circulated with the agenda. The report detailed some of the successes from last year and outlined some of the areas of focus for the coming year.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

**RESOLVED that the Annual Report of Overview and Scrutiny 2014-15 be endorsed and forward to Council to be noted.**

**13. UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS**

The Democracy Officer gave the following updates on various scrutiny task groups;

Cycling and Walking STG – the task group had concluded their review and were in the process of establishing implications for the numerous recommendations they planned to make in the final report. This was scheduled on the work plan for the next meeting of the committee.

Railway STG – the report and recommendations had been finalised and agreed. This report was now ready for consideration at the next meeting of the committee (26 October).

Shopmobility STG – the STG report was considered by Cabinet in July, at which point they resolved to consult on the future delivery of Shobmobility. Cabinet considered the results of the consultation at their meeting on the 15 September and resolved: to the relocation of the service to The Horse and Groom, St. Georges Place; that a commissioning process for the service would commence in January 2016; and in the interim a review of fees and funding sources would be undertaken in conjunction with the 2016/17 budget setting process.

Broadband STG – three members from Cheltenham and two from Gloucester City had volunteered for the task group. Arranging the first meeting had proved difficult but had since been set for the 20 October 2015. Councillor hay

suggested that the group contact Nigel Riglar at GCC as he had been undertaking some work with Fastershire to identify the blackspots in the county.

Devolution STG – an email would be sent to all non-executive members inviting them to be involved in a task group to maintain an overview of the ongoing discussions in relation to devolution and Cheltenham's position. It was suggested that it would be useful to have a mix of Borough, County and Parish Councillors on this group.

**14. REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN**

Members were referred to the committee work plan which had been circulated with the agenda.

As previously discussed, the committee would be receiving final reports of the Cheltenham Spa Railway Station and Cycling & Walking scrutiny task groups at the next meeting.

The Chairman confirmed that he had received an email from Gill Morris on the Tourism Strategy and was inclined to schedule a presentation of the draft report on the 30 November meeting. The committee agreed.

It was also confirmed that the Chairman had arranged for representatives of the Gloucestershire NHS Trust to attend a meeting in April 2016 to give the committee more information on their future plans for Hospitals across Gloucestershire.

In response to a member query about the Strategic Partnerships, the Chief Executive confirmed that a presentation on this very topic had been arranged for immediately prior to the upcoming Council meeting (19 October).

The work plan would be updated as necessary.

**15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting was scheduled for the 26 October 2015.

Tim Harman  
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

# ***Information/Discussion Paper***

## **Overview & Scrutiny Committee - 26 October 2015**

### **Growing Places - Allotment Strategy 2015**

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

#### **1. Why has this come to scrutiny?**

- 1.1 The Allotment Strategy 2015 is due to go before Cabinet in November 2015. Therefore, it is requested that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee consider and review the strategy such that feedback and comments can be available for the Cabinet meeting of November 10th 2015.

#### **2. Summary of the Issue**

- 2.1 The Allotment Strategy 2015 is an updated allotment strategy, building on the comprehensive document produced in 2005, which explores supply and demand issues for allotments in Cheltenham and proposes actions in key areas of allotments management.
- 2.2 There are proposals to explore the option to use some of the money currently set aside for new allotment provision for allotment site improvements, particularly in relation to site security, health and safety and provision for disabled gardeners.

#### **3. Summary of evidence/information**

- 3.1 The strategy looks at supply and demand of allotments in Cheltenham, now and over the last 10 years, and also considers feedback from a customer satisfaction survey carried out in early 2015, to which one third of allotment holders (247 people) responded.
- 3.2 There is an action plan proposing activities in 5 key areas: allotment management, infrastructure, protection and provision, promotion and health and safety.

#### **4. Next Steps**

- 4.1 Members may want to forward the notes of their discussion on this item or make some specific recommendations to Cabinet. They may also like to review the recommendations from the allotments scrutiny task group that were approved by Cabinet in March 2013 subject to feasibility and resources and identify any areas they would like to follow up in the future.

---

<b>Background Papers</b>	Report to O&S 3 November 2014 <a href="https://democracy.cheltenham.gov.uk/documents/s13821/2014_11_03_OS_8_Allotments_STG_update.pdf">https://democracy.cheltenham.gov.uk/documents/s13821/2014_11_03_OS_8_Allotments_STG_update.pdf</a>
<b>Contact Officer</b>	Fiona Warin, Green Space & Allotment Officer, 01242 774672, <a href="mailto:Fiona.warin@cheltenham.gov.uk">Fiona.warin@cheltenham.gov.uk</a>
<b>Accountability</b>	Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment Cllr. Chris Coleman

# Growing Places



Cheltenham Borough Council  
Allotments Strategy 2015

## **SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION TO THE ALLOTMENT STRATEGY 2015**

### **1.1 Introduction**

- 1.1.1 In 2005, Cheltenham Borough Council wrote a detailed allotment strategy.
- 1.1.2 It addressed geographical demand and provision and 5 key areas: effective management, infrastructure, promoting allotment and community gardening, provision and protection of allotments, health, safety and environment.
- 1.1.3 It incorporated an investment programme to install toilets on most sites, improve paths and haulingsways, fences, gates, water supplies and car parking areas. It included provision for community areas, signage, renovation of derelict allotment land, provision of raised beds for wheelchair gardeners, planting of a community orchard, provision of new sheds and more.
- 1.1.4 The strategy was reviewed in 2010, with a revised action plan drawn up to address remaining and emerging items.
- 1.1.5 This 2015 strategy builds on the previous one, addressing the same key areas, noting the current situation and anticipated future developments and highlighting the key themes and action points to be addressed.
- 1.1.6 This ten-year strategy will likewise be reviewed after 5 years.

### **1.2 Aims of the strategy**

1.2.1 The Council looks to recognise the broad appeal of allotment gardening and the contribution it makes to the town and to the quality of life of many who live here. These days, it is more likely to be viewed as a leisure activity than the economic necessity of former times, but the benefits are still considerable:

- Home-grown fruit and vegetables, herbs and flowers
- Exercise and fresh air, offering physical and mental health benefits
- Opportunity for social interaction, friendship, sense of community
- Bio-diversity of both flora and fauna in the urban environment
- Sustainability associated with local food production, composting, recycling



1.2.2 The strategy seeks to ensure the effective management and funding of allotments, the provision of a thriving network of growing spaces that allow for the widest possible participation in allotments and also to address key areas identified in consultation with plot-holders.

### **1.3 Stakeholders**

1.3.1 There are various groups and individuals who have a stake in the provision and management of allotments in Cheltenham and these include:

- Cheltenham Borough Council allotment holders
- Applicants and other potential plot-holders (from all sectors of the community)
- Non-CBC allotment holders and providers (Parish Councils and others)
- Cheltenham & District Allotment Holders' Association (C&DAHA) / groups
- Residents living near to allotment sites
- Local environmental groups and those promoting local food production
- Community, health-care and educational organisations involved in allotments
- The wider community of Cheltenham (environmental and social benefits)

### **1.4 Structure of the document**

1.4.1 This strategy is in 5 sections: The introduction is followed by a section on the supply and demand situation and how this has changed over time. It also highlights areas that plot-holders have identified in a recent customer survey.

1.4.2 The third section addresses the 5 key areas: effective management, infrastructure, promoting allotment and community gardening, provision and protection of allotments and health, safety and environment.

1.4.3 The fourth section details the policy and service standards which can be expected in relation to allotment provision and administration.

1.4.4 The fifth section is the Action Plan detailing the activities to be undertaken within the 5 key areas identified.

## **SECTION 2. THE CURRENT SITUATION**

### **2.1 Provision of Plots**

- 2.1.1 There are 9 allotment sites in Cheltenham managed by the Borough Council, covering an area of 16.03 hectares. In recent years, there has been increasing demand for smaller allotments and so larger plots have been divided. As a result, there are 811 individual allotments available to let (equivalent to 507 standard full-sized plots of 250 square metres).
- 2.1.2 A further 423 standard plots (approximately) are provided by Parish Councils and others and this gives a total number of standard plots in Cheltenham of 930. This equates to approximately 8.5 full-sized plots per thousand people.
- 2.1.3 There is currently a statutory allotment designation on Elmfield Playing Field, equivalent to a further 62 full-sized plots. Since the last strategy was written in 2005, a small area of allotment land was lost at the Holy Apostles Church in Charlton Kings and a small area gained in Windsor Street, with small plots constructed as part of the development of a new care home. This means a small net loss over the 10 year period of approximately 4 plots in Cheltenham.

### **2.2 Uptake of Plots**

- 2.2.1 The Allotment Strategy of 2005 made reference to a slight increase in interest in allotments and raised the question as to whether a renaissance in allotment and community gardening might be around the corner.
- 2.2.2 In fact, interest in allotments snowballed across the country. Food scares relating to pesticide and chemical use, environmental concerns (e.g. food miles) and continual promotion of allotment gardening on television helped to fuel a nationwide allotment 'frenzy' that saw demand peak from 2007 to 2010, with over 300 applicants in 2008 alone for Borough Council sites.
- 2.2.3 With annual plot turnover at around half this rate, for a number of years, waiting lists got longer and longer. The Council identified a need for a large number of additional plots, particularly in the South of the Borough where

turnover was low. At one point, it was estimated that applicants might have to wait up to 7 years for a plot at the popular Asquith Road site or the well-established Hatherley Road site.

- 2.2.4 A strategy was drawn up for the identification of potential new allotment sites and money was set aside for additional provision. Green and open spaces were examined for their potential for use as allotments. Consultation was undertaken in two areas to gauge local views and levels of interest.
- 2.2.5 Then rates of application began to fall, as did the rate of take-up of allotments from the waiting list as applicants became more cautious about diving in to what can be quite a time-consuming occupation. At some sites, take-up fell from 90% to less than 50%. Demand for small plots continued to rise and larger plots were divided, meaning an increase in the number of plots overall.
- 2.2.6 With more plots, lower rates of application and lower take-up of plots, the waiting lists started to fall in 2012 and are back at pre-2005 levels for many sites. By the end of 2014, some sites had just a handful of applicants and a wait for a plot of three or four months.
- 2.2.7 With an understanding of how quickly the supply / demand picture can change, the Council will look to act prudently in terms of additional provision and will also look to work with the Parish Councils and other providers to consider demand for the Borough overall and to develop a strategy to try to address year on year fluctuations in demand for and take-up of plots.

### **2.3 Geographical distribution of allotments, including parish areas**

- 2.3.1 There are allotment sites reasonably well distributed across the Borough, albeit with little provision in the centre and to the east.
- 2.3.2 There are three parishes within the Borough that own and manage allotment sites and two that do not. Parishes are responsible for allotment provision for their populations. The Borough is responsible for non-parish area provision.
- 2.3.3 With Parish residents sometimes living nearer to a Borough site or vice versa, and with two parishes not having allotments, an approach had developed over

time by which most parishes with allotments and the Borough Council accepted other applicants where vacancies permitted.

- 2.3.4 This became problematic during the period of very high demand when the Borough was looking to develop new allotments but was unable, for legal reasons, to do so in a parish area or to satisfy demand from parish residents. Parishes and Borough alike looked to their statutory responsibilities in terms of allotment provision but this meant, potentially, less choice for the resident.
- 2.3.5 The Council will seek to work with Parish Councils to clarify procedures for out of area applicants, particularly during periods of low or very high demand.

## **2.4 Disposal of former allotment land and proceeds of sale**

- 2.4.1 A large area of disused allotment land adjacent to the Midwinter allotment site was put up for sale by the Council for residential development. The scheme selected incorporated the relocation of an area of (then existing but unused) allotments to Elmfield Playing Field (it's relocation also envisaged at the time).
- 2.4.2 Funds were set aside, from the proceeds of the land sale, for the development of new allotments amounting to £600,000 which included £50,000 to fund infrastructure and site improvements at the adjacent Midwinter allotment site.
- 2.4.3 There is currently a statutory allotment designation on the Elmfield Playing Field and a planning condition that could trigger development of allotments in the event that allotment demand was to significantly increase.
- 2.4.4 With significant provision in the area already (Midwinter allotment site has 200 plots and a short waiting list) the preference is to move the statutory designation so that any future development of plots would be in an area of lower provision and proven demand.
- 2.4.5 Consultation in the Priors area of Cheltenham in summer 2013 revealed a latent demand for allotments, i.e. a number of people who were not on a waiting list elsewhere because they would not travel to a plot but who would be interested in a locally available plot). Priors / Oakley is an area of low allotment provision in Cheltenham.

- 2.4.6 With the Council owning land in the area, there is the option to explore the possibility of moving the statutory allotment designation and possibly to go on to develop a small allotment site in the Priors area, if overall demand / supply in the Borough warranted it or as part of any wider-scale development of the area. There has been a significant increase in housing in recent years.
- 2.4.7 In addition, past proceeds of sale of allotment land have been used to upgrade and develop allotment sites to make them accessible for families and disabled gardeners (upgraded, accessible pathways, fully accessible composting toilets on most sites, community areas, raised beds for wheelchair users).
- 2.4.8 The feedback from the allotment surveys and the allotment site wardens has identified site improvements that could be funded out of sale proceeds, given that the entire sum may not be needed for additional provision.
- 2.4.9 These include additional security for Hayden Road and Midwinter sites, where 60% of plot-holders have experienced theft or vandalism in the last 5 years, reinstating grass paths at Alma Road site, where narrow and uneven paths are an access challenge for some, additional raised bed plots designed for wheelchair use at two sites where there are suitable applicants and possibly a toilet at Severn Road site and new gate and toilet entry systems.

## **2.5 Link to Council Business Priorities**

- 2.5.1 Allotments contribute to two of the three over-arching aims that the Council has for the Borough.
- 2.5.2 The first is that *Cheltenham's environmental quality and heritage are protected, maintained and enhanced* and the second is that *People live in strong, safe and healthy communities*.
- 2.5.3 The feedback from a survey of allotment holders undertaken in the first half of 2015 indicates that the number of people benefitting from each allotment plot is 8, on average, and that the health and well-being benefits to plot-holders and the families and friends who receive produce can be considerable.
- 2.5.4 Moreover, allotments score more highly for bio-diversity than any other

publicly owned green space in the Borough.

## **2.6 Consultation**

- 2.6.1 In early 2015, the Council undertook a survey of allotment holders to gain feedback on the allotment service and to gather information that would inform this allotment strategy. There were 247 responses, representing one third of allotment holders.
- 2.6.2 Overall, most allotment holders were satisfied with the service provision, with 83% of survey responders indicating that they held the Council's allotment service to be good or very good.
- 2.6.3 The main issues that stood out were the need for additional security measures at the Midwinter and Hayden sites and that the level of allotment rent is now at the upper limit of what some people would be prepared to pay.
- 2.6.4 It was useful to note that 70% of plot-holders spent over 5 hours each week on their allotment and that 8 people, on average, benefitted from each plot (which means a significant number of people across Cheltenham, if all Borough and non-Borough plots are included.)
- 2.6.5 There was little interest in self-management of sites, with 29 people expressing some level of interest versus 204 who said they were not interested in self-management.
- 2.6.6 In terms of the service 'extras', assistance with rubbish removal (skips) was firmly supported by many plot-holders, as was the communication with plot-holders via the annual newsletter. There was slightly less support for the annual plot competition. Some felt it helped to raise standards and enjoyed taking part. A slightly higher number were not interested themselves (albeit many of those recognised the importance for others).

### **3. SECTION 3: KEY AREAS IN ALLOTMENTS MANAGEMENT**

#### **3.1 Section Overview**

3.1.1 The following 5 key areas are explored in this section:

1. Effective management
2. Infrastructure
3. Promoting allotments and community gardening
4. Provision and protection of allotments
5. Health, safety and environment

#### **3.2 Key Area 1: Effective management and administration**

3.2.1 The allotment strategy of 2005 highlighted key areas in the administration of allotment sites:

- To ensure the effective day to day maintenance and operation of allotment sites
- to provide an effective and efficient administration system
- to charge fair and affordable rents with an appropriate range of discounts and payment systems
- to offer a range of plot sizes and shared plots
- to provide the staff and financial resources necessary for effective management
- to seek other sources of income to support allotments, e.g. grants
- to provide help and support to new tenants
- to consult plot holders and their representatives on the day-to-day management and strategic direction of allotments

3.2.2 A number of measures were implemented over the course of the 2005-2015 allotment strategy, including computerised administration software, widening of the volunteer warden role, re-writing the tenancy agreement, review of, and increase in, allotment rents, review of office procedures (with an increase in use of electronic communications), allotment information and application pages on the Council's website re-written, allotments administration becoming a full-time post.

- 3.2.3 The number of small and half-sized allotments increased significantly, to respond to the demand for smaller allotments as more families and working people took up plots and the number of community allotments also increased.
- 3.2.4 Moving forwards, developments in technology should enable further efficiencies in the delivery of allotment administration and the service will continue to liaise with other authorities and technology providers to keep up to date with the options.
- 3.2.5 Sponsorship and / or grants could be sought to support additional improvements or existing items (e.g. gaining commercial sponsorship of the newsletter(s) or the allotment competition, to help fund the service 'extras' which are of value to many allotment holders).
- 3.2.6 In terms of support for new tenants, the service offers some advice, via a leaflet, on clearing a plot and liaises for skip provision if rubbish has been left by a previous tenant. There is a lot of information available on the internet and the volunteer site wardens often give advice and assistance. Additional support can be considered.
- 3.2.7 Consultation continues, via the volunteer site wardens and the C&DAHA and directly with allotment holders through surveys and feedback requests.

**3.2.8 Objective: To continue to develop the allotment service to ensure efficient and effective management and administration**

### **3.3 Key Area 2: Infrastructure**

3.3.1 The Council is responsible for allotment site infrastructure and it is included in the inspection regimes for parks and green spaces. There is a small budget at the disposal of the allotment officer for maintenance of existing site infrastructure. The strategy of 2005 identified 3 key areas for improvement:

- Site security
- vehicle and foot access
- toilet facilities

3.3.2 Funds for the delivery of improvements to site infrastructure were secured



through the 2005 allotment strategy from proceeds of sale of former allotment land off Howell Road. Toilets were installed on all sites, except for the Severn Road site where there were only 7 allotment holders and no requirement for a toilet. Security and access were addressed with paths and roadways upgraded at several sites and new fencing and gates installed where required.

- 3.3.3 Emerging issues include degraded grass pathways at Alma Road site and tarmac roadways at Midwinter site and the need for improved security measures at Hayden Road and Midwinter sites (where 60% of tenants have experienced theft or damage).
- 3.3.4 In addition, there are emerging requirements to upgrade water supplies on allotment sites to reduce the risk of contamination of the general water supply. Some water authorities are now requiring use of a specific type of dip tank or an expensive air gap device for allotment site water supplies or sites face their supplies being cut off. This could require significant resources.
- 3.3.5 In terms of catering for disabled gardeners, there are two sites with people waiting for an adapted plot (Asquith and Midwinter sites) similar to the raised bed plots installed at Terry Ashdown and Hayden Road sites in 2007.
- 3.3.6 There is also a small group of allotment holders at Severn Road who have expressed the desire to have a toilet on site.
- 3.3.7 Once costed, the Council will be in a better position to prioritise these proposed investments. Funds for the delivery of these additional infrastructure improvements could be secured using some of the funds set aside for new allotment provision, given that the supply and demand situation has stabilised.
- 3.3.8 Objective: To continue to maintain the infrastructure of allotments and deliver the improvements identified, dependant on priorities and funding**

#### **3.4 Key Area 4: Promoting allotment and community gardening**

- 3.4.1 When the 2005 allotment strategy was written, it was felt that many groups were under-represented on allotment sites. It was hoped that with additional support and information, as well as the provision of toilets, improved signage and community areas, women, families, people with special needs and people

on low incomes would be encouraged to take up the opportunity to work an allotment.

3.4.2 In fact, with the extensive presence of allotment gardening in the media, the job of promoting allotments was largely accomplished. Many women, families, younger people, working people, community groups, education providers, mobility scooter users, ethnic minority groups and more took up allotments.

3.4.3 With the recent fall in applications and the prospect of vacant plots on two sites, the Council has once again started to advertise / market the allotments, issuing a press release in early 2015 that waiting lists were very short for the Midwinter and Hayden Road sites. A number of applications resulted.

3.4.4 The allotment service will draw up a marketing plan to be put into action if waiting lists drop below a 3 month wait for a plot. It is preferable to have a short waiting list, rather than vacant plots deteriorating while waiting to be let.

**3.4.5 Objective: To develop a simple marketing and media plan to promote allotment gardening to ensure the continued uptake of plots and increase the value placed on allotments by the community as a whole**

### **3.5 Key area 4: Provision and protection of allotments**

3.5.1 Cheltenham Borough Council has demonstrated a strong commitment to the provision and protection of allotments in terms of the resources allocated to the development and management of allotments and the increase in the number of allotments through the renovation of derelict allotment land.

3.5.2 Future measures for the provision and protection of allotments include:

- Use planning process to ensure provision in large-scale residential developments
- Explore option to relocate Elmfield playing field allotment designation to a location in the east of the borough where supply is lower and there is latent demand
- Continue to support the allotment service with the resources required to deliver the infrastructure improvements identified and to ensure efficient administration

- Work with the parish councils to look at the overall picture of supply and demand across the borough and seek to work cooperatively with the parish councils to manage over/under supply and waiting lists
- Continue to consult with allotment holders on changes in allotment provision

**Objective:** To ensure that there are enough allotments in the right locations, using the guidelines above

### **3.6 Key Area 5: Health, Safety and Environment**

- 3.6.1 While many allotment holders and organisations recognise the health and environmental benefits of allotment gardening, there are also some risks associated with horticultural activities that need to be identified and managed.
- 3.6.2 Some potential risks arise from infrastructure issues e.g. quality of roadways, whilst others arise from activities of plot holders e.g. use of garden machinery and tools. Some arise from changes in legislation, e.g. Food & Environment Protection Act 1985 or Water Supply (Water Fittings) Regulations 1999.
- 3.6.3 Over the course of the previous strategy, measures were introduced to identify and manage health and safety risks, including regular infrastructure inspections and a health and safety leaflet for allotment holders.
- 3.6.4 In addition, a leaflet was given to allotment holders explaining how they could manage their plot to support wildlife and wildlife habitats. This coincided with a general desire among plot-holders to decrease the amount of chemicals used in food production and it is likely that there have been environmental benefits, although not quantified through any empirical research at a local level.
- 3.6.5 With wardens meetings taking place less frequently and changes in advice at a national level, the health and safety and environment policy in relation to allotments will be reviewed to ensure that the Council's approach is current.

**Objective:** To continue to improve the risk management of allotments and promote the health and environmental benefits

#### **4. SECTION 4: POLICY AND STANDARDS OF SERVICE**

As stated in the 2005-2015 allotment strategy, the Council will look to:

- 4.1 Provide sufficient high quality allotments, in the right places, to meet the needs of the people of Cheltenham. This will involve:
  - Protecting allotment land from the pressures of development, neglect and vandalism
  - Securing the provision of new allotments in areas of need
- 4.2 Provide an excellent service to plot holders from which they can expect:
  - High quality, safe sites, accessible to all parts of the community and supported by appropriate infrastructure
  - Efficient and effective administration
  - Fair rents and charges
  - Advice, information and assistance
- 4.3 Promote allotments:
  - To potential tenants, especially those groups under-represented in the allotment community
  - To the wider community so that they become aware of the value of allotments and their contribution to a sustainable town
- 4.4 Consult with and involve allotment holders in the management of allotments, from both operational and strategic perspectives
- 4.5 Provide adequate resources to achieve the above and to invest in the allotment service and infrastructure using monies received from the sale of former allotment land or other sources.

#### **5. SECTION 5: ACTION PLAN**

This section proposes actions over the next 10 years by the Borough Council and others to help achieve the aims of the strategy. The actions are grouped according to the five key areas previously identified.

## 5.1 Key Action 1: Effective Management

**Objective:** To continue to develop the allotment service to ensure efficient and effective management and administration

ACTION	WHO	TIMESCALE	RESOURCES
Continue to work with and support on-site wardens and volunteers who assist with plot-lettings and day to day liaison about site issues and unworked plots. Undertake a survey of volunteers and wardens to facilitate this process.	Allotment Officer Wardens	On-going  August 2016	Current internal resources
Attend regional allotment officer forums / GATPC meetings as and when organised to keep current with best practice and national advice.	Allotment Officer	Annual / as and when organised	Current internal resources
Restrict allotment rent increases to inflationary amounts in light of survey feedback and legal requirements in relation to allotment rents. Review in 5 years.	Allotment Officer	2015-2019 End 2020	Current internal resources
Monitor and continue to divide plots if the demand for smaller allotments continues. Continue with policy of allotment holders taking medium or half plot (or smaller) in the first instance, but with the possibility to have a full-sized or large plot when available, once initial area deemed by officers to be fully cultivated.	Allotment Officer	On-going	Current internal resources
Seek additional funding e.g. sponsorship of newsletters / competitions as and when internal resources may become available to undertake.	Unidentified	Unidentified	Additional resources
Review support for new allotment holders with site representatives and implement changes identified that can be undertaken within current resources (e.g. changes to literature, use of on-line links, volunteer mentors on site).	Allotments Officer and Wardens	December 2016	Current internal resources

## 5.2 Key Action 2: Infrastructure

**Objective:** To continue to maintain the infrastructure of allotments and deliver the improvements identified, dependant on priorities and funding

ACTION	LED BY	TIMESCALE	RESOURCES
<p>Obtain costings for identified site infrastructure improvements and consult with site representatives and Cabinet Member to prioritise. Approve virement of funds (proceeds of sale) set aside for allotment provision to fund prioritised improvements.</p>	<p>Parks Development Manager and Allotments Officer</p>	<p>Initial costings, prioritising and allocation of funds by end 2016</p>	<p>Capital funding (proceeds of sale of former allotment land)</p>
<p><b>All sites</b>            All water supply equipment (in light of current regulations)            Site entrance locks / system for ease of entry and security and to reduce cost and administration to Council of issuing individual keys            Key box for toilets to negate requirement for individual toilet keys            (Council) shed repair fund (materials only)</p>			
<p><b>Alma Road</b>            Reinstatement of narrow and uneven grass pathways</p>			
<p><b>Asquith Road</b>            Development of disabled raised bed plot</p>			

<p><b>Hayden Road</b></p> <p>Security measures (increased gate height, anti-vandal paint, lighting at entrance, use of security cameras)</p> <p>Reparations to disabled raised beds</p>			
<p><b>Midwinter</b></p> <p>Security measures (increased gate height, anti-vandal paint, lighting at entrance, use of security cameras)</p> <p>Improvements to tarmac roadway</p> <p>Development of disabled raised bed plot</p>			
<p><b>Severn Road</b></p> <p>Allotment toilet</p>			

### 5.3 Key Action 3: Promoting allotment gardening

**Objective:** To develop a simple marketing and media plan to promote allotment gardening to ensure the continued uptake of plots and increase the value placed on allotments by the community as a whole

ACTION	LED BY	TIMESCALE	RESOURCES
Prepare press release and other materials (leaflet, tweet, facebook update) to be used if/when plot waiting lists drop below 3 months.	Allotments Officer	April 2016 On-going	Current internal resources
Continue to look for opportunities to promote allotment gardening in the local media	Allotments Officer	Minimum of 2 media releases per annum	Current internal resources
Draw up a list of organisations that could be approached for marketing campaign in the event that allotment waiting lists evaporate e.g. CBH, large local employers, local publications reaching various groups, local radio etc	Allotments Officer Communica- tions Team	April 2016 On-going	Current internal resources



#### 5.4 Key Action 4: Provision and protection of allotments

**Objective:** To ensure that there are enough allotments in the right locations

ACTION	LED BY	TIMESCALE	RESOURCES
Explore the option to relocate the allotment designation from Elmfield Playing Field to council owned land in Priors area of Cheltenham and subsequently explore options to develop new site as stand-alone or as wider development of the area	TBC	TBC	Current internal resources
Ensure provision of additional allotments in large-scale residential developments through the planning process.	Green Space Development Manager Planning Officers	On-going	Current internal resources
Liaise with the parish councils to consider supply and demand across the borough and develop joint / shared policies with regard to surplus allotments and waiting lists in other areas	Allotment Officer	Meeting every two years as a minimum	Current internal resources
Develop a policy to address changing allotment demand and consult on possible measures such as offering additional plots to existing plot-holders at reduced rent as 'potato grounds' or allowing plot-holders to have multiple plots in the event that demand drops to the extent that there are vacant / unwanted plots.	Allotment Officer Site Wardens Consultation with allotment holders	End 2016	Current internal resources

## 5.5 Key Action 5: Health, Safety and Environment

**Objective:** To continue to improve the risk management of allotments and promote the health and environmental benefits

ACTIONS	WHO	TIMESCALE	RESOURCES
Review the health and safety policy for allotments, including frequency of inspections, permissible items (e.g. ponds, glass greenhouses) and information given to allotment holders	Parks Development Manager Allotments Officer Corporate Health and Safety Advisor	June 2016	Current internal resources
Review water supply equipment at all allotment sites and make recommendations based on current regulations	Properties Dept. Allotments Officer	December 2016	Current internal resources
Review and amend advice given to allotment holders on legal, safe and environmentally friendly allotment gardening techniques	Ecology Ranger Allotments Officer	December 2016	Current internal resources
Explore options to undertake a survey of the wildlife and biodiversity of allotments. Identify areas/features for protection and enhancement.	Ecology Ranger Allotments Officer Local nature organisations	December 2017	Current internal and external resources

DRAFT

This page is intentionally left blank

## Cheltenham Borough Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee – 26 October 2015 Scrutiny Task Group Review – Cheltenham Spa Railway Station Covering Report

<b>Accountable member</b>	Councillor Roger Whyborn, Chair of Task Group
<b>Accountable officer</b>	Saira Malin, Democracy Officer
<b>Executive summary</b>	<p>At its meeting on 8 September 2014 the Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee commenced a review of the Cheltenham Spa Railway Station. A Scrutiny task group was set up and undertook to better understand the franchise renewal process. The group were also tasked with developing a wish-list of improvements to the station, transport links and rail service itself and establish if and how they were being progressed.</p> <p>The findings and recommendations of that Group are set out in detail in the attached Scrutiny Task Group Report.</p>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p><b>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee agree the recommendations as set out in the Scrutiny Task Group report and recommends that Cabinet:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Authorise the Managing Director of the Cheltenham Task force in conjunction with the Leader of the Council to undertake the following tasks and to report progress to O&amp;S in 12 months' time;</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>To proactively lobby the relevant parties for all improvements in Phase 1A and 1B as listed in the table at 5.1.3 of the task group report.</b></li> <li>• <b>Being mindful of devolution, particularly the integration of transport, to continue dialogue with Gloucestershire County Council, Local Economic Partnership and others; in particular to pursue all possible opportunities to improve public transport links to/from Cheltenham Spa station.</b></li> <li>• <b>Publicise Smartcard and PlusBus opportunities in the area.</b></li> <li>• <b>In view of the fact that some funding levels and finalised proposals for all of the improvements to the station have not yet been announced, to keep O&amp;S informed of any developments.</b></li> </ul> </li> <li><b>2. Note that whilst the service improvements announced by FGW are to be welcomed, it should be acknowledged, with concern, that a consequence of the increased services to London will be increased pressure on the rail network in the need to terminate additional trains. Thus Phase 2 will be even more necessary than it is a</b></li> </ol>

present.

3. To note the other relevant matters raised;

- On the north/south route, though train services are fairly frequent, there is concern that lack of route capacity may stifle traffic, and hence modal shift to rail in the future, with too high a proportion of traffic going by road.
- The rolling stock on some local services, particularly operated by Arrive trains, if life-expired, and should be a factor when this franchise is renewed.
- The train service to Worcester remains poor and is not addressed by the recent proposals.
- The potential for future improvements through both electrification and re-signalling on the Bristol-Birmingham line is to be welcomed.

<b>Financial implications</b>	There are no financial implications to the council, arising from this report. <b>Contact officer: Sarah Didcote, <a href="mailto:sarah.didcote@cheltenham.gov.uk">sarah.didcote@cheltenham.gov.uk</a>, 01242 264125</b>
<b>Legal implications</b>	There are no legal implications arising from this report. <b>Contact officer: Shirin Wotherspoon, <a href="mailto:shirin.wotherspoon@tewkesbury.gov.uk">shirin.wotherspoon@tewkesbury.gov.uk</a></b>
<b>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</b>	No direct HR implications arising from this report. <b>Contact officer: Julie McCarthy, <a href="mailto:Julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk">Julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk</a>, 01242 264355</b>
<b>Key risks</b>	
<b>Corporate and Community Plan implications</b>	
<b>Environmental and climate change implications</b>	Improvements to the railway station, increasing the frequency of service and provision of a wider integrated transport network all support modal shift, which delivers benefits for the environment and climate change by contributing to a reduction in carbon emissions. However, in order to maximise the potential for modal shift, improvements need to be delivered as an integrated package, ie an increase in services should be linked to a high quality facility and easy transport links to and from the station to ensure a positive passenger experience. As the task group has highlighted, there are already existing schemes, notably the plus-bus scheme and the smartcard ticket which, if more effectively promoted, could also encourage modal shift.
<b>Property/Asset Implications</b>	

<b>Report author</b>	<b>Contact officer: Saira Malin, <a href="mailto:saira.malin@cheltenham.gov.uk">saira.malin@cheltenham.gov.uk</a>, 01242 774937</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	1. Task Group report (including appendices)
<b>Background information</b>	

This page is intentionally left blank





**SCRUTINY TASK GROUP REPORT  
CHELTENHAM SPA RAILWAY STATION**

**26 OCTOBER 2015**



**1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1** A review of the Cheltenham Spa Railway Station was initiated by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at their meeting on 8 September 2014 following a suggestion by the Leader of the Council that this would be an important issue for the town in view of the franchise renewal in 2016, and the parallel activity by the Task Force in trying to secure funding to make improvements.
- 1.2** Members felt that there were issues relating to the station itself, the transport links to the station and within the borough, as well as the rail service offered.
- 1.3** This report sets out the findings and recommendations arising from the scrutiny review by the scrutiny task group.

**2. MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE**

- 2.1** Membership of the task group:-
- Councillor Roger Whyborn (Chair)
  - Councillor Flo Clucas
  - Councillor Chris Mason
  - Councillor Dan Murch
  - Councillor John Payne
  - Councillor Max Wilkinson
- 2.2** Councillor Whyborn would like to put on record his thanks to his colleagues on the task group.
- 2.3** The one page strategy for this task group was agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the 18 September 2014 and this is attached as Appendix 1. The ambitions for the review were as follows:
- Understand the franchise renewal process
  - Understand the implications of any improvements for Cheltenham railway station and the town as a whole
  - Understand how these issues are currently being progressed
  - Influence the decision makers regarding improvements that would benefit the station and town
  - Consider if there are any wider 'integrated transport' issues
- 2.4** In the event, the London train service franchise was extended by the DfT to the existing franchise holder, First Great Western, in April 2015 by a period of three and a half years who at the same time announced the introduction of improved train services to take place in 2017/18. As a result, the first objective of the task group was superseded.
- 2.5** The main outcome required was therefore for the task group to develop a list of issues (improvements to the station, transport links and rail service itself) that

should be considered as part of a campaign agenda for the Council working with its partners, for the benefit of Cheltenham and residents.

### **3. HOW DID THE TASK GROUP GO ABOUT THIS REVIEW?**

**3.1** The task group met on five occasions between November 2014 and June 2015 and spoke to a range of experts who all contributed to the discussions and were able to respond to members questions or provide additional information outside of meetings. These officers and experts included:

- Jeremy Williamson – Cheltenham Development Task Force Managing Director
- Saira Malin – Democracy Officer (facilitator for this scrutiny review)
- Frank Chambers – TravelWatch South West
- Michael Ratcliffe – Chamber of Commerce
- Richard Clarke – National Rail
- Matthew Barnes – First Great Western
- Rupert Cox – Stagecoach West
- Shirin Wotherspoon – OneLegal

Members would like to thank all of the experts and officers who attended meetings and contributed to the review.

The Leader was also involved in our review and we thank him for his input.

### **4. WHAT WE DID**

**4.1** The following paragraphs describe the areas covered in and outside of meetings:

#### **4.2 24 November 2014**

The task group met with Jeremy Williamson, Managing Director of the Cheltenham Development Task Force.

He explained that there had been no major upgrades to the station for some 60 years. The station has restricted up and down, uni-directional two track layout; one track north, one track south and no way of crossing between. This restrictive layout caused major delays in the event of a train failure and meant that the entire network had to close for 7 minutes to allow terminating services to cross the line. As an indication of scale, there were 94 Cross Country train services daily and in addition to this, terminating services and freight trains and 1,812,624 passenger journeys were recorded in 2011/12.

The formation of the Gloucestershire Local Transport Board created an opportunity for third parties to identify and submit bids towards localised priorities and this resulted in the development of a bid, by the Task Force in conjunction with the Chamber of Commerce, with the following components:- two new platforms that would accommodate the future anticipated passenger growth and critically improve performance by separating terminating from through trains (They would also be designed to cater for the Intercity express trains to be

introduced in 2017); a completely new hub layout with a proper bus interchange, cycle facilities and a 2 storey car park (to help alleviate parking issues); new passenger facilities within a new concourse. Members were shown a virtual tour of what the changes would achieve, which he felt reflected upgrades which had been undertaken to a number of stations.

An initial bid for £3.3m of the anticipated £20m spend, was secured from the Gloucestershire Local Transport Board. However, Network Rail and First Great Western (FGW) subsequently felt that the additional bay platforms could not be delivered within control period 5 (which is 2014-2019, a railway operating financial structure) so this element was deleted and a new bid submitted. The revised bid for £1.95m of an estimated £10m spend was submitted and whilst it scored highly, only £1.1m was awarded initially and after further negotiation with GLTB this was raised to c£1.5m. The rail industry had secured funding from Access for All and the National Stations Improvement Programme and whilst it is hoped to be worth £2-3m, these sums had not yet been confirmed. A further bid had been made, with the support of Sustrans from the Department for Transport Cycle-Rail initiative, which would assist delivery of the connection of the Honeybourne Line southwards to Lansdown. This would immediately open up cycle connectivity to the south and an interface with the 10 minute X94 Stagecoach service. This would also align with another ambition/bidding process to create a 4 mile Cheltenham-Bishops Cleeve cycle route. The LEP Growth Fund round 2 (or top-up) had called for projects so a bid was submitted for £10m to fund the bay platforms. This was never expected to be successful as it did not meet the delivery criteria in terms of timescale and it was inevitably unsuccessful, but it was felt important to note future potential, as an important County wide project; Cheltenham is by far the busiest station in the County. To avoid any confusion he explained that he was simply securing funding and that governance and delivery of any improvements would fall to Network Rail and FGW.

The station improvements had thus evolved into what came to be known as Phases 1 and 2, c£10M each. Phase 1 is for a wide range of improvements to the station and station site including car parking, commensurate with a passenger usage looking to exceed c. 2m movements per annum. Phase 2, for which Phase 1 allows passive provision, is the addition of two bay platforms and the associated signalling and enhanced station building.

The task group were reassured to learn that; the Local Transport Plan 3, mentioned rail in far greater detail compared to earlier versions; the publication of the Western Route Survey also supported many of the ambitions for Cheltenham and actually acknowledged the capacity issue posed by Cheltenham; and the LEP Strategic Economic Plan noted that there is: - Limited direct train services to London; High car dependence; High levels of commuting within the County and beyond.

### **4.3 15 December 2014**

The Scrutiny task group had, by email, agreed the wording for a motion.

The motion proposed that the draft response to the Western Route Study, be formally submitted by the Leader, on behalf of Cheltenham Borough Council. The response to the consultation document, which included a statement of

support from colleagues at Gloucestershire County Council, set out areas which the Council were pleased to see had been included and highlight concerns in relation to the proposed timescales and what were considered to be omissions.

The motion was considered and passed by Council at the meeting held on the 15 December 2014 and was duly submitted prior to the consultation deadline.

*"Cheltenham Borough Council is pleased to note the proposals for an enhanced train service from Cheltenham to (especially) London within the Western Route Study Consultation, being conducted by Network Rail. However, this Council is very concerned that these much needed improvements are not projected to take place until 2019 at the earliest, rather than taking advantage of the recent doubling of tracks on the line between Kemble and Swindon, and also supporting the LEP growth strategy.*

*This Council also notes with approval that Cheltenham Spa Station features in the report as a candidate for improvement under NSIP (National Station Improvement Plan) and AfA (Access for All); this is in addition to funding offered by Gloucestershire Local Transport Board and other bids funded by this Council and partners at GCC for an improved Cycle-Rail link. However, the Council is concerned that station facilities are already under enormous strain from greatly increased levels of use in recent years, now expected to increase to 2 million journeys per annum; this Council is concerned that the limitations of access and parking, including disabled access, together with the London train service, are already restricting its use and hampering modal shift by passengers to rail.*

*Cheltenham Borough Council therefore urges Network Rail and First Great Western to do all in their power to expedite improvements to both the rail station and the train service and the authority is willing and keen to engage with all stakeholders in order to facilitate further improvements (e.g. car parking capacity and terminating train constraints), and to help secure the associated funding."*

#### **4.4 8 January 2015**

Frank Chambers (TravelWatch South West) and Michael Ratcliffe (Chamber of Commerce) met with the task group and showed them illustrations, commissioned by the Chamber of Commerce, which showed what the improved station could look like.

The Chamber of Commerce were firmly of the opinion that the bay platforms would improve the passenger experience by allowing them more time to get on and off trains, as well as satisfying the operational need.

Travelwatch South West, who had been advising the Chamber of Commerce in support of the improvements to the station since 2007/08, felt that the station was lacking in functionality and needed dramatic improvements.

The task group were advised that there had been no major investment at Cheltenham since 1953, in contrast with other stations such as Oxford, Bristol Temple Meads, Newport and Swindon, which had recently benefited from a huge amount of work. The suggestion was that improvements would be further warranted once passenger usage increased to 2m per annum (it was currently

1.924m per annum) as the station would then be categorised as B by Passenger Watch on their scale of A-C. The group were also advised that the five year control periods to which the rail industry were wedded, often conflicted with funding programmes such as GLTB.

### **4.5 10 March 2015**

The task group met with representatives from Network Rail (NR) and First Great Western (FGW) to discuss their thoughts on the council's submission to the Western Route Study and to establish their position on the proposed improvements to the station and rail service.

FGW accepted that the existing station facilities and layout were a possible reason for why people living in the North and South of the town travelled to Evesham and Swindon or Kemble respectively, to board a train. Both NR and FGW were generally supportive of a scheme to make improvements to the station building, car parking facilities and taxi/bus interchange arrangements at Cheltenham Spa Railway Station; whilst making passive allowance for new bay platforms at some point in the future, should NR deem them necessary.

At the time, FGW were still in negotiations with the Department for Transport over the new direct award franchise and were therefore unable to divulge details of the future service pattern. NR, however, anticipated that, enabled by the route modernisation and deployment of new express trains, an hourly direct service to London was deliverable and that there was potential for reduced journey times. Subsequent to this meeting, it was announced that FGW had been given a new direct award franchise which covered 3.5 years with an option for a 1 year extension.

Following the announcement of the direct award franchise, FGW circulated a briefing to members of the task group which set out some short and long term timetable changes and improvements, which included journey times to Paddington of below two hours.

### **4.6 12 May 2015**

In order to fulfil all of the objectives for the review, as set by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the task group met with Rupert Cox, the Managing Director of Stagecoach West, to discuss existing bus links to and from the station.

Members were comfortable that the D service provided good linkage and frequency from some areas and that the grant from the Cycle Rail Fund would allow for a meaningful link to the 94 service, but felt that, particularly from the West of the town, links to the station were not as good. They accepted that Stagecoach considered demographics of areas and the suburbs of Cheltenham from which people were most likely to want to access the station but felt that a number of brand new route options, in some cases replacing existing routes, could address connectivity issues in some of the worst affected areas and should form part of a wider network review.

The task group were encouraged by the news that Stagecoach were open to allowing the southbound 'D' service to enter the forecourt at the station and accepted that this would only be possible if there was sufficient clearance on the

forecourt for one bus to pass another; either through increased segregation of the forecourt, or, in the short term, better enforcement. Segregation of the forecourt was a key element of the wider improvements being sought.

Members of the task group were aware that PlusBus tickets were available, but were surprised to learn that these tickets were available for journeys over a weekly, 4 weekly and annual periods and felt that this needed to be more widely publicised.

### 4.7 9 June 2015

At the final meeting held on the 9 June 2015, the Leader of the Council, Cabinet Member Development and Safety and a representative of OneLegal were given the opportunity to consider and comment upon the draft report and recommendations and their feedback was taken into account by the task group.

Of all the issues the group had considered, the poor disabled access and ramp access, which also pose issues to those with prams and small children and the shortage of parking bays, (including disabled) were considered the most serious. Integrated transport and economic development of the town was something else which needed to be taken very seriously. The station must be integral to the economic development of the town rather than a barrier to both. The group therefore wanted to focus its attention on completion of phases 1 and 2.

In particular it was expedient to re-define Phase 1 of the proposed improvements as Phases 1A and 1B, the detail of this is described within our conclusions at paragraph 5.1.3.

An approach to integrated transport, similar to that adopted in London, i.e. with more localised funding, was being discussed as part of the devolution debate, though it was too early to be clear how that might work in Gloucestershire.

The group had had some very useful discussions with FGW, NR, Stagecoach and user groups but had concerns there was still no formal mechanism for CBC, as a second tier council, to get involved in formal discussions. The Leader anticipated such discussions are likely to involve the LEP Joint Board, County Council and others. It was important for CBC to be involved in this dialogue.

## 5. OUR CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1.1 *Understand the franchise renewal process*** It would be fair to say, that whilst the group learned a good deal about the franchise renewal process, and received some valuable insights from industry representatives, as an overall subject it is quite complex. The task group recommends that the Council administration flag to central government and to elected representatives of other bodies, and to the LGA, that the present franchising structure is ill-suited to effective local input. There is no mechanism for ensuring effective local input, and importantly the rail industry's control periods do not really mesh effectively with local government's finance or electoral cycles. Something the group is very much exercised over is that the franchising process does not enable meaningful input from local communities, and especially second tier local authorities, who with populations of

typically the size of Cheltenham are, in our view, key players in the use and development of a mainline railway station.

- 5.1.2** As to, say, the fitness of First Great Western to be the preferred franchisee, the task group does not have specific comment to make.

The group has concerns that the franchising process as a whole is flawed, awarding one contract to one supplier for a number of years without (generally) the options of either open access competition on the one hand or a publicly owned franchisee on the other. This is a wider discussion which needs to take place elsewhere, and is arguably beyond the group's remit. Events have overtaken the original group remit, to the extent that FGW has had its current franchise extended by direct award for some three+ years as of April 2015.

- 5.1.3** *Understand the implications of any improvements for Cheltenham railway station and the town as a whole. Understand how these issues are currently being progressed.*

Before considering these questions we received in-depth assessments of the current weaknesses that beset rail provision at Cheltenham, particularly given its status as the busiest railway station in the County. We were particularly heartened by the public recognition of these issues in the Western Route Study of October 2014 where the constraint of "Capacity through Cheltenham due to terminating trains" was formally noted. This was most helpful as it gave credence to the concerns that we had heard from passenger user groups. Equally we were encouraged and welcomed the service improvements announced as part of the FGW franchise renewal process, in April 2015 although a little cautious over how more & improved services may impact upon the declared challenge posed by terminating trains.

Taking these two aims together we conclude that:

The Council – working closely with the Cheltenham Development Task Force, the County Council, local MP, local transport consumer groups, and local business groups including both the LEP and the Chamber of Commerce should continue to lobby the rail authorities and central government for improvements to Cheltenham Spa station, and for funding. Similarly, the Council should continue to hold the rail authorities and the DfT to account to enact the improvements to the train service already announced for 2017/18, to be achieved on time, and preferably earlier.

Whilst recognising the paramount importance of maintaining consensus across the county, and wishing to see a fully rebuilt rail station within the next 5 to 10 years, the problems at Cheltenham Spa station are acute and cannot wait. We fully support the proposals in phase 1 which effectively provide a major station customer experience upgrade with the exception of any future bay platforms which may become a necessity within a phase 2 long-term plan. The priorities are noted as follows, with the appropriate funding stream status at the time of writing identified, and with the strong recommendation to complete Phase 1 within the Rail industry's control period 5, that is 2014-2019:



Proposed improvement	Funding Source	Status	Phase
<p><b>Full equality access:</b> The group particularly identified problems with the present access via ramps and the need for lifts. Also lack of disabled toilet facilities at platform level - – currently only on Platform 1 &amp; forecourt level. Better safer routes for disabled (and all) passengers accessing/egressing across the forecourt to/from Queens Road on foot. NR have engaged in detailed in detailed discussions with Cheltenham based disability groups, which will in turn, inform the scale of the works to be undertaken.</p>	<p>Access for All –Network Rail to implement.</p> <p>Agreed in principle.</p>	<p>The liaison with representatives from disability groups is welcomed. Design and costing work to be completed. Budget will then be agreed.</p>	Phase 1A
<p><b>Car parking (short term):</b> Plan for 70 surface car spaces as part of the works associated with the cycle-rail link, although will require additional funding.</p>	First Great Western	Bid made by FGW on 05/06/15.to NR/DfT	Phase 1A
<p><b>Forecourt improvements:</b> Re-planning of the whole layout to make it user friendly for buses, taxis, car-parking, pedestrians and cyclists. Providing an integrated transport hub.</p>	Gloucestershire Local Transport Board.	£1.497m funding approved subject to securing other funding components.	Phase 1A
<p><b>Improved cycle and passenger linkage particularly to Lansdown Road:</b> (also giving a link to the 94 bus route)</p>	Successful Cycle-Rail bid – FGW to implement.	£733k funding approved. Design and costing work to be completed.	Phase 1A
<p><b>Ticketing office and other facilities:</b> Improved toilets, waiting rooms and ticket hall, buffet/coffee shop and other passenger facilities. If it is possible, enable access to/from Gloucester Road across footbridge to ticket hall without going through barrier.</p>	National Station Improvement Programme – FGW to implement	FGW registered as deliverer but funding not finalised	Phase 1A
<p><b>Car parking (longer term):</b> two storey car park.</p>	Commercial Facilities Fund	FGW to pursue once phase 1A implemented	Phase 1B
<p><b>Bay platforms:</b> to alleviate the constraint of capacity at Cheltenham due to terminating trains.</p>	To be determined – potentially rail industry or LEP or a combination	Improvements at Cheltenham Spa to be part of emerging rail strategy for LTP3	Phase 2

### Phase 1A

The group added that it considered the pedestrian route markings for all passengers across the forecourt to/from Queens Road to represent a possible safety hazard. Subsequently FGW has re-marked this within existing budgets.

### Phase 1B

The group recognised that whilst the FGW funding bid to increase car parking capacity by approximately 70 spaces was both welcome and useful, it was only a short term expedient to deal with an acute shortage of car parking. Phase 1B is thus the provision of a decked car park facility across much of the present car park site, but designed such as to enable subsequent installation of Phase 2 (bay platforms). The addition of decked car parking would provide c. 400 spaces. Members are concerned that additional decked car parking should be built in a way which is sympathetic to adjacent housing in Kensington Avenue; this should form part of future discussions between CBC and the rail industry.

It would appear that the ambition to complete Phase 1A and 1B is not only supported by the rail industry, local Council, MP, etc, but this has now been validated by the Under Secretary of State, Claire Perry MP, in a letter to the MP in which she confirms that a significant programme of investment and improvement worth approximately £10m is planned (Appendix 2).

### Phase 2

The increased services announced by FGW would, by their very definition, increase pressure on both the car park, which was already full on occasions despite the addition of 50+ spaces in 2014, and on the single siding with London trains running hourly. Increased services would also add pressure to the rail network's limited capacity for terminating trains at Cheltenham Spa, and the group saw it as essential to address this.

Until delivered, CBC should collectively campaign for these improvements in order to cope with the c2m passengers p.a. and rising. By 'Control period 6', that is 2019 – 2024, a fully rebuilt station is a realistic aim for CBC to work for with others, and it would reflect the expectation of Cheltenham Spa moving into station category B, with over 2m passenger movement p.a. Within control period 6 we should aim to establish whether the additional bay platforms for which passive provision will have been allowed are a necessary requirement and if so progress through the rail industry to full implementation and take advantage of expected rail passenger growth, new Inter City Express trains and potential future electrification, signal upgrades etc.

#### **5.1.4 *Influence the decision makers regarding improvements that would benefit the station and town.***

We note agreeably that during the currency of the group's investigations, significant progress has been made in securing funding from various silos for proposed improvements at the railway station, although the group would not wish to claim too much credit for this, as our work follows the earlier work of others, notably the joint efforts of the Task Force and Chamber of Commerce.

However, what has been extremely useful has been the opportunity to meet with the rail authorities, passenger user groups and other key parties e.g. Stagecoach to explain the full picture of needs and concerns at first hand, and to put the case to managers who have to make business cases for each of the allocations of monies for various stations and services from a defined pot of money available to First Great Western and Network Rail..

What has been demonstrated is the power of collective working to both promote the needs of Cheltenham and its economy and also proactively bid for funds, although we recognise that delivery will be entirely in the hands of the rail industry given that the station lies entirely within rail ownership. The latter point being a major advantage to deliver upgrades at Cheltenham Spa station as there are no land assembly barriers. It will be helpful for elected members to repeat this dialogue in the future, especially as there appears to be no formalised mechanism for consultation between the rail industry and local authorities.

### **5.1.5 Consider if there are any wider 'integrated transport' issues**

Buses: Having met with the principal operator Stagecoach, the group had formed a number of conclusions:

- Stagecoach was committed to provide good/improving links particularly to the town centre and principle stops on routes D and 94, and to engage fully in future plans for the station, meaning that there would be better linkages to the 94 (Cheltenham-Churchdown Gloucester); there would also be better linkages to the Southbound 'D' (Bishops Cleeve Town –Hatherley/Warden Hill). Both of these should encourage modal shift.
- The group was keen for Stagecoach to re-appraise its overall offer in the light of a rebuilt station with a bus interchange – using this as an opportunity to remodel the whole route network to the advantage of all; Stagecoach included, with holistic network links across the rest of the town, particularly the west of Cheltenham. It was noted that the company has run a network which has been quite successful, and in practice is prepared to cross-subsidise services for the wider benefit of the network. However it was also noted that introduction of new routes are expensive, and recent experiments with new route 'B' to serve Cheltenham Spa Rail station had not been a success. The group would therefore encourage Stagecoach to revisit this opportunity, and encourage the Council and all stakeholders to explore how best to achieve an affordable integrated transport approach encompassing the station.
- The group noted agreeably that plus-bus schemes which utilise combined bus and train tickets already exist, not only as singles and returns but also as weekly and monthly tickets. This was not well known to the public, and the group urges the CBC, GCC and all stakeholders to give much more publicity to this facility, again with the aim to increase modal shift.
- Stagecoach and GCC had been testing a smartcard ticket, a multi-operator ticket which would allow travel in any zone(s). Again the group saw this as an excellent way to promote modal shift from private cars, but adequate promotion is essential for it to become widespread.

Cycle and pedestrian links: The group did not commit a great deal of time to this, as clearly much work of an overview and scrutiny nature had been committed by others, resulting in the successful Cycle-Rail bid and the promise of £733,000 to open up links at Lansdown Road. Nevertheless the group did review both cycle route maps, and the proposed new linkages. It was felt that the main issue at the station was the forecourt, upon which there was no segregation for cyclists, pedestrians, or indeed, buses and taxis. A reorganisation of the forecourt should address most the issues currently faced.

### **5.1.6 Other relevant matters**

The group stressed that the main focus should be on Cheltenham Spa station and its ability to cope with the increased 2017/18 London train service, which was in itself a very

welcome development. This was not to say that other matters were unimportant but rather the focus should be on completion of Phase 1 and 2 improvements. Other matters which the group believes should remain on the agenda are as follows:

- On the north/south route, though train services are fairly frequent, there is concern that lack of route capacity may stifle traffic, and hence modal shift to rail in the future, with too high a proportion of traffic going by road.
- The rolling stock on some local services, particularly operated by Arriva trains, is life-expired, and should be a factor when this franchise is renewed.
- The train service to Worcester remains poor and is not addressed by recent proposals.
- The potential for future improvements through both electrification and re-signalling on the Bristol-Birmingham line is to be welcomed.

## **6 CONSULTATION**

- 6.1** During the course of this review we have consulted with various experts involved in this issue. The Leader and OneLegal were given the opportunity to review our draft report.

## **7 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1** Taking all our findings into consideration, the task group agreed a number of recommendations, namely that:

**Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommends to Cabinet:**

**1) To Authorise the Managing Director of the Cheltenham Task Force in conjunction with the leader of the Council to undertake the following tasks and to report progress to O&S in 12 months' time:**

- **To proactively lobby the relevant parties for all the improvements in phase 1A and 1B as listed in the table set out in section [ 5.1.3 ] of the report.**
- **Being mindful of devolution, particularly the integration of transport, to continue dialogue with Gloucestershire County Council, Local Economic Partnership and others; in particular to pursue all possible opportunities to improve public transport links to/from Cheltenham Spa station.**
- **Publicise Smartcard and PlusBus opportunities in the area.**
- **In view of the fact that some funding levels and finalised proposals for all of the improvements to the station have not yet been announced, to keep O&S informed of any developments.**
- **To pursue opportunities for CBC to be represented in formal consultation processes to ensure that local interests are taken into account when relevant authorities make decisions relevant to CBC residents.**

**2) To NOTE that whilst the service improvements announced by FGW are to be welcomed, it should be acknowledged, with concern, that a consequence of the increased services to London will be increased pressure on the rail network in the need to terminate additional trains. Thus Phase 2 will be even more necessary than it is at present.**

3) To NOTE the other relevant matters raised:

- On the north/south route, though train services are fairly frequent, there is concern that lack of route capacity may stifle traffic, and hence modal shift to rail in the future, with too high a proportion of traffic going by road.
- The rolling stock on some local services, particularly operated by Arriva trains, is life-expired, and should be a factor when this franchise is renewed.
- The train service to Worcester remains poor and is not addressed by recent proposals.
- The potential for future improvements through both electrification and re-signalling on the Bristol-Birmingham line is to be welcomed.

**7.2 PROGRESSING THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

In terms of the reference set for us by the O&S committee, we feel confident that these have been met.

<b>Report author</b>	<b>Councillor Roger Whyborn, Chair of the scrutiny task group</b>  <b>Contact officer: Saira Malin, Democracy Officer</b> <b>Saira.Malin@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 77 5153</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The One page strategy for this review</li> <li>2. Letter from Claire Perry MP to Alex Chalk MP of 17 June 2015</li> </ol>
<b>Background information</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Council minutes (15 December 2014)</li> </ol>

This page is intentionally left blank



## SCRUTINY REVIEW – ONE PAGE STRATEGY

FOR COMPLETION BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	
Broad topic area	Cheltenham Spa Railway Station
Specific topic area	To review the issues arising from the renewal of the Great Western Franchise in 2016. The Leader has suggested that O&S may want to look at the potential issues that the council should be lobbying for as part of the new franchise. This would include understanding how this links to proposals to refurbish the station as well as transport links to the station and the rail service itself.
Ambitions for the review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understand the franchise renewal process</li> <li>• Understand the implications of any improvements for Cheltenham station and the town as a whole</li> <li>• Understand how these issues are currently being progressed</li> <li>• Influence the decision makers regarding improvements that would benefit the station and the town</li> <li>• Consider if there are any wider 'integrated transport' issues</li> </ul>
Outcomes	A list of issues (improvements to the station, transport links and rail service itself) that should be considered as part of the renewal of the franchise for the benefit of Cheltenham and its residents
How long should the review take?	Approximately 6 months
Recommendations to be reported to:	Cabinet
FOR COMPLETION BY OFFICERS	
Members	Flo Clucas Dan Murch Max Wilkinson Roger Whyborn John Payne Chris Mason
Officers experts and witnesses	Jeremy Williamson
Sponsoring officer	Exec Board
Facilitator	Saira Malin
Cabinet Member	Leader of the Council
FOR COMPLETION BY THE SCRUTINY TASK GROUP	
Are there any current issues with performance?	It has been acknowledged that there are capacity issues relating to the car park and accessibility issues relating to the station in general. Members also want to consider operational issues and whether there is any economic impact on the town or county.
Co-optees	n/a
Other consultees	User groups (TravelWatch South West) Chamber of Commerce

	Network Rail and First Great Western Stagecoach West
Background information	Members want to establish an understanding of the issues and evidence the impact.
Suggested method of approach	Meetings will be arranged as required. Work on the response to the WRS will be undertaken by email given the timescales.
How will we involve the public/media? Or at what stages	Press release(s) will be made at appropriate times.





Department  
for Transport

Alex Chalk MP  
House of Commons  
London  
SW1A 0AA

From the Parliamentary  
Under Secretary of State  
Claire Perry MP

Great Minster House  
33 Horseferry Road  
London  
SW1P 4DR

Tel: 0300 330 3000  
Fax: 020 7944 4521  
E-Mail: [claire.perry@dft.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:claire.perry@dft.gsi.gov.uk)

Web site: [www.gov.uk/dft](http://www.gov.uk/dft)

Our Ref:

17 JUN 2015

*Loe Alex*

Thank you for attending the tea room surgery I held on the 27 May, and I was interested to hear your thoughts on Cheltenham station, and train services between Cheltenham and Swindon. I thought that I should write to you to set out in full the current position and future plans for the station.

A multi-billion pound programme of national rail investment by Network Rail has already seen more than £5 billion pumped into projects benefitting passengers on the Great Western network. These include Crossrail, the electrification of more than 200 miles of track on the Great Western line, and the upgrade of Reading Station. The Great Western Main Line is also set to benefit from 57 state-of-the-art intercity express trains as part of the government's £5.8 billion Intercity Express Programme (IEP) from 2017.

There are already a number of direct services between Swindon and Cheltenham, and we currently expect these new IEP trains to provide an hourly Swindon – Cheltenham service from the December 2018 timetable change date. In addition, the recently published consultation draft of the western route study identified extending Swindon – Gloucester services to Worcester via Cheltenham as a possible way of meeting growing demand for Worcester services; we are working hard with Network Rail and First Great Western to evaluate the business case for this. We would certainly encourage the local authority to continue working with First Great Western to monitor the usage in order to assess demand.

In terms of Cheltenham station itself, we are aware that passenger numbers have more than doubled in recent years but is constrained by the station

<sup>1</sup><https://www.gov.uk/government/news/franchising-deal-to-boost-services-on-great-western-main-line>

<sup>2</sup><https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/franchise-announcement>

building, which is largely Victorian, and facilities which struggle to cope with today's level of demand.

I am pleased to be able to confirm that a significant programme of investment and improvement worth approximately £10m is planned. This includes level access to the platforms via new lifts, additional passenger capacity, more retail space and a better interchange with other transport modes. Funding is being provided by the Department for Transport's Access for All, and Cycle-Rail funds as well as Gloucester Local Transport Board, and First Great Western. I trust that you and your constituents will welcome these planned improvements.

Thank you once again for your enquiry. I am sure you will join me in recognising that Great Britain's railways are a great success story. Our railway is the busiest it has been since the 1920s, we have some of the safest and most punctual rail services in Europe and we are carrying out the biggest programme of railway modernisation in a generation. Network Rail will spend over £38 billion on the railways over the next five years, allowing it to continue maintaining and enhancing the railway, not counting the massive investment in the new HS2 rail link. It really is an exciting time for railway users and it is part of this Government's commitment to reinvest the proceeds of economic recovery in world-class British infrastructure.

Yours,



**CLAIRE PERRY**

I am sure your constituents are delighted that you have picked up their rail concerns & guided.

## Cheltenham Borough Council

### Overview & Scrutiny

26 October 2015

## Scrutiny Task Group Review – Cycling and Walking Covering Report

<b>Accountable member</b>	Councillor Max Wilkinson, Chair of Scrutiny Task Group
<b>Accountable officer</b>	Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager.
<b>Executive summary</b>	<p>The Cycling &amp; Walking Scrutiny Task Group was initiated in September 2015 in order to identify opportunities for improving provision for cycling and walking in Cheltenham and to make recommendations which would facilitate these improvements.</p> <p>The scope of this topic is wide and the task group considered a range of evidence. They met with a variety of officers from the borough and county, as well as seeking advice from experts. They undertook a field trip to Bristol to see what could be achieved through implementing a cycling and walking strategy supported by a team of dedicated cycling officers at Bristol City Council.</p> <p>The group have made a number of recommendations to Cabinet which they believe will improve provision for cycling and walking across the borough. They acknowledge that the majority of the recommendations could only be implemented through partnership working so at this stage they would be looking for Cabinet's support in taking the recommendations to the next stage..</p>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>To endorse the recommendations set out in Appendix 2 and forward them to Cabinet for consideration.</b>

<b>Financial implications</b>	<p>No direct financial implications at this stage but a full assessment on the impact of 'car free' days in parts of the town centre will need to be undertaken.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Paul Jones, Head of Finance</b>  <a href="mailto:paul.jones@cheltenham.gov.uk">paul.jones@cheltenham.gov.uk</a>, 01242 775154</p>
<b>Legal implications</b>	<p><b>Legal implications will be considered as part of the detailed development of the recommendations e.g. planning policy implications, any budgetary impact and consideration of matters which fall within the remit of the County Council.</b></p> <p><b>Contact officer: Shirin Wotherspoon, Head of Law (Commercial)</b>  <a href="mailto:shirin.wotherspoon@teWKesbury.gov.uk">shirin.wotherspoon@teWKesbury.gov.uk</a> 01684 272017</p>

<b>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</b>	No direct HR implications as a result of this report. Consideration should be given to whether training or development of staff may be helpful to ensure that collaboration and transport hierarchy are fully understood and actioned. <b>Contact officer: Richard Hall, HR Business Partner</b> <a href="mailto:richard.hall@cheltenham.gov.uk">richard.hall@cheltenham.gov.uk</a> 01242 77 4972
<b>Key risks</b>	
<b>Corporate and Community Plan implications</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cheltenham's environmental quality and heritage is protected, maintained and enhanced;</li> <li>• People live in strong, safe and healthy communities.</li> <li>• We will work to promote healthy lifestyles across all communities in Cheltenham.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental and climate change implications</b>	<p>Encouraging a shift from short car journeys to cycling and walking delivers benefits for the environment and climate change by cutting off the carbon emissions that would otherwise have been produced by those cars and reducing air pollution, thereby improving local air quality. This, in turn, promotes a more pleasant environment encouraging more people to switch.</p> <p>As the task group has highlighted, in order to maximise this shift it is important to consider walking and cycling as different forms of travel to ensure that provision for cyclists does not impact on provision for pedestrians. It is also important for the hierarchy of transport modes to be applied at an early stage in policy and planning decisions to ensure integrated provision and to maximise the opportunities for people to walk and cycle.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Gill Morris, Client Officer</b> <a href="mailto:Gill.morris@cheltenham.gov.uk">Gill.morris@cheltenham.gov.uk</a> 01242 26 4229</p>
<b>Property/Asset Implications</b>	none

## 1. Background

1.1 As set out in the report

## 2. Reasons for recommendations

2.1 The scrutiny task group was initiated following a request from a member of the committee and their rationale is set out in the report.

## 3. Alternative options considered

## 4. Consultation and feedback

## 5. Performance management–monitoring and review

5.1 The O&S Committee will schedule a follow up to determine the progress on implementing any recommendations agreed by Cabinet.

<b>Report author</b>	<b>Contact officer: Tess Beck, Democracy Assistant</b> <b>Tess.beck@cheltenham.gov.uk,</b> <b>01242 26 4130</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	1. Risk Assessment 2. Task Group Recommendations 3. Task Group Report
<b>Background information</b>	None

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 policies for walking and cycling are not included in the Cheltenham Plan, this will be a missed opportunity to influence future planning decisions		21/09/2015	3	3	9	Reduce				
	If more people are not encouraged to walk or cycle rather than use the car, congestion levels are likely to increase, alongside air quality problems.		21/09/2015	3	3	9	Reduce				
<p><b>Explanatory notes</b></p> <p><b>Impact</b> – 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><b>Likelihood</b> – 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><b>Control</b> - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close</p>											

OUTCOME	RECOMMENDATIONS	HOW THIS COULD BE IMPLEMENTED
Produce a strategy for cycling and walking	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cheltenham Borough Council should endorse the Gloucestershire County Council Cycling Strategy (due to be adopted later this year) and seek to take on some of its recommendations.</li> <li>2. Produce a similar walking strategy for Cheltenham.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include in Cheltenham Plan</li> <li>• Create alongside Cheltenham Plan</li> </ul>
Improve cycle route permeability and cycle parking in areas both in and outside the town centre.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Monitor the implementation of the Cheltenham Transport plan to ensure any barriers to cycling and walking in the town centre continue to be removed.</li> <li>4. Endorse Cheltenham &amp; Tewkesbury Cycling Campaign’s wish list for improvements to Cheltenham’s cycle network and assess the options for implementation.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Future follow up from O&amp;S</li> <li>• Explore funding options within the council, GCC and external funding bids.</li> </ul>
Encourage more walking in the town by identifying and removing some of the barriers.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Initiate a wish list for walkers in the borough similar to that produced for cyclists and review how it could be implemented.</li> <li>6. Undertake an assessment of benches along walking routes to ensure they are strategically positioned, well maintained and suitable for the elderly and disabled, and identify any opportunities for further provision.</li> <li>7. Undertake an assessment of guard rails and identify any that could be removed</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commission local groups with assistance from Councillors working with their residents</li> <li>• In liaison with GCC</li> </ul>
Improve safety for walkers and cyclists	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Initiate a review to assess the appetite for a 20 mph across the town from residents, businesses and visitors and if need confirmed request GCC to conduct a more detailed feasibility study.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investigate funding opportunities from public health bodies to support the review and implementation</li> </ul>
Promote cycling and walking	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Produce guidelines for appropriate images of cycling and walking in Cheltenham Borough Council and Cheltenham Trust promotional material to ensure they are depicted as attractive and</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work in partnership with Cheltenham Trust and GCC.</li> </ul>

	<p>normal activities for everybody</p> <p>10. Improve the Cheltenham.gov.uk page: Walking in Cheltenham</p> <p>11. Create a map of walking routes within the town and promote through website and Tourist Information Centre</p> <p>12. Appoint a cycling and walking champion Member Champion for CBC and seek an invitation from the GCC for them to join the GCC Cycle Forum.</p> <p>13. Cheltenham Borough Council should lead by example by devising and implementing its own green staff travel plan.</p> <p>14. Consider the introduction of Car Free Sundays. This would involve the shutting of defined town centre streets to traffic one Sunday per month to allow for community events, following the example of successful schemes elsewhere.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with Cheltenham Trust</li> </ul>
<p>Consider the needs of walkers and cyclists before other road users when making policy and planning decisions</p>	<p>15. Incorporate the following in planning policy and guidelines</p> <p>i. At the start of any major project when the equality impact statement is carried out, the needs of cyclists and walkers should be considered (as two separate categories).</p> <p>ii. Cycling and walking are not the same mode and their needs should be considered separately in all policies and plans. The planning hierarchy of transport modes adopted by the JCS should also be adopted by the Cheltenham Plan and applied to planning and policy decisions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• .</li> </ul>



	<table border="1" data-bbox="600 124 1458 432"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="600 124 1458 180">Hierarchy of Transport Modes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="600 180 763 371">Highest</td> <td data-bbox="763 180 1458 371">           1. Pedestrians and people with mobility difficulties            2. Cyclists            3. Public transport and social/ community services            4. Access by commercial vehicles            5. Ultra-low emission vehicles         </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="600 371 763 432">Lowest</td> <td data-bbox="763 371 1458 432">6. Other motorised vehicles</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="622 456 1458 592">iii. Increased cycling provision should not be at the expense of walkers. Ideally cycle provision should not be on the footway. Where traffic speeds make it necessary, good quality segregation should be provided for bikes on the highway.</p> <p data-bbox="622 624 1458 791">iv. If people are to be encouraged to walk, pedestrians need to have an at least equal level of service as other methods of transport and positive provision of space and safe crossing points. Their needs should be considered in the design of all public space including car parks.</p> <p data-bbox="622 823 1458 959">v. Walking is a particularly important mode of transport for some groups of people such as those with visual impairment or other disabilities. The needs of these groups should be considered in planning and policy decisions.</p> <p data-bbox="622 991 1458 1062">vi. The Cheltenham Plan will consider the inclusion of separate cycling and walking policies.</p>	Hierarchy of Transport Modes		Highest	1. Pedestrians and people with mobility difficulties 2. Cyclists 3. Public transport and social/ community services 4. Access by commercial vehicles 5. Ultra-low emission vehicles	Lowest	6. Other motorised vehicles	<ul data-bbox="1496 320 1928 552" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cheltenham Borough Council should push for a more collaborative approach on street design, working across disciplines and departments and also across councils (County and Borough).</li> </ul>
Hierarchy of Transport Modes								
Highest	1. Pedestrians and people with mobility difficulties 2. Cyclists 3. Public transport and social/ community services 4. Access by commercial vehicles 5. Ultra-low emission vehicles							
Lowest	6. Other motorised vehicles							
<p data-bbox="73 1098 405 1161">Improve street design for cyclists and walkers</p>	<p data-bbox="555 1098 1368 1129">16. Consider the needs of walkers and cyclists in street design</p> <p data-bbox="555 1161 1458 1225">17. A cycling and walking working group should be created to provide input into projects.</p> <p data-bbox="555 1257 1469 1329">18. Develop a collaborative approach on street design, working across disciplines and across the borough and county council.</p>	<ul data-bbox="1496 1102 1895 1334" style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> <li>This could operate in a similar way to the accessibility working group with Wilf Tomaney as the facilitator</li> </ul>						

This page is intentionally left blank

**SCRUTINY TASK GROUP REPORT**

**CYCLING & WALKING**

**JULY 2015**



Photo courtesy of Thinktravel.

- 1.1 A review of cycling and walking in Cheltenham was initiated by Overview and Scrutiny in September 2014 in response to a request by Councillor Max Wilkinson. Cheltenham is well placed to foster a cycling and walking culture. There is also an acute need to reduce congestion and improve air quality within the borough. A shift from driving to cycling or walking will benefit the health and fitness of residents and help to tackle health inequalities.
- 1.2 The review supports Cheltenham Borough Council's Corporate Strategy outcomes that:
- Cheltenham's environmental quality and heritage is protected, maintained and enhanced; and
  - People live in strong, safe and healthy communities.
- And the Cheltenham Partnerships' action plan<sup>1</sup> priority:
- We will work to promote healthy lifestyles across all communities in Cheltenham.
- 1.3 Nationally, there is a commitment to investment in promoting cycling, with the Department for Transport (DfT) publishing a Cycling Delivery Draft plan for consultation in October 2014<sup>2</sup> (despite the name, it did also include mention of walking). The government has pledged to double the number of journeys taken by bicycle and pledged £200million to making cycling safer<sup>3</sup>. The Infrastructure Act 2015<sup>4</sup> has committed the government to producing a cycling and walking investment strategy (CWIS).
- 1.4 This report sets out the findings and recommendations arising from the scrutiny review by the scrutiny task group.

## 2. MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

- 2.1 Membership of the task group:
- Councillor Max Wilkinson (chair);
  - Councillor Tim Harman;
  - Councillor Adam Lillywhite; and
  - Councillor Suzanne Wilkinson.
- The group also included co-optees who fully participated in the review, producing and evaluating evidence, and they have demonstrated the value they can add to the scrutiny process:
- John Mallows of Cheltenham & Tewkesbury Cycling Campaign (C&TCC);
  - Bronwen Thornton of Walk21; and
  - John Newbury of Living Streets.
- 2.2 Terms of Reference agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- Develop a wish list of improvements to cycle provision in Cheltenham;\*
  - Submit proposals that will enhance the cycling and walking provision in the town centre for consideration by Gloucestershire Highways as part of the town centre development;
  - Promote cycling and walking in the town and the associated benefits (including health);
  - Consider opportunities for walking and cycling as part of a Borough Council staff green travel plan;
  - Submit proposals to the Borough Council and County Council for policy development in both planning and transport;
  - Submit proposals on street design principles to help promote cycling and walking; and
  - Feed into the Cheltenham Plan.

\* As the task group covers walking as well as cycling, there should also be a wish list of improvements to the walking environment.

### 3. METHOD OF APPROACH

- 3.1 The task group met on eight occasions and a site visit was undertaken to Bristol to see examples of good practice in cycling infrastructure and promotion. Some members went on a walkabout in Cheltenham to look at the walking environment from a pedestrian point of view, in the manner of a street audit. Members of the task group also attended presentations on 20's plenty (a national campaign to reduce speed in urban areas) and the Gloucestershire local transport plan consultation.
- 3.2 The group heard evidence from a range of people, namely:
- Chris Riley from Gloucestershire Highways;
  - Howard Barber, Public Space Designer at Cheltenham Borough Council;
  - Mark Power, Gloucestershire Highways Development Manager;
  - Martin Chandler, Planning Applications Team Leader;
  - Sue Bushell from Guide Dogs;
  - Marc Gulwell from Insight; and
  - Rowena Tassell, Healthy Lifestyles Development Officer at the Cheltenham Trust.
- We were supported in the review by the following officers:
- Tess Beck – Democratic Services Assistant : Facilitator for the task group
- 3.3 Members would like to thank all of the officers who attended meetings and contributed to the review, especially Wilf Tomaney, Townscape Manager, Rhonda Tauman, Transport Projects Officer, James Brain, Senior Planning Policy Officer, Malcolm Walls, Community Parks Officer, and Richard Cornell and Thomas Evans, Gloucestershire Local Sustainable Transport Fund Programme Managers.
- 3.4 Members would also like to thank Gloucestershire County Councillor Iain Dobie for his updates on progress with the County Council's work on barriers to cycling.
- 3.5 The task group reviewed a variety of evidence including:
- Baseline figures for walking and cycling to help set the local and current context;
  - Current initiatives in Cheltenham to support walking and cycling;
  - Barriers to walking and cycling in Cheltenham;
  - Consideration of walking and cycling by Gloucestershire Highways;
  - Consideration of walking and cycling in the planning process;
  - The needs and concerns of blind and visually impaired people;
  - Policy options for walking and cycling; and
  - Promotion of walking and cycling.

### 4. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- 4.1 It may be helpful to clarify the roles and responsibilities of those mentioned in the report in the context of this review
- 4.2 **Gloucestershire County Council** has responsibility for Highways design and maintenance in Cheltenham.
- 4.3 **Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF)** is funded from the Department for Transport. This is

delivered locally through Gloucester Council in partnership with other local authorities and organisations. Projects funded include the Thinktravel initiative promoting smarter travel choices and the Cheltenham Transport Plan.

- 4.4 The Cheltenham Trust** was created in October 2014. It is a charitable trust contracted to promote physical recreation and healthy lifestyles on behalf of Cheltenham Borough Council. The Trust's Healthy Lifestyles team works across the borough encouraging people of all ages to be more active.
- 4.5 Cheltenham Borough Council** has responsibility for planning decisions within the borough, townscape design in the town centre, and Development Plan Documents such as the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and the Cheltenham Plan. As a commissioning council it sets objectives for the Cheltenham Trust to deliver. It works with Gloucestershire Highways to commission improvements to roads and pavements in Cheltenham.
- 4.6 Cheltenham & Tewkesbury Cycling Campaign (C&TCC)** is a local group campaigning for improved cycling provision within and around Cheltenham. It works closely with the local authorities identifying barriers and opportunities for improvement. The Campaign is a member of UK's Cyclenation, of which John Mallows is a director.
- 4.7 Walk21** is an international organisation promoting walking around the world, chiefly through a series of international conferences and policy projects. We are fortunate that one of its directors, Bronwen Thornton, lives in Cheltenham and has given us her time and expertise.
- 4.8 Living Streets** is a national charity campaigning to make streets better for pedestrians, and leads on national campaigns such as 'Walk to School Week'

## **5. OUR FINDINGS**

- 5.1 The reasons why Cheltenham Borough Council should promote walking and cycling.**
- 5.1.1** Cheltenham suffers from high levels of congestion especially at peak times, and the whole borough has been designated an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) due to the pollution levels from vehicle emissions. Cheltenham has a higher proportion of adult deaths attributable to air pollution from traffic than the UK average. Although the proportion is lower than cities like Bristol and Swindon, it is still higher than any other local authority area in Gloucestershire and third highest in the South-West region<sup>5</sup>. Encouraging residents to make short trips by bike or on foot rather than in the car would help to reduce both congestion and pollution. It will also reduce road danger and traffic noise
- 5.1.2** Cheltenham is a town which lends itself to cycling and walking on a number of levels. The historic town estates create an urban form which is easily walkable for fit adults, thanks to a permeable street layout, manageable distances and a relatively easy topography. The town as a whole should be easily capable of supporting cycling for similar reasons.
- 5.1.3** Cheltenham is often described as a 'town within a park' with many green spaces which create a pleasant environment for walking and cycling. Walking and cycling enable everyone to participate in and enjoy the outdoor environment and maintain independent mobility, especially young adults and older residents.
- 5.1.4** Cycling and walking help to sustain and grow the local economy. Walking and cycling have been shown by a number of studies to contribute to local spend<sup>6</sup>, with walkers and cyclists making more frequent visits to shops and spending more in the local economy.

- 5.1.5** A switch to more active forms of travel such as walking and cycling of travel will improve the health and physical fitness of individuals. Increasing physical activity levels reduces the risk of many diseases and disorders as well as promoting mental wellbeing. For older people, it helps to maintain cognitive function, bone density and independence.
- 5.1.6** Walking and cycling provide more opportunities for social interaction and help to reduce social exclusion, as well as putting more 'eyes on the street' that contributes to crime reduction and community safety.
- 5.1.7** Local authorities are expected to take an active role in promoting walking and cycling on the recommendations of the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)<sup>7</sup> and Gloucestershire NHS<sup>8</sup>

## **5.2 Base Line Data**

- 5.2.1** Bi-annual surveys of cycling levels carried out by Cheltenham & Tewkesbury Cycling Campaign (C&TCC)<sup>9</sup> and ongoing monitoring of key cycle routes by the LSTF indicate no significant overall change in cycling levels between 2002 and 2012. Anecdotally, cycle parking is well used.
- 5.2.2** Figures from the Department for Transport 2013-2014 Walking and Cycling Statistics<sup>10</sup> (see Appendix 3) show 26% of Cheltenham adult residents cycle at least once a month which is in the top ten of local authorities nationally, and shows a significant increase on previous years. The proportion of people cycling more frequently and for utility purposes is lower and has not shown similar levels of growth, so there is room for improvement.
- 5.2.3** The number of residents who walk at least once a month (definition of walking is for more than 10 minutes) is 90% which is above the national average, and which indicates that most people who can walk do walk at least once a month. 53% of Cheltenham residents walk at least five times a week, which is also higher than both the national and the county average<sup>11</sup>.
- 5.2.4** Parking reviews in South Cheltenham in 2011<sup>12</sup> showed that 20% of car journeys started and finished in a c.1km radius. As a result the LSTF commissioned a personal travel planning (PTP) intervention which consisted of a combination of face to face travel planning advice and the provision of travel information literature. This resulted in a net reduction in the number of car journeys, with walking being the most popular alternative<sup>13</sup>. This demonstrates there is the opportunity to encourage more residents to walk and cycle in Cheltenham.

## **5.3 Barriers to cycling in Cheltenham identified by C&TCC**

- 5.3.1** John Mallows was able to update the group on the summary of barriers to cycling which had recently been compiled by C&TCC for Gloucestershire County Council. This contributed to the county council's report on Barriers to Cycling in Gloucestershire, published in November 2014<sup>14</sup>. A significant amount of funding has since been secured within the county council for more in depth feasibility studies and potential delivery of priority arterial cycle routes in Gloucestershire. Cheltenham would be the ideal location to trial the delivery plan before rolling it out to other areas.
- 5.3.2** Principal barriers in Cheltenham include roundabouts, particularly those at Kingsditch (A4019), Princess Elizabeth Way (A40), Westall Green, Old Bath Road (x2), Hatherley Way (A46) and the Racecourse (A435). Also various one way streets which mean cyclists cannot go by the most direct route.
- 5.3.3** Policy barriers to cycling included the priority given to motor vehicle movements. The increasing

Page 72  
volume and speed of motor vehicles less attractive and less safe. The location of housing in relation to services creates distances and routes that are beyond most people's cycling range. There is insufficient integration with public transport.

- 5.3.4 Key barriers to cycling in the town centre have already been addressed in the Cheltenham Transport Plan which was recently approved by Gloucestershire County Council. This lifts restrictions on cycling in traffic free areas of the High Street and Promenade and has introduced a number of contraflow cycle routes, both of which will improve permeability.
- 5.3.5 The group believed that depiction of cycling in promotional material could be a potential barrier for people choosing to take up cycling. Depiction of walkers and cyclists should emphasise the positive aspects of cycling and walking. Cyclists should be wearing normal clothes rather than lycra and helmets. Terms to avoid include: safety, congestion, pollution, helmets, sports, special clothes and equipment, and even the word cyclist.
- 5.3.6 The group agreed that images of walkers should not be limited to ramblers in hiking boots, the very young and very old, but should show a range of ages and abilities, and the interactive, social dimensions of walking, not just putting one foot in front of the other.
- 5.3.7 Publicity for both modes should focus on convenience, health, fun and reliability. Although cost-saving is relevant, cycling and walking should be seen as aspirational activities rather than a necessity for the less well off.

#### 5.4 Barriers to walking in Cheltenham identified by Bronwen Thornton of Walk 21

- 5.4.1 In Bronwen's view Cheltenham has the advantage of being very walkable due to its scale and geography. The attractiveness of its architecture, tree lined streets and parks, shops and public art all help to enhance the walking experience. However, especially outside the town centre, pedestrian movement is often compromised in favour of vehicle movement.



Pedestrian and cycle crossing at junction of Lansdown Road, Hatherley Road and Queens Road. Pedestrians and cyclists are corralled into a narrow fenced off area and have to cross on two phases of lights.

- 5.4.2 Walking is a very important local means of transport. Almost everybody can walk, and walking forms a part of most journeys. Walking is also the most popular modal shift for shorter journeys, as evidenced by the south Cheltenham PTP intervention. However, cars dominate the physical landscape, and their needs tend to be prioritised making drivers complacent. Bronwen gave Westall Green junction and crossing as an example of this. If you are inviting people to walk you



need to give them at least the same level of motorised traffic and not just in the town centre.

- 5.4.3** Many pavements are in poor condition, with uneven surfaces, often too narrow and without drop kerbs. This is a particular barrier to older people and those with reduced mobility, as well as parents with small children. These are the groups who more often rely on walking to maintain independent mobility.
- 5.4.4** It was felt that newer housing developments have failed to deliver walkable neighbourhoods. Especially on the outskirts of Cheltenham, loops of cul-de-sac development, ring roads and big box stores have promoted the idea that a vehicle is needed to reach your destination, even when the geographical distance is not great.
- 5.4.5** The school run creates a lot of short car journeys, and provides an opportunity to promote the health and social benefit of walking to school. Ironically, fear of traffic is one of the reasons many children do not walk to school<sup>15</sup>. Possible solutions include vehicle exclusion zones, more positively marketed as park and stride.
- 5.4.6** Cycling and walking are often jointly promoted, both being banded together as active travel<sup>16</sup>. They do both share the advantages of a low environmental impact and reducing congestion, as well as increasing physical activity levels. But thinking of them together leads to similar physical provision, often causing provision for cycling to impede on pedestrian space. The committee were agreed that walking and cycling are not the same and need to be treated differently. Local transport plans and strategies should have specific and separate sections and policies for walking and cycling.
- 5.4.7** The committee are agreed that, with very few exceptions, cycles should be on the carriageway, not on the footway. The committee also recognised that to encourage more cycling, provision on the highway needs to be clear and safe space for bicycles.

The group has made a number of recommendations to facilitate pedestrians in response to the Local Transport Plan consultation:

- That pavement railings are removed where possible to encourage the free movements of pedestrians;
- Pedestrians should be enabled to cross roads in places they find convenient rather than being considered as a secondary thought after the convenience of traffic;
- Pavement parking should be discouraged as this discourages walking and is particularly discriminatory to those who use wheelchairs or have other mobility problems, as well as parents with prams;
- For pensioners, the condition of pavements is a key factor in influencing both sustainable transport use and also social inclusion. Poorly maintained pavements discourage the elderly from walking which in turn can lead to exclusion; and
- The St Margaret's Road traffic light trial should be reconsidered, as anecdotal evidence suggested that it was a success from a pedestrian perspective.

## **5.5 20's Plenty**

- 5.5.1** Members of the group, other Members, officers and members of the public attended a presentation by Rod King of the 20's Plenty Campaign. Research has shown a significant increase in both walking and cycling in 20mph zones. A study in Bristol showed an average increase of over 20% in both cycling and walking<sup>17</sup>. The group recommends that Cheltenham

follow the example of several other **Page 74s** and introduces a default 20mph speed limit. Higher speeds are then sign-posted only where appropriate.

**5.5.2** Cheltenham's AQMA Action Plan supports the reduction of the urban speed limit to 20 mph in some areas to improve air quality<sup>18</sup>. As the 20 mph speed limit has benefits for public health from both improved air quality and increased physical activity levels, it has been funded from local public health budgets in some parts of the country. Some major arterial roads would be exempt from this default. Other roads, such as the High Street, would have an even lower speed limit. In practice, the actual change in traffic speeds may not be as much as prescribed, but there will be some reduction, and the reduced speed limit would give reassurance to cyclists and walkers. It should also lead to a reduction in acceleration which has a negative effect on both air quality and noise.

**5.5.3** This recommendation was included in the group's response to the Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan consultation which was agreed by Cabinet in April 2015.

**5.5.4** The group realises that to achieve compliance and acceptance of a lowered speed limit, there should be local buy in. Therefore they believe there should be public consultation before any imposition of the lower speed limit. In other parts of the country, where a 20 mph limit has been implemented, it has not been lifted and where trials have taken place, the limit has not been raised at the end of the trial (except for individual roads).

## **5.6 Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan Consultation**

**5.6.1** Members of the group attended a Members' Briefing on the Gloucestershire County Council Local Transport Plan in March 2015. The group's response to that consultation (see appendix) was included in the Cheltenham Borough Council response<sup>19</sup> to the consultation agreed by Cabinet in April 2015. A revised Local Transport Plan will be put out for a second round of consultation in November 2015, with plans for its eventual adoption in May 2016.

## **5.7 Highway design**

**5.7.1** Chris Riley from Gloucestershire Highways came and met with the group to discuss highway design and how that could facilitate cycling and walking.

**5.7.2** Any major improvements such as pavement widening could only be undertaken as part of a wider scheme as there is no funding available otherwise. But some minor changes such as road markings could be possible, and it is possible to do trials as was done at the top of Bath Road. Group members suggest that the use of white paint to 'remake the space' could be a powerful and cost-effective means of addressing some critical concerns in the short term.

**5.7.3** The move for cycle provision has moved away from containment to including cycle provision in the overall design. Gloucestershire County Council has already resolved that cycling and cycle parking is considered as part of all highways schemes.

**5.7.4** The aim to facilitate pedestrian movement and road crossings has been taken into account in the Cheltenham Transport Plan. The favoured approach is to look at where people want to cross and see what can be done to facilitate that. There are still a number of railings around Cheltenham for historic reasons, which no longer required by DfT guidelines. Where there is no safety argument for retaining the railings, someone needs to have the courage to initiate their removal.

## **5.8 Shared spaces**

- 5.8.1** The removal of the ban on cycling on parts of the High Street and Promenade is essential to enable cycle permeability of the town centre, and underpins the Cheltenham Transport Plan and LSTF bid.
- 5.8.2** The task group met with representatives of Insight Gloucestershire and Guide Dogs. Walking is an essential method of transport for blind and visually impaired people and the walking environment is fundamental to independent mobility. The needs of this group include clearly demarcated footpaths and controlled crossings. There is understandable concern by this group about sharing space with cyclists. The group agrees that with limited exceptions, cycles should be on the carriageway, not on the footway.
- 5.8.3** There is potential for conflict in the non-motorised areas of the High Street and Promenade. The Promenade does have a marked space for vehicle movement which could possibly be employed in the High Street. The movement of most shoppers is not linear, though that of cyclists is likely to be. Decisions over demarcation of space in these areas should take into account the needs of blind and visually impaired people. Cyclists should be made aware of the needs of other users – though this will not mitigate for anti-social cyclists.
- 5.8.4** The group heard from Howard Barber, CBC Public Space Designer, that there has been a move away from fully shared space without demarcated areas for traffic. This has been in response to the needs of people with disabilities. However shared space is still attractive to developers who mistakenly perceive it as a means to create less public space.
- 5.8.5** Howard Barber has established an accessibility working group who are assembled on an adhoc basis to give their views on major projects. Marc Gulwell of Insight who attended the scrutiny committee is part of this group. Projects the group have been involved in include plans for the town centre and Lower High Street, and more recently the group went to the railway station to look at access and signage. Wilf Tomaney would like to create an equivalent working group of walking and cycling experts.
- 5.8.6** At the start of any major project an Equality Impact Assessment is carried out. Howard Barber suggested that the needs of cyclists and walkers (as two separate groups) could be considered at the same time, and this was agreed by the group.

## **5.9 Creating Streets for Cycling and Walking**

- 5.9.1** Wilf Tomaney, Townscape Manager, emphasised that attractive streets were essential to encouraging more people to walk and cycle. People are attracted to beautiful and interesting places, which are safe - both from crime and traffic danger; they shy away from ugly, dangerous places. Cheltenham has tree-lined streets, lined with buildings which overlook them and a selection of attractive parks and gardens strategically located around the town. This gives it a head-start in delivering a place to walk and cycle around. The values of creating beautiful streets and spaces should not be underestimated in delivering walking and cycling to the town - we should be creating streets and places where people want to be and where they want to linger. Planting, surface materials, public art, benches, attractive buildings, shade, water, visual stimulation are all valuable tools in delivering this
- 5.9.2** Street and space design must be supported by a multi-disciplinary approach and ongoing maintenance. This requires collaboration between engineers, architects, landscape architects, police, and local authorities in delivering street-scene and highway design. The group members who went to Bristol saw the results of this collaborative approach.

## **5.10 Planning**

**5.10.1** The group met with Mark Power of County Council Highways and Martin Chandler, Cheltenham Borough Council Applications Team Leader.

**5.10.2** Mark Power's role is to respond to significant planning proposals on behalf of Gloucestershire Highways as a statutory consultee. He stated that highways have the power to suggest improvements or conditions, but that all conditions must be reasonable, related and viable. He considers that large developments give more opportunity for improvements and imaginative thinking as there is more money to spend. In his view, in smaller developments, the money and attention needs to go to the mode of transport that will cause most (negative) impact (i.e. motorised vehicles).

**5.10.3** Responses have to be in the context of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and any local policy documents such as the Local Transport Plan, JCS and the Cheltenham Plan. The more current a document, the more weight it will carry. Any policies must stand up to legal scrutiny.

**5.10.4** Influencing developers remains a challenge. Although Highways are not involved until later in the process, there is the possibility of Cheltenham Borough Council having some influence at the pre-planning stage. Martin Chandler is re-introducing the 'Design Surgery', and has invited John Mallows to join the panel on a trial basis.

**5.10.5** The group had concerns about the permeability of many residential developments, especially on the outskirts of Cheltenham, e.g. Up Hatherley and Warden Hill. These areas tended to be very car-centric, as the direct routes preferred by walkers and cyclists were not available. Martin suggested that the police would be concerned about open-ended street layouts that hinder enforcement. Building in permeability would require attention to Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles and building out this concern.

**5.10.6** Both CBC planning and Highways consulted with C&TCC on plans with regard to cycling. There is as yet no equivalent organisation for them to consult with on walking.

**5.10.7** Wilf Tomaney suggested that the hierarchy proposed by policy SD5<sup>20</sup> of the JCS be applied to all policy and planning decisions, and the needs of walkers and cyclists should be considered before other road users. Walking should come before cycling in the hierarchy because almost everyone walks at some time, and most people will do part of any journey on foot.

Hierarchy of Transport Modes	
Highest	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pedestrians and people with mobility difficulties</li> <li>2. Cyclists</li> <li>3. Public transport and social/ community services</li> <li>4. Access by commercial vehicles</li> <li>5. Ultra-low emission vehicles</li> </ol>
Lowest	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Other motorised vehicles</li> </ol>

**5.10.8** The group agreed that the hierarchy of planning adopted for the JCS should also be adopted by the Cheltenham Plan.

**5.11 Planning Policy**

**5.11.1** James Brain, Senior Planning Policy Officer, has attended almost all the meetings of the scrutiny task group and taken note of what has been discussed. He considered that the proposals made

are achievable within the Cheltenham Plan. **Page 77** consider the inclusion of separate walking and cycling policies. When the policy has been drafted, he would like to reconvene the group to review it.

**5.11.2** James suggested that a corporate strategy or suite of strategies would help support the Cheltenham Plan. A strategy would lend more detail to the policies contained in the plan, and would provide significant weight to the direction and content of planning policy as well as support wider spatial strategies (networks) for walking and cycling. He suggested the group looked at creating separate cycling and walking strategies as have been done in Bristol, and possibly an additional public realm strategy to cover the town centre. Specific strategies could also form the basis for future funding bids. The group supported this proposal

**5.11.3** Gloucestershire County Council's Cycling Strategy for Gloucestershire is currently at the draft stage. It is likely to be finalised and adopted in 2015/16.

## **5.12 Cheltenham Borough staff green travel plan**

**5.12.1** Money raised from CBC staff parking charges is collected to fund a green travel plan and officers have been assigned to develop it. A green travel scheme could include the provision of facilities and incentives or personalised travel planning. The results should be monitored. In the event of moving out of the Municipal Offices, it should be ensured that any new premises provides suitable facilities for walking and cycling, and can be easily accessed by residents, members and staff on foot or by bike.

## **5.13 Promotion of walking and cycling.**

**5.13.1** Rowena Tassell from the Cheltenham Trust told the group about the success of the Walk Well Health Walks. These are volunteer led, very popular and very sustainable, the main costs to the Trust being that of producing and printing the walk programmes. The Trust is attempting to introduce the same sort of scheme for cycling, but that is still at an early stage and so far take up has been slow. Both schemes are promoted through the exercise on prescription scheme and are open to all.

**5.13.2** The Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) currently has responsibility for promotion of sustainable transport in Gloucestershire. Its current emphasis is on travel planning, with workplaces and around stations. They support national promotions such as walk to school week and bike week. Active travel is promoted through the Thinktravel website [www.thinktravel.info](http://www.thinktravel.info) They have funding until March 2016, when ownership of the Thinktravel brand will pass to the Integrated Transport Unit for maintenance.

**5.13.3** In the group's opinion, there was a missed opportunity to promote walking on the Cheltenham.gov.uk website which, apart from the health walks, mostly refers to walking outside Cheltenham. There is also currently no walking map of Cheltenham, though this could be a possibility in the future with plans for a new suite of maps (in partnership with the Tourist Information Centre). A partnership with the Walkit website could be considered as this would also be used to promote health walks and themed walks on behalf of the Trust.

**5.13.4** Open Streets events where an area of the town is closed to traffic on one Sunday a month were discussed, similar to Open Streets events in London or Make Sunday Special in Bristol. This would encourage people to walk and give an opportunity for traffic-free cycling.

## **5.14 Fieldtrip to Bristol**

5.14.1 Members of the group took a trip to **Page 78** with cycling campaigners and council officers responsible for cycling. Many of the infrastructure changes are fairly recent as Bristol has benefitted from funding from Cycling City designation (2011) and the Cycle City Ambition grant which has made a number of improvements possible. Before this there was a tolerance of cyclists using shared traffic free spaces which enabled permeability and offered the opportunity to cycle away from motorised traffic. Bristol City Council has a dedicated cycle team. The group were impressed by the number of people riding bikes, most of whom did not wear helmets, and the respect shown to cyclists by other road users. The recently introduced 20 mph speed limits meant roads were calmer and members felt more comfortable cycling in traffic.

## 5.15 Funding

5.15.1 The LSTF has no funding for infrastructure and most of its funding has already been allocated. At the time of writing there was £5-10K available to be spent by March 2016 but that is likely to be gone soon. There are also small pots of funding held by the Townscape department at Cheltenham Borough Council. Many County Councillors had funding available from their Active Together funds, and they also had small Highways budgets. Another potential funding source was the Health Inequalities Funding administered by Richard Gibson. The CBC Environmental Fund had also been used to fund some cycling projects.

5.15.2 Wilf Tomaney pointed out that projects needed to be sufficiently funded. If there is insufficient budget, the project should be cut to match the budget. Adequate maintenance budgets also need to be in place.

## 6. CONSULTATION AND FEEDBACK

6.1 Walking and cycling straddle a number of Cabinet portfolios: Healthy Lifestyles; Leader; but chiefly Development and Safety. The group chair kept the Cabinet members updated throughout the process.

## 7. RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 This has not been straightforward as many of the issues discussed have not been within Cheltenham Borough Council's remit. For this reason, and for budgetary reasons many of our recommendations have concentrated on influencing policy rather than infrastructure.

7.2 Taking all these findings into consideration, the task group are making the following recommendations to Cabinet:

i. **Rec 1: Identify opportunities for improving cycle route permeability and cycle parking in areas outside the town centre.** A lot of work has been done on removing barriers within the town centre and most of these proposals have been included in the Cheltenham Transport Plan. There is still work to be done outside the centre.

i. Cheltenham Borough Council should endorse Cheltenham & Tewkesbury Cycling Campaign's wish list for improvements to Cheltenham's cycle network. Once agreed, the authority should put aside funds each year to pay for the items suggested, or proactively identify and bid for funds to pay for the suggestions and encourage the

County Council to do the same. Page 79 should be added to a costed wish list of improvements, which could then be added to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) 123 lists or included in funding bids.

- ii. **An equivalent exercise should be undertaken for walking.** Councillors should work with residents and walking experts to draw up a wish list of improvements for residents. Locations should be identified for benches and funding identified for maintenance.
- ii. **Rec 2: Gloucestershire County Council should investigate and engage with Cheltenham residents in order to promote a borough wide 20mph default speed limit to make the environment safer and more attractive to walkers and cyclists.** A default speed limit does not mean that all roads will have a 20mph limit. Selected roads will have a higher speed limit, and a few may have an even lower limit. The Council should also investigate the possibility of securing additional funding for this from public health budgets.
- iii. **Rec 3: Gloucestershire County Council should undertake an assessment aimed at removing guard rails, which are a key barrier to walking and encourage faster vehicle speeds.**
- iv. **Rec 4: Benches should be strategically positioned along routes to allow people to rest – on inclines, at attractive view points, at nodal points on the street and transport network (bus stops in particular.** Benches are an important part of any walking strategy, for elderly and disabled people in particular. They need to be well maintained and comfortable.
- v. **Rec 5: Cheltenham Borough Council should work with the Cheltenham Trust and Gloucestershire County Council to promote cycling and walking within Cheltenham, especially once Thinktravel loses its LSTF funding in 2016.**
  - i. Images of cycling and walking in Cheltenham Borough Council and Cheltenham Trust promotional material should depict them as attractive and normal activities for everybody.
  - ii. The Cheltenham.gov.uk page: *Walking in Cheltenham* should be improved to promote walking within the borough.
  - iii. Cheltenham Borough Council should work with Cheltenham Trust to create maps of walking routes within the town.
- vi. **Rec 6: The needs of walkers and cyclists should be considered before other road users when making policy and planning decisions, and their needs should be considered at the start of any major planning project.**

- i. At the start of any major the equality impact statement is carried out, the needs of cyclists and walkers should be considered (as two separate categories).
- ii. Cycling and walking are not the same mode and their needs should be considered separately in all policies and plans.
- iii. The planning hierarchy of transport modes adopted by the JCS should also be adopted by the Cheltenham Plan and applied to planning and policy decisions.

Hierarchy of Transport Modes	
Highest	1. Pedestrians and people with mobility difficulties 2. Cyclists 3. Public transport and social/ community services 4. Access by commercial vehicles 5. Ultra-low emission vehicles
Lowest	6. Other motorised vehicles

- iv. Increased cycling provision should not be at the expense of walkers. Ideally cycle provision should not be on the footway. Where traffic speeds make it necessary, good quality segregation should be provided for bikes on the highway.
- v. If people are to be encouraged to walk, pedestrians need to have an at least equal level of service as other methods of transport and positive provision of space and safe crossing points. Their needs should be considered in the design of all public space including car parks.
- vi. Walking is a particularly important mode of transport for some groups of people such as those with visual impairment or other disabilities. The needs of these groups should be considered in planning and policy decisions.
- vii. The Cheltenham Plan will consider the inclusion of separate walking and cycling policies.
- vii. **Rec 7: A cycling and walking working group should be created to provide input into projects.** This could operate in a similar way to the access working group with Wilf Tomaney as the facilitator.
- viii. **Rec 8: Cheltenham Borough Council should endorse the Gloucestershire County Council Cycling Strategy and draw up its own walking strategy.** The Gloucestershire County Council Cycling Strategy is likely to be adopted this municipal year. Cheltenham Borough Council could resolve to endorse it and take on some of its recommendations. There is no equivalent County Council strategy for walking, which strengthens the case for CBC producing its own walking strategy.



- ix. **Rec 9: Cheltenham Borough Council should elect a cycling and walking champion from its members.** This member could represent CBC on the GCC Cycle Forum.
- x. **Rec 10: Cheltenham Borough Council should lead by example by devising and implementing its own green staff travel plan.**
- xi. **Rec 11: Cheltenham Borough Council should consider the introduction of Car Free Sundays.** This would involve the shutting of defined town centre streets to traffic one Sunday per month to allow for community events, following the example of successful schemes elsewhere.
- xii. **Rec 12: Cheltenham Borough Council should push for a more collaborative approach on street design, working across disciplines and departments and also across councils (County and Borough).**

## 8. TAKING FORWARD THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM SCRUTINY

### 8.1

<b>Report author</b>	<b>Contact officer: Tess Beck , tess.beck@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264130</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. One page strategy agreed by O&amp;S committee</li> <li>2. Group response to Local Transport Plan consultation</li> <li>3. Walking and cycling statistics</li> </ol>
<b>Background information</b>	



## SCRUTINY REVIEW – ONE PAGE STRATEGY

FOR COMPLETION BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	
Broad topic area	Cycling and Walking
Specific topic area	To review the facilities for cycling and walking in the town.
Ambitions for the review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish existing provision for cycling and walking in the town</li> <li>• Identify any areas for improvement</li> <li>• Establish how best to influence the decision makers</li> <li>• Determine means by which the council could help to promote cycling and walking</li> <li>• Consider if there are any wider 'integrated transport' issues</li> </ul>
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a wish list of improvements to cycle provision in Cheltenham</li> <li>• Submit proposals that will enhance the cycling and walking provision in the town centre for consideration by Gloucestershire Highways as part of the town centre development</li> <li>• Promote cycling and walking in the town and the associated benefits (including health)</li> <li>• Consider opportunities for walking and cycling as part of a Borough Council staff green travel plan</li> <li>• Submit proposals to the Borough Council and County Council for policy development in both planning and transport</li> <li>• Submit proposals on street design principles to help promote cycling and walking</li> <li>• Feed into the Cheltenham Plan</li> </ul>
How long should the review take?	It is suggested that this review will take six months
Recommendations to be reported to:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee and CBC Cabinet
FOR COMPLETION BY OFFICERS	
Members	Tim Harman Dan Murch Suzanne Williams Max Wilkinson Adam Lillywhite

Officers experts and witnesses	Wilf Tomane, nan Rowena Tassell, Malcolm Walls, James Brain
Sponsoring officer	Tbc
Facilitator	Bev Thomas/Tess Beck
Cabinet Member	Cabinet Member Development & Safety and Cabinet Member Healthy Lifestyles
<b>FOR COMPLETION BY THE SCRUTINY TASK GROUP</b>	
Are there any current issues with performance?	
Co-optees	John Mallows, Cheltenham & Tewkesbury Cycle Campaign Bronwen Thornton, Walk 21 John Newbury, Living Streets, GCCllr Iain Dobie
Other consultees	Other interest groups to be consulted as and when throughout the review period
Background information	Tess Beck is maintaining a useful list of web sites to circulate. Local cycle leaflet; pedestrian phase information; local cycle groups
Suggested method of approach	structured programme timetable for next 6 months
How will we involve the public/media? Or at what stages	

**Cycling and Walking STG response to Local Transport Plan consultation**

The Cheltenham Borough Council Walking and Cycling Scrutiny Task Group is concerned with an investigation and analysis of the issues around and promotion of walking and cycling as a transport choice within Cheltenham.

The group notes and welcomes the fact that in LTP3 almost the entire area of the borough of Cheltenham is designated a 'place for people' in the vision for 2031. However, if the borough of Cheltenham is to become a 'place for people', rather than a place beholden to traffic, significant changes to encourage active travel choices will need to be enabled.

Evidence presented to the group by Rod King, of the 20s Plenty campaign, suggests that introducing default lower speed limits in urban areas encourages the development of spaces in which people use sustainable transport rather than cars. We would encourage the county council, if it is truly seeking to create a 'place for people', to pursue a policy of introducing a default 20mph limit in the borough. The group would recommend that, in line with practice elsewhere, the county seeks funding from health authorities to help pay for a scheme.

The group has heard evidence that positive promotion of cycling should be used to encourage a change in mindset. The choice of cycling should be made to look attractive and normal, rather than a niche pursuit.

Having heard evidence from county council officers, the group would question why the trial scheme for removing traffic lights in St Margaret's Road was not made permanent. Anecdotal evidence suggested the trial was a success from a pedestrian perspective, regardless of the apparent lack of car journey time improvement. However, it should be considered that a solution to the problem of a reduced cycle links resulting from the trial would need to be solved.

The group would encourage the removal of as many pavement railings as possible, to encourage the free movement of pedestrians across the town. Pedestrians should be enabled to cross in places they find convenient, rather than being considered as a secondary thought after the convenience of motorists. As part of this, we must seek to discourage pavement parking, which discourages walking and is particularly discriminatory to those who use wheelchairs or have other mobility problems, as well as parents with prams.

For pensioners, the condition of pavements is a key factor in influencing both sustainable transport use and also social inclusion. Poorly maintained pavements discourage the elderly from walking, which in turn can lead to exclusion.

The full findings of the scrutiny task group are due to be completed this summer, but we hope these interim thoughts will help inform the county council's LTP3.

Max Wilkinson

On behalf of Cheltenham Borough Council Walking and Cycling Scrutiny Task Group

## Department for Transport statistics

Walking and Cycling Statistics (<http://www.dft.gov.uk/statistics/series/walking-and-cycling/>)Proportion of residents<sup>1</sup> who do any walking<sup>2</sup> or cycling<sup>3</sup>, at least once per month: England, 2013/14

	% Walking	% Cycling
<b>Cheltenham</b>	<b>90.2</b>	<b>26.1</b>
Gloucestershire	88.5	19.1
Bristol	87.4	25.9
South West	87.3	18.2
England	86.3	14.971

Proportion of residents<sup>1</sup> who walk<sup>2</sup> or cycle (any length or purpose) at a given frequency: England, 2013/14

	Walking				Cycling			
	1xper month	1xperweek	3xperweek	5xperweek	1xper month	1xperweek	3xperweek	5xperweek
<b>Cheltenham</b>	<b>90.2</b>	<b>83.3</b>	<b>61.8</b>	<b>53.1</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>
Gloucestershire	88.5	81.1	59.0	47.8	19.1	11.5	4.9	2.6
Bristol	87.4	78.8	59.1	46.1	25.9	17.0	9.4	5.0
South West	87.3	80.0	59.2	48.2	18.2	11.6	5.5	3.1
England	86.3	78.9	57.9	47.2	15.0	9.5	4.4	2.5

Proportion of residents<sup>1</sup> who walk<sup>2</sup> or cycle (any length) for utility purposes<sup>5</sup> at a given frequency: England, 95% CI refers to the 95% confidence interval<sup>4</sup>

	Walking				Cycling			
	1xper month	1xperweek	3xperweek	5xperweek	1xper month	1xperweek	3xperweek	5xperweek
<b>Cheltenham</b>	<b>65.1</b>	<b>56.5</b>	<b>38.6</b>	<b>28.7</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>2.3</b>
Gloucestershire	56.7	47.8	30.2	20.2	7.9	5.3	2.6	1.6
Bristol	70.9	59.5	36.5	25.4	15.5	12.4	7.2	2.8
South West	55.9	47.2	29.5	19.4	7.8	5.4	3.0	1.8
England	58.7	50.1	33.0	22.3	6.5	4.5	2.6	1.6

Proportion of residents<sup>1</sup> who walk<sup>2</sup> or cycle (any length) for recreational purposes at a given frequency; Eng

	Walking				Cycling			
	1xper month	1xperweek	3xperweek	5xperweek	1xper month	1xperweek	3xperweek	5xperweek
<b>Cheltenham</b>	<b>59.3</b>	<b>44.6</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>
Gloucestershire	60.3	47.8	27.5	19.2	13.3	6.6	2.2	0.7
Bristol	51.0	37.3	18.3	11.7	13.9	5.8	1.5	0.7
South West	60.5	48.7	27.8	19.8	12.7	7.0	2.2	0.8
England	55.4	42.2	23.1	16.2	10.3	5.7	1.7	0.7

Cycling to work: Data from the 2011 Census<sup>6</sup>,

Proportion of adult residents who usually cycle to work, as at March 2011 (Office for National Statistics, 2011 Census)

	%
<b>Cheltenham</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Cotswold	1.4
Forest of Dean	0.8
Gloucester	3.5
Stroud	1.5
Tewkesbury	3.1
Gloucestershire	2.6
Bristol	5.0
South West	2.3
England	1.9

## Comments:

Cheltenham shows a significant increase in the number of adults walking 5x a week or more (up from 44.6% to 53.1%) with increases in the numbers walking at all frequencies. This correlates with significant increases in utility walking.

Cheltenham shows a significant increase in the numbers cycling 1x a month (up from 20% to 26%) and increases in the level of recreational cycling. Cheltenham is one of the top 10 local authorities nationally with the highest % of adults cycling 1x a week. There has, however, been a decrease in the numbers cycling 5x a week or more and no significant changes in utility cycling levels.

Nationally, there is a distinct gender difference in cycling uptake, with men outnumbering women 2:1 across all ages. Although cycling levels decline with age, there is also a decline in the 25 - 34 age band with numbers increasing again in the 35-44 age band.

For walking, there is no significant gender difference, and smaller differences between age groups, although there is a decline with age, especially in utility walking.

People who walk and cycle regularly are also more likely to be physically active in other ways.

## Notes

1. Residents based on a sample of adults aged 16 up surveyed by Sport England's Active People Survey (APS)
2. Walking refers to a continuous walk of at least 10 minutes and can be any type of walk, although 'walking around shops'
3. Cycling can be any distance and any type of cycling.
4. The APS data is weighted and has a 95% confidence interval.
5. Estimate of number of days of utility walking = Total number of days walking – Number of days
6. The census only asks about cycling to work, so would exclude other journeys and those not working, e.g. students,

- 
- <sup>1</sup>Cheltenham Partnership action plan  
[http://www.cheltenhampartnership.org.uk/cheltenhampartnership/info/21/project\\_information/2/partnership\\_action\\_plan](http://www.cheltenhampartnership.org.uk/cheltenhampartnership/info/21/project_information/2/partnership_action_plan)
- <sup>2</sup> DfT Cycling Delivery Plan Draft October 2014  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/364791/141015\\_Cycling\\_Delivery\\_Plan.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/364791/141015_Cycling_Delivery_Plan.pdf)
- <sup>3</sup> The Conservative Party Manifesto 2015 <https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/manifesto2015/ConservativeManifesto2015.pdf>
- <sup>4</sup> Infrastructure Act 2015 part 2 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2015/7/part/2/enacted>
- <sup>5</sup> Public Health England (2014) Estimating Local Mortality Burdens Associated with Particulate Air Pollution.  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/332854/PHE\\_CRCE\\_010.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/332854/PHE_CRCE_010.pdf)
- <sup>6</sup> e.g. Transport for London: Town Centre Study 2011: Economic contribution made by walkers, cyclists and other transport users to retail centres. <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/cdn/static/cms/documents/town-centre-study-2011-report.pdf>
- <sup>7</sup> NICE local government briefings: Walking and cycling (2013) <http://publications.nice.org.uk/lgb8>
- <sup>8</sup> Ballantyne, R & Blackshaw, N (2014) Active Planning Toolkit 2. Gloucestershire NHS  
<http://www.gloucestershireccg.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/Active-Planning-Toolkit-2.pdf>
- <sup>9</sup> <http://www.cyclecheltenham.org.uk/counts.html>
- <sup>10</sup> [www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport/series/walking-and-cycling-statistics](http://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport/series/walking-and-cycling-statistics)
- <sup>11</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>12</sup> Cheltenham Parking Review Phase II – Southern Review Area June 2011: Gloucestershire County Council
- <sup>13</sup> Steer Davies Gleave (2014) Cheltenham PTP 2013 Executive Summary Report February 2014  
[http://www.thinktravel.info/files/uploads/Executive\\_Summary\\_Cheltenham.pdf](http://www.thinktravel.info/files/uploads/Executive_Summary_Cheltenham.pdf)
- <sup>14</sup> <http://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/documents/s23808/Barriers%20to%20Cycling%20Report.pdf>
- <sup>15</sup> <http://www.livingstreets.org.uk/time-to-target-the-walk-to-school-says-living-streets>
- <sup>16</sup> As they were in the Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan consultation
- <sup>17</sup> [https://bristol.gov.uk/committee/2012/ua/ua000/0726\\_7.pdf](https://bristol.gov.uk/committee/2012/ua/ua000/0726_7.pdf)
- <sup>18</sup> Cheltenham Borough Council Air Quality Action Plan April 2014  
[http://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/downloads/file/3780/air\\_quality\\_action\\_plan\\_2014](http://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/downloads/file/3780/air_quality_action_plan_2014)
- <sup>19</sup> [https://democracy.cheltenham.gov.uk/documents/s15154/2015\\_04\\_14\\_CAB\\_LTP3\\_Appendix\\_2\\_CBC\\_comments.pdf](https://democracy.cheltenham.gov.uk/documents/s15154/2015_04_14_CAB_LTP3_Appendix_2_CBC_comments.pdf)
- <sup>20</sup> Joint Core Strategy – Gloucester – Cheltenham- Tewkesbury Submission Version November 2014  
<http://www.gct-jcs.org/Documents/Publications/Submission/JCS-Submission-Version-November-2014a-corrected.pdf>

O&S Task group	Purpose	Status summary	Nominations/Membership (chairman in bold)	Facilitating Officer	Sponsoring Officer	Cabinet Member	Proposed by	Terms of Ref agreed by O&S	Recs to O&S	Report to Council	Report to Cabinet	Cabinet follow up	O&S Follow up scheduled
<b>KEY TO COLOURS</b>													
	Active STGs												
	On hold												
	Standing group												
	Not prioritised by O&S												
Cheltenham Railway Station	To review the issues arising from the renewal of the Great Western Franchise in 2016. This would include understanding how this links with the proposals to refurbish the station.	The Leader suggested that O&S may want an STG to look at the franchise renewal and station improvements. The task group drafted a response to the Western Route Study which was tabled as a motion and agreed at Council before being submitted as the council's formal response. The group have met with representatives from Travelwatch South West, the Chamber of Commerce, Network Rail and Frist Great Western, Stagecoach West and the Leader of the Council. The final report will be considered by the O&S Committee on 26/10 and if approved the recommendations will be forwarded to Cabinet 10/10.	Cllr Clucas, Murch, <b>Whyborn</b> , and Wilkinson, Payne and Mason	Saira Malin	Exec Board	Leader (Cllr Jordan)	Leader, Cllr Jordan	Jul-14	Oct-15	Nov-15			
Cycling and Walking	To review the facilities for cycling and walking in the town.	O&S at its July meeting agreed to set up a STG to look at this issue. The timing was appropriate as any new road networks in Cheltenham currently being planned should be designed to facilitate cycling and walking. First meeting held on the 15/10 and task group agreed approach. The group met with various groups and representatives and even undertook a site visit. The final report will be considered by the O&S Committee on 26/10 and if approved the recommendations will be forwarded to Cabinet 10/10.	Cllrs Harman, Murch, Willimans, <b>Wilkinson</b> and Lillywhite	Tess Beck	Exec Board	Development and Safety (Cllr McKinlay)	Cllr Max Wilkinson	Jul-14	Oct-15	Nov-15			
Broadband	Members at the O&S meeting in April asked if a task group might want to look at what and where the issues in relation to slow broadband are in Cheltenham (and possibly Gloucester City if they want to undertake joint scrutiny) and use this information to help lobby GCC and/or BT and Virgin to make improvements.	Membership has been confirmed (see next column) and the first meeting has been arranged or 20/10. A further update will be provided at the meeting.	Cllrs Babbage, Britter and Whyborn and Cllrs Gordon Taylor and Neil Hampson (Gloucester City Council)	Annette Wight	Exec Board	tbc	Cllr Tim Harman	tbc					
Devolution	The Leader asked if O&S would set up a task group to maintain an overview of the ongoing discussions in relation to devolution and explore the opportunities and benefits for Cheltenham.	Membership has been confirmed and the first meeting took place on the 12/10 and Cllr Mason was elected as Chair. A draft one page strategy was devised and the O&S Committee will be asked to approve this at their meeting on the 26/10. The next meeting is planned for the 29 October and the task group plan to be in a position to give their initial views direct to the special Council meeting arranged for 16 November to consider devolution.	Cllrs, Clucas, Harman, Whyborn, Payne, <b>Mason</b> and C. Hay (Cllrs Jordan and Reid will observe)	Rosalind Reeves	Andrew North	Leader (Cllr Jordan)	Leader, Cllr Jordan	Oct-15					
Budget scrutiny working group	The working group's role is to develop the budget process, support the development of Members' scrutiny role and to consider ideas from Members for reducing the budget gap.	The working group has a schedule of meetings arranged throughout the year. The new members held their first meeting on 10/07/2014 when the Chief Executive attended to outline his vision and the group considered the financial implications of Vision 20/20.	Cllrs Babbage, Nelson, Payne, Thornton, Whyborn, Wilkinson  Cabinet Member Finance to attend by invitation.	Rosalind Reeves	Mark Sheldon	Finance (Cllr Rawson)	Council	May-12	Jan-15	Feb-15	Jan-15		

This page is intentionally left blank





**(DRAFT) SCRUTINY REVIEW – ONE PAGE STRATEGY**

FOR COMPLETION BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	
Broad topic area	Devolution
Specific topic area	The Gloucestershire Bid
Terms of Reference for the review	<p>To identify the opportunities for Cheltenham that members would want explored in any devolution arrangements for Gloucestershire.</p> <p>To act as a sounding board on behalf of a wider group of members as the devolution bid develops.</p> <p>To review potential governance and scrutiny arrangements for the combined authority and understand how members could influence future decision making</p>
Outcomes	<p>A list of opportunities that Cheltenham would like to see explored in any devolution bid with specific reference to subsidiarity.</p> <p>A clear understanding of the benefits of devolution for the council and the town it serves and how the council can maximise its contribution to the devolution arrangements.</p> <p>An agreement to any governance and scrutiny arrangements that are being proposed as part of the bid or any recommendations for change.</p>
How long should the review take?	<p>The government expect all parties in Gloucestershire Devolution to be signed up by 25 November and an Extraordinary Council meeting has been arranged for the 16 November so the task group should be in a position to make its views known by that date.</p> <p>Following that milestone, the group will need to understand the timescales for devolution going forward and make their plans accordingly.</p> <p>The Leader has a meeting with the GCC Leader on Thursday 15 October and would welcome some initial views from the task group before that meeting on outcomes for Cheltenham.</p>
Recommendations to reported to:	In view of the timescales for this first phase, it should be agreed at the O&S committee on 26 October that the scrutiny task group will reports its initial conclusions direct to Council on 16 November.
Membership:	
FOR COMPLETION BY OFFICERS	
Officers experts and witnesses	Andrew North, Richard Gibson, Bryan Parsons who have all been involved in the devolution bid to date

Sponsoring officer	Andrew North
Facilitator	Rosalind Reeves
<b>FOR COMPLETION BY THE SCRUTINY TASK GROUP</b>	
Are there any current issues with performance?	Not applicable.
Co-optees	None identified at this stage.
Other experts and witnesses	Richard Gibson (communities and neighbourhoods), Andrew North (governance), Bryan Parsons (governance).
Other consultees	Gloucestershire Scrutiny Group could have devolution on their agenda.
Background information	Grant Thornton, Centre for Public Scrutiny and government have all produced briefing papers and guidance
Suggested method of approach	Initial approach will be to review all available documentation both within Gloucestershire and advice from external bodies. Find out how members in other councils are approaching it.
How will we involve the public/media? Or at what stages	To be agreed.
Preferred timing for meetings	6 pm.

O&S Committee 2014/15 work plan

Item	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
------	---------	-------------------	--------------

<b>Meeting date: 26 October (report deadline: 14 October)</b>			
Cheltenham Spa Railway Station STG	Approve the draft report and recommendations and forward to Cabinet	Decision	STG Chair (Cllr Whyborn)
Cycling & Walking STG	Approve the draft report and recommendations and forward to Cabinet	Decision	STG Chair (Cllr Wilkinson)
Growing Places - Allotment Strategy	Review and comment on the draft strategy ahead of Cabinet	Discussion	Fiona Warin, Allotments Officer
<b>Meeting date: 30 November (report deadline: 18 November)</b>			
Q2 performance	Review Q2 performance	Discussion	Richard Gibson
Joint Waste Committee Business Plan 2016-18	Consider what is included prior to the budget setting process	Discussion	Steve Read, Head of Service – Joint Waste Committee
ICT	Review progress on the implementation of the ICT strategy	Discussion	Tbc
Cheltenham Tourism Project	Consider draft consultant report	Presentation	Gill Morris and consultant (?)
Cemetery and Crematorium	Consider the programme definition document (might be January)	Discussion	Ken Dale
<b>Meeting date: 25 January (report deadline: 13 January)</b>			
Budget recommendations	STG recommendations to the Cabinet on the budget proposals for 2016/17		Mark Sheldon
Cemetery and Crematorium	Consider the programme definition document (might be November)	Discussion	Ken Dale
<b>Meeting date: 22 February (report deadline: 10 February)</b>			
Public Art Panel STG	Review progress on the STG recommendations which went to Cabinet (Feb 2015) and agreed in March 2015	Discussion	Rowena Hay/Wilf Tomaney

O&S Committee 2014/15 work plan

Item	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
------	---------	-------------------	--------------

Members' ICT STG	Review progress on the STG recommendations which went to Cabinet (Feb 2015) and agreed in April 2015	Discussion	Jon Walklett/tbc
DRAFT Corporate strategy	Consider final draft of corporate strategy	Discussion	Richard Gibson
<b>Meeting date: 11 April (report deadline: 30 March)</b>			
Deprivation STG	Progress against recommendations (18 months since Cabinet and 12 since last at O&S)	Discussion	Various
Cheltenham Trust	Successes and lessons learned following the first 12-18 months in operation. Set parameters for future scrutiny	Discussion	Tbc
NHS Trust	Overview of plans for Gloucestershire Hospitals (date yet to be accepted)	Presentation	Clair Chilvers and Dr Sally Pearson
<b>Meeting date: 27 June (report deadline: 15 June)</b>			
Procurement and Contract management strategy	12 month review of whether 'culture' has changed since adoption of the revised strategy	Discussion	Cabinet Member Corporate Services

<b>Items for future meetings (a date to be established)</b>			
North Place	Watching brief and further in-depth scrutiny as necessary	Tbc	Tbc
Economic Development	Consider draft cabinet proposals on options for future support of economic development	Tbc	Mike Redman
Cheltenham integrated transport issues??	Look at issues (if any) that are identified by various scrutiny task groups once they have completed their work and consider how to take them forward??	Tbc	Tbc

O&S Committee 2014/15 work plan

Item	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
------	---------	-------------------	--------------

Review of milestone relating to developing a more collaborative approach to tackle drug dealing	This was 'amber' in July 2015 when the committee considered the end of year performance and asked to review progress	Tbc	Tbc
---	--	-----	-----

Annual Items		
Budget recommendations	January	Chair, Budget Scrutiny Working Group
Draft Corporate Strategy	March	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager
Quarter 3 performance review	March	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager
End of year performance review	June/July	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager
Scrutiny annual report	July/Sept	Saira Malin, Democracy Officer
Quarter 2 performance review	November	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager

This page is intentionally left blank