



CHEL TENHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Notice of a meeting of Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 16 January 2017
6.00 pm
Pittville Room - Municipal Offices

Membership	
Councillors:	Tim Harman (Chair), Jon Walklett (Vice-Chair), Colin Hay, Sandra Holliday, Chris Mason, Helena McCloskey, Dan Murch, John Payne, Paul Baker and Max Wilkinson

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

Agenda

1.	APOLOGIES	
2.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
3.	MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING 28 November 2016	(Pages 3 - 14)
4.	PUBLIC AND MEMBER QUESTIONS, CALLS FOR ACTIONS AND PETITIONS	
5.	MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE	
6.	FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED Gloucestershire Health and Care O&S Committee (15 December and 10 January) – verbal update from Councillor Harvey Gloucestershire Economic Growth O&S Committee (30 November) – verbal update from Councillor Paul McCloskey The Police and Crime Panel have not met since the last meeting of this committee.	
7.	CABINET BRIEFING A verbal 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	

8.		EVERYMAN THEATRE Presentation	
9.		DEVELOPMENT OF A PLACE STRATEGY FOR CHELTENHAM Discussion Paper (no recommendations)	(Pages 15 - 24)
10.		UPDATE ON CREMATORIUM DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME Discussion Paper (no recommendations)	(Pages 25 - 28)
11.		BUDGET PROPOSALS 2017-18 Budget Scrutiny Working Group recommendations (to follow)	
12.		UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS	(Pages 29 - 30)
13.		REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN	(Pages 31 - 34)
14.		DATE OF NEXT MEETING 20 February 2017	
		BRIEFING NOTES (not for discussion)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parking strategy update 	

Contact Officer: Saira Malin, Democracy Officer, 01242 775153
Email: democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk

Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 28th November, 2016

6.00 - 8.15 pm

Attendees	
Councillors:	Tim Harman (Chair), Jon Walklett (Vice-Chair), Colin Hay, Sandra Holliday, Chris Mason, Helena McCloskey, Dan Murch, John Payne, Paul Baker and Max Wilkinson
Also in attendance:	Rupert Cox (Stagecoach), Richard Gibson (Strategy and Engagement Manager), Steve Jordan (Leader) and Mark Nelson (Enforcement Manager)

Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

Councillors Wilkinson, Holliday and Hay had advised that they would be late and subsequently arrived at 6.05pm, 6.35pm and 7.15pm 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 31 October 2016 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

Council had asked that Overview and Scrutiny review bus services in general and how they could be better provided in Cheltenham. This item featured later on the agenda.

6. FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED

Councillor Harvey had produced a written update on the recent meeting (15 November) of the Gloucestershire Health and Care O&S Committee. This had been circulated with the agenda and was taken as read. As a County representative on this committee, the Chairman advised that a special meeting had been arranged for the 15 December 2016 to discuss some of the issues raised in this update.

Councillor H McCloskey provided a verbal update on the recent meeting of the Police and Crime Panel. The Panel received a presentation on the new Operating Model. These changes were implemented in anticipation of further financial cuts in the coming years and to address the increase in computer enabled crime. As a result of the changes the organisation had become more resilient and flexible and had seen improvements in performance. National statistics showed that Gloucestershire now had the fourth lowest crime rate in the country, the lowest rate for violent crime and a significant increase in customer satisfaction. Further work was required on the Neighbourhood Policing model. PCSOs would still be assigned to particular communities but would be called out to other areas and would attend less community group and Parish Council meetings. The Panel recommended that local policing should be stabilised as a priority.

Discussions at Government level were on-going regarding possible changes to the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) role. These included the overseeing of fire services and certain aspects of the criminal justice system and could have a major impact on the PCC workload and potential revision of the Police and Crime Plan.

The Panel considered performance statistics for the 101 non-emergency number in comparison with other similar forces. Concern was expressed that only data up to March 2015 was available on the national website. Further data, although submitted, had not been audited and was therefore not available, which the panel found disappointing. However, the User Satisfaction Survey for the 12 months ending September 2016 showed 97.2% satisfaction rate with ease of contact with the Gloucestershire 101 service.

Councillor H McCloskey gave the following responses to member questions;

- The proposal that the PCC should oversee fire services had come from Government and the PCC for Gloucestershire was of the opinion that this should remain separate.
- Gloucestershire was ahead of the game somewhat and had identified Cyber Crime as a priority for the force 18 months to 2 years ago. A special unit was established, which employed computer experts and officers were given basic training, as the first point of contact for cyber crime.

Some members felt that it was self-defeating for Neighbourhood Policing teams not to attend community or Parish Council meetings as these were often effective as means of building relationships and trust or simply learning about local issues.

The Chairman reminded members that the PCC had attended a meeting earlier in the year and the committee agreed that another invitation should be extended to him, for 2017.

The Gloucestershire Economic Growth O&S Committee had not met since the last meeting of this committee, but were scheduled to meet on Wednesday (30 November) and an update would be provided at the January meeting of this committee.

7. CABINET BRIEFING

The Leader gave a verbal briefing to the committee. In view of the discussion just prior to his briefing in which members had discussed neighbourhood policing, the Leader explained that a number of PCSOs had been moved from Cheltenham to Gloucester to tackle ASB issues. The council had recently been approached with the suggestion of joint funding of ASB, though he was keen that Cheltenham PCSO's be reinstated first.

He referred members to the Place Strategy briefing note which had been circulated with the agenda. This provided an update on the Place Strategy as well as some context to Devolution. The Autumn Statement hadn't given much clarity on Devolution, but many of the civil servants who had been supporting it had been diverted to Brexit and this could demonstrate a reduced appetite for Devolution. He also felt that there was a preference for bids from authorities with a directly elected Mayor.

In relation to the JCS, members would be aware that Tewkesbury Borough Council did not approve the document for public consultation, though Cheltenham and Gloucester had. A further meeting at TBC had been arranged for the 31 January and as soon as he had confirmation that this date was definitely going ahead he would be contacting members about when we would have our debate. He noted that he was currently minded to schedule the debate for the 10 February (Budget setting) meeting, rather than arrange a third meeting in February, as he imagined it would be a relatively short debate, simply to affirm the debate that had been held at the previous meeting.

At their meeting in November, the Cabinet had considered an urgent item on the Crematorium development programme. Cabinet agreed to change the scope of the programme to develop the business case for a second new chapel and potential alternative access road options. This was taken as an urgent decision so as not to delay the programme to replace the existing cremators.

This council was not consulted prior to the A40 Bus Lane scheme being dropped, though, nor had it been advised that it was to be included in the first instance. In response to a member question, the Leader confirmed that the money for this project had come from the short lived Local Transport Board and as such, had gone back to the Local Enterprise Partnership rather than GCC. It may be that this council would be interested in bidding for some of this funding.

8. STAGECOACH

Council had referred the matter of Cheltenham's bus service and how it could be improved, to this committee. The Chairman explained that the Managing Director of Stagecoach (West) had been asked to prepare a PowerPoint presentation and reminded members that the focus of the debate would be the bus service in general, rather than individual services.

Rupert Cox, the Managing Director of Stagecoach (West) introduced the PowerPoint presentation (attached at Appendix 1). In addition to the slides, he explained;

- They employed 180 people based in Cheltenham, up from 140 10 years ago.

Page 6

- The depot at Lansdown Industrial Estate could accommodate 65 buses. The fleet currently totalled 63, so this represented a future constraint.
- 35 new buses were introduced 2 years ago and only 10 days ago, new 94 buses had been introduced. The average age of the fleet was 4.7 years compared to the national average of 8.5 years.
- According to the DfT only 1 in 9 counties was seeing passenger growth. Cheltenham was at 2% growth; 30% since 2005. This did not apply to all routes however, some of the letter services had seen a 1-2% decline and he felt that cheaper fuel prices were impacting these local/shorter services. This reduction was on all categories of passenger free/child/single/concession). At the moment, the £2 daily fare for under 19's was showing growth of 30% plus.
- Transport Focus were finalising the 2016 surveys. Overall satisfaction with the service was at 90% in 2014 and rose to 91% in 2015. The national average was 83%. Value for Money, whilst ahead of the national average, was the lowest scoring at 69%. Each year approximately 1000 passengers were surveyed and 30% said that the bus represented better value than their car.
- In 2014 Stagecoach undertook an exercise with GCC surveying people about why they had come to Cheltenham. Over a 1 week period 1400 people were surveyed (the target was 1000) and of those 1400 people, 40% had travelled to the town by bus. Whilst on average bus users were spending less on each visit, they were making more journeys to the town and so spend more across a typical year. He therefore considered it a myth that getting people to journey to town in their car was better for the economy. 42% of those that had driven to town on the day of the survey said that they had used the bus at some point.
- In support of Small Business Saturday and some of the highstreets in Gloucestershire, a special fare of £2 was being offered.
- If only 2% of those that drove to the town centre used a bus it would help to ease congestion.
- Zurich paid for their staff to travel to and from work for free. A new service was introduced which stopped outside the terminal building at Gloucestershire Airport and which is seeing growing usage. Stagecoach had a good relationship with the Racecourse and 80 extra buses ran during Festival week. Through work with the Cheltenham BID any employee of a business in Cheltenham could now get 30% off a local travel ticket.
- The biggest challenge facing Stagecoach was congestion. The 94 was the most prominent service in Gloucestershire, linking Cheltenham and Gloucester and now took 60 minutes, 90% longer and required 11 buses rather than 6, compared to 1990. The knock on impact of a journey taking 5-10 minutes longer than it should ultimately resulted in a journey not operating, currently measured at 0.5% of journeys.
- Stagecoach were working closely with GCC and the JCS Team and had identified areas where there was capacity within existing

services and where investment would be required for bus priority measures.

- Faster journeys would result in more people using buses, as with every 10% reduction in bus speed equating to a 10% reduction in those using that service.
- The cost of parking in Cheltenham for 2 hours was the same today as it had been 10 years ago and he did not feel that Economic Development should focus on promoting people to drive into town. He would be comfortable working in partnership with the council and having a written agreement that if parking charges were increased, bus charges would be reduced. He was aware that Nottingham City Council had introduced a work place parking levy.
- The BID deal could backfire in the sense that no more people use the bus service and instead existing users simply get to travel for less each week/month.
- Bus priority measures were key; not only would bus journeys be speeded up but they would also be more predictable as the bus would be unhindered. To this end parking and bus lane enforcement would also be important.
- The new 94 buses entered service 10 days ago and included USB points for every passenger, free Wi-Fi, leather seats, air cooling systems and greener engines that produces less emissions.
- Smart cards accounted for 60% of journeys but he saw mobile tickets sales were the future.

Rupert Cox gave the following answers to member questions:

- There were no issues with the location of existing town centre bus stops but his concern was, if bus use increased, was there adequate space in convenient locations for new bus stops.
- There were some areas where the Transport Plan would alleviate issues with parked vehicles making it difficult for buses to pass.
- Tewkesbury Road in particular would benefit from a bus lane. The Benhall A40 scheme was unpopular with the public but the business case had merit. He felt that the JCS represented a good opportunity as 106 monies could help fund improvements.
- He considered North West Cheltenham to be a good area for development as it had potential to add a park and ride service. Existing services could be made more frequent and given the size of the site, new services could be introduced; to the hospital and/or station for example. This would benefit existing users as well as incentivising more people to use the bus. Depending on demand a bus hub could quite possibly work at this site.
- He didn't feel that building properties with a single car parking space would be beneficial as in reality people would simply park on the road.
- His view was that affordable housing should be located closer to bus stops and it wasn't advisable to build initial phases at the back of a site and furthest away from bus stops.
- Changes to the road layout at Albion Street had resulted in a shorter route for the B service, which meant less emissions and fuel savings. An A40 bus lane would result in a shorter journey particularly at peak

times and throughout the day an uninterrupted one. When the inbound Cheltenham route was introduced passenger numbers increased by 3% but it was not possible to say whether these were previously car users.

- The B service had not only been extended but was now more reliable since being linked with the H service. It also meant that residents on the back of the estate in Springbank were now being served, where they were not before.
- Stagecoach had a lease with the racecourse and there had been no indication, either formally or informally that the racecourse hoped to change these arrangements.

Rupert felt that there was a perception about bus users that needed to be dispelled and he accepted that Stagecoach themselves could do more to do that. The 12 new buses on the 94 service were luxury and could certainly dispel any such myths.

The Chairman thanked Rupert for his time and input into what he felt had been a very useful discussion.

9. UPDATE FROM THE URBAN GULLS FOCUS GROUP

In the absence of Helen Down, Team Leader – Participation and Engagement, the Chairman introduced the paper on behalf of the Urban Gulls Focus Group. Urban gull complaints were nuisance related, but gulls were wild birds and as such the council did not have a statutory responsibility to deal with them. However, in recognition of the considerable disturbance that they caused, the council did allocate a budget for gull control. Prior to 2015, the budget was £5000 per annum for the oiling of eggs. In 2015 the budget was increased to £9,100 and enabled the switch from oiling to replacing eggs with dummy eggs when the oil was withdrawn from sale. Dummy egg replacement was more effective than oil as the gull would continue to sit on them for longer, without re-laying and adults that failed to produce offspring at a site tended to move on in future years. Gulls were also noisiest with hatchlings in the nest, so noise reduced over the summer when the eggs did not hatch. Whilst more effective, dummy egg replacement was more expensive due to the hire cost of the cherry picker needed to replace the eggs and collect them again at the end of the season. The Urban Gulls Focus Group was attended by residents and councillors from affected areas and would, from this point onwards, be chaired by Councillor Harman. The Group were of the opinion that a strategy had to be developed within the context of budget constraints and operational capacity.

As Chairman of the committee, Councillor Harman explained that it had been suggested that a Scrutiny Task Group should be set-up to develop a strategy, but given that the Focus Group already operated well, members may not be minded to do this. He noted that the publication of this report had sparked media interest from the Gloucestershire Echo and BBC Radio Gloucestershire, both of whom had said that they would be happy to assist with a media campaign in the future.

Expert advice was that the problem could not be eradicated irrespective of budget and therefore members questioned whether spending more would actually benefit the town. Members were keen that a more scientific approach

be adopted when devising the strategy. There were no calls from members to establish a task group.

The committee agreed that the Urban Gulls Focus Group should investigate further what strategy would deal with the issue more comprehensively, based on scientific evidence.

The Chairman confirmed that the Focus Group were scheduled to meet again in January 2017.

10. THE UPDATE ON PRIVATE RENTED HOUSES OF MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) SURVEY

Mark Nelson, Enforcement Manager, introduced the discussion paper as circulated with the agenda. He explained that following a desktop analysis to identify possible Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMO's), 450 had been identified within the St Pauls Ward and survey work commenced in early September 2016. So far 225 HMO's had been fully inspected and a further 72 properties had been visited and found not to be HMO's following an interview with the occupants. If this trend continued it was likely that approximately 300 HMO's would have been identified in St Paul's. Of the HMO's inspected thus far, only 10 had been referred to the enforcement team for further investigation (following the identification of poor management, poor standards of accommodation or where a licensable HMO was not licensed) and this figure (5%) was extremely low for this type of housing stock. He felt that this was undoubtedly a result of the proactive work that had been undertaken by enforcement officers over the last 5 years, which had included the licensing of 130 HMO's in the St Pauls ward area under the Governments Mandatory HMO Licensing Scheme. It was likely that the survey work in St Pauls would be complete by February and at that stage a report could be produced.

In response to a member question, the Enforcement Manager explained that the housing health and safety rating system was a risk-based evaluation tool used to assess safety in housing. There were 29 types of hazard which are assessed under this system and category 1 hazards posed the most risk to the occupants. The level of risk was determined by the likelihood of harm caused by the hazard and the severity of the harm which would result. In the example of a glass door; it might only be rated as category 1 if there was trip hazard which increased the risk of the glass being broken.

Members felt that were the number of HMO's in St Pauls to exceed the national limit of 10%, that this council should invoke Article 4 Direction and remove permitted development rights of HMO's within that area (and any other ward found to exceed the national limit), so that planning permission needed to be obtained. This would be flagged with the Planning Liaison Group at this stage, with a request that they consider the issue further once the final survey results have been fully collated and analysed, assuming the final figure was in fact above the 10% limit.

The Chairman thanked the Enforcement Manager for his attendance and looked forward to seeing the final report.

11. QUARTER 2 PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Richard Gibson, the Strategy and Engagement Manager, introduced the Quarter 2 performance figures and he apologised for the delay in having circulated it to members. He highlighted that of the 99 milestones identified in the 2016-17 action plan, 37 were amber, meaning there were concerns about the deliverability of the project and 7 were red and related to 4 key projects; North Place (1), car parking (3), the Cheltenham Plan (2) and the Crematorium development (1). Being classed as red meant that there are concerns about whether these milestones will be delivered by March 2017.

The Strategy and Engagement Officer and the Leader where appropriate, gave the following responses to member questions;

- Adoption of the Cheltenham Plan was amber as officers were optimistic that this could be done within 2017, though admittedly this was almost entirely dependent on the JCS.
- If the JCS was unable to be adopted as planned then the council would need to have a Local Plan which included strategic allocations set out in the JCS and the implications of this were in the process of being determined. But we were not in that situation yet. However, the Leader acknowledged that it is more difficult to properly assess new developments without the framework of an adopted strategic plan.
- The potential for developing a business case for a second chapel had always been included in the Crematorium Development programme and it was in the context of the original costings of £10m having reduced that the potential for the second chapel was being considered now.
- The MD Place and Economic Development had confirmed at the last meeting of this committee that representatives from GCC had attended a meeting of the Parking Working Group.

Given that the deadline for the opening of the new crematorium building has been pushed back, members of the committee felt that they would like to understand more about the reasons why. The committee agreed that they would invite a formal update on the programme, to their next meeting, to establish how the programme was progressing.

12. UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS

The Democracy Officer explained that progress in relation to the Devolution task group was as it had been at the time that the summary had been circulated with the agenda; there had been no further developments.

The Street People STG had held a workshop with various agencies to discuss the extent of the issue in Cheltenham. This was a useful session and the task group agreed that they needed to meet with representatives of Project SOLACE, which worked to bring agencies together to deal with anti-social behaviour and which had resulted in the number of persistent beggars in Gloucester having fallen significantly. This meeting would be arranged in due course. A number of members of the committee felt that some of the messages coming from Project SOLACE were quite negative and urged the STG to take a different approach. Members of the committee, who also sat on the STG gave assurances that the group accepted that this was a complex issue, with no single solution; some rough sleepers were genuinely homeless, for some it was a lifestyle choice and some were not homeless at all, claiming benefits and free

prescriptions and were begging to make, in some cases, hundreds of pounds a day.

13. REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN

The work plan had been circulated with the agenda and would be updated to include a formal update on the Crematorium Development Programme at the meeting in January, as well as a briefing note on progress relating to car parking.

The committee agreed the two items that had been proposed for the next meeting (January 16); Everyman Theatre presentation from Geoffrey Rowe and a further discussion on the Place Strategy.

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting was scheduled for Monday 16 January 2017.

Tim Harman
Chairman

Stagecoach In Cheltenham

Rupert Cox
Managing Director



Who we are

- We employ about 180 people based in the town – mixture of drivers, supervisors, engineers and support staff
- Two sites – depot in Lansdown Ind. Est. and operations facility plus travel shop in the High Street
- We have a fleet of 63 buses – average age of fleet 4.7 years



Bus usage

- 16 Stagecoach routes that serve the town – some from depots in Gloucester, Stroud and Swindon
- Routes see about 11m annual passenger journeys
- Passenger growth of around 2%. About 30% growth since 2005



Route by route trends

- Usage is increasing on services B, 41, 42/42A, 51, 94U/X, 97/98
- Fewer people are using services A, C, D/E, P/Q, 10, 61, 94, 99



What do our customers say?

- Transport Focus independent annual surveys – autumn 2014 and 2015
- Accent Economic research 2014



Working with others

- University of Gloucestershire
- Zurich Financial
- Gloucestershire Airport
- Cheltenham Racecourse
- Cheltenham BID



Page 14

Major events

- Cheltenham Race 'Festival' – 90,000 passengers on dedicated shuttle buses
- Cheltenham Race 'Open' – 15,000 passengers on dedicated shuttle buses
- Royal International Air Tattoo – special Park & Ride service with 10 buses

We need some assistance - 1

- Congestion is a major problem
- Service 94 takes 90% longer at peak times to travel between Gloucester and Cheltenham
- 70% of trips in Gloucestershire are by car (62% in 2004). Bus journeys 4%.
- We measure the number of journeys that don't operate – 75% of cause is congestion

We need some assistance - 2

- Key hotspots that have biggest impact
- Access the town centre – convenient bus stops
- Parking and bus lane enforcement
- Car parking charges
- Planning and development control – including Joint Core Strategy

New initiatives

- £3million for 12 new buses for service 94. Entered service 10 days ago
- Stagecoach Bus App – track, plan and buy tickets – launched 2 weeks ago
- Next generation ticket machine with contactless payment – 2017
- Smartcards – around 60% of all journeys now made using smartcard

Any questions?

Information/Discussion Paper

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

16 January 2017

Development of a place strategy for Cheltenham

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 To update members on the development of a place strategy for Cheltenham since the last update on 28 November 2016

1.2 To discuss the development of our place strategy and to answer five questions:

- What do you see as the key challenges that the town faces?
- What do you see as the key strengths we can build on?
- What does a vision for 2050 look like?
- Are the 4 outcomes: “*businesses, tourists, young people and communities*” the right ones?
- Any thoughts about how we build an effective partnership that can provide a forum for strategic discussions on place?

2. Place Strategy background

2.1 The place strategy will pull together collective thinking on a range of issues that help define Cheltenham as a place. In doing so, it will help co-ordinate partners and agencies’ activities to focus on the outcomes that will support economic growth, cultural vitality and the wider well-being of our communities.

2.2 The draft place strategy that was endorsed by Cabinet in October set out a working vision to start the conversations around what type of place we want Cheltenham to be:

We want to unlock the ambition of our communities to achieve their promising future – recognising Cheltenham’s history whilst refocussing on innovation, vibrant cultural experiences, economic growth and growing our talent pool.

We will be a regional leader, well connected and have delivered a sustainable legacy.

2.3 The scope of the Place Strategy was proposed as follows:

- A collective assessment of the challenges that the town faces, and the strengths we can build on. What are the key risks for the town in the future and what are the key opportunities?
- A shared vision for Cheltenham – setting out our ambitions for the kind of town we want Cheltenham to be in the future;
- The development of a framework for action to deliver these ambitions – using commissioning principles to identify the key supporting outcomes and then working with partners to facilitate delivery of the vision, and with a clear sense of the priority projects that will make the biggest impact.

- 2.4** The key supporting outcomes were proposed as being:
- A place where businesses choose to invest, where skills, innovation and talent are sought and fostered;
 - A place where tourists choose to visit and return – recognising the vibrancy of the town, its offer and relevance to different age groups;
 - A place where young people study and prosper; and linked to the vibrancy of the town and its job opportunities, wish to stay after their studying is completed;
 - A place where people live in thriving communities.
- 2.5** Whilst Cheltenham Borough Council will take the lead in the development of the place strategy, we want the strategy to be owned by a wide range of stakeholders so that we can:
- Harness the ambitions for success shared by local businesses, agencies and organisations;
 - Reflect the pride that people living in Cheltenham feel for their town, and
 - Tell a story of ambition to the outside world, both nationally and internationally, to those people wishing to visit, study in or invest in Cheltenham.

3. Place Strategy engagement plans

- 3.1** To support the wider ownership of the strategy, an engagement plan has been developed to run to the end of January 2017. This will then enable officers and members to review the information ahead of the strategy coming back to Council at the end of March for approval.
- 3.2** The consultation programme is now live and was kicked off at a stakeholders’ meeting on 21 November. Five engagement sessions have been held to date, and these have generated lots of positive feedback. The summary notes of these are attached as **appendix A**.
- 3.3** Whilst it might be premature to start drawing conclusions from the events so far, there are some consistent messages emerging:
- Using the place strategy to set out our ambitions for the type of town we want Cheltenham to be in the future recognising building on what we are already good at;
 - Quality should underpin everything we do;
 - The opportunity to build on our spa and cyber heritages;
 - Digital connectivity is very important;
 - Making sure our cultural offer harnesses and celebrates local talent and helps create vibrancy and a year round whole-town buzz;
 - Liveability and wellbeing are key selling points for Cheltenham;
 - The importance of our relationship with Gloucester and Gloucestershire;
 - The vision needs to be inclusive and equitable - and speak to and benefit all our communities.
- 3.4** What has also been consistent is the willingness of a diverse range of individuals and agencies to get involved in the consultation and their desire to remain involved.

3.5 The following events will take place over the next month or so:

When	Who	Purpose
12 Jan	Positive Participation Partnership meeting that includes a range of community providers, housing providers	Engage with a range of public and VCS partners about how we can use the place strategy to harness skills and resources within our communities

	and VCS organisations	
16 Jan	CBC - Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Engage with elected member to help shape the vision and the four outcomes
13 Jan	Branding workshop	Engage with hospitality trade
19 Jan	Cultural and creative workshop	Engage with cultural and creative providers to define how the place strategy can help create a buzz in Cheltenham
23 Jan	VCS forum	Engage with VCS partners and youth providers
24 Jan pm 25 Jan am 31 Jan pm 1 Feb am	CBC – staff sessions	Engage with CBC staff to help shape the vision and the four outcomes – 1 hour drop-in sessions to be held in the Pittville Room
26 Jan	Cheltenham Tourism Partnership	Engage with hospitality trade
9 Feb (provisional)	Place Strategy Stakeholders and consultation leads:	For consultation leads to share the findings from their consultation activities, and develop our collective thinking on the vision, outcomes and actions ahead of cabinet / council

3.6 One of the other considerations that we will be testing with stakeholders and members is how we build an effective partnership that can provide a forum for strategic discussions as we move into the implementation phase of the strategy.

4. Questions for Overview and Scrutiny Committee

4.1 The session at Overview and Scrutiny Committee gives us the opportunity to engage with elected member to help shape the vision and the four outcomes. The questions we would like discussed are as follows:

- What do you see as the key challenges that the town faces
- What do you see as the key strengths we can build on
- What does a vision for 2050 look like?
- Are the 4 outcomes: “*businesses, tourists, young people and communities*” the right ones?
- Any thoughts about how we build an effective partnership that can provide a forum for strategic discussions on place?

5. Place strategy – next steps

5.1 In consultation with key partners and elected members, a draft place strategy will come forward to council on 27 March 2017 for approval. This will include:

- A working vision statement sets out our broad ambition to 2050 and that broadly aligns to our strategic tourism work – but this might not be the finished article;
- A broad document setting out Cheltenham’s strengths and challenges and the rationale for vision and outcomes;
- A set of robust outcomes – the stepping stones to deliver the vision;
- An aligned action plan setting out some key actions that partners and elected members are committed to.

5.2 But time is short, and we want to highlight that the 2017 place strategy may just be the start of a journey and that we will need to commit more time to continue the conversation with partners and residents to define what the vision for Cheltenham should be.

5.3 In addition, elected members may also be aware that there is parallel work ongoing at the county level on the Vision 2050 work. With much work ongoing both at the Gloucestershire level and at the Cheltenham level on defining and articulating our common vision for our respective places, there are some significant opportunities to

work collaboratively. Our place strategy is only the start of a journey, but one that we will be sharing with our local partners as much as our county partners.

Background Papers	Report to Cabinet, 11 October 2016, "Place Strategy Scoping" Report to Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 31 October; "Place and Economic Development" Report to Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 28 November 2016; "Place Strategy – engagement plans and links to the devolution agenda"
Contact Officer	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager. 01242 235354. richard.gibson@cheltenham.gov.uk
Accountability	Cllr. Steve Jordan, Leader of the Council

Place Strategy – initial engagement workshop

21st November 2016

Strengths

- Cheltenham is like a small city but without the overwhelming mass of a metropolis – a city on a human scale
- Our festival and wider cultural offer gives us an international reach
- The quality of our offer is well recognised
- Cheltenham is a great place to bring up a family and is very liveable.
- We have recently seen a cluster of new legal firms setting up in Cheltenham

Challenges

If we set out an ambition to grow business investment, we need to understand who the decision-makers are and what their criteria are – what role will Cheltenham play in a truly globalised economy? How do we make ourselves attractive to new investment?

We need to be ambitious about our liveability, what makes Cheltenham a special place to live now and what are we going to emphasise in the future.

Connectivity is going to be hugely significant for our future success; be that the physical infrastructure connections we have with the outside world (the M5 corridor, mainline rail services), our education links, investment flows, broadband connectivity, how we connect new communities with the existing communities.

We need to generate a buzz about Cheltenham that can appeal to many people but especially young people.

How do we ensure that all children and young people benefit from our fantastic education establishments and make sure that this is seen as a priority

How do we make sure that the benefits of growth and investment are shared equitably

Risk that we don't fully develop our relationship with Gloucester.

What does a 2050 vision look like

The place strategy vision needs to recognise and celebrate what is special and unique about Cheltenham.

The vision should be specific to Cheltenham and not to any other town in the UK.

Our cultural and festivals offer is really important, but other unique selling points are our spa heritage, our cyber success, the Gold Cup, our green spaces and our education offer.

The vision needs to map Cheltenham's spatial scale and define the reach of our ambition – are we bold enough to have an international reach?

We need to define the qualities that will inform how we deliver the 4 outcomes of place-shaping that links our heritage to our future; can we redefine what a mid-21st century spa town looks like? Is there a link between cyber and spa?

We need to make sure that our branding and marketing tells a consistent story of ambition to the outside world

The vision needs to be inclusive and speak for young people, and for those from less affluent backgrounds

The vision should recognise that quality should be part of what we do making sure visitors come back.

Place Strategy Engagement Workshop with youth workers – Tuesday 29th November

Key messages:

Strengths

- There is a lot of uncertainty in young people's lives hence the importance of community development in building sustainable communities
- In terms of good examples, Charlton Kings has already developed a community plan that young people were able to contribute to.

Challenges

- In terms of issues facing young people in the future, the supply of affordable housing is absolutely critical.
- Also we need to make sure that there are sufficient appealing jobs for young people and then good public transport so that young people can access jobs.

What does a 2050 vision look like

The place strategy should offer hope to young people, its vision should be aspirational and be able to engage their dreams – the strategy should celebrate the positives of young people.

Can the place strategy also articulate a vision about Cheltenham valuing young people and being a child-friendly city (in-line with Unicef).

How would you like to be involved

In terms of engaging with young people, there is widespread support for looking at different ways of engaging with young people eg social media being favoured rather than a young person's forum.

Any particular actions / requests?

There was a suggestion that CBC should put the aspirations of the place strategy centre-stage when looking at options for the Municipal Offices / Town Hall.

Place Strategy - Engagement Workshop with Cheltenham Strategic Leadership Group

Monday 12 December

Summary of discussion

Strengths

- Make sure that the young people outcome reflects our aspirations for our home-grown young people

Challenges

- Ensure the strategy makes linkages to the wider wellbeing agenda being articulated through county-wide prevention and self-care, enabling active communities agendas
- Ensure the strategy engages with the young people and young adults 20+

What does a 2050 vision look like

- Ensure that the Cheltenham Place Strategy vision interacts and reflects the Gloucestershire 2050 vision work
- Ensure the vision and strategy recognises our relationship with Gloucester
- Ensure the vision and strategy is clear about the type of economic growth we want to see
- Ensure the vision and strategy celebrates the strengths of diversity
- Ensure the vision and strategy confirms the importance of the liveability of Cheltenham to support all four outcomes

How would you like to be involved

- Role of the Strategic Leadership Group potentially to build an effective relationship including the Development Taskforce and the Business Improvement District
- Role of the Strategic Leadership Group to bring it all together

Place Strategy - Engagement Workshop with Cheltenham

VCS Forum

Tuesday 13 December

Strengths

- Our cultural offer, including retail and dining out
- Older people, what can retirees offer?
- Build on our heritage
- Pittville park
- Racecourse
- Spa town heritage - make sure it is as beautiful as it can be
- 300 year anniversary of Spa waters

Challenges

- Tight boundaries around our urban area
- The need to champion diversity
- The need to tackle disadvantage within our communities
- Not much for young people
- Affordability of cultural offer
- Lack of vibrancy and buzz
- Transport infrastructure is poor, road, rail
- Ensure young people want to stay in Cheltenham

What does a 2050 vision look like

- Make the best of what we've got
- Make sure that focus is wider, not too limited on a narrow demographic
- Ensure that the Vision is equitable to make sure that scarce resources are distributed more equitably
- Make sure that vision works for local people, not just tourists
- Make sure vision related to improvements today

How would you like to be involved?

- VCS involvement is critical, to make sure that disadvantaged get a voice
- Make sure that we share best practice
- Capture feedback from neighbourhood plans
- Need for governance, that brings together private, public and VCS sectors together

The VCS forum agreed to hold another place-shaping workshop in January to support the engagement plans

Place Strategy Engagement Workshop with the Wilson Arts Collective

14 December 2016

What is Cheltenham good at?

- Presence of the University
- Lots of events and activities going on
- Picks up cultural over-spill from Bristol, a sense the Cheltenham and Gloucester are well – placed to develop their links with Bristol.
- The role of the Trust and the Wilson as a venue and the Arts Collective to support cultural ambitions of young people

What could it be better at?

- Ensure cultural offer is more inclusive
- Make sure that Cheltenham is known as a creative place
- Supporting young people harness their ambitions – ensure the vision fosters creativity in the town and taps into mentoring support.
- Lack of support mechanisms for budding artists, plus lack of marketing

What is missing?

- Links between young people and businesses – request for mentoring schemes to help them develop their skills and talents
- Skills support eg around life skills and business skills
- Establish talent pathway; linking space for young people to establish creative enterprises, with support, advice and mentoring, with showcases for their talents and awards.
- Lack of access to theatre/performance spaces for performance art and music
- Access to affordable dance classes for 13-18 year olds
- Lack of forum for independent business sector to support each other through cross-promotional activities
- Spaces for young people to try out business ideas

How would young people like to contribute to shaping a sense of place in the future – what could be put in place

- Young people want to be heard.
- Respect for ideas, innovation and creativity – a place that enables young people
- A request for young people to have some responsibility for an element of our cultural offer
- Make sure that we are doing things with young people, not for young people

Is there anything that is needed for Cheltenham? If you had to choose one thing, what would it be?

- Celebrate the talent of young people
- Create the talent pathway concept
- Create business incubator / start-up space
- Lift Cheltenham out of its comfort zone

Information/Discussion Paper

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

16 January 2017

Update on Crematorium Development programme

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

Why has this come to scrutiny?

An update on progress with the new crematorium development was requested at the last meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, on 28th November, 2016.

Specifically, O&S asked about current risks and levels, how the Scape procurement framework works and what action is planned if a cremator fails before the project is complete.

Programme progress and timeline

The authority has not yet contracted for the construction of the new crematorium, but is proceeding with the pre-construction phase, which will result in the submission of a detailed planning application in May/June.

In light of the above, the timetable for delivery of the new facility is not yet fixed and there has never been a definitive date given for project completion. The cross-party member working group has always been supportive of the need to deliver this programme to an acceptable quality and has been made fully aware of the range of risks, including those which may impact on costs and/or the delivery timetable.

The timetable remains an important consideration due to the limited life expectancy of the existing cremation plant and Spring 2019 is the current best estimate of the likely completion date.

The programme is still currently within the Council approved budget. Recent pressures on the programme timetable have related to procurement procedures and the commissioning of study reports which will support the design and planning application process. It is hoped that the extensive preparatory work undertaken will have a positive impact on the timetable further down the line.

Current risks and levels

Programme risks are actively identified and managed on a monthly basis by a group of key officers. The updated risk register is reported to each meeting of the programme board, again on a monthly basis. The programme provides a status report to meetings of the Senior Leadership Team which includes an update on the risk

profile and detail on significant risks. Risks relating to the programme and the reliability of the existing cremators are set out in the Corporate Risk Register and reviewed regularly by Cabinet.

Risks are assessed under the Council's corporate risk management policy, using the adopted 'Risk Scorecard' guidance which looks at the potential impact of identified risks and the likelihood of them occurring.

There are currently 34 risks identified on the crematorium programme risk register. The top ten risks have an average risk score of 12.8, with the highest risks scoring 16. (Individual risks can score up to 30, with risks scoring 16 and above escalated to the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) for consideration).

Key risks include timescales, impact on the existing service, escalating costs, potential failure of current cremator plant, second chapel business case development, reputational damage, planning process, legal, contractor failure, access route identification, staffing capacity and related project impacts.

The highest scoring risks relate to the potential for cremator failure within the existing plant and the risks associated with related projects.

Existing cremator plant maintenance

As outlined above, there is a significant risk to business continuity in relation to the existing sub-standard cremator plant that was installed by the firm Crawfords, which went into liquidation part way through the installation project in 2009.

As a result, the Council was advised that the cremators had only a 5 year serviceable lifespan and this was the trigger for the current new-build crematorium project.

Regular and significant maintenance is required to the existing plant, with one of the cremators recently subject to the installation of a new hearth and re-bricking of the cremator lining. This had lasted less than 12 months since similar work was undertaken.

The Council has recently re-tendered its maintenance contract for the cremator plant, resulting in the appointment in November of ATI, a major European supplier and installers of cremators, mercury abatement and ancillary equipment.

ATI is advising us on what cremator spares the authority should hold to minimise business continuity risks and is confident that they will be able to maintain the current service over the next two year period, as the new build project takes place.

Contingency planning for cremator failure

As outlined above, arrangements are in place to mitigate the risk of cremator failure and the advice from our maintenance contractor is that at the moment they do not foresee any situation where both cremators would fail and be beyond economic repair (i.e. more than £50k).

However, they have also stated that with Crawford machines anything is possible due to the poor design of the equipment.

If necessary, ATI could supply and install/build a single replacement cremator on site (non-abated) for around £250k, the estimated install time would be 5 to 6 months.

In these circumstances, it is likely that the Council's cremation service would have to be suspended for at least part of this period. Although the authority is not legally obliged to provide a cremation service, it would have serious implications for the Council's reputation and income.

The Council is therefore investigating whether the new cremators which are to be procured and installed in the new crematorium could be made operational at an early stage (before the new chapels come into use).

The Bereavement team has a contingency plan in place to help manage business continuity failures, but this cannot mitigate fully for the consequences of a complete service shutdown.

There are also concerns that some families are likely to have to travel a significant distance to access an alternative cremation facility.

Scape procurement framework

The Council is procuring services in relation to the project through the Scape procurement framework and is in the process of contracting with Willmott Dixon for pre-construction work which will take the project up to the detailed planning application stage.

Associated professional services are being commissioned through Willmott Dixon as our principal contractor and we have independent quantity surveying and project management advice being provided by Pick Everard.

[Scape](#) Group is a public sector-owned built environment specialist offering a full suite of national frameworks and design solutions. By bringing together the strongest teams from the public and private sector, Scape's rapidly deployed, performance managed and collaborative approach delivers value for money and quality buildings while stimulating local growth and community benefits.

Willmott Dixon is Scape's sole partner on the Major Works Framework, one of six frameworks provided by Scape. They were appointed after scoring the highest marks for cost and quality during a rigorous tender process.

Major Works can be used by a public sector organisation to procure any type of construction project with a value above £2 million. Adopting an NEC form of contract, it covers new-build, refurbishment, extensions and adaptation projects.

Benefits of using the Major Works framework

1. Time savings - a minimum of 200 days are saved compared to traditional procurement. 100% of projects delivered on time and budget since 2006.
2. Cost savings - currently an average of 14p for every £1 spent is saved across all projects through procurement, supply chain and early risk reduction savings.
3. Robust validated costs - cost plans will be market informed: 65% at feasibility, 85% at planning and 100% at contract to ensure robustness. 100% of the final price is market informed and verified to achieve value for money.
4. Demonstrable performance - performance is monitored and captured by Scape at all stages of the project. Audited KPIs are reported direct to CBC as client.

5. National delivery, local growth - procured nationally, the framework secures huge economies of scale. Delivered locally, it also drives social and economic benefits for communities throughout the UK.
6. Low contractor fees - set at 1.75%.

Note: the current Scape Major Works framework expires on 7th May 2017, so the Council will need to contract for the build phase of the project by that date, or will have to go through a new procurement process, which would add to the current project timeline.

The project team is mindful of this deadline, is actively managing the related risks and is planning to ensure that this issue does not impact on the Council's delivery of the scheme.

Background Papers	n/a
Contact Officer	Mike Redman mike.redman@cheltenham.gov.uk 01242 264140
Accountability	Councillor Coleman, Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment

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
KEY TO COLOURS	Active STGs												
	On hold												
	Standing group												
	Not prioritised by O&S												
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.	It became clear in February that the Chancellor would not be making any announcements in his budget statement regarding the Gloucestershire bid so the meeting of the task group planned for the 1 March was cancelled. On the 25 February Leadership Gloucestershire were advised of the Cotswold Unitary bid and the implications of this proposal and the timescales for progressing it are currently being reviewed. Scrutiny will continue to keep a watching brief and the task group will be reconvened when there is a revised way forward to discuss. There have been no further developments on this since the last O&S meeting.	Cllrs Williams, Harman, Paul McCloskey, Payne, Mason and C. Hay (Cllrs Jordan and Reid will observe)	Rosalind Reeves	Pat Pratley	Leader (Cllr Jordan)	Leader, Cllr Jordan	Oct-15					
Street People	Get a better understanding of the extent and nature of the issue(s) and identify any areas which could be more effective	The task group held a workshop with various agencies and organisations on the 14 November. The task group were able to confirm that there has been an increase in the number of rough sleepers and that they are not all homeless. The group also identified some areas which require further discussion. The group would now like to meet representatives of Project SOLACE, a multi-agency team which works to bring agencies together to deal with ASB and has success in reducing the number of persistent beggars on the street in Gloucester. DSU are awaiting confirmation of officer availability before contacting members with proposed dates.	Cllrs Payne, Savage, C. Hay, Parsons, Wheeler and Nelson	Saira Malin	Exec Board	Housing (Cllr Jeffries)	Leader, Cllr Jordan	Jul-16					
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 have a schedule of meetings arranged throughout the year and consider the budget as well as financial implications for projects such as the 2020 partnership.	Cllrs Babbage, Nelson, Payne, Sudbury and Walklett * there is still a Lib Dem vacancy Cabinet Member Finance to attend by invitation.	Rosalind Reeves	Mark Sheldon	Finance (Cllr R. Hay)	Council	May-12	Jan-15	Feb-15	Jan-15		

O&S Committee 2016/17 work plan

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

Meeting date: 16 January 2017 (report deadline: 4 January)			
Everyman Theatre	Presentation on recent successes and Geoffrey's hopes for the future (before he leaves the Everyman)	Presentation	Geoffrey Rowe
DRAFT budget	Consider the recommendations of the budget scrutiny working group	Discussion	Chair of BSWG
Place Strategy	Help define the vision for this strategy	Discussion	Richard Gibson / Steve Jordan
Crematorium Development programme	Update on how the project is progressing and what action will be taken if a cremator fails before the project is complete	Discussion	Ken Dale / Rob Hainsworth
Car parking strategy	Update on progress	Briefing note	Mike Redman
Meeting date: 20 February 2017 (report deadline: 8 February)			
DRAFT Corporate Strategy	Consider draft Corporate Strategy before it goes to council and comment as necessary	Discussion	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager
HMO survey	Final report	Discussion	Mark Nelson, Enforcement Manager
Cycling and Walking STG	Review of progress against recommendations 12 months on	Discussion	Wilf Tomaney
Meeting date: 24 April (2017) (report deadline: 12 April)			
Meeting date: 26 June 2017 (report deadline: 14 June)			
End of year performance	Consider end of year performance and comment as necessary	Discussion	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager

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

Items for future meetings (a date to be established)			
North Place	Watching brief and further in-depth scrutiny as necessary	Presentation	Jeremy Williamson
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
Cheltenham Spa Railway Station STG	Review progress against recommendations 12 months on	12 months on from Cabinet response (not yet scheduled on forward plan)	Jeremy Williamson
BID update	Progress update from BID	When there is more to update the committee on	Kevan Blackadder

Annual Items		
Budget recommendations	January	Chair, Budget Scrutiny Working Group
Draft Corporate Strategy	February	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager
End of year performance review	June	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager
Scrutiny annual report	Sept	Saira Malin, Democracy Officer

O&S Committee 2016/17 work plan

Item	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
Quarter 2 performance review		November	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager

Briefing Notes

Committee name: Overview and Scrutiny

Date: 16th January, 2017

Project sponsor: Mike Redman

Accountable member: Cllr McKinlay,
Cabinet member for Development and
Safety

This note contains information to keep Members informed of matters relating to the work of the Cabinet or a committee but where no decisions from Members are needed.

If Members have questions relating to matters shown, they are asked to contact the Officer indicated.

Update regarding Car Parking Strategy

Why has this come to scrutiny?

A briefing note updating on progress with car parking was requested at the last meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, on 28th November, 2016.

Summary of the issue

Members will be aware of the longstanding commitment within the corporate plan to review the Council's car parking strategy.

This work is being actively progressed through a formal corporate project, with oversight from the cross-party Car Parking Member Working Group (CPMWG) which has been meeting since October 2015.

Purpose: To help develop the vision and provide support to the development of a holistic parking strategy for Cheltenham, in consultation with key stakeholders

Specific remit:

1. To identify and agree the key components and focus for the proposed parking strategy, including the following key issues:-
 - Car parking quantum;
 - Relationship between 'on' and 'off-street' parking provision;
 - Impact of car parking on the local economy;
 - Future approach to parking charges;
 - Service costs and current staffing arrangements;
 - Legal constraints on service development;
 - Relationship to objectives within the Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan;
 - Opportunities for off street parking site consolidation, or further investment in provision;
 - Disabled parking arrangements.
2. To determine what evidence and stakeholder engagement is required;

3. To provide a steer to Cabinet on how the Council should deliver its off-street parking arrangements as part of an integrated approach, to contribute to the future well-being of the town and its economy.

Consultant contract update

Procurement of a consultant to produce the parking strategy, together with associated evidence gathering has been completed, with tenders received from 4 consultants.

Arup, with partners Parking Matters (parking specialists) and Cushman & Wakefield, land valuation specialists, have been selected at a total cost of £54,890. This is well within the budgeted cost of £60,000 approved by Cabinet.

Arup (with Parking Matters) has commenced data collection work, with the first survey using automatic number plate recognition cameras undertaken in mid-December, at key town centre car parks. This process will be repeated after Christmas and data will be analysed alongside income information to give a robust picture of visitation and capacity issues.

Arup also convened an initial workshop with key stakeholders on 15th December, to discuss priorities of the strategy, outcomes focused on customer experience, data capture, relationship with other parking providers/possible partners and income. They will also be undertaking a public online survey in January, which we plan to promote countywide, including through social media.

GCC parking proposals

CPMWG has had a presentation from GCC on 7th November 2016, regarding proposals for the extension of on-street parking restrictions to the north and west of the town centre, following public consultation. This will include the extension of pay and display parking in Lansdown. Concerns had been raised that pricing policy may be in direct competition with the off-street parking offer, running contrary to the established approach underpinned by the Local Transport Plan.

Proposed parking changes are likely to proceed with a number of amendments, including better alignment of on and off-street charging regimes. This will allow for further consideration of mitigation measures, including incentives for more sustainable travel alternatives.

There are some continuing concerns about GCC communications and the presentation of CBC's position, which has not been unequivocal support.

GCC has indicated that implementation of the extended on-street scheme is now unlikely to take place until early summer 2017.

On-going parking relationship with GCC

Arup will be considering the relationship between on and off-street parking regimes as part of its brief and is able to make recommendations about how this might work more effectively. Arup will also be looking at the current structure of the Council's parking service and any alternative options for providing the service more efficiently.

CBC continues to engage with GCC on key issues affecting transport arrangements in the town, although this is an area where in-house staffing expertise is currently limited.

For example, we are currently in discussions about how private parking impacts arising from the implementation of Phase 2 of the Cheltenham Transport Plan at Oriol Road can be moderated. The highway changes are planned to start on 9th January, 2017.

GCC has also provided some input in relation to the issue of parking quantum, along the following lines..

'If the vision is ample parking all year round, then members will need to accept the cost of paying for a significant parking asset that will be empty 90% of the time. For the other 10% of the time, such a strategy of supplying to meet demand is likely to overwhelm the capacity of the road network and create a poor visitor experience. Glos City ended up in this position when they did a car park review about 6 years ago. The only way to increase footfall is through a multi-modal approach to access, including coach parking.'

Wider Considerations

Consideration will also need to be given to the emerging Place Strategy for Cheltenham, particularly in relation to longer-term interventions needed to support Cheltenham becoming a stronger economic and cultural destination. On street / off street car parking and highways matters play an important role in shaping place.

The parking strategy will need make provisions for the delivery for this emerging vision for the Town and close collaboratively working will be necessary between the county and borough council's along with other partners such as the BID, Chamber of Commerce, bus companies etc.

Next steps and programme timeline

The draft strategy, along with a 5 year action plan is due to be delivered to CBC in April 2017 and will be presented to the Car Parking Member Working Group and onwards to Cabinet with recommendations in May/June.

Contact Officer: Mike Redman
Tel No: 01242 264160
Email: mike.redman@cheltenham.gov.uk

Appendix 1 – Risks and issues

Key Risks Update (highlight, in bold, decisions requested from Operational Programmes Board)		
<i>Risk ID</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Update to include planned mitigation</i>
ID004	If the car parking strategy results in a reduction in income, it will have a direct financial impact on the MTFs and the authority's ability to support discretionary environmental activities.	Consultant's brief specifically highlights that current income levels are an important consideration, albeit that the rationale for off-street parking provision is primarily to manage congestion.
ID005	If the car parking strategy is not informed by appropriate consultation with stakeholders it may be subject to legal challenge.	Consultants brief requires consultation with identified key stakeholders and the wider public.
ID006	If the parking strategy does not have due regard to the need to encourage more sustainable modes of accessing the town centre, there is a risk of increasing congestion and a negative impact on air quality	The car parking strategy must consider the wider issues of access to the town.
ID007	If the parking strategy does not achieve an appropriate balance between access by car and other modes of transport, there may be an adverse effect on the local economy	The car parking strategy must consider the wider issues of access to the town.
ID008	If the parking strategy does not have due regard to on-street parking arrangements, there is a risk that there will be inconsistencies in charges and impacts on parking availability for local residents	The car parking strategy must consider the wider issues of access to the town.

Key Issues Update (highlight, in bold, decisions requested from Operational Programmes Board)		
<i>Issue ID</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Update to include planned resolution</i>
001	Core staffing within the parking team is inadequate, with a lack of dedicated management / technical support capacity.	Consultant's brief includes the requirement for recommendations in the strategy to address operational needs.
002	Whilst some capital funding is available, there is currently no identified revenue budget for supporting and developing the strategy.	No resolution to date.
003	Emerging proposals for environmental improvements at Bath Terrace car park which are subject to CBC/GCC grant-assisted feasibility work by ConnectRegen,	<p>The feasibility study is now complete and <i>ConnectRegen</i> reported their findings to members and officers at a briefing on 29th November, 2016.</p> <p>The briefing set out suggestions for improvements to the car park (layout, disabled spaces, green infrastructure, sustainable drainage), but also highlighted the challenges of proceeding in the face of some local opposition, most notably from the Bath Road traders' organisation (BaRTA).</p> <p>In the absence of anticipated external grant funding for capital improvements, there are likely to be calls for the Council to take a more direct role in implementation. The results of the study will feed into the broader car parking strategy work which is being supported by Arup, so that a holistic view can be taken of the implications of investment.</p>
004	GCC has undertaken consultation on changes	Proposed parking changes are likely to proceed

Key Issues Update (highlight, in bold, decisions requested from Operational Programmes Board)		
<i>Issue ID</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Update to include planned resolution</i>
	to on-street parking arrangements, including the extension of pay and display parking in Lansdown. Pricing policy may be in direct competition with the off-street offer, running contrary to the established approach underpinned by the Local Transport Plan.	<p>with a number of amendments, including better alignment of on and off-street charging regimes. This will allow for further consideration of mitigation measures, including incentives for more sustainable travel alternatives.</p> <p>There are some continuing concerns about GCC communications and the misrepresentation of CBC's position, which has not been unequivocal support.</p> <p>GCC has indicated that implementation is now unlikely to take place until early summer 2017.</p>

