

## Summary of comments from consultation questionnaire responses.

List of Abbreviations:

GCC – Gloucestershire County Council

CBC – Cheltenham Borough Council

CTP – Cheltenham Transport Plan

LSTF – Local Sustainable Transport Fund

GH – Gloucestershire Highways

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

		consultation and information on impacts of the scheme.	avenues to reach as many residents and stakeholders as possible while providing plenty of time to seek additional information where it was desired. Some examples of how we tried to achieve this were; delivered consultation packs to 16,000 residents, undertook 10 exhibitions initially adding another 3 in August following requests, responded to emails for further information, developed an area of the website to house additional information and added to it as further information became available, identified effected stakeholders and offered meetings where appropriate, enabled residents to respond directly to the consultation online. In order to ensure the consultation achieved the highest levels of best practice, GCC asked The Consultation Institute to quality assure the CTP consultation and a transport consultation expert was appointed by them for this role. The Consultation Institute will be reporting their findings in due course and their report will be made available on GCC's website <a href="http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/cheltenhamtp">www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/cheltenhamtp</a>	
42	Safety	Reduce the speed limit at Boots Corner.	Rather than taking steps to merely reduce the speed limit, the ongoing design of the public realm scheme by CBC will acknowledge that the intended design speed for the area should be low and will be catered for accordingly.	Urban realm scheme to be designed to only enable appropriate vehicle speeds.
43	Inconvenience	Reduce the number of traffic signals.	The scheme proposals make account of the general public desire to reduce traffic signalised junctions wherever possible within the scope and budgetary confines of the project. The current proposal removes five signalised junctions and one pedestrian crossing (see no.3) and replaces with measures more appropriate for the expected traffic volumes.	Traffic signals removed within scope of project wherever feasible.
44	Inconvenience	Changes to town centre access will deter visitors to town.	Although access to two very central roads is to be restricted, access around the town is generally improved under the current proposals. It is important to recognise	None required.

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

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

## Summary of Comments from Stakeholders.

List of Abbreviations:

GCC – Gloucestershire County Council

CBC – Cheltenham Borough Council

CTP – Cheltenham Transport Plan

LSTF – Local Sustainable Transport Fund

GH – Gloucestershire Highways

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

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



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

				lead to closures and empty units which is not in accordance with the goal of economic progression	
55	Inconvenience	The impact of displaced vehicles on the surrounding road network.	See no. 33.		See no. 33.
56	Inconvenience	Increase in traffic caused by housing developments.	See no. 39.		See no. 39.
57	Inconvenience	Efficiency of the traffic signals along the St Margaret's Road corridor.	GCC is aware of perceived issues with the operation of the traffic signals on this corridor. The report into the trial held in November 2012 acknowledged that, should external funding become available development of a design that included removal of some of the signalised junctions was feasible. GCC will fund an investigation into the junctions at St Georges St, Henrietta St and Monson Ave with the intention of optimising the operation of these junctions prior to introducing any prohibition at Boots Corner.		Undertake signal review as described.
58	Modal Shift	Importance of promoting alternative transport solution and whether the railway station could form a more important strategic link.	Much of the funding awarded by the Department for Transport as part of the LSTF funding is aimed at encouraging sustainable transport. Measures with funding that are currently under development include ensuring that development plans for the railway station include better access by walking, cycling and bus. Improving information at the railway station will make it easier for people to complete their whole journey with confidence.		Support sustainable transport promotion included within wider LSTF project.
59	Inconvenience	Should Imperial Sq convert to two way traffic and Oriel Road	It would be possible in engineering terms to achieve this however the potential effects		Include Oriel Road into two-way proposal.

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

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

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

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