

## Council

**Monday, 26th January, 2015**  
**6.00 - 10.35 pm**

<b>Attendees</b>	
<b>Councillors:</b>	Simon Wheeler (Chair), Duncan Smith (Vice-Chair), Matt Babbage, Flo Clucas, Adam Lillywhite, Chris Mason, Dan Murch, Chris Nelson, John Payne, Max Wilkinson, Wendy Flynn, Andrew Chard, Paul Baker, Garth Barnes, Nigel Britter, Chris Coleman, Bernard Fisher, Jacky Fletcher, Colin Hay, Tim Harman, Rowena Hay, Sandra Holliday, Peter Jeffries, Steve Jordan, Andrew Lansley, Andrew McKinlay, David Prince, John Rawson, Anne Regan, Rob Reid, Chris Ryder, Diggory Seacome, Malcolm Stennett, Klara Sudbury, Pat Thornton, Jon Walklett, Roger Whyborn and Suzanne Williams

## Minutes

### 1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Helena McCloskey.

### 2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Prince declared an interest as a member of the county council TRO committee but advised that he had given his apologies to the meeting of 15 January 2015 so that he could take part in this debate at Council today.

### 3. **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

Upon a vote it was unanimously

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2014 be agreed and signed as an accurate record.**

### 4. **COMMUNICATIONS BY THE MAYOR**

The Mayor expressed his sadness at the recent passing away of Honorary Aldermen Daphne Pennell and Terry Ruck. The former had been a borough councillor for 12 years during the late 1980s and 90s and had been Mayor in the 2000/2001 Municipal Year. Similarly Honorary Alderman Terry Ruck had been a councillor for many years. He asked members to stand for a minutes silence in their remembrance.

### 5. **COMMUNICATIONS BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

The Leader advised members that following the debate at the last Council meeting regarding the rail utilisation strategy he had submitted a letter as the Council's response to the Western Route Study Consultation. He thanked members of the cross party scrutiny task group for their work on this.

He had been requested to give a statement on North Place. He advised that Auger Buchler, the lead developer for North Place, had agreed a contract with Morrisons supermarket. Morrisons had given notice to cancel the contract on 16 December 2014 and consequently discussions were under way between Morrisons and Auger Buchler. As CBC were not involved in the contract he could give no more information at this stage.

**6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

There were 35 public questions and these are set out in the Appendix.

**7. MEMBER QUESTIONS**

There were 15 member questions and these are set out in the Appendix.

At the conclusion of this item at 7.25 pm, the Mayor adjourned the meeting for a short break and it reconvened at 7:45 p.m.

**8. CONSIDERATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GCC TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER COMMITTEE**

The Cabinet Member Councillor Andrew McKinlay introduced the report which has been circulated with the agenda. The report explained that in November 2013, Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) committed to further consider the Cheltenham Transport Plan (CTP) once the recommendations of Gloucestershire County Council's (GCC's) Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Committee had been received. The TRO Committee met on 15 January 2015.

The Cabinet Member reminded members that they were here to debate the Council's response to the TRO committee decision of the 15 January and not to re-examine every aspect of the proposals again. He wanted to put on record his thanks to the TRO committee for their time and diligence in considering the Cheltenham Transport Plan. Council's role today was to advise GCC of their view on how the Cheltenham Transport Plan should proceed in light of the TRO committee decision. He referred members to the minutes of the TRO committee which had been circulated to all Members. These confirmed that the TRO had approved all aspects of the Traffic Regulation Orders it considered as permanent schemes with the exception of the closure of Boots Corner to traffic which the committee made temporary for 18 months, with a review after 10 months.

He reminded members that the debate about the Cheltenham Transport Structure had been going on for over 70 years. The current one-way system solution was adopted in the 1960s and had never been satisfactory. In reality a 1960s traffic solution had been grafted onto a Regency Road Network and as a result, consultation had found little support for continuing with the status quo. There had been a long public debate and consultation on how best to address the issues and the current process had started in 2000. GCC believes that the Cheltenham Transport Plan can assist in delivering a long-term sustainable future for the town. He acknowledged that some people were sceptical about the impact of the plan on neighbourhoods and had questioned the accuracy of some of the evidence used. In a scheme of this complexity it was inevitable that some adjustments would be required and these would be addressed by the county council as they were identified. In the case of the Boots Corner TRO there would be a specific review after 10 months.

The Cabinet Member went on to address a number of specific concerns which had been raised:

Equality Impact Assessment - this document had been prepared by GCC in partnership with this council and relevant groups had been consulted.

Risk Assessment – to date the risks considered by CBC have been high-level since no decision have been taken to implement the scheme. Detailed risks would emerge from finalised designs and would be subject to safety audits by the GCC Highways Team.

Bath Road - a safety trial is currently underway following two fatal accidents with the aim of reducing speeds and increasing safety.

Reversal costs - these were covered in the letter from Scott Tompkins, Lead Commissioner Highway Authority, GCC, to the Leader. For clarity the costs of reversing the scheme at Boots Corner were low as major works would not begin until the TRO is made permanent.

Boots Corner experiment - this was no impediment to progress as it was always intended that there would be a review prior to making the scheme permanent.

In conclusion he encouraged members to consider the debate today to be about the town's future as a whole including the economy, its attractiveness of visitors, businesses and investors and for its citizens. It was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity and he warned that if Council did not support it they could be condemning Cheltenham to decades of increasing traffic chaos with a transport system that was widely acknowledged as not being fit for purpose.

He therefore moved the resolution

*"This council supports the recommendations of the Gloucestershire County Council Transport Regulation Order Committee of 15 January 2015 and asks the Chief Executive to convey this support to Gloucestershire County Council and request that they progress the delivery of the Cheltenham Transport Plan."*

Councillor Tim Harman reminded members that he now spoke as the new Group Leader of the Conservative party and he thanked Councillor Duncan Smith for his excellent work in this role.

Councillor Harman proposed the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Babbage.

1. *That all changes under the Cheltenham Transport Plan TRO should be experimental, not just Boots Corner*
2. *That the county council is requested to provide clear, quantifiable success/failure criteria set out in advance, including regard to:*
  - *safety, number of accidents*
  - *pollution levels generally, AQMA areas*
  - *journey times on certain routes in particular*
  - *number of vehicles on a range of roads*
3. *That the county council is requested to provide bi- monthly updates on progress and assessments of the scheme*

4. *that mitigation funding is increased to £300,000.*

In proposing the amendment, Councillor Harman felt the meeting so far had posed more questions than answers. Although he welcomed the TRO committee's decision to make the Boots Corner TRO experimental he felt that all TROs in the scheme should be experimental. They had already been advised that under current plans if the rest of the scheme didn't work it couldn't be reversed and if this was the case they would be failing in their duty to residents. He reminded members that the mitigation funding had been increased by Council at a previous meeting in response to an amendment from former Councillor Rob Garnham. This increase was to be funded from the New Homes Bonus and how to pay for a further increase would be something that needed to be discussed with the county council. However he pointed out that the council had received a large capital receipt for North Place which could be used to make some contribution.

In seconding the amendment, Councillor Babbage, had fundamental concerns about the transport plan that was being proposed for Cheltenham and he could only support it if all the TROs were experimental. He raised concerns about particular streets which would suffer increased traffic flow and named Sanford Street, Trafalgar Street and Hales Road. He was also concerned that the flow of traffic from Rodney Road into Winchcombe Street would become the new Boots Corner.

A Member raised a point of order and asked for clarification on the information that they had been given earlier in the meeting that any attempt by this council to amend any of the TRO recommendations would be likely to result in the recommendation to the GCC Cabinet being negated.

ST advised that as a GCC officer he could only speak in terms of the advice that he would give to his Cabinet Member in this situation and could not comment on the legal/constitutional issues. He advised members that experimental traffic schemes were expensive to implement and could cause anger and confusion with drivers and would be unlikely to provide members with the type of trial they were looking for. He emphasised that the changes to the inner ring-road were not irreversible and needed to be given time to bed in and he reassured members that if any safety concerns were identified they would be addressed. The cost of a two-week trial at St Margaret's Road had been in the order of £30,000 as the equipment had to be hired and checked daily. Thus the costs of making the whole scheme temporary would be very high and he would recommend that if that level of funding was available it would be better placed being put into mitigation measures.

The Cabinet Member Finance, Councillor Rawson, suggested that amendment 2 would be welcomed and was not controversial and county council officers had already offered to provide a quarterly update as requested in 3. He was concerned about the arbitrary doubling of the mitigation funding and felt that the council was already committed to working with the county council to find the necessary funds to make the new system work. The council should not risk the scheme being pulled by agreeing the amendment. The traffic measures being proposed were sensible and would make the roads in Cheltenham safer and increase traffic capacity.

Another member was concerned that the implications of the amendment were uncostered and the likely reaction of the county council was unknown.

Another member speaking against the amendment, highlighted the risk of doing nothing and if there was no plan B returning to a blank sheet of paper. Doing nothing would result in Cheltenham becoming more gridlocked as traffic increases and risk damaging the economy of the town and its attractiveness as a shopping centre.

Several members described the amendment as a 'wrecking' amendment which would result in no scheme happening. They considered the benefits of the scheme had already been set out in great detail and issues had been addressed in the risk assessment. They reminded members that Council had the opportunity to express their views at the meeting in November 2013 and there had been cross-party support for the recommendations at that stage. The consultation showed that most of the residents of Cheltenham supported the scheme for its economic and environmental benefits and its support for businesses. The Chamber of Commerce and businesses also supported the scheme. The Council's decision today should be a straight yes or no to the scheme.

Another member whilst wholeheartedly supporting the closure of Boots Corner could not support the amendment as they felt the whole scheme of trying to get more traffic on fewer roads would not work.

A member felt that an experimental scheme would not be an accurate provider of traffic data. Another member agreed that the whole traffic scheme would probably be too big and too complicated to trial so that could be a reason to vote against the amendment. A member reminded Council that an experimental option for Boots Corner had been put forward following concerns raised and it may be that if the council passed this amendment other feasible options for trials could appear. They also highlighted that 94% of people who expressed an opinion on the proposals were against so this was not a mandate for change.

In responding to the debate, the proposer assured members that this was not a wrecking motion. He understood that there were financial implications but he asked Council to consider the costs of getting the whole scheme wrong.

Before the vote, Councillor McKinlay indicated that he was happy to accept points 2. and .3 of the amendment into the substantive motion. Having heard the response from GCC officers he could not support 1. and he felt the fixing of a figure in 4. was premature, particularly as the Cabinet Member Finance had already assured Council that mitigation funding would be found where necessary to make the scheme work.

A vote on each part of the amendment requested and the voting was as followed:

- 1) Voting For 14, Against 22, Abstentions 2
- 2) Voting For 35, Against 2, Abstentions 1
- 3) Voting For 35, Against 2, Abstentions 1
- 4) Voting For 11, Against 23, Abstentions 4

Parts 2 and 3 were incorporated in the original resolution proposed by Councillor McKinlay and this became the substantive motion as follows.

- 1. This Council supports the recommendations of the Gloucestershire County Council Transport Regulation Order Committee of the 15 January 2015**
- 2. Requests the Chief Executive of the Council to convey this support to Gloucestershire County Council and request that they progress the delivery of the Cheltenham Transport Plan subject to the following being provided by the County Council**
  - i) clear, quantifiable success/failure criteria set out in advance, including**
    - **Safety, number of accidents**
    - **Pollution levels generally, Air Quality Management Areas**
    - **Journey times on certain routes in particular**
    - **Number of vehicles on a range of roads**
  - ii) Quarterly updates on progress and assessment of the scheme**

Speaking against the motion, members made the following comments:

- The scheme as presented was simply moving the traffic from one inner ring road to another and with fewer roads and increasing levels of traffic it would create a series of bottlenecks and possibly a new boy racer route. The correct solution was to look at developments and mitigations which would substantially reduce the volume of traffic coming into the town centre.
- The North West distributor road should be revisited as an option.
- The plans for the pedestrian scheme at Boots Corner was flawed by the inclusion of access for taxis, buses and cyclists. There was scepticism over whether the idyllic pictures of Boots Corner would actually be delivered in reality. The trial of Boots Corner was not a proper trial unless it included bus traffic as well. One member estimated that there could be as many as 60 to 70 buses per hour passing through this area. Boots Corner could not be compared to the shared area in the lower High Street where there was much more delineation between the road and the pavement.
- There were still concerns that the scheme at Boots Corner permitted Hackney Carriages but not private hire vehicles and this was seen as discriminatory to many people, including the elderly, who would have to pay higher fares for the longer routes that private hire vehicles would have to travel.
- There were concerns and sympathy for residents in St Lukes, College Road and the Sandford Park area who may suffer serious traffic problems as a result of the scheme.

- A member was personally committed to making the town a better place to live in and even though it had taken a very long time to get to this stage that was not a good reason for implementing a solution which would not work for Cheltenham residents.
- Previously the council had encouraged people to live in the town centre but the scheme would positively discourage people by pushing cars down residential streets causing a denigration of their standard of living with increased traffic and fumes.
- Concerns were expressed about the lack of work that had been done to quantify the risks both social, economic, safety and environmental that remained in the scheme.
- There has been a failure to respond to the public and member questions which had not been answered satisfactorily at this meeting. It was important to spend more time getting the scheme right and address concerns.
- Many cities were looking to reverse pedestrianisation
- Other routes such as Princess Elizabeth Way had not been included in the modelling but would be adversely impacted.
- To date many members and the public did not have confidence in the scheme as there were still too many imponderables. Members were disappointed by the lack of clarity in this debate and answers to questions.
- The consultation appeared to show that only corporate bodies were in favour of the scheme and the council must listen to the views of the people of Cheltenham. The silent majority may not have responded to the consultation if they felt their view wouldn't be listened to. There was no mandate for the scheme from residents of the town and most people in the town were probably unaware of it.
- Councillor Mason wished to put on record his request to the Cabinet Member for measurable outcomes to be made fully available to the public within the next three days.
- The current traffic trial in Bath Road did not seem to be a success and it had already raised a safety issue for pedestrians crossing by the Playhouse. A more simple way of improving safety was to put in a speed camera.
- There had been an emphasis on modal shift but there was nothing in the plan to evidence that and cycling had not been featured much in the debate.
- There were concerns that the £150K would provide insufficient funds for the mitigation necessary and the impact on schools also needs to be included.

Speaking in support of the substantive motion, Members made the following comments.

- The scheme as presented was a good first step in getting traffic out of the town centre.
- The suggestion of a North West bypass was an odd solution from members who favoured protecting the green belt
- Similar schemes adopted in other towns such as Oxford and Cardiff worked well.
- Cheltenham had a series of wide one-way routes which could easily accommodate two-way traffic.
- Cheltenham is currently famous for its traffic problems and the scheme set out to address that. There had already been extensive informal consultation on the scheme and the council must not lose this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to address a long-standing problem. If nothing was done then there would be gridlock before 2026 hence doing nothing was not an option.
- The transport improvements to Cheltenham were a key domino which would kick off further improvements, for example reducing traffic adjacent to Royal Well would allow improvements to that area. Increased footfall could be attracted to areas of the town like St Mary's churchyard and the Brewery 2 development which were important to the town's economy and to the town's communities in terms of generating jobs. The only alternative was a plan B. which would need to knock down buildings and change the very nature of the town.
- The scheme would also encourage and enable people to use more sustainable transport such as cycling and walking which would benefit their health and well-being. They noted that the new scheme created at least 12 new routes for cyclists.
- Concerns had been expressed that buses would be allowed through Boots Corner. Buses must be able to access the town centre and if not at Boots Corner it would be somewhere else in the town centre.
- The shared scheme in the lower High Street seemed to work well with no problems.
- Members expressed confidence in the officers to deliver the scheme and their ability to implement the necessary mitigation measures.
- Traffic flow and air quality must be monitored during the implementation
- Change is always challenging for some people and there would probably have been similar reactions when pedestrianising the Promenade for example. There was regret if some people suffered as a result of the scheme but mitigations would be put in place.

In summing up, Councillor McKinlay was disappointed that members in the chamber had focussed on finding reasons for not making a decision. In his view the scheme was the culmination of 13 years of work and lots of information had been provided during that time. If the scheme is adopted there was major benefits to the economy and the environment but he acknowledged that it needed bravery to take such a decision. He regretted that there was no magical alternative and therefore he urged members to support the recommendations of the TRO committee.

Upon 7 Members standing in their seats, a recorded vote was requested and agreed.



**Upon a vote the motion was CARRIED.**

For; 21 – Councillors Baker, Britter, Clucas, Coleman, Fisher, Flynn, Colin Hay, Rowena Hay, Holliday, Jeffries, Jordan, McKinlay, Murch, Reid, Rawson, Thornton, Walklett, Wheeler, Whyborn, Wilkinson and Williams.

Against; 17;- Councillors Babbage, Barnes, Chard, Fletcher, Harman, Lansley, Lillywhite, Mason, Nelson, Payne, Prince, Regan, Ryder, Seacome, Smith, Stennett, and Sudbury.

Abstentions; 0

**9. NOTICES OF MOTION**

None.

**10. TO RECEIVE PETITIONS**

None received.

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

None.

Simon Wheeler  
**Chair**

This page is intentionally left blank

## Extraordinary Council

26 January 2015

## Public Questions (35)

1.	<b>Question from Jayne Lillywhite to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	<p>Who will be responsible for the cost of the complete reversal of the scheme if it becomes evident that for political reasons it is imperative that reversal is required, and CBC and GCC officers are instructed by Council to undertake a reversal?</p> <p>It is essential that this information is on the public record as to whether it will be GCC or CBC who will pay for complete reversal before the final decision to implement the CTP is taken at either CBC Full Council or by any subsequent decision by Nigel Riglar or GCC Council.</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>The decision by the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) committee was to implement the TRO's as advertised with the exception of Boots' Corner which will be undertaken on an experimental basis. Elements such as Bath Road which are being implemented for safety reasons are not expected to be reversed, so the only element which would be subject to reversal is Boots Corner.</p> <p>The costs of implementing Boots' Corner on an experimental basis are low as no major construction works are required by GCC. The CBC £2m public realm enhancement will only occur after the TRO committee have met and approved the permanent implementation of the Boots' Corner TRO.</p> <p>Thus, any reinstatement works, to return Boots' Corner to its previous state will be met by GCC as the highways authority.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Jayne Lillywhite stated that many towns across the country were going through depedestrianisation due to the damaging impact such schemes were having on their commercial core and highlighted the significant cost associated with this. She asked whether the Cabinet Member could provide assurance that CBC could fund a reversal of the TRO relating to Boots Corner perhaps by reserving some of the funds surplus from the sale of North Place.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member referred to the letter submitted by the County Council explaining the responsibilities of both councils relating to the implementation of the TRO. He stated that the County Council was responsible for implementing the scheme and any changes necessary to it, including reversal. However, he highlighted that the cost of reversing the experimental scheme would be relatively small compared to those following the implementation of major works.</p>

2.	<b>Question from Jayne Lillywhite to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	Can you please explain why when going through the risk register that none of the risks are sufficiently severe to cause the revocation of the scheme, even though the TROC stated that the Boots Corner Element would be a trial. Can you outline what level of failure would be required to back out the scheme.
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>The TRO committee supported the wider scheme as they share a commonly held perception that the current Cheltenham road network is deficient and holds various safety concerns. On this basis, we do not anticipate a revocation of the whole scheme. The Boots' Corner experiment aligns with previous commitments to a "bedding-in" period, thus the risk register identifies opportunities for revocation of that component.</p> <p>The risk register identifies both the assessed impact and likelihood of individual risks.</p> <p>Jayne Lillywhite repeated her question as she felt it had not been sufficiently answered. In response the Cabinet Member said that this was a matter to be considered by the transport authority having looked at the experimental scheme. He explained that the risks were not yet in the register as no detailed scheme had been drawn up yet but they would feature once a detailed plan was in place. In terms of the risk register for the general scheme none of the risks identified had scored more than 16 which represented the trigger point and risks were scored as severity times likelihood.</p>
3.	<b>Question from Peter Sayers to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	Concerning the temporary closure of Boots' Corner, what 'before and after' metrics, including traffic volumes and NO2 monitoring, will be utilised to judge the success or otherwise of this trial? And where exactly will these be collected and how public will the resulting data be?
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>All traffic monitoring will be carried out by the highways authority, which has the skills, resources and responsibility for such tasks. CBC will work in partnership with GCC regarding air quality monitoring, as they currently do, in order to deliver the action plan associated with the Cheltenham Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). This data will be made public as the TRO committee has asked to reconvene to consider same, prior to any final implementation decision relating to Boots' Corner.</p> <p>The questioner felt that his question had not been answered sufficiently. In response the Cabinet Member invited Scott Tompkins, Lead Commissioner, Highway Authority for the detail of the TRO process. Scott Tompkins explained that greater details of the scheme were not yet available. The intention would be to progress the inner ring road portions of the scheme to the final design</p>

	<p>stage which would include stage 2 safety audits. Officers were also looking at what traffic data would need to be collected in order to assess the trial experiment at Boots Corner.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Peter Sayers stated that according to the map circulated at a previous meeting traffic the indicators were that traffic would double on the south side of Clarence Square. He requested that an N02 monitoring station be placed at the top of Monson Avenue where it meets Clarence Square in order that real data can be collected at least 2 months before the trial and 2 months after the trial.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member stated that whilst an answer could not be provided now he assured him that the county officers would have noted his point and added that similar representations had been made which would be taken on board as part of the process.</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Peter Sayers to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>At the public meeting on 15-1-15 I requested the details of structural surveys and risk assessments to the residential buildings on both sides of the south side of Clarence Square be made available. The proposed temporary closure of Boots Corner will result in a large traffic increase and vibration impinging on these Regency residential properties with scant 600mm foundations built on sand. This would indicate that a formal risk assessment be a responsible action by those proposing such a scheme: it has not yet been made available. Please can this be made available before a final decision on the trial is agreed. In addition, please let me know how much money has been set aside to compensate if damage from the increased vibration is proven to have occurred.</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>At the meeting referred to, the Highways Authority advised that no such surveys had been undertaken and they had not been alerted to any evidence of structural damage to property associated with the existing road network. CBC is not the Highways Authority so unable to provide any further advice. The assumption that the Cheltenham Transport Plan (CTP) will result in large traffic increases is not correct. Overall, the CTP encourages modal shift and reduces the amount of traffic growth that is anticipated without any scheme in place. On those roads where there is an anticipated increase in traffic, the growth is not substantially higher than the anticipated growth from development in Cheltenham going forward and therefore, there is not seen to be any greater risk of damage to properties from traffic-generated vibration.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Peter Sayers how any structural damage would be paid for. How would that be measured, who would measure it and what risk assessment would be undertaken. This was one of the finest squares in England and he believed it was being put at risk.</p>

	<p>In response the Lead Commissioner, Highways Authority explained that if there was damage to property then the Highways Authority would take responsibility for any claims if the link was proved between increased traffic and increased vibrations on property foundations. He highlighted that key to the Cheltenham Transport Plan was controlling the growth of traffic in the future. The doubling of traffic referred to included taking account of any new housing in Cheltenham. The Plan assisted by influencing modal shift in terms of adopting different forms of transportation.</p>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Question from John Firth to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	<p>What is the cost of altering the three junctions along Oriol Road (i.e. all the works from Bath Road to the Promenade), and what proportion thereof comes from LSTF ?</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>Funding is a combination of Highways safety monies and Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) monies.. The specifics would need to be advised by GCC.</p> <p>£600k of funding has been set aside by GCC from the LSTF programme to fund the physical changes to the Inner Ring Road.</p> <p>In a supplementary question John Firth asked whether, in the case where the scheme failed, would there be funds available to the order of £600k for a reversal.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member stated that the costs of any reversal would fall upon the County Council but reiterated that at this stage the cost of reversal would not be that great as it was not being proposed to change many facets on a permanent basis. Scott Tompkins clarified that the inner ring road changes would be physical changes to the road network and it was not being anticipated that these would need to be reversed. In terms of the experiment at Boots Corner this was a temporary 10 month scheme using temporary materials and therefore no major physical changes to the road network would be made. Therefore if there was a reversal of this experimental scheme this would be low cost.</p>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Question from John Firth to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	<p>What is the cost of altering the junctions along Albion Street (i.e. all the works from Pittville Street to St. James' Street)?</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>GCC as Highways Authority would need to advise on the detail of this.</p> <p>£600k of funding has been set aside by GCC from the LSTF programme to</p>

	fund the physical changes to the Inner Ring Road.
<b>7.</b>	<b>Question from Nic Pehkonen to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	In the CTP strategic risk assessment, a 20 mph zone is proposed for St Paul's. A 20 mph limit makes streets more attractive to cyclists and pedestrians. Why isn't Cheltenham following the example of most towns and cities and making 20mph the speed limit for <b>all</b> residential streets?
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>There is conflicting evidence over whether 'whole town' 20mph zones work, whilst positive results exist for localised areas within towns, especially where the local community has not only supported implementation, but also actively assists in demonstrating positive behaviours; the Netherlands has invested heavily in this approach.</p> <p>I am not aware that a whole town 20mph has ever been seriously proposed for Cheltenham, but I will gladly ask GCC for its formal view regarding this.</p> <p>My current understanding is that GCC has had a very mixed result with 20mph zones, with compliance in most zones being difficult to achieve without significant traffic calming features being introduced. Nationally, the case for large scale 20mph zones has not been successfully made and where they have been implemented, they have not shown the improvements in safety or accident reduction that were anticipated.</p>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Question from Nic Pehkonen to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	In St Paul's we have been discussing and asking for traffic calming measures on St Paul's Road for several years now. As well as the 20 mph limit, our wish list includes: pavement widening, pinch points with traffic prioritization and place making at entrance points, and built out pavement/ parking bays. Is the £30,000 mitigation cost quoted in the Strategic Risk Assessment enough to cover all these necessary measures, as proposed to us by GCC Highways officers?
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	The mitigation cost estimates have been provided by GCC as highways authority. £100k of mitigation funding has been set aside by GCC from the LSTF in order to address safety issues. CBC has offered to provide up to an additional £50k to deal with any additional issues arising as a direct result of the CTP works, this is not expected to mitigate all pre-existing traffic management issues. Once the scheme is in place, all of the roads affected will be carefully monitored and measures introduced on a prioritised and evidence based approach. GCC as Highways Authority ultimately holds responsibility for safety on the network and would need to introduce measures or changes to schemes where required.

9.	<b>Question from Helen Bailey to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	In view of the scale of the impact of the 'Strategic Risks' just published (CTP 1 to CTP19), should not most of these risks be returned to the Corporate Risk Register, rather than their progress be 'hidden' from public scrutiny in the Task Force's "divisional" Risk Register ?
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	The Corporate Risk register is not designed to pick up the level of detail identified, hence they are managed more locally by relevant teams. In this instance the risks are shared between GCC and CBC, but responsibility for monitoring and mitigation may rest with either or both organisations (i.e. the identified risk owner(s)). CBC risks are not generally escalated for inclusion on the Council's corporate risk register unless they are at a score of 16 or above.
10.	<b>Question from Helen Bailey to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	Aside from your eagerness not to miss the deadline for the LSTF handout, (if there really is a definite deadline beyond March 2015), would you not like to have had the confidence of receiving an independent assessor's report into the credibility of the CTP Modelling? (I ask this in light of the fact that everything depends upon this Modelling projection, yet objectors and TR Committee members found many aspects unbelievable or difficult to accept)?
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	There has been a huge array of modelling over the years, undertaken by highly respected traffic industry experts e.g. Colin Buchanan & Associates. The <i>Paramics</i> traffic model is the Department for Transport's (DfT's) accepted modelling tool for this type of situation and was prepared by Atkins and subsequently checked by Amey as the Highways Authority's term contractors. Whilst the subject matter is complex, there has been no credible suggestion that the outputs are deficient. A comprehensive model validation report was produced by Atkins and has been made available on the CTP area of the GCC website. There is no deadline for the LSTF funding, as GCC has already secured this.
11.	<b>Question from Carl Friessner-Day to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	Having reviewed the modelling figures, the TRO Committee expressed some concern over the displaced vehicles into residential areas, and therefore asked the Traffic Manager a simple question " Can the Boots Corner closure be done independently of the other TRO's, and if so can it therefore be trialled?" The answer was YES. We (Cheltenham Residents Forum) have requested and have in recording our requests for a trial closure of Boots Corner, but on numerous occasions been told by this CBC that this was not possible. Can the Council actively blocked what is a common sense tactic of trialling, or did not ask the question of GCC Highways which as a result has now lead to further meetings and further waste of tax payers monies?



	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>The question of trialling was raised on numerous occasions. You will be aware that CBC and the Task Force working with GCC did exactly that at the Monson Avenue junction, so clearly, CBC has not been opposed to trialling. However, CBC was given to understand that the complexities of the Cheltenham network would make a full scale trial unworkable and as a result, agreed with GCC as Highways Authority that a better solution would be to ensure that there was a full public consultation, so that all aspects could be debated prior to any works being implemented.</p> <p>A result of the consultation recommended that a “bedding-in” period be enacted, so in reality, we have all arrived at a similar conclusion.</p> <p>The difference in approach is that CBC &amp; GCC have gone to considerable lengths to engage the public, rather than simply relying on highways powers to implement a trial and consult on the outcomes later.</p> <p>Effectively, this is the price of democracy.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Carl Friessner –Day asked the Cabinet Member to provide dates, times and meetings and names of attendees of meetings held between CBC and the County with regard to Boots Corner.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member undertook to provide that information to the questioner.</p>
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Carl Friessner-Day to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>The risk register of 09/01/2012 shows that the Council officers were well aware that Brewery 2 could go ahead without the ‘closure of Boots Corner’ stating that if the Department of Transport are unable to support the traffic proposals (Outlined in the LSTF Bid) ....certain schemes such as North Place and Brewery phase 2 could go ahead. The threat of the economic impact of not closing Boots Corner has been held over the town for some time and has been underpinned by the Council including letters by Andrew North to the department of transport and others. Were Cllrs wittingly involved in misleading the public or just naive allowing themselves to be swayed by the PR machine, will Cllrs now do the honourable thing and support an investigation?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>At the TRO committee meeting, the Brewery was represented and made it clear that they believed that the closure of Boots’ Corner was beneficial to both their scheme and the wider performance of the town centre.</p> <p>At the time of the LSTF bid, various schemes were being promoted both in Cheltenham and Gloucester. Cheltenham has managed to enable the Brewery Phase II scheme, whilst comparable schemes in Gloucester have yet to start. Developments on this scale do not always enjoy an easy passage, but the final decision to proceed in the absence of Boots’ Corner, but with a very clear desire to see it implemented, reflected a growing confidence of investors in the town.</p>

	<p>That confidence, as demonstrated by a significant number of representatives at the TRO committee, has largely been as a result of the Task Force and its CEO, so Cabinet will not be asking the CEO to step down.</p> <p>Carl Friessner Day wished to highlight that the latter part of the Cabinet Member's response was no longer relevant as his original question had been amended.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Mr Friessner Day highlighted that the risk register from 9 January 2012 stated that Brewery Phase 2 was feasible without the closure of Boots Corner but a letter from CBC on 21 February 2012 stated that the final decision with regard to Brewery 2 rested on the implementation of the Boots Corner scheme. He asked the council to investigate why misleading information was shared with the Department of Transport, Councillors and the public.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member undertook to look into the issue further. He acknowledged that there appeared to be a change in between the two dates of the letters referred to but officers would investigate the facts.</p>
<p><b>13.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Mary Nelson to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>There was a serious failure of due process at the 18<sup>th</sup> November 2013 Council CTP Decision meeting, as the reports put before councillors failed to include the CTP Equality Impact Assessment (of July 2013), and also the Boots Corner plan which had been shown to the Disability Working Group, and failed to make any mention of the need for PSDR to be taken into account in the councillors' decision, as required by the Equality Act 2010, which states that PSDR must be taken into account at the time a decision is taken, NOT AFTER it has been made.</p> <p>This Equality failure has been brought to the attention of GC in a formal complaint, but they claim it is not their responsibility and should be addressed by CBC. As this procedural error has never been rectified, any further CBC CTP decision or agreement now made, is based upon the previous legally unsound 13<sup>th</sup> November decision and would provide grounds for a judicial review by any group or individual, should they choose to challenge it.</p> <p>As Leader, are you not sufficiently concerned about this situation to request that another CTP Decision meeting is held at which a full set of papers regarding PSDR are put before councillors, together with a detailed layout plan for Boots Corner, showing the new bus lane that has now BEEN PERMITTED, so that councillors can see exactly what they are approving and what the impacts upon the Equality Groups are likely to be? Otherwise, any subsequent serious injury or fatality arising from the CTP could result in expensive litigation costs for this Council.</p>
	<p><b>Response from the Cabinet Member Development and Safety</b></p>
	<p>GCC has the responsibility for ensuring that the CTP scheme is equality</p>

compliant and originally drafted the July 2013 document, this has been updated as part of partnership working and will be kept under review. GCC has in place a due regard statement to ensure that the equality aspects have been kept and will be kept under review. Also, CBC/GCC with the Task Force, organised meetings with representatives of various disability groups to establish what works and does not work for them in the town centre now, as the scale of works being proposed create an opportunity to rectify any previous failings.

When the Council decision was made on 18/11/13 we were confident that appropriate steps were being taken to hear the views of the various groups, but equally recognised that any work could only be a broad based discussion to identify concerns as the whole process would be subject to the TRO process. The Disability Working Group continues to be consulted and meet to discuss and provide input into actual rather than theoretical design issues. Recently advice has been sought on the High Street scheme associated with Brewery II and responses will be taken into account in final design work, to be implemented this Spring.

Physical changes to Boots Corner will not occur until the TRO committee have considered the outcomes of the trial, but in the interim we are confident that this representative group will be heard and their concerns fully taken on-board should a public realm upgrade be implemented.

Equally, all schemes involving the highway require an independent audit to ensure compliance with safety and the proposals for the High Street, Boots Corner and any other elements of the Cheltenham Transport Plan will be assessed by GCC in this manner.

Taking the above in to account, I am confident that equality issues have been and will continue to be taken on board in progressing the CTP and that there is sufficient assurance for CBC to take a decision on the TRO Committee recommendations at this stage.

In a supplementary question Mary Nelson made reference to the confidence expressed that appropriate steps had been taken to hear the views of various groups during the consultation. However, there was no mention of this in the officer report for the November 2013 Council meeting nor did any member during the recent TRO hearing refer to the Council's due regard statement. She referred to the Equalities Act 2010 which required that all existing policy related information should be before Councillors before a decision is taken. She asked whether the Cabinet Member felt that his confidence that these requirements had been met was misplaced and that this needed addressing before a decision was taken at this meeting. In addition there was no mention of this issue in the officer report presented for this meeting.

In response the Cabinet Member disagreed with the questioner and confirmed that he was confident that all relevant parties had been consulted including those with disabilities. He gave the example of the consultation which had been undertaken for the Brewery phase 2. He reiterated that the council did consult with relevant parties including the disabled and was therefore confident that it complied with relevant legislation.

14.	<b>Question from Mary Nelson to Cabinet Member Development and Safety Andrew McKinlay</b>
	<p>The recommendation to “trial” the Boots Corner element of the CTP requires a full and detailed explanation by the Traffic Regulation Committee.</p> <p>As the Cabinet member responsible, what is your understanding of their recommendation - did they mean a trial of just the removal of general traffic through Boots Corner, or did they mean a trial of the new bus lane past Boots, which necessarily means the removal of the pedestrian crossing?</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>The trial means a removal of general traffic from Boots’ Corner, as the first round of consultation resulted in the proposed retention of the pedestrian crossing at Boots Corner. Buses will continue to use Imperial Circus during the trial period.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Mary Nelson made reference to the consultation leaflet which showed that the reduction in the number of vehicles at Boots Corner would create an attractive public space and this was a major selling point for public support of the proposals. However, she said that a new public space could not be created without the implementation of a new bus lane in front of Boots shop. This would require the removal of a pedestrian crossing which was used by 16 000 pedestrians each day. She asked whether the Cabinet Member agreed that it was imperative that the new bus lane was trialled and that if it proved to give rise to too many safety issues then the new public square would not be deliverable meaning that the major benefit of the scheme would be outweighed by the many disbenefits.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member confirmed that the experimental TRO did not have the bus route in front of Boots corner. This was a longer term aspiration.</p> <p>Scott Tompkins, Lead Commissioner, Highways Authority reiterated that before a final design scheme is drawn up there would be a stage 2 safety audit. Officers had advised him that there were some concerns with regard to the actual turning movement for buses and these issues would be looked at before that was implemented. During the experiment buses would continue to go through Pittville Street. There had to be confidence that safety issues were addressed with regard to these bus movements. He highlighted that there was no change to the order but the line of the curve stops buses doing this at the moment and there was no intention to change that during the experiment. Scott Tompkins undertook to engage further on that particular issue.</p>
15.	<b>Question from James Molloy to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	<p>The risk register produced post TRO available online for this meeting shows values assigned for mitigation, the sum currently stands at £110,000. At the TRO Committee a couple of schools were mentioned including St Gregory’s of</p>

	<p>which the TRO Committee sought reassurance that mitigation could be offered. Although these funds are only proposed spend, with only £150,000 available and pedestrian crossings costing circa £30,000, where is the additional monies likely to come from to support the many other streets requiring assistance or will this Council just adopt an approach to pacify the TRO Committee and forget about the rest of the town?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>At this stage such allocations are notional, until traffic data identifies any actual issues. As a consequence it is not possible to answer this question in detail. However, GCC has advised that a zebra crossing, if required, is a lot less than the £30k quoted, whilst a puffin crossing could cost more than this. GCC, as Highways Authority, would have responsibility for funding such works.</p> <p>As an aside, the number of private vehicle movements (claimed by the Head teacher) associated with St Gregory's would suggest that an active travel plan should be considered. It is important to remember that the LSTF is not just about changing roads, but also about changing habits and I will encourage GCC to see what support can be given to this school to assist more children attending via means other than private cars, which significantly contribute to the surge of vehicles at peak times.</p> <p>In a supplementary question James Molloy noted that the smarter choices had been factored into the model. Given that these had only been partially implemented this would limit the effects on numbers. He referred to the 4/5 specific risk areas which had been identified for which monies were assumed to be sufficient but asked what would happen if additional problems were identified and where the additional monies would come from to address these.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member acknowledged that it was unknown what would be found until the implementation of the scheme. There was adequate funding available to undertake any necessary identified works. Scott Tompkins added that inherent in the County Council making the bid to the LSTP was the County Council accepting liability for any changes. The Highway Authority had enough confidence that the scheme would work but if small changes were necessary then these would come at a cost to the County Council.</p>
<p><b>16.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from James Molloy to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>The TRO Committee concluded that excluding smarter choices, the closure of Boots Corner at best has a steady state effect on Nitrogen Dioxide by decreasing the NO<sub>2</sub> in two locations and increasing it in two locations. However the trial road changes on Bath Road in the words of GCC will not only addresses safety, but will address the pollution issues here. If this is therefore taken into account, then infact closing Boots Corner will only account for reduced NO<sub>2</sub> levels in one location, Gloucester Road junction. Will the Council therefore openly and honestly, in line with the comments made at the TRO, state for the first time on public record and to the public, that the closure of BC</p>

	has more of a detrimental effect on NO2?
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>GCC as the Highways Authority has responsibility for this scheme. The scheme was originally designed to work with the CTP, including the proposed Boots' Corner closure. The Bath Road changes were only modelled with the Boots' Corner closure. The current trial is to see if the scheme would work and deliver benefits without Boots' Corner being closed. The CTP is not just about the closure of Boots' Corner, but includes a whole package of measures designed to encourage modal shift and reduce traffic growth over the whole network, which should in turn help with air quality issues.</p> <p>In a supplementary question James Molloy said that the closure of Boots Corner had been on the agenda for some 25 years. All the documents relating to the closure only illustrated the positive effects on pollution. The benefits of smarter choices and other alternatives to the closure at Boots Corner had in his view never been set out in a transparent manner for the public to see that there are other ways to achieve pollution reduction. He believed that by refusing to answer his question fully the Cabinet Member now accepted this fact.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member said that this was not the case. He said that the Boots Corner scheme was viewed as "the cherry on the cake" but it did not mean that the other traffic changes were completely dependent on it. The other changes in the transport plan would be beneficial in their own right. With regard to the current trial at Bath Road he said that things took time to bed in and more information would be available about the trial in a few weeks time.</p>
<b>17.</b>	<b>Question from Andrew Riley to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	Who are the members of the Task Force ' <b>Risks &amp; Accountability Group</b> ', and are their deliberations and decisions subject to the same levels of audit and scrutiny as is the Council's Corporate Risk Register, in view of the recent 'black mark' of a PIR (Public Interest Report) issued against CBC following the Christine Laird Prosecution fiasco, primarily based on failure of risk management ?
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>The risk &amp; accountability group consists of Andrew North (CBC), Simon Excell (GCC), David Oldham (Task Force member), Jeff Brinley (Task Force member), Jeremy Williamson (Task Force) and has in attendance staff from internal audit.</p> <p>That risk register is also regularly considered by the Senior Leadership Team of CBC and is subject to the same level of audit and scrutiny as all other Council activities.</p>
<b>18.</b>	<b>Question from Andrew Riley to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	Isn't the Utopian promise of a 'public space', with trees or fountains based on

	<p>artists' dreams, far too flakey to risk the viability of the town's <u>traffic network</u> on, particularly when it has been allied hitherto with an absolute refusal to consider that risk ?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>The Boots' Corner space amounts to approximately 1000m<sup>2</sup> through which passages have to be defined for bus routes of approximately 3.5m width. There would appear to be ample space for people, a public space and certain vehicles. However, no such 'Utopian dreams' will be implemented until the risks have been considered further by the GCC TRO committee.</p>
<b>19.</b>	<p><b>Question from Gaynor Riley to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>If further mitigation money is required (which is very likely, given the scale of impact which will cover a widespread geographical area of the town) who will be responsible for providing it - will it be CBC or GCC? This vital information must be decided and recorded in public now, so that there is no future wrangling between GCC and CBC as to who is going to pay.</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>The modelling work does not suggest that the impact will be widespread or significant as the questioner suggests. GCC as the Highway Authority is responsible for providing any mitigation, changes to, or reversal of the scheme. To this end, funding from the LSTF has been set aside. Should further funding be required beyond that already identified, then GCC would be responsible for this too. This risk was acknowledged by GCC in its Cabinet approval to take the Traffic Regulation Orders forward.</p>
<b>20.</b>	<p><b>Question from Gaynor Riley to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>Do you agree that the only part of the CTP that can be trialled is the actual closure of the inner ring road through Boots Corner to general traffic, and that this claimed trial does not, and cannot, test the desired 'Shared Space' at Boots Corner, because it is only possible to trial the public space if the existing bus route around Imperial Circus is closed and the buses are re-routed past Boots shop and this new bus route requires the removal of the pedestrian crossing?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>My understanding of the trial is exactly as you describe. However, we have been trialling 'space-sharing' between buses and people on the High Street between Primark &amp; Tesco for the last 7 years. When the TRO committee further considers the experiment, they will no doubt consider whether further changes need to be implemented permanently, or alternatively could decide to abandon the scheme.</p>
<b>21.</b>	<p><b>Question from Daud McDonald to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>



	<p>I would like to ask the council what mitigation they are considering re the increased volume of traffic on St Paul's Road and the extra pollution this will bring?</p> <p>As a resident of St Pauls Road I have experienced the volume of traffic that will pass through St Paul's on a daily basis. When the sewer works were done on St Margaret's Road in 2014, traffic was gridlocked and the pollution could be tasted!</p> <p>Mr Jordan, leader of the council, said "No one wants gridlock" and a person called Alex from highways said " this scheme will reduce pollution" neither of these statements reflects the truth of what St Paul's will suffer without mitigation to make sure we are not victims of this scheme</p> <p>I do not believe that an unenforceable 20 mile an hour speed limit is sufficient. Having spoken to many of my neighbours I think that pinch points at either end of St Paul's Road or blocking the road to through traffic are the only solutions we would find acceptable at the moment.</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>GCC, as Highways Authority, will be monitoring the impact of the changes. Any mitigation measures proposed will be subject to public scrutiny prior to implementation. My understanding is that certain measures currently proposed, such as a 20mph zone, have been the result of active public engagement with the community, including both CBC Councillors and GCC representatives. I am hopeful that this will continue and also that this wider scheme helps to address some existing concerns too, rather than just exacerbating the situation.</p>
<p><b>22.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Liz Rolls to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Cllr Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>Now that Morrison's has withdrawn from the North Place site, what access routes from the south of Cheltenham (where 70% of residents live) will the Council be suggesting to potential replacement businesses and their customers once easy access via Boots Corner into St. Margaret's Road is no longer an option - the St. James' Square, Ambrose Street, St. George's Street into St. Margaret's Road route? The Rodney Road, High Street, Winchcombe St, Albion Street, St John's Avenue into St. Margaret's Road route? Or the College Road via St Lukes Rd, High Street, Street, James Street, St John's Avenue into St. Margaret's Road route? Will the increase in traffic through all of the above mentioned routes as a result of this site development and the closure of Boots corner be managed or will traffic be allowed to 'disperse' and find its own way as has been suggested to date? Will poor access for customers as well as businesses not make this site commercially unattractive, leading to years of planning 're-negotiation', i.e. the opposite of "regeneration" for Cheltenham?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>The situation regarding Morrisons is unclear; as a result, it is far too early to speculate what may happen to that site and as a consequence, what traffic demand it will generate. Certainly, if Morrisons does not proceed, it is unlikely</p>



	<p>that another supermarket will take its place in the current circumstances. However, one also assumes that changing consumer behaviour in relation to on-line shopping would suggest that foodstores will no longer be the trip generators they previously were. Any future proposal will have to be considered upon its merits, with traffic generation projections tested according.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Liz Rolls said that given that so much environmental monitoring and risk data and plans for routes through Cheltenham is unforthcoming in relation to closure Boots Corner, changes to traffic flow and to the major development including Morrisons on North Place how can residents, visitors, businesses and councillors be confident that these proposals were in the best interest of the town.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member said that work on these issues had been ongoing for 14 years and had been following a structured plan which from modelling showed that it would work. He acknowledged that things had changed over time and whilst Morrisons were no longer going to occupy North Place it did not mean that North Place would not be developed in the future.</p> <p>Scott Tompkins, Lead Commissioner, said that the model used for assessment was a Paramix model based on the Saturn data as well as validated traffic data. It represented the industry standard for developing these types of changes. The modelling work looked at traffic flow across the whole network, peak flows of traffic, worse case scenarios and the year 2026 which included all growth in Cheltenham. He was confident that the data had been correctly validated and there was a comprehensive validation report. He highlighted that two separate professional consultants had been involved and he had confidence in their work. He noted that the model used was the same model used for planning applications across the County.</p>
<p><b>23.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Liz Rolls to Cabinet Member Finance, Councillor John Rawson</b></p>
	<p>Part of the justification for the changes proposed by the Cheltenham Transport Plan is to increase access to town car parks. Will the closure of the Boots Corner route adversely affect Cheltenham's chance of getting the permitted number of public car parking spaces on the North Place site (to continue to serve the town centre), or has that number been 'guaranteed' by an Agreement when the site was sold to 'Augur Buchler Cheltenham Limited'?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member, Cllr John Rawson</b></p>
	<p>No, the number of car spaces is linked to an agreement and equates to a net reduction in previous provision. The car parks that will be better served by the Cheltenham Transport Plan are Regents Arcade and those along Albion Street.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Liz Rolls asked what assurance could be given by the Council to town centre residents such as those in Clarence Square, Wellington Street, College Road, St Lukes and Montpellier that the net reduction in previous car parking spaces alluded to in the Cabinet member's</p>

	<p>answer would not jeopardise residential parking in these areas.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member Finance explained that when the assessment was carried out there was a calculation made that there was a need for car parking in that part of town. The view was taken that car parking capacity was unduly located in the north of the town. If more parking capacity was located in the south then there may well be a reduction in north to south traffic movements. The council was confident that the capacity provided at North Place combined with other car parks would sufficiently meet the need, particularly if parking capacity was made elsewhere in the town. He gave the example of a potential public car park on the former Shopfitters site in St George's Walk.</p>
<p><b>24.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Ken Pollock to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>When the trial of closing the inner ring road through Boots Corner commences, will it be controlled <b>from the START</b> by automatic number plate recognition (APNR) and <b>will it be CBC or GCC who will be responsible for funding each of the following expenditure items:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cost of installation of the cameras.</li> <li>2. Cost of administration of the APNR scheme e.g. the additional staff, who are likely to receive a huge amount of challenges to fines issued, as happened in both York – where 53,000 fines were issued in a 6 month trial inner ring closure, and where a successful legal challenge meant all fines issued had to be refunded with a huge cost to the taxpayers, and Bath, where 9,000 fines were issued in the first month of a trial, all of which also had to be refunded costing Bath's taxpayers over £270,000. (Trials in York and Bath were both abandoned due to public/political pressure.)</li> <li>3. Cost of court cases for fine challenges.</li> </ol>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>GCC, as Highways Authority, will have responsibility for implementing the trial scheme, details of which have yet to be determined. It is likely that during the trial period, GCC would use temporary cameras, ensuring that the cameras and related signage meet or exceed all statutory requirements, in order to allow fair and successful enforcement. GCC would be responsible for managing this and any subsequent challenges to enforcement.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Mr Pollock stated that in listening to the answers to the questions posed the Cheltenham Transport Plan now appeared to be split into 5 disconnected schemes which were to be implemented separately if necessary and per se. These were the Boots Corner closure, public square. changes to Oriel Road/ Imperial Square, the Bath Road safety scheme and the Albion Street contraflow. He said that the public was being informed that all these schemes were wanted on their own merits. He asked whether it was credible that the important east to west flow at Oriel Road/Imperial Square to get to St Georges road was going to be a net benefit without any further investigation.</p>

	<p>In response the Cabinet Member said there were a number of TROs dealing with different parts of the overall plan and some could be done on their own merits but this did not mean that there was not a plan into which they were all integrated. He stated that these TROs would be implemented in a sequential order to ensure that the traffic flow would continue in a sensible manner.</p> <p>Scott Tompkins, Lead Commissioner stated that in terms of a plan for the roll out of changes to the inner ring road these would be done one at a time with media support so that members of the public, including residents and commuters, understood the changes as they were made. This should reduce the “bedding in” period. In addition the changes would be reviewed periodically and changes would be made if required.</p>
<p><b>25.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Ken Pollock to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>As the Full Council decision on CTP on 26th January is stated to affect not just the required "two" Wards but 'All Wards', and as the overall cost of CTP is very "significant", <b>should not this be marked as a 'Key' Decision, as also should the subsequent Decision by the Leader ?</b></p> <p>(This correction is especially necessary because <u>Full Council's</u> previous decision on "CTP", in November 2013, was also incorrectly handled as 'Non-Key', and was therefore invalid. See: <a href="https://democracy.cheltenham.gov.uk/mglIssueHistoryHome.aspx?Ild=7616&amp;Opt=0">https://democracy.cheltenham.gov.uk/mglIssueHistoryHome.aspx?Ild=7616&amp;Opt=0</a> )</p> <p>(Only after the November 2013 meeting was the Leader's December 5th decision on "CTP" switched to 'Key'.)</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>Key decisions are executive decisions taken by Cabinet, the Leader, Lead Members or Officers and do not apply to reports considered by Council. Non-executive decisions (such as Council decisions) which are likely to have a significant effect on people in two or more wards in the Borough are marked, as in the report in this case, as being a 'significant decision'. This is in accordance with our Constitution and does not invalidate the decision made by Council in November 2013.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Mr Pollock said that the answer provided implied that it would be executive decisions, not full Council decisions which were key as opposed to non-key. He gave the example of the potential CPO on the brewery site which was a full Council key decision. He asked whether the decision to be taken tonight should be a full Council key decision not a non-key decision as listed and asked what a significant decision was.</p> <p>In response, the Head of Legal Services, One Legal, said that this was a significant decision for Council as stated in the report. He explained that the Council's Constitution referred to both significant and key decisions and that</p>

	<p>the definitions of significant and key decisions in the Constitution were the same. Key decisions related to Executive matters only. He read out the definition of significant decision, i.e. one that was likely to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living and working in two or more wards in the borough, and said that the Council was being asked to consider the matter on that basis.</p>
<b>26.</b>	<p><b>Question from Anne Brookes to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>In view of the CTP being focused on and driven by the closure of Boots corner, and the promise of a public realm 'shared space', and in view of concerns raised by the GCC Traffic Regulation Committee in their recommendation to trial the closure, how can the council justify the irreversible junction and network changes (albeit LSTF funded) and the risk of non delivery of the primary objective, should the experimental TROs for Boots corner not be made permanent?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>There was never a single or primary objective of the Cheltenham Transport Plan. It has always consisted of various elements, such as breaking the stranglehold of the one-way system; dealing with various safety issues, particularly vehicle speed and improving access to car parks. The removal of traffic from Boots' Corner was always seen as the final element, only deliverable after the others and contributing to the long term economic performance of the town.</p> <p>Some of these other elements can be delivered independently of Boots' Corner e.g. the safety scheme on Bath Road, and if shown to be delivering the desired safety improvement, are very unlikely to be reversed.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Anne Brookes felt that if what was being said was true, it was a mockery that the public consultation focused on Boots Corner which claimed a mandate of public support. The consultation did not seek views on the ring road being broken up. She asked that this be clarified and the Council consult again.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member acknowledged that there was a section in the consultation regarding Boots Corner but emphasised that there was also a great deal of consultation on junction works and other transport works. To that end he was confident that there had been a fair consultation.</p>
<b>27.</b>	<p><b>Question from Anne Brookes to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>While the world moves on, CBC sticks doggedly to what's left of the ill-conceived and outdated Civic Pride scheme, (overseen by the non-elected and unaccountable Task Force), and squanders opportunities by ill-timed land disposal, for the irrational and now doomed development for North Place. Now there is a possibility that the Boots corner plans may not happen, and the junction and ring road changes were not sought or desired on their own, is it</p>

	<p>not now time for the council to start again, to re-think, to take control, and demand a new and better vision for Cheltenham in these changing and challenging times?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>The Task Force was formed with the objective of delivering a host of stalled schemes. I would cite Midwinters, Honeybourne Gate, Brewery Phase II and Albion Street as evidence of their successes, along with the securing of significant government funds, such as LSTF, with our partners.</p> <p>Whilst North Place is frustrating and I think in fairness, subject to factors well beyond the remit of CBC or the Task Force, CBC has benefited from the capital receipts generated by these disposals and is seeking to reinvest significant sums back into the town.</p> <p>I am not sure what you have in mind for a new vision, given that we have been effectively tackling moribund sites, creating job opportunities and releasing capital for reinvestment in those elements that make Cheltenham special.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Anne Brookes made reference to the support for the Cheltenham Development Task Force but believed that the LST funds had been obtained through lies and lobbying. In her view releasing capital by allowing unwanted and inappropriate development was in her view nothing to be proud of. She questioned how this approach could protect or enhance the special character of the town.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member disagreed with the thoughts expressed. He said that Cheltenham Borough Council was very successful at facilitating new developments and improvements for the town centre at a time of economic uncertainty.</p>
<p><b>28.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Christine Saunders to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>What is the cost of reversing each set of junction changes, (i.e. the Oriel Road set and the Albion Street set), and are there any ways of making the junction changes initially in a temporary or part-finished manner which could make them appreciably cheaper to reverse in the short term?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>GCC, as Highways Authority, has responsibility for the implementation of the inner-ring road changes. The TRO Committee has now recommended the adoption of these changes. If the scheme goes ahead, GCC will progress the inner-ring road changes through a final design stage, including a Stage Two safety audit. It is not anticipated that any of these changes would be reversed, as they are designed to improve traffic flow and safety, with or without the Boots' Corner closure in place. It is more likely that after a bedding-in period changes or mitigation measures may be introduced to these schemes, rather than complete reversal.</p>

29.	<b>Question from Christine Saunders to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	What is the total LSTF amount available to Cheltenham for infrastructure works on the Inner Ring highway including pavements, and what is the LSTF remainder for non-infrastructure items (e. g. encouraging 'Personal Travel Plans')?
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>£600k of funding has been set aside by GCC from the LSTF programme to fund the physical changes to the Inner Ring Road.</p> <p>Gloucestershire has been allocated a further grant of £920k for 2015/16 from the LSTF programme for a countywide package of measures to promote a wider range of travel choices. Part of this additional budget has been allocated to carry out a 'Station Travel Plan' in relation to Cheltenham Spa railway station.</p>
30.	<b>Question from David Saunders to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	Considering that the <u>two</u> -waying of Oriel Road is intended to 'mitigate' for cutting Cheltenham's one-way Ring Road, is it wise (or just) to destroy <u>permanently</u> the major east-to-west flow capacity along Oriel Road <u>before</u> the viability of closing Boots Corner has completed its Trial ?
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	The changes proposed to Oriel Road/Imperial Square are seen to have positive affects for improved traffic flow, rather than being an attempt to mitigate the closure of Boots' Corner. Aside from traffic flow improvements, alterations to Oriel Road/Imperial Square are intended to have other benefits such as; improved access to Regent Street car park, removal of rat-running traffic attempting to bypass the one way system on Vittoria Walk, eased cycle penetration and the possibility of a revised no. 10 bus route that could serve the whole of Bath Road rather than, or in addition to, the route through Park Place. GCC, as Highways Authority, will be progressing the design work on these changes including Stage Two safety audits before moving to implementation.
31.	<b>Question from David Saunders to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	<p>Has Dft</p> <p>(1) been informed of the impending <u>Trial</u> for the key CTP element (namely the cutting of the Inner Ring at Boots Corner), and</p> <p>(2) been asked to <u>delay</u> disbursement of the LSTF funds for the expensive Oriel Road and Albion Street works, which once begun would necessarily be permanent due to the clearly unaffordable cost of reversal.</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	GCC as Highways Authority has responsibility for implementing the changes to the inner-ring road. GCC is not required to inform DfT. The LSTF funding has

	<p>been distributed to GCC and this funding will be available going forwards for LSTF works, including the physical changes to Oriel Road and Albion Street. GCC will progress these schemes to final design stages including Stage Two safety audits before construction. It is not anticipated that any of these changes would be reversed, as they are designed to improve traffic flow and safety, with or without the Boots' Corner closure in place. It is more likely that after a bedding-in period, changes or mitigation measures may be introduced to these schemes, rather than complete reversal.</p>
<b>32.</b>	<p><b>Question from Hanna Andersen-Zarei to Cabinet Member Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>Clarence Square is the only intact Regency Square in Cheltenham. Many buildings are grade 2 listed and nearly 200 years old with shallow foundations.</p> <p>If a trial period does go ahead is it possible to have traffic monitors at Evesham Rd and Monson Avenue 2 weeks prior to trial and two weeks into trial and have these figures made officially available?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>GCC has committed to a comprehensive 'before and after' traffic study being produced, to assist the TRO Committee in assessing the success of the experimental order restricting traffic at Boots' Corner. This study will require significant traffic-flow data to be collected across the inner and outer ring roads, as well as other roads which may be affected by the trial closure.</p>
<b>33.</b>	<p><b>Question from Hanna Andersen-Zarei to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>My second question relates to the vibrations caused by extra traffic volume. In Clarence Square kerbside to frontage of houses is 8m. In Evesham Rd for example it is 11m....nearly half the extra width before traffic.</p> <p>To access the structural implications of extra traffic volume, is it possible in the same period to monitor vibrations and have these figures made officially available as well?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>The assumption that the Cheltenham Transport Plan will result in extra traffic volumes is not correct. Overall, the CTP encourages modal shift and reduces the amount of traffic growth that is anticipated without any scheme in place. On those roads where there is an anticipated increase in traffic, the growth is not substantially higher than the anticipated growth from development in Cheltenham going forward. As such, there is not considered to be any greater risk of damage to properties from traffic-generated vibration. Although a comprehensive before/after traffic study is anticipated, GCC is not planning to carry out any measurement of vibrations and is not aware of having ever done this on any scheme.</p>
<b>34.</b>	<p><b>Question from David Rogers to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>

	<p>The closure of Boots Corner will result in a large increase in traffic travelling up Rodney Road, crossing the High Street and continuing up Winchcombe Street, this being the next available south to north route east of the inner ring road at Boots Corner.</p> <p>Would you not agree that there will be a serious safety issue for pedestrians using the High Street at the Rodney Road junction, especially for those in the tEquality Groups including the elderly, which has not been addressed by the tEquality Groups including the elderly, which has not been addressed by the Due Regard Statement for the CTP, and that the claimed problem of “severance” to pedestrians at Boots Corner will simply be moved further up the High Street and replicated at the Rodney Road junction, with the possible requirement of another two pedestrian crossings, one new Rodney Road and one near Winchcombe Street?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>My understanding is that this situation is not predicted by the model, however, it has been raised by members of the public and GCC will be monitoring the impact along with all the other changes.</p> <p>This issue is an example of why a mitigation budget has been identified and indeed, why the TRO Committee has recommended a trial at Boots’ corner.</p>
<p><b>35.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from David Rogers to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>I live in Vernon Place (just off the Strand part of the High Street), and I suffer from asthma. Narrowing the Bath Road down to one lane will cause almost constant queuing of traffic along this section of the High Street stretching up to Berkeley Street junction and beyond to the College Road lights.</p> <p>Do you not agree that this will not only exacerbate air pollution in this area, which is not good for asthma sufferers, but also cause many drivers to make sudden decisions to divert up St James Street, causing unexpected and fast vehicle movements which can be confusing and dangerous for non-wary pedestrians.</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>I do not agree, as the objective of the proposed changes to Bath Road is to improve safety and in so doing and in conjunction with the wider aims of the scheme, to reduce pollution. GCC, as Highways Authority, is currently operating a trial on this stretch of road and we should await the results of their analysis and how this relates to the wider scheme proposed.</p> <p>In a supplementary question David Rogers said that he agreed that the proposed changes at Bath Road were designed to improve road safety but highlighted that the traffic backed up in the Strand, Hewlett Road, College Road and London Road and had even been reported as far back as Charlton Kings. He asked whether the Cabinet Member agreed that this would increase</p>



air pollution levels in the area, particularly on hot, dry summer days when there were more tourists coming to the town.

In response the Cabinet Member said that he hoped that this would not be the case but explained that this was the purpose of the trial, to gain more information.

Scott Tompkins, Lead Commissioner, explained that the trial would conclude on 6 February. Traffic counters were in place to collect data on site. A site meeting was scheduled the following day to examine journey times and queue lengths. All comments would be taken on board.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Extraordinary Council

26 January 2015

## Member Questions (15)

1.	<b>Question from Councillor Chris Nelson to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</b>
	<p>At the Traffic Regulation Committee on 15 Jan, you stated that the Cheltenham Transport Plan project was broadly supported by two thirds of Cheltenham. I understand that this opinion was gained from the consultation in 2013? How do you reconcile your statement of wide support with the results from the latest consultations in 2014, conducted by GCC, proving that “....levels of individual objection generally out-weigh support, and therefore there is no clear mandate for a scheme to be introduced”, as quoted on page 6 of the Executive Summary of the TRO Committee Report?</p>
	<b>Response from Leader</b>
	<p>My comment was based upon a historical perspective with similar results across 3 consultations carried out between 2007 and 2013. Those consultations elicited much higher response numbers than those for the TRO consultations. For instance. 1496 people responded to the 2013 consultation compared to 167 for the 2<sup>nd</sup> TRO consultation in 2014. This generally reflects the fact that the 2013 consultation was designed to establish general opinions about the proposals, while the TRO process is intended to generate specific concerns and objections.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Nelson asked the Leader whether he was saying the Executive Summary was wrong?</p> <p>The Leader advised that he was not responsible for the information in the report to the TRO Committee and in his response he was referring to the consultation that had taken place in Cheltenham over the years. In terms of the scale of responses clearly there was far more responses in 2013 than to the 2<sup>nd</sup> TRO consultation and that was the point he was making.</p>
2.	<b>Question from Councillor Chris Nelson to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</b>
	<p>At the Traffic Regulation Committee on 15 Jan, you stated that the JCS house increases had been factored into the traffic modelling. Yet the TRO Committee Report at page 28, para 17.11 clearly states that only new developments with existing planning permission have been included. Although it also states that some generic growth factor assumptions have actually been included for the period up to 2026, that is not quite the same thing as taking on board all the specific and large housing proposals in the JCS, which actually goes up to 2031. Can you please explain the apparent contradiction in your statement to the TRO Committee?</p>

	<p><b>Response from Leader</b></p>
	<p>What I actually said at the TRO committee was that the TRO traffic modelling had assumed the town centre developments currently underway; that the JCS traffic modelling had assumed the implementation of the Cheltenham Transport Plan; and that traffic issues in areas such as Princess Elizabeth Way, resulting from any North-West Cheltenham urban extension, are considered in the JCS traffic modelling.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Nelson said that he was not convinced that everything up to 2031 was included in the modelling work. Even if it was, the JCS used the Saturn model which was originally used for the Boots Corner modelling but was then rejected because it was inappropriate and lacked detail. An alternative model was then used which only uses peak day time traffic and so what about the surge traffic that takes place during the course of the year on a regular basis. Has this been taken into account in the traffic modelling?</p> <p>The Leader was not an expert on traffic modelling and it was not the council's responsibility so was not able to answer the question but invited the officer Scott Tompkins to comment.</p> <p>The officer advised that his understanding was that the model used took into account all the housing, employment and retail developments with existing planning permissions as well as those committed or allocated developments in the Cheltenham Local Plan 3. It didn't account for everything in the JCS because this has been further developed since the point the modelling was done but his understanding was that it accounts for almost all of that anticipated growth.</p>
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Chris Nelson to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>I am pleased that officers have finally taken on board the requirement to develop a Strategic Risk Assessment for the Cheltenham Transport Plan, although this should have been drafted well before the Council's decision on the Boots Corner Plan, in Nov 2013. I am sure this Risk Register will be fully debated in Council on 26 Jan. However, to assist that debate, I would be grateful to receive more information on the Risk register 'potential mitigation budget spend' column. In particular, what are the funding implications of Risk CTP10 (total, not just the mitigation £40K assumed); and Risks CTP 16, 17 and 18, which appear to be hiding some of the potential costs of this project within other budgets, which may not have formally planned for these risks. I am sure Council would appreciate having sight of the total potential mitigation costs of the Cheltenham Transport Plan, so that any decision to progress this Plan is informed by a full awareness of the financial implications.</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet member</b></p>

	<p>GCC currently estimates the cost of implementing the Cheltenham Transport Plan TROs at approximately £600k, but has not yet provided a scheme by scheme breakdown of costs to this authority.</p> <p>At this stage, there are no detailed scheme costs relating to mitigation measures and these are impossible to assess and prioritise in detail at this stage beyond the estimates set out and in advance of the reality of scheme implementation. However, the Highways Authority is confident that the total budget identified for mitigation measures is likely to be sufficient to manage identified risks down to an acceptable level.</p> <p>Whilst the Council has made available an additional £50,000 to assist with additional mitigation costs should these prove necessary, it is GCC as Highways Authority that has the primary responsibility for the safety and integrity of the road network (as confirmed by the GCC letter of 22<sup>nd</sup> Jan 2015 to the Leader).</p> <p>Other costs are identified that are either actual or agreed responsibilities of CBC e.g. off-street car parks directional signage and public realm improvements beyond the GCC standard.</p> <p>It is worth bearing in mind that there are existing issues relating to the capacity and operation of the highway network, so we are certainly not starting from a perfect situation.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Nelson commented that all the TROs were being implemented relatively cheaply at a cost of only £600K and if that was so why could all the TROs not be made experimental?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member advised that the £600K related to the cost directly relating to the implementation of TROs themselves but there was a further budget of £2M for the civic works around the Boots Corner square.</p> <p>The officer added the reason that the TRO committee did not recommend that the whole scheme be experimental was that the changes to the inner ring road required physical changes to be made which will cost up to £600K and they would not look to reverse those as the cost of reversal would be in the same order. This recommendation had gone through the statutory consultation process and he did not think that the TRO committee's recommendation could be reversed.</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Chris Nelson to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>I understand that on an internal CBC 'wish list' of budget enhancements, there is mention of a £300k Vehicle Management System that could be used to help traffic find available car park spaces and perhaps also offer help choosing the least congested routes through Town. In the Strategic</p>

	<p>Risk Assessment at CTP 9, it is suggested that CBC has identified funding for this enhancement, yet I assume it is not yet in the budget for next year? Is that correct? If it is yet to be budgeted for, does he not have sympathy for the argument that such a system is an essential component of the Boots Corner plan and if not, why not?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>Had such an item been in the budget for next year, no doubt I would have been accused of presumption given that the TRO committee had not yet sat to consider their decision. It has been an aspiration for several years, but not a commitment given the key factors that would impinge upon it, including not only the Cheltenham Transport Plan, but also major developments such as North Place. It would be profligate to install such a system knowing that major strategic changes were being considered.</p> <p>In a supplementary question, Councillor Nelson asked if the Cabinet Member considered £300K was sufficient funding for the system and if the aim of the Boots Corner Plan was to improve access to car parks why do we not have a car parking strategy?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member believed that it would be sufficient but he could not say definitely until they had tested the market. The car parking strategy is complex as the council owns a lot of car parks in the centre of town and the strategy is work in progress. Many car parks such as Town Centre East and Regent Arcade are still going to remain as car parks so the fact that the car parking strategy is still a year away from being finalised is not a show stopper for the scheme being considered today.</p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Chris Nelson to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>What would be the financial implications of making all the Cheltenham Traffic Plan TROs experimental, rather than just the Boots Corner component? Please show the costs of each TRO separately?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>This question is more appropriately directed to the Highways Authority, but in many senses is academic, as the TRO committee has delivered its recommendation.</p> <p>GCC currently estimates the cost of implementing the Cheltenham Transport Plan TROs at approximately £600k, but has not yet provided a scheme by scheme breakdown of costs to this authority.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Nelson asked if there was any point in the Council debating the issue today and would the county council listen to what Members had to say?</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member replied yes and no. The TRO committee</p>

	<p>had made their recommendation so that was not going to change but there was still a chance for Cheltenham to say whether they supported the scheme or rejected it. If Council tonight rejected the scheme presumably the county council would not progress the scheme. However it was a yes or no to the scheme and there was no opportunity to amend it.</p> <p>The officer confirmed that the commissioning director specifically asked for the issue to come back to this Council to reaffirm their commitment or otherwise to the scheme and that would be taken into account when the county Cabinet made their final decision. If Council decided to amend the scheme the likely outcome would be that the county council would drop the scheme as they would have to re-advertise and re-consult.</p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Chris Mason to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>With regard to the "mixed space" what safeguards will be in place to prevent pedestrians and cyclists colliding?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>A point made by the police at the TRO committee was that there are a significant number of cyclists already in a non-cycling zone on the High Street. No safeguards exist today other than police presence to enforce, but as the police advised, incidents are extremely rare. Impacts are invariably low, because risks are much lower with non-motorised transport. The formalising of an existing situation does not suggest that additional measures, such as segregation of cyclists and pedestrians, are warranted.</p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Chris Mason to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>How are pedestrians going to safely walk from the High St to the lower High Street when buses and taxis are crossing it?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>Initially the pelican crossing will remain. It is however, worth noting that pedestrians comfortably walk across a bus lane when traversing across the High Street, say from the Nationwide Building Society to Patisserie Valerie, without the aid of a formalised crossing. The fundamental difference is the reduction in the volume of traffic and critically, the average speed of it.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Mason asked why the proposal to run buses through this route was not included in the trial.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member referred the question to the officer. He responded that ideally they would like to trial it but this would require physical changes which would require a lot more investment. A number of people had raised concerns that the Boots Corner scheme would cause an increase in traffic in other areas of the town and the purpose of the trail was to assess this.</p>

<b>8.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Diggory Seacome to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	Can we please know how any impact on residents affected by the change in traffic flows has been calculated, and what consultation took place to achieve these findings.
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>GCC has provided the outputs of their detailed modelling in its consultations across the town, on its website and in various meetings over the last 2 years.</p> <p>Outputs were shown as traffic flows in 2010, traffic flows projected to 2026 with no intervention and traffic flows projected to 2026 with the changes proposed.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Seacome asked whether the Cabinet Member felt that information on the website and in various meetings was sufficiently accessible.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member felt that given the sheer volume of information it had been made available in the best way and members and the public had had sufficient opportunities to access it.</p>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Matt Babbage to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	Is the £150k fund put aside for mitigation measures from the Cheltenham Transport Plan still considered to be adequate, and if not what amount would be appropriate? What risks have been considered that could affect this figure?
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>In the absence of any advice to the contrary from colleagues at GCC highways, we are confident that the identified sum is likely to be sufficient. The risks considered are listed in the risk register associated with the papers for this meeting. Please also refer to GCC letter to the Leader dated 22<sup>nd</sup> January, 2015.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Babbage said there had been a suggestion from officers at CBC and GCC that an increase in the mitigation funds would be sensible. Would the Cabinet Member support this and by how much?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member thought this was a question for the County Council but it was his understanding that they would fund whatever is required and he didn't believe they had set a limit on that. If the situation did arise he thought this council would seriously consider their position as they work in partnership with the county council.</p>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Adam Lillywhite to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>



	<p>Please provide the following, a hard copy of the relevant versions and sections of the risk register or risk assessment that were used by CBC when making the two decisions to forward this scheme to the TRO Committee in November/December 2013.</p> <p>These decisions are the 'Non Key' decision of Full Council of 18/11/2013 and the "key" decision made by the leader, 5<sup>th</sup> December.</p> <p>The published notice of intent and documentation for this a "key" decision, which should be 28 days was cut to just three, please include the documentation of how this risk was considered and recorded for the 5th December.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Lillywhite said he had not received the information he had requested so asked where were the risks from November 2013? What was the point of having a risk register when its fundamental requirement to list risks was repeatedly ignored.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member said he would ask officers to provide this information. The risk register would not have a great deal in it from the CBC point of view because the risks sit with the County Level and are high level risks. A more detailed risk register would be provided as the scheme progresses into the design stage.</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>The risk assessment at that time was CBC-specific and made available on the Council's website at the end of the associated reports. This has since developed into the much fuller shared risk assessment with GCC associated with the latest report to Council. This risk assessment identifies the risk owner(s) for each identified risk.</p> <p>The Leader decision on 5 December 2013 was an urgent decision, in order to inform the GCC lead Cabinet member on 9 December 2013 and, therefore, the 28 notice period did not apply.</p> <p>Council now has a further opportunity to consider the Cheltenham Transport Plan, including the shared risk assessment and to decide whether or not to support the recommendations of the TRO committee.</p>
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Adam Lillywhite to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>Please confirm that any roads which may lose their on-street parking and/or be made one way to facilitate the greater volume of demand from traffic, as suggested by the mitigation team, will have the works performed during the trial, so that a true assessment can be made of all impacts before the trial is completed or any conclusions are drawn.</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>This is for determination by GCC as Highways Authority in the light of any</p>

	<p>outputs from traffic monitoring, but it seems a sensible approach which I suggest, we, as ward Councillors jointly propose to GCC.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Lillywhite asked for conformation that a true trial would occur as a trail was pointless if the most controversial and dangerous element was removed.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member did not agree with this statement and the officer had already explained the process for testing this part of the plan.</p>
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Chris Ryder to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b></p>
	<p>Has sufficient work been carried out with the Disability Working Group, and other organisations of the town who have a voice on behalf of people with disabilities, who will use 'Boots corner Space' along with cyclists, taxis, buses and coaches, who have equal rights, on ensuring their safety when using this area of proposed significant change?</p>
	<p><b>Response from Cabinet Member</b></p>
	<p>GCC, which has the responsibility for equality proofing the scheme proposals, has undertaken consultation with various groups including the Disability Working Group. Also, as you note, CBC with the Task Force organised meetings with representatives of various disability groups to establish what works and does not work for them in the town centre now, as the scale of works being proposed create an opportunity to rectify existing failings.</p> <p>When the Council decision was made on 18/11/13, we were confident that appropriate steps were being taken to hear the views of the various groups, but equally recognised that any work could only be a broad based discussion to identify concerns as the whole process would be subject to the TRO process.</p> <p>That group continues to be consulted and meet to discuss and provide input into actual rather than theoretical design issues. Recently, advice has been sought on the High Street scheme associated with Brewery Phase II and responses will be taken into account in final design work, to be implemented this Spring.</p> <p>Physical changes to Boots Corner will not occur until the TRO committee has considered the outcomes of the trial, but in the interim we are confident that this representative group will be heard and their concerns fully taken on-board should a public realm upgrade be implemented.</p> <p>Equally, all schemes involving the highway require an independent audit to ensure compliance with safety and the proposals for the High Street, Boots' Corner and any other elements of the Cheltenham Transport Plan will be assessed in this manner.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Ryder asked for assurance that designated drop off and pick up points in and around the town centre for vehicles transporting disabled people would be identified and that this</p>

	<p>would be discussed with appropriate disability groups.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member was sure that it would be and there would be consultation with all relevant parties but he could not be more specific on locations at this stage.</p>
<b>13</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Andrew Lansley to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	<p>Like other residential areas close to the town centre, the residents of St Paul's are seeking reassurance around the mitigation of the CTP and wish for there to be a further consultation process within the community to determine that appropriate measures are in place. Will the opinions of our residents be taken into account in providing effective, measurable mitigation as part of this trial period?</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>GCC, as Highways Authority, will be monitoring the impact of the changes. Any mitigation measures proposed will be subject to public scrutiny, prior to implementation. My understanding is that certain measures currently proposed such as a 20mph zone have been the result of active public engagement of the community with both CBC Councillors and GCC representatives. I am hopeful that this will continue and also that this wider scheme will help to address some existing concerns, in addition to those arising from the scheme itself.</p>
<b>14.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Andrew Lansley to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	<p>As St Paul's Road was not included in the original traffic data that was provided, can we have reassurances that it will be this time? Monitoring at key points in the area would help provide a more accurate picture of the impact of these proposed changes. Residents have suggested the Eastern entrance to St Paul's Road, around the regenerated CBH areas on Folly Lane and outside Gardner's Lane school as appropriate places – could these be included as part of the monitoring process?</p>
	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>This seems a reasonable request and I suggest that CBC Councillors ask colleagues at GCC whether this is feasible.</p>
<b>15.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Andrew Lansley to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</b>
	<p>With the recent capitulation and uncertainty over North Place, it is unclear as to the impact (and timescale) of this development on the expected traffic volume change. When combined with the parking review and other developments in the north of Cheltenham I believe there should be a clear overview of the cumulative impact of multiple projects occurring across our town. What does this council intend to do with respect to a cohesive approach to the future planning of this town when it is evident there is none?</p>

	<b>Response from Cabinet Member</b>
	<p>Your observation regarding North Place is correct and until there is clarity from the two parties involved, it would be premature to speculate upon the way forward.</p> <p>It is an unfortunate fact that not all developments progress, but despite the setback at North Place, we do have Honeybourne Gate, Brewery Phase II and Albion Street all on site presently. The recommendation by the TRO committee provides another step towards the longer term goal of delivering sustainable development, so in reality we have many of the building blocks and also a comprehensive traffic-modelling tool against which new developments can be tested. This allows GCC as Highways Authority to establish potential impacts and require developments to mitigate as necessary and appropriate.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Lansley asked if the south part of Clarence Square would be monitored.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member indicated that officers had received this request and would be taken on board.</p>