

# Cheltenham Borough Council

## Cabinet – 12 January 2016

### Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Walking and Cycling Task Group - Cabinet Member Response

<b>Accountable member</b>	<b>Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinley</b>
<b>Accountable officer</b>	<b>Wilf Tomaney (Townscape Manager)</b>
<b>Ward(s) affected</b>	<b>All</b>
<b>Key/Significant Decision</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	In November 2015, Cabinet received the report from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee into its considerations on Walking and Cycling within the Borough. It contained 12 recommendations. This report sets out the Cabinet Member's (Development and Safety) response to the recommendations.
<b>Recommendations</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1. That Cabinet endorses the direction of travel in the Walking and Cycling Task Group's recommendations and agrees the Cabinet Responses identified at Appendix 2.</b></li><li><b>2. That, in respect of the responses at Appendix 2:</b><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>2.1. a Delivery Programme is submitted to Cabinet in Summer 2016, the Programme to identify resource and budgetary implications and a timeline for implementation.</b></li><li><b>2.2. implementation can commence in advance of the Delivery Programme where the impact of a recommendation is consistent with current work-streams and policies and is deliverable within existing staff and budgetary resources;</b></li><li><b>2.3. implementation can commence in advance of the Delivery Programme in respect of the cycling and walking champion; and</b></li><li><b>2.4. implementation can commence in advance of the Delivery Programme in respect of the Cheltenham Cycling and Walking Advisory Group – terms of reference at Appendix 3.</b></li></ol></li></ol>
<b>Financial implications</b>	<p>None directly arising from this report. The budgetary implications of the report to be submitted to Cabinet in Summer 2016 will need to be considered as part of the budget for 2017/18.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Nina Philippidis, nina.philippidis@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264121</b></p>

<b>Legal implications</b>	Legal implications will be considered as part of the detailed development of the recommendations e.g. planning policy formulation. It is important to note that some of the proposed actions, such as setting new speed limits, will require due process to be undertaken by the County Council as highway authority. <b>Contact officer: peter.lewis@teWKesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272012</b>
<b>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</b>	None directly arising from this report. <b>Contact officer: Julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk 01242 264355</b>
<b>Key risks</b>	See Risk Assessment
<b>Corporate and community plan Implications</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cheltenham's environmental quality and heritage is protected, maintained and enhanced;</li> <li>People live in strong, safe and healthy communities.</li> <li>We will work to promote healthy lifestyles across all communities in Cheltenham.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental and climate change implications</b>	Walking and Cycling can make a significant contribution to reducing the impact of carbon from traffic. A strategy to increase levels of walking and cycling will contribute to initiatives aimed at addressing climate change and contribute to air quality strategy objectives.
<b>Property/Asset Implications</b>	No direct implications currently identified from his report. <b>Contact officer: David Roberts@cheltenham.gov.uk</b>

## 1. Background

- 1.1. A Cycling & Walking Scrutiny Task Group was initiated in September 2014 in order to identify opportunities for improving provision for cycling and walking in Cheltenham and to make recommendations which would facilitate these improvements. It reported to Overview and Scrutiny Committee in October and Cabinet received its recommendations in November. This report sets out the Cabinet Member Development and Safety's response to the recommendations. The recommendations are summarised at Appendix 2, with a Cabinet Member response to each.

## 2. Reasons for recommendations

- 2.1. The value of walking and cycling in a compact urban area such as Cheltenham is acknowledged - both modes can make a valuable contribution to addressing climate change, tackling air pollution, easing traffic flows and promoting healthy lifestyles.
- 2.2. The direction of travel in the Task Group's recommendations is endorsed. It is suggested that recommendations are addressed through a Delivery Programme, to be submitted to Cabinet in Summer 2016. The Delivery Programme will identify resource and budgetary implications and a timeline for implementation.
- 2.3. Nevertheless, a number of the recommendations can be delivered immediately and need not wait for the Delivery Programme. This will apply in the following circumstances:
  - a. where the impact of the recommendation is consistent with current work-streams and

- policies and is deliverable within existing staff or budgetary resources;
- b. in respect of the cycling and walking champion; and
  - c. in respect of the cycling and walking group – a suggested terms of reference is at App 3.

### **3. Responsibility and staffing**

- 3.1. As discussed, many of the recommendations need additional work to establish a more accurate assessment of timescale, delivery options, funding requirements and staffing implications. The responsibilities fall predominantly within the Director of Planning's area, where there is already a heavy workload. Some recommendations will require input from The Cheltenham Trust, other Borough Council divisions, the County Council or others.
- 3.2. The Planning Directorate has 1 FTE post aimed at delivering transport related work - currently 0.4 of that post is committed to Shopmobility; leaving 0.6 of the post available for transport projects. However, Cabinet has requested Shopmobility enter a commissioning process and this may free the remainder of the post for transport work including cycling and walking. This should greatly assist in work on a programme and on delivery.
- 3.3. Additionally, many of the likely outputs from the recommendations will coincide with the objectives and rationale of various projects on which the Directorate is working – particularly design-related Cheltenham Development Task Force projects, policy-related Cheltenham Plan, transport projects and ad hoc improvements to infrastructure associated with planning applications.

### **4. Budgets**

- 4.1. Currently there is no specific budget for cycling or walking projects and there is no specific allocation in the 2016-17 budget. As mentioned, there are funded projects on-going which are delivering cycling and walking benefits – particularly CDTF projects and a variety of County Council projects which Borough officers are supporting. Additionally, a £5,000 street maintenance budget is available for street benches and cycle stand provision as well as repair of street-nameplates – though each year this is largely committed to reactive work.
- 4.2. In order to deliver some of the work recommended in the Task Group report, it seems likely that a small base budget provision would be beneficial. It would give the Council leverage in partner projects, enable it to bid for match funding or allow an increase in small scale projects. When the Delivery Programme is presented to Cabinet in the summer 2016, it will give a clearer indication of what level of additional budgetary provision would be appropriate and this could form the basis of a future funding bid.

### **5. Alternative options considered**

- 5.1. None

### **6. Consultation and feedback**

- 6.1. The Overview and Scrutiny Task Group included a wide range of stakeholders.

### **7. Performance management –monitoring and review**

- 7.1. Monitoring and review criteria will form part of the delivery programme.

<b>Report author</b>	<b>Contact officer: Wilf Tomaney,</b> <b>wilf.tomaney@cheltenham.gov.uk,</b> <b>01242 264145</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Risk Assessment</li> <li>2. Cabinet Member response to Task Group recommendations.</li> <li>3. Draft Terms of Reference and Membership for Cheltenham Cycling and Walking Advisory Group</li> </ol>
<b>Background information</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overview and Scrutiny Committee 26 October 2015</li> </ol>

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-5	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
	If opportunities are not taken to address the issues raised by the O&S Task Group, then active travel initiatives will be more difficult to implement to the detriment of air quality and healthy lifestyles.	Wilf Tomaney	12 Jan 2016	3	4	12	Reduce	Prepare delivery programme as recommended; implement with immediate effect where recommendation is consistent with policy, work streams and resourcing.	Sept 2016	WT	Divisional
<p><b>Explanatory notes</b></p> <p><b>Impact</b> – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-5 (1 being least impact and 5 being major or critical)</p> <p><b>Likelihood</b> – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6 (1 being almost impossible, 2 is very low, 3 is low, 4 significant, 5 high and 6 a very high probability)</p> <p><b>Control</b> - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close</p>											

Overview & Scrutiny Task Group Report		Suggested Cabinet Response
Recommendation	Commentary	
Rec 1: Identify opportunities for improving cycle route permeability and cycle parking in areas outside the town centre.	Cheltenham Borough Council should endorse Cheltenham & Tewkesbury Cycling Campaign’s wish list for improvements to Cheltenham’s cycle network. Once agreed, the authority should put aside funds each year to pay for the items suggested, or proactively identify and bid for funds to pay for the suggestions and encourage the County Council to do the same. These could be added to a costed wish list of improvements, which could then be added to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) 123 lists or included in funding bids.	<p>Agree</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An exercise to identify route opportunities could be undertaken using existing staff resources; the CTCC “wish-list” would be a good starting point.</li> <li>• Cabinet endorsement would then establish a basis for seeking implementation on an ad hoc basis through a variety of projects.</li> <li>• Implementation could be via:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CBC funded projects (e.g. task force, parks, townscape projects)</li> <li>○ support for projects funded by other bodies (e.g. GCC Highways, railway station)</li> <li>○ planning applications (S106, CIL, integrated design as part of applications)</li> <li>○ bids to external bodies</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Rec 1a: An equivalent exercise should be undertaken for walking	Councillors should work with residents and walking experts to draw up a wish list of improvements for residents. Locations should be identified for benches and funding identified for maintenance.	<p>Agree</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Route identification is not as advanced for walking as it is for cycling and the lobby group less active locally.</li> <li>• An exercise to identify route opportunities could be undertaken using existing staff resources.</li> <li>• Cabinet endorsement would then establish a basis for seeking implementation on an ad hoc basis through a variety of projects.</li> <li>• Implementation could be via:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CBC funded projects (e.g. task force, parks, townscape projects)</li> <li>○ support for projects funded by other bodies (e.g. GCC Highways, railway station)</li> <li>○ planning applications (S106, CIL, integrated design as part of applications)</li> <li>○ bids to external bodies</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>Rec 2: Gloucestershire County Council should investigate and engage with Cheltenham residents in order to promote a borough wide 20mph default speed limit to make the environment safer and more attractive to walkers and cyclists.</p>	<p>A default speed limit does not mean that all roads will have a 20mph limit. Selected roads will have a higher speed limit, and a few may have an even lower limit. The Council should also investigate the possibility of securing additional funding for this from public health budgets</p>	<p>Agree – subject to consultation on public appetite for 20mph zones.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council carried a motion at its 20<sup>th</sup> December 2015 meeting to “include provision for a consultation exercise in the 2016/17 corporate work plan to establish where there is appetite for 20 mile per hour limits in Cheltenham and that the Council use its best endeavours in conjunction with Gloucestershire County Council to work towards trials in suitable areas where public support exists.”</li> <li>• Ultimately a decision for the County Council. CBC would need to work with others to lobby for 20mph limits.</li> <li>• CBC will need to work with GCC to undertake further work to consider impacts, opportunities, extent of implementation etc.</li> <li>• Implementation would need broad based political and community consensus.</li> <li>• Timescale, budget and staff resource – unclear at present. Level of work required is dependent on level of support within GCC.</li> </ul>
<p>Rec 3: Gloucestershire County Council should undertake an assessment aimed at removing guard rails, which are a key barrier to walking and encourage faster vehicle speeds.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree.</li> <li>• Guard rail removal and street declutter is an integral element in the design considerations for most street based projects (task force, GCC maintenance, GCC capital and safety schemes).</li> </ul> <p>This work is being considered as a low-cost, quick win through CDTF projects where funding is available.</p>
<p>Rec 4: Benches should be strategically positioned along routes to allow people to rest – on inclines, at attractive viewpoints, at nodal points on the street and transport network (bus stops in particular</p>	<p>Benches are an important part of any walking strategy, for elderly and disabled people in particular. They need to be well maintained and comfortable.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A small budget exists for street bench repair, but is shared amongst other functions and focussed on repair. It is insufficient to launch a proactive strategy.</li> </ul>
<p>Rec 5: Cheltenham Borough Council should work with the Cheltenham Trust and Gloucestershire County Council to promote cycling and walking</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Images of cycling and walking in Cheltenham Borough Council and Cheltenham Trust promotional material should depict them as attractive and normal activities for everybody.</li> <li>The Cheltenham.gov.uk page: <i>Walking in Cheltenham</i> should be improved to promote walking within the</li> </ol>	<p>Agree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to agree approach on walking with the Trust, which currently holds information on leisure walking. Subject to agreement of input from Trust.</li> </ul>

Rec 6: The needs of walkers and cyclists should be considered before other road users when making policy and planning decisions and their needs should be considered at the start of any major planning project.

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

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

- iv. Increased cycling provision should not be at the expense of walkers. Ideally cycle provision should not be on the footway. Where traffic speeds make it necessary, good quality segregation should be provided for bikes on the highway.
- v. If people are to be encouraged to walk, pedestrians need to have an at least equal level of service as other methods of transport and positive provision of space and safe crossing points. Their needs should be considered in the design of all public space including car parks.
- vi. Walking is a particularly important mode of transport for some groups of people such as those with visual impairment or other disabilities. The needs of these groups should be considered in planning and policy decisions.

Agree.

- Planning policy already aware and incorporating into relevant plans. Though there is no need to repeat the JCS hierarchy statement in the Cheltenham Plan
- Need to continue to raise awareness in development management and as part of projects. Some process adjustments already made.
- These are policy and project process issues and should not, in themselves have cost implications.



	The Cheltenham Plan will consider the inclusion of separate walking and cycling policies	
--	--	--

<p>Rec 7: A cycling and walking working group should be created to provide input into projects.</p>	<p>This could operate in a similar way to the access working group with Wilf Tomaney as the facilitator.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree.</li> <li>• Implement on a 6 monthly meeting cycle.</li> <li>• Composition as per O&amp;S Task Group.</li> <li>• To act as advisory group only in respect of various projects as appropriate.</li> <li>• Cycle and Walking Champion (see below) to chair.</li> <li>• Governance arrangements subject to advice by Democratic Services.</li> <li>• Chair to be the cycling and walking champion.</li> </ul>
<p>Rec 8: Cheltenham Borough Council should endorse the Gloucestershire County Council Cycling Strategy and draw up its own walking strategy.</p>	<p>The Gloucestershire County Council Cycling Strategy is likely to be adopted this municipal year. Cheltenham Borough Council could resolve to endorse it and take on some of its recommendations. There is no equivalent County Council strategy for walking, which strengthens the case for CBC producing its own walking strategy.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle Strategy – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CBC should consider endorsing the GCC cycling strategy, which the Task Group broadly supported.</li> <li>○ Report required to Cabinet.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Walking strategy – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Likely to have benefits, but this would be a major piece of work.</li> <li>○ Strategy preparation would need to cover routing plus a gamut of issues including joint working and corporate buy-in, health and others.</li> <li>○ Insufficient staff resource or skills. Likely to require consultancy advice.</li> <li>○ Report on feasibility required to Cabinet.</li> <li>○</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>Rec 9: Cheltenham Borough Council should select a cycling and walking champion from its members.</p>	<p>This member could represent CBC on the GCC Cycle Forum.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree – resolve to establish Cycling Champion.</li> <li>• A Member “champion” would drive the walking cycling agenda; report to cabinet; be available as a point of contact to consider project development.</li> </ul>
<p>Rec 10: Cheltenham Borough Council should lead by example by devising and implementing its own green staff travel plan.</p>		<p>Agree</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work in hand – completion date March 2016.</li> </ul>
<p>Rec 11: Cheltenham Borough Council should consider the introduction of Car Free Sundays.</p>	<p>This would involve the shutting of defined town centre streets to traffic one Sunday per month to allow for community events, following the example of successful schemes elsewhere.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to explore opportunities to implement car-free Sundays.</li> <li>• Officer report to Cabinet Member required.</li> <li>• An issue already being discussed by Cheltenham Business Partnership and Cheltenham Connect.</li> <li>• Champion could promote.</li> <li>• Needs GCC decision.</li> </ul>
<p>Rec 12: Cheltenham Borough Council should push for a more collaborative approach on street design, working across disciplines and departments and also across councils (County and Borough).</p>		<p>Agree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A cycle/walking champion would be helpful in promoting multi-disciplinary working within and across organisations. Likely to affect planning, townscape, green space, property, CDT, car parks, tourism.</li> </ul>

## Cheltenham Cycling and Walking Advisory Group

### Terms of reference and membership

#### **The role of the group:**

The group was established in January 2016 as a result of a recommendation to Cabinet from the cycling and walking scrutiny task group.

The role of the group is to provide a consultative and discussion forum who can advise on the cycling and walking aspects of various projects and initiatives that will affect the Cheltenham borough.

#### **Membership:**

Group Leaders will be invited to nominate a member from each group and a Member Champion as part of the selection process following elections every 2 years.

Other groups will have a fixed representation but organisations may choose who they send as their representative to any particular meeting.

- A member Champion from CBC who will chair the meeting
- One or more Cabinet Members from CBC
- Up to 2 additional non-Executive member of CBC
- Lead Officer from CBC
- An officer from Gloucestershire County Council Highways
- A representative from Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycle Campaign
- A representative from Walk 21
- A representative from Living Streets
- Ad hoc advisors who may be invited depending on the nature of the project being discussed

#### **Accountability:**

The group is not decision making and has no budget and cannot make any commitments. As it was set up as a resolution from Cabinet it will be accountable to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety.

The Lead Officer from CBC will be responsible for administering the group and ensuring their feedback is documented and forwarded to lead project officers.

Notes of the meeting will be forwarded to its members and the Lead Cabinet Member.

#### **Working methods / ways of working:**

- The Group will normally meet 6 monthly but may call a special meeting if their input is required outside of those timescales

- Members of the group will receive papers 1 week before the meeting and agendas will be organised by the Lead Officer who will also act as/provide a secretary for the meeting
- Minutes of the meeting will be kept and agreed by the chair and circulated to the members of the group
- Members may be contacted between meetings should the need arise
- From time to time individuals may be co-opted to provide specific advice and expertise
- The group may wish to set up sub-groups to work on specific issues
- Items can be raised by any member of the Group, any Council Member or officers of the Council.