

Council

Monday, 21st January, 2019
6.00 - 11.15 pm

Attendees	
Councillors:	Bernard Fisher (Chair), Roger Whyborn (Vice-Chair), Victoria Atherstone, Matt Babbage, Paul Baker, Garth Barnes, Dilys Barrell, Angie Boyes, Nigel Britter, Jonny Brownstein, Flo Clucas, Chris Coleman, Mike Collins, Stephen Cooke, Iain Dobie, Tim Harman, Steve Harvey, Rowena Hay, Alex Hegenbarth, Sandra Holliday, Martin Horwood, Peter Jeffries, Steve Jordan, Chris Mason, Andrew McKinlay, Dennis Parsons, John Payne, Louis Savage, Diggory Seacome, Malcolm Stennett, Klara Sudbury, Simon Wheeler, Max Wilkinson, Suzanne Williams and David Willingham

Minutes

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Oliver, Councillor Stafford and Councillor Flynn.

2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Babbage, Coleman, Dobie, Fisher, Harman, Payne, Sudbury and Wheeler declared an interest in agenda items 9 and 10 as Gloucestershire County Councillors.

Councillor Savage declared an interest in agenda item 11 as an employee of Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Trust.

3. **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2018 were approved and signed as a correct record.

4. **COMMUNICATIONS BY THE MAYOR**

The Mayor wished to put on record his thanks to Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager who had now retired from the Council after 15 years service.

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

The Leader reiterated the thanks to Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager who had made a major contribution to the Council. He also wished to welcome back the Chief Executive, Pat Pratley who was on a phased return following a serious illness. He thanked all officers who had gone the extra mile in her absence, in particular Tim Atkins, Deputy Chief Executive.

6. **TO RECEIVE PETITIONS**

There were none.

7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

1.	Question from Anne Smith to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Who had the casting vote for closure of Boots Corner? This decision seems to be causing more pollution, inconvenience, & loss of revenue to the businesses in the town. When will common sense prevail?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	The decision was two-fold. This Council confirmed on 26 th January, 2015, that it supported the outcomes of the GCC Traffic Regulation Order committee and GCC cabinet confirmed the TRO committee recommendations on 22 nd July, 2015. That process confirmed the phased approach with a trial phase for Boots Corner, which is what is currently being delivered.
2.	Question from Fiona Mcleod to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Can I ask please when the decision to close Boots Corner to general traffic will be reversed so that reasonable traffic flow through that town is restored. Closing Boots corner has done nothing to improve traffic flow in the town, it has made the back-log of traffic outside A&E ten times worse during peak times and it has made the town centre far more dangerous for pedestrians.
	The ridiculous scenario that cars are now racing down Rodney road and piling up outside the new John Lewis is nothing short of dangerous. As pedestrians gaze at the new John Lewis and step out of the shadows under the scaffolding outside the LloydsTSB building into cars racing up Rodney Road it is a fatal accident waiting to happen.
	Which councillor is going to swallow their pride, admit it hasn't worked and reopen that traffic flow?
	I look forward to being able to drive safely back to Pittville again.
	Response from Cabinet Member
	A petition requesting the re-opening of Boots' Corner is being considered by Council at its meeting on 21 st January, 2019.
	However, it should be recognised that the scheme, including the trial, was funded by central government as part of a wider strategy to encourage individuals to consider alternative means of transport.
	GCC, as Highways authority, plans to make amendments to the scheme to respond to concerns raised, including potential traffic calming on Rodney Road.
3.	Question from David Evans to Cabinet Member, Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Whilst I support the closure of Boots corner I feel that no real alternative measures have been put in place to take the traffic to properly transverse Cheltenham. Because of this if it came to a vote I would vote against the closure.
	My question is does CBC agree that this is probably the most embarrassing decision that they have made since the introduction of the Noddy train?
	If the closure becomes permanent what alternative plans are in place to ensure

	traffic flows better through Cheltenham and would these plans involve demolishing buildings as has been done in the past and destroying the very character of our town?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	The trial is exactly that, so until a final decision is made, it is difficult to progress permanent changes. Such changes, if the net benefit of the trial is confirmed, would include amendments to signage, but would definitely not include demolishing property. The objectives of the Cheltenham Transport Plan include protecting the key features for which Cheltenham is renowned, so no new roads or associated demolition work is envisaged.
4.	Question from Peter Walsh to Cabinet Member, Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	What is the total cost of the experimental closure of 'Boots' Corner' and how was it justified in the face of widespread opposition to the plan and at a time when resources available to the Council were scarce and could/should have been devoted to more pressing needs.
	Response from Cabinet Member
	Boots' Corner is the last phase of a whole package of works funded through a successful GCC bid (supported by CBC) to the Department for Transport Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) for £4.95m. Beyond this, CBC has funded the temporary works at Boots' Corner to demonstrate how much space can be reclaimed from the streetscape and how differently it can be used. This cost £45,970. Should the scheme be made permanent, a higher quality solution, similar to that recently delivered on the High Street between Rodney Road and Cambray Place will be developed, as part of an on-going wider public realm uplift and several of the components of the current temporary scheme at Boots' Corner will be re-used elsewhere.
5.	Question from Sharon Roberts to Cabinet Member, Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Regarding the increase in footfall at boots corner. Does council think this could be partly due to the opening of new shops such as John Lewis etc. and more people parking on the Montpellier side of the high street and walking through town due to increased congestion driving to car parks on the other side of town?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	It is never easy to directly attribute 'cause and effect' in dynamic situations with a number of variables at play. Equally, one could argue that the very reason that significant new retail entrants have appeared locally is in response to the phased roll-out of the Cheltenham Transport Plan. The key however is the cumulative effect on footfall, at a time when government is calling for local authorities to take action to protect their town centres.
6.	Question from Sharon Roberts to Cabinet Member, Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	What does council propose to do regarding the increased levels of congestion and pollution levels in the small residential streets such as St Luke's Road, College Road, Ambrose St, and St George's street?

	Response from Cabinet Member															
	<p>CBC has been working collaboratively with GCC throughout the delivery of the Cheltenham Transport Plan. GCC has been monitoring traffic flows, recognising that the Department for Transport anticipates background growth in traffic, which is why the scheme is promoting alternative transport options. CBC has been carrying out additional pollution monitoring and will be able to assess if nitrogen-dioxide levels have increased against statutory limits when sufficient data has been collected. At this stage, it is too early to compare results against the annual legal limit. It should also be noted that traffic, whilst significant, is not the only factor contributing to air pollution levels.</p> <p>Certain areas suffered from traffic hotspots prior to the Cheltenham Transport Plan implementation and it is pleasing to note that GCC has recently confirmed funding to improve the traffic lights on the A4019 corridor, which should assist with the wider circulation of traffic. This may also impact positively on nitrogen-dioxide levels at longstanding pollution hotspots along that road corridor.</p>															
7.	Question from Bharat Gupta to Cabinet Member, Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay															
	What has been the new pollution level on two known pinch points on College road and near the St. Georges Street and do they exceed the EA guidelines?															
	Response from Cabinet Member															
	<p>Pollution levels for College Road and St George's Street are made available on our website soon after the results are received https://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/downloads/file/6643/no2_raw_data_2018</p> <p>The last four months of NO2 data is as follows for College Road and St George's Street (but please bear in mind this data snapshot must not be taken out of context as it is not 12 months of bias adjusted data). December's data will be added to the website as soon as it is available.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>August 2018</th> <th>September</th> <th>October</th> <th>November</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>15 College Road</td> <td>21.67</td> <td>23.82</td> <td>28.64</td> <td>29.94</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50 St Georges Street</td> <td>25.70</td> <td>32.89</td> <td>25.82</td> <td>37.21</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>There are no Environment Agency guidelines in relation to this. It is too early to assess whether the DEFRA annual nitrogen dioxide limit has been exceeded, as we are waiting for the national bias adjustment figure. The national hourly nitrogen dioxide limit has not been exceeded at these locations.</p>		August 2018	September	October	November	15 College Road	21.67	23.82	28.64	29.94	50 St Georges Street	25.70	32.89	25.82	37.21
	August 2018	September	October	November												
15 College Road	21.67	23.82	28.64	29.94												
50 St Georges Street	25.70	32.89	25.82	37.21												
8.	Question from Bharat Gupta to Cabinet Member, Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay															
	How much reduction in car numbers has the Boots Corner scheme made in the centre of town and what benefits have resulted to the trade as a result?															
	Response from Cabinet Member															
	Daily traffic flows on Clarence Parade, on the approach to Boots' Corner have reduced by approximately 80% since the introduction of the trial restriction.															
9.	Question from Clare Winter to Cabinet Member Development and Safety,															

	Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>I would like to know if the closure of Boots Corner has resulted in more or less total air pollution in Cheltenham (not just around Boots Corner), as it seems to me that the resultant near stationary traffic in roads a little further out of the centre but still close to the centre during busy times of the day (e.g. College Road, St Luke's Road, St James Square, St George's St, Clarence Square, Clarence Road...) may be producing more overall fumes, not less. So whilst the town centre itself may be benefiting from less traffic, surely the consequent impact on areas just outside is a prohibitively high a price to pay. These areas are largely residential, so people cannot choose not to be there, unlike the town centre, and the roads are clearly not fit for the sudden massively increased volumes of traffic as a direct result of the closure of Boots Corner. Journeys are significantly longer in terms of both distance and time, and much, much slower, all of which surely increases overall pollution in Cheltenham.</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>The Council measures the main pollutant of local concern (nitrogen-dioxide) at a number of locations around the Borough and has installed additional nitrogen-dioxide and particulate monitoring points, in response to concerns relating to the Cheltenham Transport Plan.</p> <p>We have a statutory duty to monitor and assess local air quality and to report on this annually, but the duty to meet national air quality standards rests with the government, reflecting the cross-boundary nature of pollution sources.</p> <p>We are collating December's results and waiting for the national bias adjustment figure to be released, before we can finalise our annual assessment. We are also awaiting the outcome of a 'Detailed Air Quality Assessment' which we commissioned to better understand the local air quality situation. We will publish the results of this work on our website, but it will not be possible to determine the exact contributions that the Boots' Corner restriction has made to overall air pollution levels in the town (if any).</p>
10.	Question from Jan Walters to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>Are the Council aware that closure of Boots Corner has only driven the traffic further back up the High Street as cars seeking a way through now come up Rodney Road onto the High Street, up Winchcombe Street, into Albion Street and mostly along St Georges Place?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>GCC has been monitoring traffic flows since before the first phase of the Cheltenham Transport Plan was undertaken. The Council recognises that the trial at Boots' Corner has resulted in increased traffic on Rodney Road and colleagues at GCC are exploring options, such as traffic calming, as a means of mitigating this impact and discouraging traffic from using this route.</p> <p>As Cheltenham grows (and there is significant planned growth), the issue of air quality was always likely to become more challenging. One of the key aims of the Boots' Corner scheme is to encourage more use of public transport, walking and cycling, especially for shorter journeys. Regardless of the outcome of the experimental traffic order, Cheltenham needs to achieve some modal shift in the future to help manage pollution and congestion issues and this assumption is built into traffic impact assessments relating to the Joint Core Strategy.</p>

11.	Question from Jan Walters to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	In the light of recent publicity about the dangers of pollution particularly to our children, sick and elderly, are the Council aware that the closure of Boots Corner has led traffic to find alternative routes which include College Road, where there is a school, a hospital with A and E and a playground for young children?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>The data from GCC identifies various locations with traffic growth categorised into growth between 5-10% against expected levels of background growth and above 20%. College Road is in the first category.</p> <p>CBC has a statutory duty to monitor local air pollution and to implement improvement measures through an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) if levels are exceeded. We are also carrying out additional monitoring in response to public concerns about the Boots' Corner restriction. However, any level of air pollution has some adverse impact on health, so we all have a collective responsibility as a community to minimise our individual contributions, for example by choosing more sustainable and active means of travel wherever possible.</p>
12.	Question from Derek Plumb to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	What specific criteria are being used to measure the social, economic and environmental impact, both positive and negative, caused by the closure of Boots Corner? For each criteria, what are the critical threshold values that have to be breached in order for Boots Corner to be re-opened to traffic?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>Given that the funding was secured from central government to reduce severance on the High street and encourage regeneration and modal shift, a range of measures have been considered. These include footfall movements at Boots' Corner, jobs generated and the usage of non-private motor vehicle transport.</p> <p>Full details of these measures are contained in the Council papers for the meeting on 21st January – for example the number of jobs generated, compared to an independent Treasury Green Book analysis, as part of the LSTF bid.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Derek Plumb asked what specific criteria were being used to measure the socio, economic and environmental impact and what were the threshold values these were being assessed against.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member said that in terms of the economic thresholds these were outlined in the report and more specifically when the bid for funding was put to Government in 2011 it was estimated that there would be 420 additional jobs created in the town. He reported that the actual figure was 550. In terms of environment factors air pollution information was being gathered long term, rather than a snapshot.</p>
13.	Question from Neil Smith to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	I have analysed the arguments for the closure of Boots Corner to normal traffic and not one of them stands up to serious scrutiny. Who are the real beneficiaries to this

	<p>scheme because it isn't local residents or businesses?</p> <p>As a general population we are addicted to our cars. In some cases travel by bus simply isn't a practical solution – for example I have equipment and tools which I need to take everywhere with me. We are at the start of electric vehicles but over the next 10 to 20 years the pollution problem will become far less as a result. The arguments for closing Boots Corner just don't add up. Personally I think the earlier parts of the Cheltenham Transport Plan have worked out well – but not this bit.</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p> <p>The scheme is part of a wider ambition to maintain the vibrancy of the town centre in line with government policy e.g. the recently announced Future High Streets Fund.</p> <p>The purpose is to encourage footfall by reducing the former severance at Boots' Corner. Data sets showing increased footfall, cycling and bus patronage suggest that the scheme is having a positive impact and evidence shows that people travelling to town using these methods are the greatest spenders.</p> <p>Cheltenham is behind the curve on this, as many towns and cities have already removed traffic from the town centre e.g. Worcester, Bath and Oxford and believe that it contributes to long term performance of the town centre.</p> <p>The objectives of the Cheltenham Transport Plan were never specifically targeting an improvement in air quality, but the Council is concerned about this issue generally, as demonstrated by the extensive monitoring activity which the authority is engaged in and associated action planning.</p>
14.	<p>Question from Neil Smith to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</p> <p>What has to happen or what has to be proved to enable the trial to be cancelled early?</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p> <p>The monitoring would have to show a severe impact on the performance of the wider road network beyond background growth and a detrimental effect upon the performance of trade more generally within the town centre.</p>
15.	<p>Question from Alan McDougall to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</p> <p>Is the Council and Cllr. McKinlay (Development & Safety), in particular, equally as satisfied with the changes made to the protected pedestrian crossing at Boots Corner, as they are/he is with health and safety issues resulting from the increased Non-protected pedestrian area between Rodney Road and Winchcombe Street at the John Lewis end of the High Street?</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p> <p>The pedestrian crossing at Boots' Corner was retained following consultation with the disability forum prior to the trial. Should the scheme be made permanent, I would not be satisfied with the current arrangement and would push for the signalling to be permanently 'on green' for pedestrians and only red when traffic approaches, rather than 'on-call' as at present.</p> <p>GCC advises that they will be exploring traffic calming on Rodney Road, which will aim to reduce both the volume and speed of traffic. Once this has been implemented</p>

	<p>we will need to see what other changes are required, given that this area is desperately in need of an uplift following the successful Rodney Road to Cambray public realm improvement works on the High Street.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Alan McDougall asked the Cabinet Member if he knew how many taxis, public transport and other commercial vehicles that passed through this area were in fact not diesel vehicles?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member explained that he did not know how many vehicles had passed through Boots Corner, and that the question should be directed at the County Council who are doing the monitoring of traffic at Boots Corner.</p>
16.	Question from Alan McDougall to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>Can the Council assure the electorate that the 'partial closure' of Boots Corner intention is not being driven by development proposals in respect of the Municipal Buildings, its adjacencies or Royal Well, made by the Council (or other associated agencies such as the Cheltenham Development Task Force, BID, the Chamber of Commerce, etc.) either in consultation with or at the request of Developers e.g. Blackrock, Hammerson, Intu or Financial Institutions e.g. Canada Life?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>There are no development proposals for the Municipal Offices beyond a development brief for the area, which was approved by this Council in 2013. Many individuals have hypothesised options, but it is unlikely to appeal to the developers cited, who generally prefer retail parks, which given the heritage status of the buildings concerned is not going to happen.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Alan McDougall asked that given that the owners of the new John Lewis site, made it a condition in their negotiations that the Albion Street phase of the Cheltenham Transport Plan had to be implemented and that similarly a condition i.e. the closure of Boots Corner, minuted (April 2015), outlined that failure to do so may render any development proposals for the Municipal Building and Royal Well to be marginal were there any other important development details/minutes known to the Council/Councillor that the public were not being made aware of?</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member stated that this was not conditional and there was no current plan to redevelop the Municipal Offices.</p>
17.	Question from Chris Owen to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>Why has the so called trial closure of Boots corner been extended even further despite the massive amount of adverse feedback received from the rate payers and also the affects on the roads around the centre of town and the rise in pollution in those areas?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>The trial is being run as an experimental traffic order made by GCC. Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders can run for up to 18 months. The trial Boots' Corner restriction commenced on 28th June 2018, so can run through to December 28th 2019. GCC has now reviewed the traffic data and suggested amendments to mitigate certain impacts. Meanwhile, other data sets such as footfall, cycling in the Boots' Corner area and bus patronage suggest positive improvements.</p>

	<p>We are collecting evidence about changes to air quality in Cheltenham (by measuring certain pollutants) and will share these results when enough months' monitoring data has been received to allow valid conclusions to be drawn.</p> <p>In the meantime, monthly monitoring data has been published to the Council's website providing full transparency regarding the position in relation the main pollutant, nitrogen-dioxide.</p>
18.	Question from Cat Metcalfe to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Has the impact on number of visitors to Cheltenham town centre been measured?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	That data is collected annually, so it is probably too early to be certain, but anecdotally, we are aware that the November race meeting achieved record numbers and that CBC car park patronage has been very strong. Neither of these factors suggest a reduction in visitor numbers.
19.	Question from Cat Metcalfe to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Has there been an impact on house prices? I'd be interested to know an estate agent's view on the desirability of living in Pittville/Fairview/Prestbury etc. now it's harder to access.
	Response from Cabinet Member
	As I am not an estate agent, I do not feel qualified to answer this question.
20.	Question from Lorraine Du Feu on behalf of Cheltenham Green Party to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>The council will be aware of the shocking reports published last week concerning the effects of air pollution on the health of unborn children and children travelling in cars. Although we view the Boots corner closure as a positive move in terms of discouraging traffic in the town centre, it is also unlikely to improve the air quality in the town as a whole as most drivers will use other routes.</p> <p>It is a disgrace that Cheltenham has had such poor air quality for so long and the main reason for this is a failure to address the problem of the large number of cars travelling through the town. Simply diverting cars from one route to another will not solve this, but measures such as alternate number plate days and congestion charging, which must be supported by robust investment in alternative transport infrastructure, would make a big difference.</p> <p>We would like to know if the council has considered these options and if not, what measures they intend to take to bring air pollution in Cheltenham under control once and for all?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>The Council will be fully assessing the local air quality situation for 2018, once the last month's data is received and the national bias adjustment figure is released.</p> <p>We are awaiting the outcome of a 'Detailed Air Quality Assessment' which we have commissioned. All of this will inform an Air Quality Action Plan, containing measures to improve air quality and protect health, particularly at any locations where relevant limits are exceeded. Tackling the issue effectively will require behavioural change at a national level and Cheltenham is working with GCC in relation to this issue, recognising the cross-boundary impacts of air pollution.</p>

	<p>We are also part of a countywide 'Air Quality and Health Partnership' and will take guidance from public health colleagues about the effectiveness of future interventions locally. The Boots' Corner trial is certainly encouraging modal shift, with Stagecoach reporting 5000 extra passenger journeys per week.</p> <p>I note your helpful suggestions should further action be necessary and will be liaising with GCC as Highways authority in relation to these matters and the viability of improvement strategies.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Lorraine DuFeu asked the Cabinet Member to name one thing in his power to do this year to improve air quality in Cheltenham.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member recognised the issue of air quality in Cheltenham which was partly due to the location of Cheltenham at the bottom of the escarpment. He advised that they had been working with Stagecoach to put in low emission buses in the town, installed electric charging points for electric cars and the first three phases of the Cheltenham Transport Plan had reduced the amount of traffic on the ring road by about 6%. Air pollution had to be tackled collectively and on national and international level. CBC was tackling it however it is only one part of the process. When approving the progression of the closure of Boots Corner this would improve air pollution across the town, not just the town centre.</p>
21.	Question from Peter Gibbons to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>I understand the purpose of closing Boots corner to general traffic is to encourage shoppers to use the Lower High Street as well as the High Street. Is this action really necessary? Surely it is, first and foremost, the facilities in the Lower High Street that will attract pedestrians, who still in any event have to negotiate the same crossing at Boots Corner, albeit with a lighter traffic flow.</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>The footfall across Boots' corner since the trial began has seen a significant increase, thus reducing the historic severance that was experienced at this point. I appreciate that the pedestrian crossing remains, but many people are crossing without utilising that facility, as the traffic has reduced by around 80-85%. The crossing was retained following consultation with the local Disability Forum prior to the trial.</p>
22.	Question from Peter Gibbons to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>The resulting serious congestion in many side streets, especially during rush hour, together with the carbon-dioxide fumes in these residential areas, also makes this a grave mistake. Does the Borough Council acknowledge these factors?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>Nitrogen-dioxide is the main pollutant of concern in Cheltenham in relation to traffic and human health, not carbon dioxide.</p> <p>CBC, working in conjunction with GCC, has been monitoring traffic and nitrogen-dioxide and particulate matter pollution data across a range of locations and in response to requests from the public, further pollution monitoring points have been installed. Data from this monitoring will be an important part of the wider determination of the success or otherwise of the scheme.</p>

23.	Question from Tom Bowhill to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>Please confirm the original projected costs and man hours of the original proposal as compared to the actual numbers as of today i.e. the current estimate to complete the trial and when will that be and what the parameters are for its success or failure?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>The costs of delivering the Cheltenham Transport Plan physical changes were part of the original LSTF bid, which secured £4.95m. GCC as the highways authority controls the budget for the implementation of that fund.</p> <p>The parameters for the success or failure of the project as a whole are a combination of the economic effects, modal shift and traffic impacts.</p>
24.	Question from Tom Bowhill to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>On the subject of the enforcement cameras, what were the initial estimate of violations week days and weekends as compared to the actual and what reductions were expected from learning curves?</p> <p>If the project is being managed correctly. All this information should be available within 24 hours. So no excuses will be accepted!!</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>The question relates to enforcement, which is a highways authority issue, so I will have to refer this question to GCC.</p> <p>I can add that the purpose of the enforcement is simply to deter individuals from driving in a restricted zone. On this basis, I do not believe that specific estimates were established prior to the enforcement taking place.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Mr Bowhill made reference to information he had received from GCC via an FOI request detailing the number of violations occurring in Boots Corner. He questioned whether this was a sensible analysis and requested that the whole system be withdrawn and a competent person be employed to assess the situation.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member explained that he could not comment as he did not have access to the information received by Mr Bowhill.</p>
25.	Question from Ken Pollock to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>Cheltenham has a notoriously deficient 'road network', (for historical/heritage reasons), with now <u>zero</u> 'ring road' circuits. Boots Corner closure should never even have been "trialled" whilst it is obvious that there are no alternative free-flowing south-to-north routes.</p> <p>Do you realise that GCC acting as Highways Authority cannot 'trade off' its responsibility for avoiding harm to Cheltenham's traffic <u>viability</u> (or to safety or air quality) against a CBC-claimed assortment of "economic" or other non-highways benefits, lest it be open to judicial review for straightforward procedural error?</p>

	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>The data sets provided by GCC monitoring suggest that traffic is still flowing and because it is a trial, amendments are proposed to help further mitigate the impacts identified to date. It is also worth noting that there were congestion issues prior to the implementation of the Cheltenham Transport Plan and that a 'do nothing' option would not be without consequence in traffic and pollution terms.</p> <p>Both CBC and GCC are aware of their statutory obligations.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Ken Pollock asked whether the Cabinet Member could agree that his sanguine overall view that <i>"traffic is still flowing"</i> is not satisfactory in the context of GCC needing to at least <u>maintain</u> traffic flow (on Cheltenham's difficult network) or improve it, <u>not</u> just keep it shy of crawling, especially in the context of the coming JCS growth ?</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member said that if the County Council had deemed there to be an issue this would have been raised in Appendix 4 of the report in the main debate.</p>
26.	Question from Ken Pollock to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>Since the Trial commenced, the congestion and pollution impact on Gloucester Road (northbound) from as far back as Alstone Lane is severe stacking and pollution. This road leading to the A4019 junction has no prospect of flowing easily through the hugely increased traffic which will be generated by the JCS-approved 'Cheltenham North West' urban extension, (which has now been stalled for over one year by Highways England on Transport difficulty grounds).</p> <p>Is it not grossly unreasonable that CBC (and GCC) in their current and earlier reports have evaded modelling and monitoring of the obvious <u>western</u> 'alternative routes' (i.e. Gloucester Road and Princess Elizabeth Way), and have also minimised focus on St. Lukes's Road and College Road?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>The announcement by GCC of the completion of a separate traffic study along the A4019 corridor, with capital funding to address both existing congestion hotspots and to allow for future growth associated with JCS strategic allocations, suggests that the highways authority is planning for growth. A further example, is the GCC led delivery of the £22m 'Growth Deal 3' monies recently secured to allow the development of the Cyber Park at West Cheltenham.</p> <p>Pollution monitoring is being carried out at the locations mentioned – Gloucester Road, Princess Elizabeth Way, St Lukes/College Roads; and the results will be fed into the overall assessment of the trial.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Ken Pollock said that <i>"the highways authority is planning for growth"</i> is not evident; and their spending £22M for access into the 'West Cheltenham' Cyber Park site (west of GCHQ) is <u>not the issue</u> for Cheltenham's Inner Ring Road circulation. The problem was that traffic monitoring (and modelling) was never carried out for PE Way and Gloucester Road, and there is therefore no baseline assessment against which to <u>compare</u> any late-in-the-day checks now on the level of traffic queuing.</p>

	<p>He asked whether the Cabinet Member agreed that for fairness and propriety this final <u>Transport</u> decision (coming four years after the TRO recommendation of January 2015) needed an assessment by an <u>independent</u> Transport Inspector, <u>not</u> another TRO Committee composed of assorted GCC councillors mostly from far outside Cheltenham?</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member did not agree as there was a legal process, being followed scrupulously by GCC. He was absolutely confident that the County Council were proceeding entirely properly with this.</p>
27.	Question from Geoffrey Bloxson to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>At the October Scrutiny committee the issue was raised about pollution counters being placed in open areas where the pollutants are readily dispersed by the wind. Particulates do not concentrate as they do in confined areas such as the narrow parts of St George's Street or All Saints Rd. It is these confined areas that matter, where people live, at residential façade, where residents cannot open their windows due to the pollution. Yet we see these monitors, at the junction of St George's Street and Swindon Rd, on the corner of Clarence Rd and North Place and now at the junction of Pittville Circus Rd and All Saints Rd, not in the confined areas but in the most exposed ones, where the particulates are flushed away by the wind and pedestrian exposure is only transient and occasional. Monitoring should be at residential façade to understand the permanent levels of exposure to the residents. There is no point in taking readings from these open selected spots. What has been done to address this since it was raised at the scrutiny committee and why are we spending money on these counters until they are put in meaningful positions?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>We are carrying out two types of air quality monitoring: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statutory monitoring of nitrogen-dioxide against legal limits using diffusion tubes. In order for these results to be considered as 'relevant exposure' for health, the tubes must be sited appropriately, which we have done as far as practicable. This network of diffusion tubes helps us to understand 'the permanent levels of exposure to residents'. 2. We are also carrying out additional monitoring in response to specific concerns about the Boots' Corner restrictions. We are using air gas mesh pods, which measure both nitrogen-dioxide and particulate matter and this equipment produces faster results. The mesh pods are not part of the statutory Local Air Quality Management network, so do not need to comply with 'relevant exposure' and other elements of the EU Air Quality Data Directive. Regardless of this, we have sited the monitors as sensibly as possible to gather useful results. For example, the monitor on the corner of St George's Street and Swindon Road abuts a residential property and is co-located with our roadside unit – so in fact, results at this location will be the most robust in Cheltenham.
28.	Question from Andrew Riley to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>Can you please outline the accident reporting statistics and how long a particular accident will take to appear on the statistics for consideration. On the 23rd November 2018 I recovered a chap from a written off Lexus from outside my house, as we</p>

	<p>helped the driver we were subject to abuse from passing drivers who had been backed up along All Saints Road as we had not been able to move the car off the road, this was after another accident in late summer at the junction of Selkirk Street. In the past 14 years I have lived in this house I am not aware of a previous accident on this stretch of road. (even though it is home to the driving test centre) How have these accidents been considered in the decision to extend this trial?</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p>
	<p>There is a legal requirement for drivers involved in a traffic collision involving personal injury to report these collisions to the Police. It is this injury collision data that will be used to help determine the future of this trial.</p> <p>The time taken to process each injury collision can vary dependant on a number of factors, including the complexity of investigation, available Police resources and accessing witnesses. The majority of injury collision reports are processed within about 6 weeks of the date of the incident.</p> <p>The following link to the GCC Highways web pages allows access to the most recent 5 years of collision data in Gloucestershire https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/roads-parking-and-rights-of-way/road-safety/collision-and-camera-map/</p>
29.	<p>Question from Andrew Riley to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</p>
	<p>John Lewis has undoubtedly added to footfall on the high street but how much more would town visits have increased had it not been for the closure of the main arterial road, at Boots Corner. A brief scan of social media would have you believe people turning away from Cheltenham in favour of other towns.</p> <p>What work is being done to understand the impact of the new John Lewis as opposed to the traffic scheme and remove this from the stats to present an impartial and balanced view for the councillors to consider? Why are you allowing this scheme to undermine the boost brought to Cheltenham by John Lewis?</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p>
	<p>The owners of the site, which is home to the new John Lewis store, made it clear that delivering the Cheltenham Transport Plan, especially the Albion Street phase was a key determinant in their store acquisition negotiations.</p> <p>The increased footfall data at Boots' Corner suggests that Cheltenham town centre is generally benefiting economically from both the trial and the significant number of new entrants to the commercial heart of the town over the phased delivery of the Cheltenham Transport Plan.</p>
30.	<p>Question from Peter Sayers to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</p>
	<p>If the Council had been clear from the start that the closure of Boots Corner was felt necessary to facilitate the development of the back of the Municipal Offices, the public may well have supported the initiative and the much needed financial boost expected. Instead a variety of reasons, none credible, have been put forward to justify the closure. Does he now feel that progress could be achieved by a public apology to those so disrupted and angered and by a discussion as to the real motive?</p>

	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p> <p>There are currently no plans to develop the rear of the Municipal Offices beyond a development brief for the area, which was approved by this Council in 2013.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Peter Sayers asked the Cabinet Member to clarify the reason why Boots Corner should be closed.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member explained that the Cheltenham Transport Plan was developed in 2011 and funded by central government. This Council had agreed that the priorities for the plan was to change modal shift, reduce pollution where possible and improve the economic viability of the town centre. He stated that there was no suggestion at any point that this was associated with a redevelopment of the Municipal Offices.</p>
31.	<p>Question from Peter Sayers to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</p> <p>There is increased awareness that pollution from traffic is indeed a serious issue. In fact so serious that the Government limit of permissible pollution may well be lowered. Allowing traffic to 'find its way' and raise pollution in residential areas is not a responsible solution. Closing Boots Corner without an overall traffic plan for alternative routes has caused much anger. Please can the trial be halted and a credible traffic plan that covers the whole town, not just one small section, be initiated?</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p> <p>GCC traffic data monitoring was on-going prior to the implementation of the Cheltenham Transport Plan and its various phases. In response to the recent data, GCC plans to make amendments to the current trial scheme, as part of a package of mitigation measures which it was always anticipated may have been necessary.</p> <p>The Council has a statutory duty to monitor air quality, regardless of the local transport plan. We will be refreshing our air quality action plan in the next few months and this will be informed by the detailed air quality assessment once completed.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Peter Sayers asked why there was no credible alternative route for the traffic?</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member explained that the council and GCC had always stated that there would not be an alternative route but the plan was to allow traffic to disperse by a number of different routes as suggested by the modelling. Evidence from the County Council was that this was actually happening.</p>
32.	<p>Question from Helen Little to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</p> <p>Why was no formal Traffic Impact Assessment commissioned in advance of the changes to the traffic flows?</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p> <p>The scheme was extensively modelled to assess impact utilising a PARAMICS traffic micro-simulation model. Additionally, GCC carried out equality impact assessments prior to works being commenced. Details of these assessments are available via the GCC website.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Helen Little reiterated her question and asked why a</p>

	<p>formal traffic impact assessment was not performed. She asked what the methodology was for traffic flow recording.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member Development and Safety said PARAMICS was conducted in 2013 throughout the central area in Cheltenham and was modelled through a number of different scenarios. The modelling suggested that there would be various changes in flows following Phases 1 and 2 data collected matched closely the modelling as has been the case for phase 4. The way its modelled gives 27 points of reading for traffic flow either done via radar system or lines in the road recording every vehicle driving past. The map was included in the County Council data set in the report pack before Members.</p>
33.	Question from Helen Little to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>Why has there not been any vehicular emission pollution monitoring at one of the busiest most dangerous road junctions i.e. the area opposite St Gregory's church and school with the double roundabout at Clarence Street- Ambrose Street – Knapp Road? Is monitoring planned for this now 'inner ring road' and will particulates be included in addition to NO2?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>We are measuring nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter pollutants (linked to vehicular emissions) at this location and indeed, the results have been published on our website – see link below. https://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/downloads/download/1645/air_quality_briefing_notes</p> <p>The monitoring point near to St Gregory's Church has been returning the lowest readings out of the four additional monitoring points installed in response to Boots' Corner restriction concerns from the public.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Helen Little asked how particular pollution was measured and why particulates were not included in the assessments since the recent government report for atmospheric pollution from vehicles stressed the importance of particulates. There was no evidence of these being monitored.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member confirmed that traffic flow had increased in the areas concerned as recorded in the information the County Council had provided. In terms of air pollution there was a monitor at that junction and particles below 10 microns were able to be monitored as it was a more sophisticated piece of equipment. He stated that at that location air quality had one of the lowest pollution readings in the town, this could be found on the council's website.</p>
34.	Question from Adam Lillywhite to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>Please explain why two of the three Trials recommended by the TRO Committee for Boots Corner are not being performed as part of this newly extended trial period. These entail the narrowing of the Carriageway to a single lane to make it easier to cross and the restriction of traffic from the area during shopping hours. Both these options would resolve many of the congestion issues as well as those of pollution and dispersing traffic into residential streets throughout the night and around schools at the beginning of the day.</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	The TRO committee and subsequent GCC cabinet report identified a range of

	<p>options; it did not specify what was to be trialled.</p> <p>The carriageway has been narrowed at Boots' Corner as part of the trial; this space has now been reclaimed for use by people, rather than vehicles. Whilst not to everyone's taste, the temporary 'astro-turf' has demonstrated how the space can be better used and the dwell time data suggests that whilst only temporary, members of the public have responded positively to the newly created space. Should the scheme be approved long term, we would seek improvements in line with the standard set by the recent works undertaken further along the High Street.</p> <p>The suggested on-going amendments to the scheme are designed to address concerns raised.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Adam Lillywhite stated that the bus usage figures provided suggested around 600 car journeys a day are saved, which left around 8,000 car journeys that are longer, slower and more congested. With stop start traffic creating 4 times the pollution of free moving traffic, there was no question this scheme increases emissions whilst moving it into residential areas. The responses provided by the Cabinet Member suggested that air pollution could not be considered until it was annualized and bias adjusted, whilst serious accidents that have occurred on roads made busy by this scheme were not been considered in the decision to extend the trial. He asked what was being done to enable these factors to be considered in a final decision.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member said that air quality was absolutely being considered and the judgement dependent on what amount of data was gathered, i.e. if data was collected and available for a 12 month period then the government safe level of 40 microns of nitrogen dioxide applied. However, if only snapshot information was available the limit was 200 microns. Data collected suggested that those limits were not being exceeded apart from the Gloucester Road/Tewkesbury Road junction which was a long standing issue. In terms of queuing traffic he stated that the information being provided by the County Council in its monitoring did not support that view.</p>
<p>35.</p>	<p>Question from Adam Lillywhite to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</p>
	<p>CBC officers report states that only on four sites is the traffic increase greater than 20%, yet the GCC report identifies 7 on the month for month data. The pollution data is also under reported; Winchcombe Street/Fairview Road junction, where Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) levels have risen from 29.66 micrograms per cubic metre in October 2016 and 31.36 in October 2017 (before the Boots Corner closure) to 42.02 in October 2018. Gloucester Road has also seen an increase from an already high 45.65 µg/m³ in October 2017 to 47.23 in October 2018. Meanwhile, the data from the newly installed air quality monitoring point on Princess Elizabeth Way has exceeded the 40 ug/m³ mark for the last two recorded months (41.24 in September and 43.37 in October 2018).</p> <p>Yet the CBC officer reports that NO₂ levels remain 'below the trigger levels for the EU', it only mentions Poole Way as still being in exceedance but does not identify that the 40 ug/m³ level is being exceeded in new residential locations, why are the Members not being unambiguously informed of these breaches by this report. This is not 'Broadly neutral' but identifies new breaches which are now in residential areas so individuals suffer constant exposure. How do CBC officers consider it necessary</p>

	and acceptable to not pass this information on to its members and the general public even though this is an extraordinary meeting?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>The air quality results have unfortunately been taken out of context here. 12 months worth of data (January to December) is required in order to evaluate local levels against the national annual mean limit – hence why it is called an ‘annual mean limit’. There is also a statutory ‘hourly limit’ which has not been exceeded.</p> <p>We will share results for 2018 monitoring, including details of any exceedances of the annual mean, once the evaluation has taken place – we are awaiting December’s results and the national ‘bias adjustment’ figure, and the results of a local detailed air quality assessment first. This information has been published on our website on an annual basis for many years and more recently, new monthly raw data which has not been bias-adjusted.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Adam Lillywhite felt that the Boots Corner usage table was misleading with increased figures only reported for the period of the Music and Literature festivals against a base that was not during a festival. The detailed data for traffic flows had not been released and traffic increase graphics excluded St Georges Street which was probably most heavily affected. The Nitrogen Dioxide map was for 2017 and serious detrimental impacts on residential areas were dismissed or not addressed and economic activity from completed developments separate to the closure were inaccurately claimed as being dependant. He questioned how Members could be expected to make a reasonable decision without the necessary information and an apparently misleading report.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member said he did not agree with Mr Lillywhite’s analysis and Members had all the relevant information required.</p>
36.	Question from Mary Nelson to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>On the 14th April 2015, Full Council was asked to agree CBC’s Accommodation Strategy as part of the Corporate Strategy.</p> <p>This included an agreement to commence the process of securing a partner to enter into a joint development project with CBC for the rearward re-development of the Municipal Offices as part of the Royal Well Development Plan. In the supporting paperwork for this meeting there was one risk listed in the Risk Matrix which was deemed to be “High” – i.e. coloured red with a high score of 16, and this risk related solely to the CTP as follows:</p> <p><i>“If GCC are unable to close Boots corner (Inner Ring road) to through traffic then it would significantly reduce the development potential of the Municipal building and Royal Well and may render the development as marginal, as it would only allow the Municipal Building to be remodelled without the holistic benefit of Royal Well. (Ref Cheltenham Task Force risk TF.12.)”</i></p> <p>In the current ‘Economic and Environmental Case’ for the CTP there is not one mention of the above high risk and obvious major economic concern for CBC.</p> <p>Why is this high risk, and its stated negative economic impact, not mentioned</p>

	<p>anywhere in the CTP Economic Case, and will the Leader confirm that CBC's desire and justification for Cheltenham's inner ring road closure (as stated in the above risk) has always been, and still remains, an important driver for CBC to ensure that the inner ring road remains closed?</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p>
	<p>CBC has concentrated on other priorities in the intervening years, given the phased approach to the delivery of the Cheltenham Transport Plan.</p> <p>CBC has not progressed any joint development agreements, or other options concerning the Municipal Offices. Instead, the property team has been focussing on the performance of the Council's wider property portfolio, in response to declining central government support for local government and the need to generate income to help protect core services, which benefit the people of Cheltenham.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Mary Nelson stated that the Municipal Offices and Royal Well site had been included as a proposed development site in CBC's Local Plan, which was due to start its Examination next month.</p> <p>She asked if this did not happen would the Cabinet Member confirm that this high risk and financial incentive for CBC remained, and that it would still significantly reduce the development potential of the Royal Well proposal and still render the development as marginal?</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member acknowledged that there would be value for the council if the Royal Well was closed and there was development at the back of the site. However, this was not the reason that this was being undertaken as he had stated in his previous answer.</p>
<p>37.</p>	<p>Question from Mary Nelson to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</p>
	<p>The recently commenced air quality monitoring on Princess Elizabeth Way is showing high and increasing NO2 figures, breaching EU limits.</p> <p>Why did CBC/GCC only start monitoring air pollution on Princess Elizabeth Way in August last year, <u>after</u> Boots Corner had been closed, when it had long been recognised by residents during the CTP public consultations, that traffic going from the south to the north of Cheltenham would use PE Way once the inner ring through the town was closed?</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p>
	<p>The additional air quality monitoring on Princess Elizabeth Way is not currently evidencing data that breaches EU limits. The monthly results cannot be compared against an annual mean – 12 months data is required for that and the national bias adjustment figure.</p> <p>There have been no exceedances of the EU hourly limit for NO2. The funding for this additional monitoring was not available to the environmental health service in August last year and it was not possible to undertake modelling within the air quality budget at that time.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Mary Nelson asked, based on a response she quoted received from the lead traffic officer at the CTP decision meeting, whether the Cabinet Member agreed that PE Way <u>should</u> have been included in the modelling for</p>

	<p>the CTP at the outset, and that NO₂ monitoring should have been started 18 months ago in June 2017 in order to provide a baseline for both?</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member said that there was no direct correlation between the traffic at PE Way and that at Boots Corner as per the County Council response. There were other significant factors at PE Way. There were plans to reconfigure that junction with the west Cheltenham housing development and prior to that commencing the developers would be providing all the necessary traffic and pollution data at that time.</p>
38.	Question from Jayne Lillywhite to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	"What is John Lewis's position on the additional traffic emerging from Rodney Rd and travelling along the High street? Can you assure me that given the increased volumes of traffic taking this route since the closure of Boots Corner, if it is to be addressed, then it will be during this trial so that the impact of the additionally displaced traffic on other routes can be assessed and not masked until it is too late when the trial has been completed."
	Response from Cabinet Member
	I cannot answer a question directly relating to a third party. The recent GCC lead cabinet member report cites 'investigation into options for traffic calming on Rodney Road' as an additional element of proposed changes, so one assumes that this will be within the trial period.

8. MEMBER QUESTIONS

1.	Question from Councillor Klara Sudbury to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>In the overview and scrutiny meeting papers (14th January) it states that Gloucestershire county council has decided that they won't support the much needed refurbishment of paving on the Strand or Cambray Place because these are "shared spaces". This is because the government decided in July 2018 that work to create new shared spaces should be paused.</p> <p>Instead the Borough Council now appears to be working with the county council to improve/change areas of the High St impacted by or associated with the Cheltenham transport plan (the area High Street between Rodney Road and Winchcombe Street which has become a lot more congested since the transport plan and the planned Boots Corner shared space).</p> <p>What has CBC done to try to persuade Gloucestershire county council that the High Street between Cambray Place and Bath Road, and Cambray Place are existing and fully pedestrianised areas, that should not be considered to be new shared spaces so that work to improve paving in these areas can take place?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>The issue was raised at an officer meeting on 8th January, 2019, with a request for an update on the Department for Transport moratorium on shared space.</p> <p>It was decided that both parties will now seek a legal opinion, as with no change to the relevant traffic regulation orders, there is growing doubt that the moratorium applies in this instance.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Cllr Klara Sudbury referred to the contribution of £250k per year for 4 years from the County Council to contribute to the High Street</p>

	<p>improvements and asked whether if the legal position as to whether these were shared spaces or pedestrianised area was resolved was there sufficient funding for the works at the Strand and Cambray Place to take place.</p> <p>In response, the Cabinet Member confirmed that the funding had been agreed between CBC and the County Council and the delay was related to whether this area constituted shared space and was therefore included in the government moratorium. He believed this was not shared space as there was no through traffic there as such and in fact it did not constitute a new scheme. He was however awaiting legal confirmation from the County Council.</p>
2.	Question from Councillor Klara Sudbury to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>CBC wishes to create a new shared space at boots corner, where eventually the controlled crossing is removed, and pedestrians share the space with cyclists buses and taxis. Does the government moratorium on shared spaces apply to that area?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>As the road would remain highway, albeit reduced in width, the moratorium on shared space would seemingly not apply.</p> <p>For your information, no decision has been made on the controlled crossing other than it was to be retained during the trial at the request of the Disability Forum.</p> <p>One solution, should the trial be made permanent, would be to prioritise the lights in favour of pedestrians rather than vehicles.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Sudbury asked that CBC would not seek the removal of a controlled crossing or full height kerbs whilst vehicles were still using this space.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member said that there would be a design to make the area more attractive and the carriageway would be narrowed to a single line of traffic. It depended on guidance on disability access and what was deemed to be safe on shared space. His working assumption was that there would still be some form of kerbing to determine what was carriageway and what was pavement.</p>
3.	Question from Councillor Klara Sudbury to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	<p>I have previously requested (at a meeting overview and scrutiny committee and via email) that the straight part of Saint Luke's Road has pollution and traffic monitoring installed. This is because the location of the sensor on College Road does not pick up any displaced traffic from boots corner that travels west to east along Saint Luke's Road/Saint Lukes place and bath parade. Since there is also no traffic monitoring on Montpelier Terrace, it is possible that significant numbers of displaced vehicles travelling west to east are not captured at any point through the traffic monitoring. This issue is very important to Saint Luke's Road and Saint Lukes Place as they are very narrow and the impact of increased congestion and pollution is right by people's homes. If there are no plans for pollution monitoring on the straight part of Saint Luke's Road could I please request again that this is considered as soon as possible during the CTP trial? If there is no traffic monitoring planned for the straight part of Saint Luke's Road, please could the Cabinet member request that GCC to install traffic monitoring at this location during the trial and as soon as possible?</p>

	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p> <p>Additional traffic monitoring has been undertaken in the St. Lukes area and is currently being reviewed.</p> <p>Air pollution (nitrogen-dioxide) is being monitored in the St Luke's Road area, but it has not been possible to monitor in every precise location requested, due to budgetary constraints. In addition, we believe it is unlikely that the straight part of St Luke's Road would generate significantly different results statistically from the nearest monitoring point, due to its close proximity. We will soon be in a position to share details of any exceedances of statutory air quality limits in 2018 for all monitoring locations, using the required 12 months of data. In the unlikely event that the St Luke's area does fail the annual limit for nitrogen-dioxide, an action plan of measures would be identified and implemented, to bring the area into compliance in the shortest possible time, thereby mitigating impacts on health.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Sudbury asked how mitigation measures to reduce rat running and improve road safety in St Lukes be designed and implemented without the traffic data needed to understand the problem. She understood that baseline data had been collected in 2013 and spot monitoring was undertaken in November. She asked if the Cabinet Member would support her plea from the County Council to install permanent traffic monitoring on the straight part of St Lukes Road ?</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member said he had not been party to the discussions she had held with county officers but there was no current evidence that there was a significant problem in the St Lukes area. He would be happy for the County Council to undertake this if he deemed appropriate.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor David Willingham to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</p> <p>A number of my constituents are concerned about traffic on the B4633 Gloucester Road, and the sequencing of the traffic signals along this corridor. I note from the report that the A4019 corridor has proposals for improvements. Can I get an assurance that the B4633 Gloucester Road corridor will have investment in its traffic management, and that the sequencing of traffic signals on this corridor and other traffic flow metrics will be looked at as this trial continues?</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p> <p>GCC has completed a traffic signals study, looking at the key junctions across the whole of the network and will be making investment over the next three years to improve congestion hotspots, particularly where they are likely to be affected by the predicted housing growth development to the north-west of Cheltenham.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Willingham asked whether there could be a review of traffic signals in less than 3 years and whether the County could also be specifically asked to look at box junctions as driver behaviour was preventing traffic flow.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member stated that the County Council had funds available to address the issues but the relevant county council officers were present at the meeting and would no doubt take the points on board.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Councillor David Willingham to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</p> <p>Can I get an assurance that the signal timings at the junction of the B4633</p>

	<p>Gloucester Road with the A4019 Tewkesbury Road will be reviewed to get better traffic flows along Gloucester Road, which currently has excessive queues at peak times? As the disparity between the long flow times for the A4019 Tewkesbury Road and the excessively short flow times for the B4633 Gloucester Road, seem to be causing excessive queuing.</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p>
	<p>See answer to Q4. GCC officers have also informed me that the operation of this junction has been adjusted following feedback received during the trial and are continuing to assess what traffic control system upgrades need to be made to improve the flow of traffic in this area of Cheltenham.</p>
6.	<p>Question from Councillor David Willingham to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</p>
	<p>Can I get an assurance that a review of parking restrictions and active peak-time parking enforcement, will be considered for the lower High Street, as obstructive parking near the junction with Ambrose Street impedes the flow of buses, seems to cause rat-running and seems to exacerbate peak-time congestion in this area?</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p>
	<p>Parking restrictions have only recently been reviewed by GCC, so the key will be to achieve effective enforcement. I have asked what resources can be deployed in light of this question and the information has been passed onto the GCC on-street parking team, who will investigate the issue and determine if additional enforcement is required in the area.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Willingham asked whether the council could liaise with county civil enforcement officers and the police as there were a number of issues with people illegally parking on zebra crossing zigzags often preventing buses moving down the lower high street. There was a high level of assault on county staff performing parking enforcement and therefore action was required to ensure people could do their job in safety.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member referred to the fact that county officers were present and would no doubt take the points on board.</p>
7.	<p>Question from Councillor David Willingham to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</p>
	<p>Can I get an assurance that a review of rat-running affecting residential streets such as New Street, Grove Street, Devonshire Street and Burton Street, will be looked at as part of the review of this trial, as these residential streets are not suitable for the volume of traffic now trying to avoid the High Street / Ambrose Street junction?</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p>
	<p>This is again an issue I have raised with GCC and may well be linked to your observation about obstructive parking at the Ambrose Street/ Lower High Street junction, increasing the likelihood of drivers seeking to use alternative routes.</p> <p>GCC advises that the trial is monitoring traffic across a wide area of the Cheltenham road network to determine the impact and whether any mitigation measures need to be considered.</p>
8.	<p>Question from Councillor Max Wilkinson to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay</p>
	<p>Can the Cabinet Member report back on the increase in pedestrian movements</p>

	along the High Street, across Clarence Street, through the area known as Boots Corner since the latest phase of the transport plan was implemented?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	Data on movements (other than vehicles which is collected by GCC) has been collected and independently verified by G John Surveys Ltd. This has shown that for the week commencing 11/06/18, prior to the trial, pedestrian numbers were 14,657; for the week commencing 02/07/18, pedestrian numbers were 27,008 and for the week commencing 08/10/18, pedestrian numbers were 31,695. Growth in excess of 100% between June and October. Growth has also been identified for cyclists, wheelchair users and those sitting down within the space.
9.	Question from Councillor Max Wilkinson to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Can the Cabinet Member report on the increase or decrease in cycling through the area known as Boots Corner since the latest phase of the transport plan was implemented?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	Based upon the survey cited in Q8, cycle movements for the same period have increased from a pre-trial figure of 220, to 674 and 694 in July and October respectively. Again, significant growth, illustrating the impact of the scheme on modal travel shift.
10.	Question from Councillor Max Wilkinson to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Has footfall across the length of the High Street increased or decreased since the latest phase of the transport plan was implemented?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	The footfall cameras operated by the Business Improvement District (BID) have not been fully operational, because of the disruption caused by the significant works on the High Street. The only comparable data is that for the Brewery Quarter, which cites 15% growth since the trial began in June 2018.
11.	Question from Councillor Max Wilkinson to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Has there been evidence of an upturn in sales in town centre shops since the latest phase of the transport plan was implemented?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	Commercial confidentiality prevents us from having access to such data, so everything is anecdotal. However, with evidence of greater footfall and extended dwell times around Boots' Corner, it is hoped that traders of all sorts have benefited from the changed circumstances.
12.	Question from Councillor Jonny Brownsteen to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	St Paul's has welcomed many new businesses to the Brewery Quarter in the past few months. What kind of trading and footfall figures are the Brewery reporting since the trial closure began, and how does that compare to the same period last year?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	The last publicly quoted data from the Brewery was on 15 th October, 2018, prior to the opening of several units. That briefing noted that almost five million people have visited the Spa town's new retail and leisure centre on the former Brewery site off

	the lower High Street during the last year - an increase of 15 per cent.
13.	Question from Councillor Jonny Brownsteen to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	What information do we have about how businesses along the Lower High Street are faring since the trial began?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	It is difficult to gauge the impact on the lower High Street, as there is no unified body representing the commercial interests there, and it is outside of the BID zone. We will seek feedback from the West End Partnership.
14.	Question from Councillor Karl Hobley to Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Traffic is often backed up down St George's Street, causing delays and frustration for drivers. The lights allowing access to Swindon Road are either poorly synchronized, or not at all. Whilst this problem predates the Boots Corner trail, it has been exacerbated by it. Will the Borough Council work with Gloucestershire County Council highways to address this problem?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	It is pleasing to report that the recent GCC lead cabinet member briefing, identifies the completion of a separate review of the traffic signals on the A4019 corridor, with funding identified to tackle the challenge. It also notes that this corridor was a 'congestion hotspot' prior to the implementation of the Cheltenham Transport Plan. Hopefully this intervention will assist in addressing the issues at that location.

9. PETITION TO RE-OPEN BOOTS CORNER

The Mayor referred Members to the procedure to be followed as set out in Appendix 2 of the Petition Report. He then invited Councillor Harman as the petition organiser to address Council.

Councillor Harman introduced the petition and explained that the numbers of people and businesses signing the ongoing petition now stood at 5885. This was therefore the single biggest petition this Council had received illustrating the importance of the issue and the fact that the Boots Corner closure was the most controversial scheme Cheltenham had ever faced. He wished to put on record his thanks to those residents who had contacted him. He summarised the feelings of those signing as being too little gain for too much pain. He then quoted from a letter from a Mr Lester Maddrell, Solicitor and for 16 years deputy traffic commissioner and coroner. He had expressed concern on a number of points but mainly the displacement of traffic following the implementation of the closure and in particular the deterioration of a) the situation in Gloucester Road/Tewkesbury Road and b) the High Street between the two pedestrianised sections without the safeguard of traffic lights to Winchcombe Street and beyond.

Councillor Harman questioned whether the town centre's issue with air quality had been moved from the town centre to where residents lived and sleep was progress. He also quoted from an email he had received from the Manager of the Regent Arcade who did not agree that trade had increased and felt that it had dropped since the trial closure. Cllr Harman then referred to one of the public questioners who believed that the base figures for footfall were last years

figures prior to the opening of John Lewis and so the increase could not be attributed to the Boots Corner scheme.

He then expressed concern that the danger was that members of the public signing the petition would not get a clear answer at this meeting. He therefore gave notice that Cllr Mason would move a motion to vote on what the petition was calling on, i.e. to re-open Boots Corner at the earliest opportunity.

Finally, Cllr Harman emphasised that this was a vital issue for Cheltenham. Everyone aspired to having the best town and the best High Street and he questioned whether the closure of Boots Corner was the only way to achieve this.

The Cabinet Member Development and Safety was invited to address Council. He believed that the petition called for allowing 9000 cars back through Boots corner, for dividing the High Street and would undermine the economic growth seen in the town over the last few years. Government policy on new transport schemes was to have cycling, walking and public transport at the fore. What the petition called for was contrary to the County Council's transport plan and CBCs corporate strategy. The Cabinet Member proposed that the full debate took place during consideration of the next agenda item and that at this stage the petition should be simply noted.

Councillor Mason proposed the following amendments:

- a) to vote on reopening Boots Corner at the earliest opportunity
- b) to hold a public debate on reopening Boots Corner

The amendments were seconded by Councillor Babbage.

The following points were raised:

- Some Members felt that the Extraordinary Council meeting had not been called to debate the petition but had been called at the request of the County Council to consider the CTP update and express CBC opinion to GCC prior to the meeting of its TRO Committee in February. The main debate should therefore be held during the subsequent agenda item.
- Other Members felt strongly that this was a significant issue for the people of the town and therefore there should be a full debate and vote on the request in the petition.
- A Member recognised the importance of petitions to democracy however requested that the time limit of 15 mins for the debate of petitions be considered by the Constitution Working Group.

In seconding the amendments Cllr Babbage felt that taking no action on the petition was wrong so a vote on it was essential.

A request for a recorded vote on the amendments was proposed and with more than 7 Members standing this was accepted.

Vote on amendment a) to reopen Boots Corner at the earliest opportunity

FOR (9): Cllrs Babbage, Cooke, Harman, Mason, Payne, Savage, Seacome, Stennett, Sudbury

AGAINST (26) Cllrs Atherstone, Baker, Barnes, Barrell, Boyes, Britter, Brownsteen, Clucas, Coleman, Collins, Dobie, Fisher, Harvey, Hay, Hegenbarth, Holliday, Horwood, Jeffries, Jordan, McKinlay, Parsons, Wheeler, Whyborn, Wilkinson, Williams, Willingham

ABSTENTION: 0

The amendment was lost.

Vote on amendment b) to hold a public debate on reopening Boots Corner

FOR (11): Cllrs Babbage, Baker, Barrell, Cooke, Harman, Mason, Payne, Savage, Seacome, Stennett, Sudbury

AGAINST (23) : Cllrs Atherstone, Boyes, Britter, Brownsteen, Clucas, Coleman, Collins, Dobie, Fisher, Harvey, Hay, Hegenbarth, Holliday, Horwood, Jeffries, Jordan, McKinlay, Parsons, Wheeler, Whyborn, Wilkinson, Williams, Willingham

ABSTENTIONS: (1) Cllr Barnes

The amendment was lost.

A vote was then held on the substantive motion.

RESOLVED THAT

To take no further action on the petition, given the report and recommendations set out in the next item on the Council agenda titled 'Cheltenham Transport Plan' which provides the case for extending the trial closure with mitigations to address issues and concerns raised.

FOR : (25)

AGAINST: (8)

ABSTENTIONS: (1)

10. CHELTENHAM TRANSPORT PLAN -UPDATE REPORT

Scott Tompkins, Lead Commissioner of the Highways Authority gave a presentation to Members, this included an update on the feedback to date on the scheme, an overview of the traffic flow monitoring and an update on the phase 4 monitoring. He further advised Members of the proposed revisions to the trial and the predicted timeline for the next steps. Rupert Cox, Managing Director of Stagecoach West also gave a short presentation on the impacts of the Cheltenham transport plan on the bus services and ran through the significant positive impacts of the scheme. The presentation is appended to the minutes for reference.

The following responses were offered to Members questions:

- Cheltenham is well contained in comparison to other towns and cities with census data suggesting around 70% of journeys taken in Cheltenham are less than 2km. This is in contrast to neighbouring Gloucester which has a lot of out commuting.
- Transport modelling conducted at the outset of the scheme highlighted that the majority of journeys around Boots corner were through journeys and not people accessing the town centre.
- The evidence to date shows that in a number of roads in Cheltenham the traffic levels have fallen since the closure of Boots corner, however, in order to determine whether fewer people were using cars overall they would need to analyse the traffic levels over a longer period of time.
- Following a query regarding the predicted timescale for the traffic signal improvements on the Tewkesbury/Swindon Road junction, Mr Tompkins advised that the funding had been approved in the last month for the signal work and the feasibility study had already been completed. They, therefore, planned to take it to the design phase in the next year and hoped to deliver the scheme by late 2020.
- He confirmed that delivery vehicles could only access the area highlighted in red on the map before 10am and after 6pm which is outside of the core hours.
- The legal requirement for the experimental traffic regulation order is 18 months in length, when that comes to end they have the option to make the elements trialled permanent, abandon them or trial another experimental order.
- Ideally, GCC would have liked to put the mitigation measures in place before Gold Cup but this would not be physically possible given the timescale, he confirmed that the trial would still be in place during Gold Cup week and so they would still capture the impact on the other roads during this time.
- Mr Cox advised that they had purchased a number of new vehicles and due to the Euro 6 level of emissions on those vehicles they were seeing great environmental improvements, particularly in the Benhall area. The increased growth would also enable them to make improvements to the bus network.
- The highways authority were currently looking at the signage and how they direct people in and out of the town. They were also discussing the potential for using VMS signs which would indicate the number of parking spaces available in car parks.
- Whilst they had already tweaked the signalling on St George's Road, they acknowledged that this route was an area which needed further mitigation measures. St George's Road and Tewkesbury Road were the routes of greatest concern to them due to the increased congestion.
- They were aware that there were several days when the enforcement camera wasn't working as it had been vandalised.
- Analysis of the current data highlighted that some roads had seen on average a 25%-30% increase in traffic flow and an even greater increase during peak times. It was acknowledged that the scheme was a trade off between the positive benefits of modal shift, increase in public transport usage and other reduction in the severance on the high street compared with the negative consequences of increased traffic on some routes. It was noted that Cheltenham was bucking the downward trend in terms of the reduction in high street shops at a time when many other towns were

struggling and noted that cities such as Oxford and Bath had also made difficult decisions to take traffic out of the town centre.

- Mr Tompkins confirmed that 376 representations had been received during the formal consultation period and 422 general inquiries, he advised that all formal representations would be published when they went back to the TRO committee. He acknowledged that there had been issues with the website, but suggested anyone who had concerns as to whether their representation had been received should make contact with the highways authority.
- Mr Cox advised that there were a number of pinch points on the bus network where buses were frequently held up and explained that they were continuing to work with GCC to resolve these issues.
- Mr Tompkins confirmed that Ringway Infrastructure Services were taking over from Amey as GCC's highway maintenance contractor. Amey were committed to completing the works raised before the contract was up on the 1st April. GCC were still committed to delivering the mitigation measures and would use outside contractors if necessary.
- Mr Cox confirmed that if the buses on Tewkesbury Road could be speeded up due to the proposed mitigation measures then the link C service could be reinstated.
- Data is currently being collected in support of the West Cheltenham Development and Cyber Park schemes and will be going into the feasibility design stages very quickly. They were also collecting a lot of counter data for the wider Cheltenham area.
- They had already made tweaks to the traffic signals on Gloucester/Tewkesbury road junction, however, they acknowledged that more needed to be done including the introduction of MOVA and other traffic control units, changes to curb alignments and lanes. However, as this would involve major construction work it would need to be designed properly and tested against the transport model and other planned works.
- There isn't enough funding in the current plans to create whole new roads and so they needed to work within the existing infrastructure, as such, modal shift was critical given the anticipated traffic growth. Mr Tompkins advised that they had been looking at bus lanes and bus priority as a potential solution to increased traffic predicted around West Cheltenham.
- Regarding mitigation measures on Rodney Road, Mr Tompkins explained that they wouldn't usually go to the extreme of closing road unless there was a safety issue and they were, therefore, looking at lower impact and lower cost measures first.
- Mr Cox confirmed that they attributed the improvements in journey speeds to the Racecourse during the November meet to the closure of Boots Corner as that had been the only major change in the last few years. He explained that reliability and punctuality are key to bus users and they can only guarantee reliable services if the road network is not blocked by indiscriminate parking or deliveries. He confirmed that all of the core town centre services had directly benefitted from less traffic.
- Following concerns raised about the problems the street furniture caused to the Everyman during the pantomime season, GCC confirmed that they would be happy to engage directly with the Everyman and explained that should the scheme be made permanent the street scene would require design work with input from local businesses and users of the town centre.

The Cabinet Member Development and Safety endorsed the recommendations of the Cheltenham transport plan update report. He felt it important to first clarify that this was a Borough Council promoted scheme where the highways authority were acting as the agent. The report highlighted that the trial had overall had a positive impact and successfully achieved its objectives in terms of modal shift, reduction of traffic in the town centre, improved connectivity and increased footfall. He further acknowledged the positive economic impact on the town centre and felt there had been no significant issues with regards to air quality. He advised that phase 4 of the CTP had cut traffic around Boots Corner by 85% whilst having a limited impact on the highways network. He reported that pedestrian footfall had increased by over 200% and cycling had experienced a similar increase, whilst wheelchair access had also increased by over 70%.

Councillor McKinlay emphasised that the information available in the report predates the opening of John Lewis and therefore felt that claims that the increase in footfall in the town was as a result of that were incorrect. He advised that since 2011 when the funding for the CTP was obtained from Central Government, 531 additional jobs in the town centre had been created, including an additional 200 at John Lewis. He attributed this increased investment to the Council's commitment to deliver the CTP. He further noted the retention of existing retail outlets in Cheltenham including that of Next and House of Fraser.

He felt that the success of the CTP was clear from a range of indicators, including the increased connectivity in the town centre, the reduction in car usage and increase in use of public transport, cycling and walking, the major boost to the economy as well as the increase in the environmental standards in town centre including improvements to the air quality and increased investment in green infrastructure. In contrast, he perceived the issues experienced to be small scale and localised and noted that plans were being put in place to address these. He encouraged Council to adopt the recommendations in the report to give a clear message to GCC that Cheltenham were happy to proceed with the CTP.

Councillor Stennett requested that a vote be taken on each of the recommendations individually.

The Leader noted that when they had opted to pedestrianise the Promenade in 1988 a similar number of objections had been received, however, now it would be unimaginable to have traffic through that route. He emphasised that this was not the final decision today but a key point in the scheme to determine whether they wished to progress with the proposed amendments. He was fully supportive of the amendments which he believed would enhance the scheme and also welcomed the promise to review the Gloucester/Tewkesbury Road corridor. He reiterated that the CTP was in line with County Council policy and national government policy and that extensive modelling had been done over a long period of time. He was pleased to see that they were creating modal shift as evidenced by Mr Cox's presentation.

In the debate that followed, Members noted the following:

- The worrying increase in the number of cars around the town centre with government figures predicting a 51% increase in vehicles on roads between now and 2050. They therefore recognised the need for modal shift, particularly given the increase in housing predicted. Members also acknowledged that getting rid of traffic through the town centre would enable CBC to move forward with the place strategy.
- Members wished to thank all of the highways authority officers, Rupert Cox and the GCC Cabinet Member for all their hard work to date on the scheme.
- They stressed that it was a trial and if it was decided that it wasn't the best thing for the people of Cheltenham then it would not be made permanent. Trialling it allowed them the opportunity to gauge concerns and try to address them in order to give the scheme the best possible chance of success.
- Members acknowledged that there had been negative consequences as the result of the scheme and welcomed the mitigation measures which they agreed would alleviate some members of the public's concerns. Largely by improving deliveries to the street traders on Clarence Street and Clarence Parade, the traffic light rescheduling on the Gloucester/Tewkesbury Road. They reasoned that a lot of residents' concerns i.e. around traffic light synchronisation could be easily rectified. Members also noted that the issues around St George's Street had been there for years and saw this as an opportunity to rectify them.
- The reduction in footfall in the Regent Arcade could be as a result of the closure of BHS, the largest retailer in the arcade.
- A Member wished to remind residents that there is a process for getting their views across and they should make representations to the appropriate body as well as raise concerns with their ward Councillor not through online protests.
- Councillor Sudbury wished to place on record that the reason she had voted for phase 4 of Cheltenham Transport Plan was because it was a trial and she had campaigned hard for it to be a trial not a permanent change.
- Other Members, however, explained that they couldn't support the continuation of the trial without more comprehensive traffic modelling being done. They also noted that as buses and taxis were still allowed to use the route it was far from becoming pedestrianised. Members further cited reasons of increased traffic congestion and pollution, longer journey times, safety concerns and the negative impact on small and large retailers as reasons why they would not support the continuation of the trial. Whilst they acknowledged steps were being taken to address the concerns of some residents they felt that there was still a large number who would be disadvantaged and felt that mitigation measures such as light synchronisation had high costs and a knock-on effect on other roads.
- Other Members agreed that the pollution issue had simply been shifted to other residential streets and traffic had been displaced. Rat runs had also been created, particularly around Rodney Road.
- Following a question from a Member the Legal officer confirmed that the decision to not have a public debate was only taken as part of the previous item on the agenda, it was therefore not completely off the table.

Members also made several recommendations, including:

- The possibility of holding a public meeting following the TRO committee meeting when more data would be available, County Council officers could be available to answer residents questions.
- Exploring what other cities such as Bath had done whereby certain streets were closed off during the core shopping hours but remain open the rest of the time.

A recorded vote having been requested and supported by Members. Each recommendation as outlined in the transport plan update report was put to the vote.

Vote on recommendation a) to note and support the positive economic and environmental impact of the CTP set out in Appendix 2

FOR (26) Cllrs Atherstone, Baker, Barrell, Boyes, Britter, Brownsteen, Clucas, Coleman, Collins, Dobie, Fisher, Harvey, Hay, Hegenbarth, Holliday, Horwood, Jeffries, Jordan, McKinlay, Parsons, Payne, Wheeler, Whyborn, Wilkinson, Williams, Willingham

AGAINST (7) Cllrs Babbage, Cooke, Harman, Mason, Savage, Seacome, Stennett

ABSTENTION (1) Cllr Sudbury

The recommendation was approved.

Vote on recommendation b) to note the Gloucestershire County Council Lead Cabinet Member Briefing findings and recommendations (Appendix c) to extend the CTP trial for a further period with mitigation measures; and

FOR (27) Cllrs Atherstone, Baker, Barrell, Boyes, Britter, Brownsteen, Clucas, Coleman, Collins, Dobie, Fisher, Harvey, Hay, Hegenbarth, Holliday, Horwood, Jeffries, Jordan, McKinlay, Parsons, Payne, Sudbury, Wheeler, Whyborn, Wilkinson, Williams, Willingham

ABSTENTIONS (7) Cllrs Babbage, Cooke, Harman, Mason, Savage, Seacome, Stennett

The recommendation was approved.

Vote on recommendation c) to recommend that Cabinet agrees to the extension of the CTP trial.

FOR (26) Cllrs Atherstone, Baker, Barrell, Boyes, Britter, Brownsteen, Clucas, Coleman, Collins, Dobie, Fisher, Harvey, Hay, Hegenbarth, Holliday, Horwood, Jeffries, Jordan, McKinlay, Parsons, Payne, Wheeler, Whyborn, Wilkinson, Williams, Willingham

AGAINST (8) Cllrs Babbage, Cooke, Harman, Mason, Savage, Seacome, Stennett, Sudbury

The recommendation was approved.

11. NOTICES OF MOTION

Proposed by: Councillor Clucas

Seconded by Councillor Horwood

1. That this Council, is mindful of the concerns expressed at the HCOSC meeting on 13th November in relation to General Surgery proposals put forward by Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNFT) Board. A special issue is the letter, signed by some 58 Senior Doctors at the GHNFT, and the effect of changes on the safety of patients from Cheltenham and elsewhere, who, Senior Doctors believe will be put at greater risk as a result of the changes proposed.

2. As the next meeting of the HCOSC Committee following the Special Council meeting is scheduled for 20th February, Council recognises the urgency in forwarding its concerns to that Committee. Council therefore requests the Leader of the Council to write to the Chair of that Committee in relation to the following matters:

3. To request, as was stated at the November 13th meeting, HCOSC to invite those Senior Doctors, 58 in number, who signed the letter to the Hospitals' Trust setting out their concerns in relation to the proposed changes, formally to the meeting on 20th Feb, so that their concerns may be aired and examined;

4. That in addition, the Leader request HCOSC to raise the following Issues and the following requests for scrutiny, formally with the Trust:

5. The 58 Senior Doctors' concerns in relation to patient safety;

6. To raise the statement that the Trust proposals are a 'Pilot' and can be reversed. However, reversibility will be very hard to be effected once the 'Pilot' is set in train. What is proposed is a 'Reconfiguration', which requires public consultation and proper and appropriate scrutiny;

7. To underline that the Trust undertook to examine all Options for change, yet there is clear evidence to show that they have not been properly assessed. This is particularly the case in relation to Option 4. The Trust is requested to state why it has not fully examined Option 4;

8. To raise the issue of serious bed shortages at Gloucestershire Royal Hospital. HCOSC is requested to ask the Trust for those shortages to be quantified and to examine how the shortages are to be met;

9. HCOSC is requested to examine the lack of professional supervision by Senior Doctors which will potentially occur if the proposals are accepted and consequent loss of support for Junior doctors, when Cheltenham's Surgical Registrar is withdrawn and the HCOSC is requested to examine the implications of such withdrawal;

10. HCOSC is requested to look at the impact of changes, including on the safety of patients, throughout Gloucestershire and in Worcestershire

(Gynaecological Cancers), Herefordshire (Urology and Gynaecological Cancers) and Wiltshire (Vascular Surgery), where those patients are treated in Cheltenham GH.

11. Council requests HCOSC to undertake the necessary work as a matter of urgency. The safety of Cheltenham residents - in fact of all Gloucestershire residents and those patients from surrounding counties - who are treated in Cheltenham will, Senior Doctors who wrote to the Hospitals' Trust believe, be at greater risk because of the proposals put forward;

12. Furthermore, HCOSC is requested to write formally to those Consultants and Senior Doctors who signed the letter to the GHNFT to invite them to express their concerns directly and freely to the Committee.

13. Further, that Cheltenham Overview and Scrutiny Committee is also requested to write formally to those 58 Senior Doctors, who signed the letter to the Hospitals' Trust, for them to share their concerns directly with Overview and Scrutiny, in relation to Cheltenham Residents and those from further afield, whose safety may be put at greater risk as a result of the changes proposed.

Following a question from a Member, Councillor Clucas confirmed that the senior doctors who had written to the Trust had concerns about their own employment future should they be asked questions without a formal invitation from HOSC. She explained that if they have been formally invited it offers them a level of protection in so far as their employment is concerned. She felt that of greatest concern from the proposals put forward by Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNFT) Board was the potential downgrade of Cheltenham to a day case hospital which posed a real risk to the public's safety given that it houses a major Oncology Centre. She explained that if no senior surgical medic was available at night to deal with emergencies patients would either have to wait for a consultant to arrive or be taken by ambulance to Gloucester Hospital.

Councillor Horwood, seconding the motion reiterated that as the next meeting of the HCOSC Committee following the Special Council meeting was scheduled for 20th February, there is a real urgency in the Council forwarding its concerns. He noted that it would mean that all gastrointestinal and colorectal surgery would be moved to Gloucester and so only day cases and planned short stay cases would be accepted in Cheltenham. He explained that whilst it was being presented as a pilot, it was on a large enough scale that it was dubious as to whether it is reversible and so looks to be a downgrade of Cheltenham hospital.

Councillor Babbage wished to place on record that he was happy to support the motion, however, he had concerns regarding emergency care.

Members noted that the potential changes could affect the whole future of how health care was provided in Cheltenham and could have a knock-on effect on the whole County given that Gloucester is already overstretched.

Councillor Clucas emphasised the importance of the motion receiving cross-party support.

Upon a vote the motion was CARRIED unanimously.

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

Bernard Fisher
Chairman