Response to Member Questions   **Appendix 4**

The notes below cover questions asked and comments made:
- at the member seminar (including feedback forms) on 7th August 2019
- at the O&S meeting on 19th August 2019

together with responses and consequent changes to the 'Connecting Cheltenham' report.

Question / Comment	Response	Report change
Climate Emergency		
Need to give more emphasis to climate emergency, Cheltenham's aspirations have moved on significantly around climate change (several members made this point).	Agreed need for additional emphasis.	Emphasised CBC's agreement of a climate emergency (including referencing the Cabinet decision on 9th July), especially in the executive summary, also reference in 'targets'.
Funding the delivery of the strategy		
How can our vision be funded? Need to vigorously pursue sources of funding: - £150m GCC Roads Budget - Cheltenham's on-street parking revenue	Our strategy will support pursuit of funding.	Referenced the role of a coherent and integrated strategy in influencing partners and bidding for funds. Added to 'Roles and Responsibilities' in the Executive Summary.
In order to tackle climate change the cost to deliver infrastructure needs to be accepted.	Indicative costs of proposals set out in study	
The infrastructure will not be delivered without funding.	A clear integrated Cheltenham strategy will support funding bids, including the use of S106 and CIL funding. CBC doesn't have control of all relevant budgets	See above
S106 monies do not cross boundaries	For internal CBC discussion	
Scope (general)		
Not specific to Cheltenham, lack of understanding		Expanded the introduction to the

Question / Comment	Response	Report change
of the issues in Cheltenham, needs more Cheltenham examples.		executive summary to say more about Systra's approach. Some additional photos of Cheltenham added. The baseline report is focussed on and specific to Cheltenham as is the resultant strategy. Furthermore the approach taken to stakeholder engagement has ensured that we understand and the strategy reflects the local context and views.
Lack of detail in terms of how the proposed interchange and micro-exchanges would work, has Systra visited areas to see how these things would work in reality.		See above – especially detail in baseline report.
Doesn't consider lifestyle issues facing working parents	See comments elsewhere about affordability of cycling and public transport, also school travel planning.	
Need a stronger emphasis on safety from abuse / assault / mugging	Agreed need for additional emphasis.	Added comments to p34 – highway safety, so as not to just focus on 'accidents'; ditto p39 – health and wellbeing outcome; added comments to the 'liveable streets' section (from p 61)
Cheltenham needs to think about growth based upon the principles of sustainable development	Agreed	
No mention of powered two wheelers		Text added on p54
Need to embed principles with all partners	Agreed. Need for strong partnership working referenced.	

Question / Comment	Response	Report change
including GCC		
Don't find the terminology used meaningful – 'Cycle Cheltways', 'liveable streets'	Useful to have a brand. Accept that some people may need to be engaged in different ways.	
Gloucestershire County Council / LTP		
Have GCC been engaged throughout preparation of this strategy? What was their reaction to it?	GCC directly involved at Cabinet Member level and through involvement of officers in taking part in and reviewing the conclusions of the study. Targets have been designed to maximise consistency with GCC's. The concept of liveable streets is new to GCC, they will want to review speed limit proposals.	Text added to acknowledge the support of all stakeholders, including GCC, in the development of the strategy.
What are the timelines for the LTP?	CBC input has so far constructively challenged the approach to the LTP review, particularly its focus on cars and its limited time horizon. This has resulted in its extension to 2041. We understand the draft consultation document will be reviewed by GCC scrutiny and Cabinet before the end of the year.	
Data		
What is the average car journey distance in Cheltenham? There is a big opportunity to focus on reducing 'in-Cheltenham' car use.	Data not available – proportion of short travel to work car journeys is illustrated.	
What does 'travel to work' include? What % is travel to work of all journeys?	Travel to work data is based on individual's responses to census questions so reflects their interpretation of the phrase. National Travel Survey gives an indication of the proportion of TTW of all journeys. New technology is bringing new opportunities for sourcing data	TTW is defined in the introduction to Journeys to work on page 38 of the baseline. More text about the importance of TTW data added on page 38.
Hot spots (short journey car share) map – situation is likely to deteriorate given West Cheltenham development. Are hot spots linked to park &	Development is noted as a driver for change; we need a strategy to respond. Hot spots are linked to employment centres as the source	

Question / Comment	Response	Report change
ride/GCHQ/Kingsditch	data is Census travel to work data. Unlikely to be dominated by park and ride given short length of journeys.	
Walking and Slow Modes		
Biggest barrier to walking is safety in hours of darkness		See comments above on safety
Do slow modes include wheelchairs? Challenge is lack of dropped kerbs		Text added to 'liveable streets' (p67)
Does 'transport' include walking? Pavements are a particular problem for walking/wheelchair use.	Yes, all 'slow modes' included. Picked up within liveable streets principles. One of drivers for change is inclusivity – which means streets that work for those in wheelchairs, but also pushing prams, shopping trolleys etc. This means street design that enables inclusivity. Also includes thinking about blue badge holders and those who have to use public transport.	See above
Cycling		
Do not like 'Cycle Cheltways' label	See above comments on branding.	
Need to link into GCC cycling strategy - is there duplication. Need CBC/GCC to be aligned (several members made this point)	Agreed	
Cycle lanes and tracks need to be suitable, e.g. appropriately segregated. Concern about lack of ambition.	Guidance is available on good design of cycle lanes and tracks See p68 re ambition.	TfL cycle design guidance referenced in the strategy
Affordability and security of bikes - can we facilitate an affordable cycle hire network?	There may not be an economic case for cycle hire. We should target localities which need particular support	Cycle hire referenced on page 70
Cycling infrastructure isn't designed for speed	Opportunities to allow faster connections through good design. Anecdotally, segregated facilities in London don't seem to	

Question / Comment	Response	Report change
	hamper cycle speeds.	
There is more than 1 type of cyclist. Serious cyclists want to stay on the highway – though may depend on design, e.g. it's possible to give cycle lanes priority. Issue is on infrastructure where side streets / tree roots etc interfere.	Good quality of design is key.	TfL cycle design guidance referenced in the strategy
Drivers ignore bike lanes at junctions (e.g. PE Way junction with side roads)	Design and detailing are key – for example tightening up radii at side roads naturally slows turning traffic.	
Promote cycling to school	Via travel planning as covered within 'behaviour change'	
Missing cycle link between Charlton Kings and Leckhampton (raised at earlier events)	Systra don't see this as part of the Cycle Cheltways network. It would form part of the next tier down of cycle infrastructure which is not shown in detail in the strategy but covered within 'Liveable Streets'. The delivery of the strategy will require the Cycle Cheltways network to be identified in detail; and then developed. It will also require a long list of smaller more local cycle infrastructure projects to be developed. It is at this stage that this scheme may need to be identified as a named scheme.	
Cars		
Travel to work – thinking needs to incorporate parents taking children to school and then going on to work	School travel planning referenced within 'behaviour change'.	
A parking strategy needs to be part of this work and is part of the approach to sustainable transport. Need to disrupt commuter parking. Need to deal with people from outside Cheltenham coming into town.	Parking Strategy referenced	
PE Way – impacted by car traffic rather than HGVs	May require further research.	
Fix traffic light sequencing - currently doesn't	There is GCC funding for relevant projects in 20/21	

Question / Comment	Response	Report change
reinforce efficient movement on key routes.		
Unclear as to the need to reduce the speed limits along Shurdington Road and Up Hatherley Way as there were no obvious points at which it would be necessary to cross either of these lanes, except where crossing already existed.	The detail of exactly how speed limits are changed will go through further review and consultation but for these roads the issue is more about firstly the environment for walking and cycling along these routes and secondly because there needs to be consistency in how speed limits are set so that its easier for drivers to understand. In this case being clear that as soon as you enter the urban areas speed limits are lowered.	
Targets		
What is the logic behind the choice of targets?	Explained on p38	
Shouldn't we be targeting increased % share of walking?	A target of maintaining walking % needs to understood against a national context of declining walking %. Trying to keep targets simple.	Referenced national context on page 38
Vision zero targets are nonsense. (Split views of members on this issue – some felt a long term aspiration of zero is beneficial) Like measurable targets - are there targets that could also be applied for air quality and safety?	Look at wording – maybe distinguish targets from aspirations. Many cities around the world are committing to such targets.	Responded to this 'challenge', referencing the aspirational aspects
Strategic Connections		
Needs to reference Gloucester / Cheltenham mass transit (in addition to cycle links)		Strategic Connections (p60 and p87) amended to explain what Central Severn Vale means.
Have you looked at RTPI work and how it relates to 2nd and 3rd tier cities? This could have a significant impact on Cheltenham as people move away from major cities. Would be helpful to be looked at in terms of rail enhancements.	Not sure which publication is being referred to but we haven't referred to any specific publications other than TfL's London Cycle design guidance. This sounds like a macroeconomic report which looks at issues far wider than Cheltenham about population movements in the longer	

Question / Comment	Response	Report change
	term and the likely pressure for growth this means for places like Cheltenham. We have addressed the current growth context and set out transport principles that will allow Cheltenham to grow further. Within the scope of the current project no further document reviews are proposed.	
Timings of local trains do not work e.g. Ashchurch/Worcester. Service frequency and availability of stations within wider geography needs to improve.	Economic study being undertaken led by SLC rail	
Liveable Streets		
How have the characteristics of liveable streets been derived? Don't seem to mesh with practical concerns.	Characteristics derived from workshops. State of pavements / availability of dropped kerbs addressed in general comments about quality of public realm.	Seating and dropped kerbs referenced on p66
School streets need to be referenced - Cheltenham likely to be getting the first one in Gloucestershire	Can be included	We have already referred to community led projects as part of the liveable streets programmes. Added reference to school streets
Are 'home zones' included in liveable streets?		Reference to the home zone approach is made re quiet residential streets on page 63
New estates need footpaths, should be able to reject applications which don't provide them.	The need depends on the circumstances, there are examples where footpaths are not necessarily required. Design needs to be intelligent.	
Interchange and Public Transport		
Does interchange mean park and ride?	Not just P&R, it's an expansion of the concept to include all type of transfers between modes.	
Interchange in Charlton Kings has been removed from plans	We believe that based on the levels of traffic coming into Cheltenham from this route and the extent and frequency of	

Question / Comment	Response	Report change
	bus services it would be difficult to make a case for a Park and Interchange. The West of Cheltenham has significantly higher levels of traffic, growth and a greater density of high frequency services that already pass Park and Interchange Locations.	
Need to change buses in town centre and make radial journeys is a problem.	See p49	
Affordability is a big issue for families – given structure of public transport charges compared with private car.	See p49	Text added on page 49 to specifically reference family costs
Need to be thinking innovatively about the costs to users of public transport, Gottingen bus pricing used as an example		As above
Is the extension of Gloucestershire / Warwickshire railway included?	As a steam leisure railway it's unlikely to be hugely beneficial.	
Needs to be more connectivity at station (especially bus, cycling from different directions)	Agreed. See p51	
Behaviour Change		
Often we come up with a strategy, but on implementation not always the buy in, practicalities lead to protest.	Agree simple clear messages and repeat. Need to make sure buy-in in the first place - education needed Transport is controversial so will not be easy.	
There needs to be a change in public attitude if things are going to change	Proposals made on behaviour change. Infrastructural and behavioural change need to happen together.	
Seats have been removed from Up Hatherley pocket parks because residents don't want them outside their own homes.	See comments above re buy-in	
Hold events throughout Cheltenham	See 'Behaviour Change' suggestions	