

Cheltenham Development Task Force Board Meeting

Friday 12th October 2012 - 2.00pm – 4:00 pm
Pittville Room, Municipal offices, Cheltenham

Item 03/13 (i)

Open Minutes of meeting

Present: Graham Garbutt (Independent Chair)
Stephen Clarke
Cllr John Rawson (for Cllr Andrew McKinley)
Cllr Rob Garnham
Bernice Thomson
Dorian Wragg
Robert Duncan
Andrew Willets
Simon Excell (for Nigel Riglar)
Michael Ratcliffe

Other: Amanda Lawson-Smith
Wilf Tomaney
Howard Barber
Jeremy Williamson
Mark Sheldon
Chris Riley
David Roberts
Bryan Parsons

No.	Item	Action
69/12	Apologies: Cllr Steve Jordan, Cllr Chas Fellows, Nigel Riglar, Andrew Vines, Diane Savory, David Oldham, Andrew North, Sarah Pullen, Cllr Andrew McKinlay GG welcomed Bryan Parsons, Chris Riley and Cllr John Rawson to the meeting.	
70/12	Declarations of Interest Cllr RG declared an interest relating to JCS items.	
71/12	Minutes of previous meeting (13/07/12) – the minutes were approved for accuracy.	
72/12	Action Matrix and Matters Arising Items were either actioned, on the agenda or updated as follows: 47/12 Town centre co-ordination group – BT provided an update on recent activity. A meeting of the group including residents, church officials, tree and landscape officers, park ranger, HB, Police and Ubico was scheduled to take place in the Churchyard on 24/10/12 to scope out issues and potential solutions. After the meeting the group would look at what could be resourced and implemented. BT would give a presentation of their findings at the next Task Force meeting on 25/01/13. JW noted that he was scheduled to meet Rev Tudor Griffiths on 24/10/12. GG raised the troublesome issue of parking. BT believed there was a relatively cheap solution to the problem.	BT JW

	<p>33/12 (Task Force mtg 20/04/12) - M5 Junction 10 update – AL-S still awaiting sight of the Highways Agency report which the Minister plans to discuss with Lawrence Robertson MP and share with the County at the same time. Discussions would also take place about the bridge replacement works, to determine the duration of work and how it will be carried out to avoid long term road closure. Making J10 a full access junction was yet to be determined based upon a cost benefit calculation.</p> <p>55/12 Royal Well development brief - WT explained that revisions to the brief had gone to Cabinet the previous month and public consultation would start w/c 22/10/12 until 3/11/12. He anticipated a report going to Council by the beginning of February 2013.</p>	
73/12	Confirmation of confidentiality of items – agreed.	
	Matters for Information	
74/12	<p>GG explained that item 75/12 had been moved to item 74/12.</p> <p>Junction Efficiency Trial Chris Riley (CR) tabled details for the proposed experiment on St Margaret's Road scheduled for 29/10/12 for 3 weeks, explaining how the trial was primarily to do with the efficiency of traffic flow for vehicles travelling along St Margaret's Road. The County were committed to providing this traffic management work as best they could, but consultants for the scheme (Buchanans) were unable to support a trial which needed to cater for vulnerable users. The trial being run had therefore grown out of risks being analysed in a careful and considered way in consultation with various user groups.</p> <p>The final scheme temporarily removes traffic lights from the Dunnalley/Henrietta Street junction and Monson Avenue. The traffic lights at St George's Street would be left on to allow traffic coming out of that junction onto St Margaret's Road. It aims to avoid stop / start of traffic to improve flow and journey time, plus improvements to the air quality.</p> <p>The mitigation for vulnerable users would be a temporary 'on-demand' push-button crossing that would be installed outside the NCP car park. This would be the only controlled pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>Refuges will be placed in the centre of the road for pedestrians to use as crossing points and cyclists from Henrietta Street would be given the option to cross at the controlled crossing so long as they dismount.</p> <p>Platooning of vehicles makes a gap between traffic, which was the reason for leaving one crossing in. The trial will be monitored with CCTV cameras for the duration of the trial – 3 weeks if successful. Analysis of congestion incidents will take place, plus traffic surveys for the length of the trial.</p> <p>Cllr JR was grateful to Gloucestershire Highways for carrying out this work. He also highlighted the decision to introduce a temporary pedestrian crossing which was right in his view. He hoped that the trial would work as designed, but wouldn't be surprised if a compromise had to be reached.</p>	

	<p>CR explained that phasing of the lights was a way of intelligently managing traffic flows, but this technology was not operative at these junctions and may need to be considered in the future as a way of offering the most improvement.</p> <p>GG asked if other stretches might be looked at (ie Portland Street and Poole Way)? CR thought this possible if there was meaningful gain, having tested the principle. RD assumed the North Place junction would change as part of the North Place/Portland Street development. JW explained that a situation with no traffic lights had not been modelled to date , but that the trial would help inform that analysis.</p> <p>AW questioned if there would only be signs showing 20mph? CR explained that these were advisory speed limits only.</p> <p>GG questioned what the precedence would be for traffic coming down Dunnalloy Street wanting to turn right? CR would need to monitor that situation as 'give way' signs were not planned, but action would be taken if required. They were not required by law but if installed a whole raft of associated measures are required by DfT.</p> <p>GG raised the issue of publicity and JW confirmed that it was live that day in the Echo and anticipated feedback during the next couple of weeks but both Chris Riley and Owen Parry would manage media during the initial trial period. CR emphasised that Communications were being led by CBC with Gloucestershire Highways in support.</p> <p>Cllr RG questioned CR about the monitoring of junctions. CR explained that only those changing would be monitored on site.</p> <p>GG thanked CR and the County for their support in this matter and asked what the anticipated timescale would be for feedback on the report? Having analysed both data and feedback CR expected to have a report between Christmas and January 2013.</p> <p>RD assumed traffic arrangements would be left in place if the trial went well. CR explained that there was a daily cost for maintaining the trial from finite resource; therefore a scheme would not be implemented in 3 month's time, as there was no funding for anything further than a trial.</p> <p>CR to feedback results of trial and next stages to meeting on 25/01/13.</p>	CR
75/12	<p>Local Sustainable Transport Fund</p> <p>JW ran through a presentation that he and Chris Riley had used for the launch of the proposed network changes on 8th September. He highlighted the extremely helpful coverage provided by both the Echo and BBC and noted that very little negative feedback had been received to date which he attributed to two issues (i) that Boots Corner now seen as the prize not the process and (ii) that with Regent Arcade frontage on site, Brewery phase 2 approved and North Place in the wings there was now a clear logic for pursuing the</p>	

	<p>proposals. Key points were</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the north to south corridor of the town doesn't align like east to west so many of the network problems currently experienced stem from that. the historic 'viewing points' at the end of each road had resulted in lots of T-junctions for motorists, but that was part of Cheltenham's charm. The town's relationship with buses, stressing the Black & White bus terminus being the core hub for the whole country the St Margaret's Road impact upon historic layout in Civic pride consultations up to two thirds of consultees supported the project Based on traffic growth predictions, doing nothing was no longer an option. The Paramics traffic modelling had helped establish what impact development would have on those junctions and the network The role of the successful LSTF bid Changed behaviours (modal shift) were to be promoted The opportunity for 1000m² of important public space at Boots Corner Work was also being done to promote the use of bus maps and way finders <p>AL-S talked to paper previously circulated explaining how scheme proposals were progressing and resources being directed to delivery. Andrew Hieron had been nominated Project Manager for this scheme from 1st November, working alongside 2 project offices, all based at Shire Hall. Revenue and Capital spend was on target and £5m from the DfT was enabling evaluation of the scheme to be carried out. AL-S to invite Andrew Hieron to provide the Task Force with a presentation of the detailed design of Boots Corner and other junction changes at its next meeting on 25/01/13.</p> <p>A cycling officer (Lucy Flack) was now in post; working with schools in the LSTF target area to encourage cycling, and the National Star foundation had been commissioned until March 2015 to provide adult transport advice and training services, targeted at adults with mobility impairments. Also GCC would shortly be awarding a contract for the provision of personalised travel planning services to 20,000 households in Cheltenham.</p> <p>In January the County would be ready to launch details of the junction changes for formal consultation before traffic orders can be made. The 28 day consultation period would have to be moved back slightly, as it currently falls mid-purdah.</p> <p>Relating to Boots Corner, BT believed a 28 day consultation period was insufficient and wanted to know how best to advice constituents looking for more detail about the scheme. AL-S explained how full engineering drawings were anticipated by Christmas but that in practice there would be 3 consultation periods. The first being a 'soft' process which took place in September, the second starting in</p>	<p>AL-S /Andrew Hieron</p> <p>3:05 AW left</p> <p>AL-S</p>
--	---	--

	<p>January for 6 weeks led by GCC, and finally a formal 28 public consultation regarding the TRO's. A massive publicity event would be arranged through the Echo and display boards in the Regent Arcade.</p> <p>WT updated on the pedestrian signage strategy.</p> <p>Cllr RG asked that copies of the trial diagram be sent to both Cheltenham and County Councillors, and in response to his comments regarding the width of the road past the Racecourse having a negative impact on people cycling from Bishops Cleeve, AL-S confirmed that the LSTF work covered the corridors between Cheltenham and Bishops Cleeve, so that issue would be investigated.</p> <p>Regarding the junction alteration details shown under item 3 of the Cheltenham Transport Plan leaflet, GG raised the issue of exploring the full potential of shared space opportunities in the area of Boots Corner. AL-S explained that Glos Highways engineers would come up with suggestions of the space needed to successfully deliver the scheme which HB and WT would comment on. WT keen to establish a joint design team to ensure all spaces work well in urban design terms, and stressed the importance of having a close working relationship with the County in order to do so. HB stressed that having de-cluttered that area he didn't want to see clutter re-introduced as an open space. GG highlighted that essentially it should be considered as a large high quality pedestrian space through which buses travel and thanked everyone involved for the excellent progress thus far.</p>	<p>JW AL-S</p>
76/12	<p>Local Enterprise Partnership</p> <p>On DS' behalf JW updated on the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Gloucestershire Infrastructure Investment Fund (GIIF) – this had become a wider fund and includes the growing places fund. 7 expressions of interest had been received and 5 of these were being pursued. Next steps - a call for more detailed information prior to decisions from a specially convened investment panel to be chaired by Michael Tripp of Ecclesiastical Insurance. Target date for decisions prior to Christmas 2012. (ii) Retail pathfinder – Glos LEP were developing a brief for analytical work on behalf of BIS identifying key success factors for towns. JW noted that he had secured £5k from CBC Promoting Cheltenham Fund and would be working on joint promotions with Gloucester City Council. Other interest being shown in retail training organised through Town Centre Manager funded from High Street Innovations Fund. Additionally, an order for footfall cameras had been placed. (iii) Skills - GFirst had been cited as an exemplar nationally for its approach to the skills agenda by the Association of Colleges. (iv) JCS - currently working with local authorities and the economic data available to define growth requirements across Gloucestershire and specifically the joint core strategy area. (v) Infrastructure - working with Worcester and Swindon/Wilts LEPs 	

	<p>to lobby on key transport infrastructure issues - Nettleton Bottom, junction 10 all ways and the A46 North of Tewkesbury.</p> <p>(vi) JW also noted circulated document – Economic Vision for Gloucestershire 2022, which GG welcomed but also felt could have been made more specific and related more closely to Gloucestershire in terms of specific economic and other opportunities.</p>	
77/12	<p>Regeneration Strategy</p> <p>JW referred to document previously circulated which outlines the future regeneration model to be adopted in Gloucester following the demise of GHURC in March 2013. He noted that the model developed in Cheltenham was referred to in the document under governance board structures. GG felt the document understated the relative economic and other challenges in Gloucester compared to other places, but was otherwise good.</p>	
78/12	<p>Pedestrianised area of the Promenade</p> <p>Howard Barber presented his thinking on options for this area of the town.</p> <p>Promenade (link from medieval high street to Montpellier) – only pedestrianised space in front of Cavendish House, which in GG's view had a useful canopy. SC explained how there used to be similar canopies around the Colonnade at Boots Corner, also highlighting the canopy of trees in Cheltenham.</p> <p>Street activity – 3 street cafes, creating strong ambiance that mustn't be compromised. He also flagged up both seasonal markets, enticing people to use that space, and the promotion of balcony space above Waterstones which had been created during the 1920's by building the lower level forward. Boutique shops in that area were also seen as important.</p> <p>SC felt the area in the evenings felt a little dead. Cllr RG suggested more business could be promoted by shops staying open after normal working hours, which MR agreed to take up with Martin Quantock.</p> <p>HB also identified the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Busking - adds character • Sculpture – big draw from tourist perspective • Seating – well used • Trees – over 50% covering; positive contribution, adds character • Phone boxes – listed structures. 10 phone boxes in two blocks of 6 & 4 – presently not contributing positively, but possible future uses include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cash machines ▪ De-fibrillator (1st aid kit) ▪ Library ▪ Tourist information ▪ Power/water supply for seasonal markets <p>The Public Arts Panel have suggested further possibilities such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Display cabinets – local businesses ▪ Exhibition space for art installations 	MR

	<p>HB taking forward with BT and the Public Arts Panel.</p> <p>BT drew attention to an issue raised by the Town Centre Co-ordination Group about the smell of urine from the phone boxes outside Hufkins, and suggested sealing them off, though liked the idea of being made into power/water supply points for use during seasonal markets. WT felt if the abuse could be stopped there would be good reason to keep the boxes.</p> <p>Tree Pits – further to much research HB presented a number of images suggesting various solutions to the problems currently being faced.</p> <p>Space use – foot travel falls into 4 groups along the pedestrianised area of the Prom.</p> <p>Outcome: need systematic approach so any solution doesn't add to visual clutter in street, and uses low maintenance materials in a standardised way.</p> <p>RD questioned whether bollards were still required – as he felt the trees provided that restraint. JW noted that the bollards demarcated a zone capable of carrying heavy vehicles even on the York stone slabs, but WT/HB to investigate options</p> <p>Way forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • don't want more clutter • in 1950's raised beds used – demonstrated by several options of raised pits around trees, with low maintenance cover/seating suggestions <p>Looking for very high quality solution fit for next 50 years, using either concrete or stone.</p> <p>GG thanked HB for his informative presentation and asked that an update be provided as concepts evolve.</p>	<p>WT/HB</p> <p>HB</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------

The public part of the meeting concluded at this point