

Cheltenham Development Task Force Board Meeting

61/13 (i)

Friday 26th July 2013 - 2.00pm – 4:00 pm
Pittville Room, Municipal offices, Cheltenham

Open Minutes of meeting

Present: Graham Garbutt (Independent Chair)
 Stephen Clarke
 Nigel Riglar
 Cllr Will Windsor-Clive
 Cllr Vernon Smith
 Cllr Rob Garnham
 Bernice Thomson
 Robert Duncan
 Michael Ratcliffe
 Cllr Steve Jordan
 Cllr Andrew McKinlay
 Ross Simmonds – sub for Andrew Vines
 Andrew Willetts

Other: Wilf Tomaney
 Howard Barber
 Martin Chandler
 Jeremy Williamson
 Richard Cornell
 Mark Sheldon
 David Roberts

No.	Item	Action
40/13	<p>Apologies: Andrew Vines, Simon Excell, Diane Savory, Chris Riley, Andrew Hieron, Amanda Lawson-Smith, Andrew North, Sarah Pullen, David Oldham and Dorian Wragg</p> <p>The Chair welcomed both Cllr Will Winsor-Clive & Cllr Vernon Smith as new member reps for GCC. GG also welcomed Ross Simmonds (English Heritage) who was subbing for Andrew Vines.</p>	
41/13	<p>Declarations of Interest – Cllr W-C, JW noted that they were sponsors for projects under item 46/13 GLTB</p>	
42/13	<p>Minutes of previous meeting.</p> <p>Page 3 (JCS) – Cllr SJ highlighted that in the first paragraph – ‘Cambridge Econometrics’ should read ‘Cambridge University based company’. Also ‘early September’ should be deleted from the second paragraph as it is when the Council meeting would be held.</p> <p>Page 4 (J10) – JW confirmed on behalf of AL-S that ‘JMP’ mentioned in the first paragraph were the Highways Agency’s consultant.</p> <p>Page 3 of confidential minutes (third line) - GG flagged up that the word ‘migration’ should read ‘mitigation’.</p> <p>Both sets of minutes were otherwise approved as accurate.</p>	

<p>43/13</p>	<p>Action Matrix and Matters Arising Items were either actioned, on the agenda or updated as follows:</p> <p>29/13 Junction Efficiency Trial JW had circulated a letter from Nigel Riglar, but queried whether references to changes in traffic flow (at the bottom of the first page under recommendation 6.1, referred to SCOOT – enabling junction lights to operate in a cohesive manner). To be queried outside meeting with GCC.</p> <p>RC noted he was looking to improve that stretch of traffic signals with S106 monies, including the section by Matalan and The Brewery, which would also improve linkages.</p> <p>30/13 LSTF JW thanked Rob Duncan for kindly volunteering to assist with the public consultation.</p> <p>In relation to the signage issue by Greggs raised previously by BT, the problem had subsequently been resolved.</p> <p>32/13 Royal Well development brief Noted as an outstanding action as JW/RS had not yet had an opportunity to meet.</p> <p>33/13 Communications sub group RS had kindly volunteered for 'Meet a Board Member'.</p> <p>There were no matters arising.</p>	<p>JW</p>
<p>44/13</p>	<p>Confirmation of confidentiality of items – agreed. Under this item the Chair raised the issue of publication of minutes, which had been raised as a question to Council the previous week. It was agreed backdated copies of the 'open minutes' were to be made available on the Task Force webpage.</p>	<p>JW</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Matters for Information</p>		

<p>45/13</p>	<p>Prior to the next item GG congratulated Diane Savory on the award of her OBE</p> <p>Local Enterprise Partnership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gloucestershire Infrastructure Investment Fund – GIIF JW provided an update on behalf of DS, highlighting that all focus was currently on the Growth Plan. Task & Finish Groups had been established on connectivity, skills and promotion. They were looking for support at all levels to assist with the preparation of the Growth Plan. The quality of the County submission would determine the level of funding to be awarded. A single big infrastructure project could have a significant impact on available funding as monies were no longer ring fenced into individual silos. Funding would be available March 2015, which would coincide with national elections. MR felt it was important that someone represented the Task Force in relation to the County Growth Plan. Cllr SJ confirmed that he was already involved, but not as representative for the Task Force. It was therefore agreed that RD and JW would offer to represent the Board. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail Pathfinder DS was now sitting on a Government ‘task and finish’ group for Retail. JW highlighted that the Task Force supported retail training (funded by High Street Innovation Fund) had been a success in Cheltenham and was being rolled out across the County as a model of good practice. 	
<p>46/13</p>	<p>Wider matters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint Core Strategy Cllr SJ confirmed that the focus was on producing an options document at strategic level for Council on 5th September, and that each Council would have its own meeting during that period. The next Steering Group would be on 1st August at which hopefully a draft document would be signed-off before going to Council. <p>In response to a query raised by SC as to how consultation on the Local Plan fitted into the overall process, Cllr SJ explained that consultation incorporated scoping of the Local Plan but that anything at or above strategic level was being lead by the preferred option. Finalising a Local Plan would follow-on directly.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Junction 10 In SE’s absence NR explained that a working group, being lead by Mike Dawson (Chief Executive at Tewkesbury BC) and LEP were taking forward preliminary work with local businesses to help determine a Business Case for development of a four-way junction but much more work was needed to complete that work. The repair works however would go ahead regardless. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gloucestershire Local Transport Body JW played 'a transformation ambition' presentation of the proposed new track development to Cheltenham Spa railway station, creating two new bay platforms and a covered station. The bid had focused upon delay issues, the ability to accommodate new IEP trains due in 2017 and also transformational change to the station, and connectivity linking to existing bus and cycle networks. The bid had been presented to the GLTB the previous Wednesday which Cllr VS chaired. It had been one of four successful projects put forward, all of which Cllr VS encouraged to be developed further as there was still opportunity for funding through the GLTB and Growth Plan. The GLTB had agreed to put the top four projects forward for final determination by 2015 and delivery 2019. JW confirmed the GLTB process was £3.3m of an overall funding requirement of c£19m. GG congratulated the team on the immense amount of work involved. 	
	<p>Cllr W-C declared an interest in this item but highlighted that the Cheltenham's bid had been presented very positively but disappointingly Network Rail said they had no money to support it. MR stressed how that was Network Rail's routine response to such issues, and we should therefore not be discouraged.</p> <p>In response to MC's query about anticipated timing for an approach to the Planning Team, NR believed that if Network rail indicated they wanted to pursue the project, then that would be the time to commence the consultation process with the Planners. JW confirmed that a meeting was arranged with Network rail and train operating companies on 27th August to look at potential funding streams, for the proposed scheme which falls entirely within Network rail's land ownership.</p> <p>MR raised the issue of Network rail offering to carry out initial consultancy design work. GG believed the timescale for overall planning of the work could be carried out within the 2015 delivery timescale Cllr VS had indicated.</p>	
	Matters for consideration	

47/13	<p>Financial Target Draft</p> <p>GG explained how the Business Plan previously agreed needed to be reflected in a financial plan which a working group (consisting of MS, Cllr RG, RD, JM and himself) were attempting to prioritise. Cllr RG confirmed however that he had not been at the meeting on 19th June.</p> <p>MS also explained how in the Autumn CBC's Capital Strategy would be brought forward and this information would feed into that process.</p> <p>GG highlighted that the £100k sum for Lower High Street was an earmarked sum (subject to stakeholder consultation) enabling significant resource for use in this part of the town centre.</p> <p>Cllr SJ queried those schemes GCC were responsible for being based on an agreed budget. JW highlighted that only one scheme (4b – West Promenade Phase 3) was being supplemented by CBC, for which Chris Riley was still to finalise costs. Delivery was taking longer than anticipated, but would be completed within two weeks.</p> <p>In response to RS's enquiry regarding Transport Plan related works, JW confirmed that some schemes under (2d) were LSTF funded and others by GCC, which also demonstrated the 'value for money' approach by CBC related top up.</p> <p>MS confirmed that there was still time to revisit the programme before a position statement was finalised in the Autumn.</p> <p>It was agreed that the schemes identified go forward in forthcoming budget discussions.</p>	
--------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

The public part of the meeting concluded at this point