

Cheltenham Development Task Force Board Meeting

Item 49/16 (i)

Friday 15th April 2016 - 2.00pm – 4:30 pm
Pittville Room, Municipal offices, Cheltenham

Open Minutes of meeting

Present: Stephen Clarke (sub for Independent Chair)
Cllr Andrew McKinlay
Simon Excell
Robert Duncan
Bernice Thomson
Rosaline Andrews
Ross Simmonds
Dorian Wragg
Joyce Clifford

Other: Jeremy Williamson
Cllr Steve Jordan
Mike Redman
Scott Tompkins
David Roberts
Tracey Crews
Mark Parker
Hamish Macmillan & Steve Ardron (Blackrock)
Martin Quantock (BID Project Manager)

No.	Item	Action
23/16	Apologies: Graham Garbutt, Tim Atkins, Fraser Reid, Diane Savory, Cllr Chris Nelson, Cllr Nigel Moor, Cllr Vernon Smith, Michael Ratcliffe, Jeff Brinley and Chris Riley.	
24/16	Declarations of Interest: <ul style="list-style-type: none">SE confirmed declaration of interest as sponsor of GLTB projects (item 32/16); and also in relation to the TRO issues (item 35/16).	
25/16	Minutes of previous meeting 22/01/15 Open minutes – issues of accuracy below: Accuracy – SE confirmed he was no longer subbing for Nigel Riglar. Matters Arising – were picked up from the agenda.	
	Confidential minutes – approved as accurate. Matters Arising – were picked up from the agenda.	
26/16	Action Matrix and Matters Arising JW confirmed items were either actioned, or on the agenda. <ul style="list-style-type: none">Bath Square transformation project – following the meeting and thanks to joint action with the County LSTF and CBC community fund, sufficient funding had been found to allow the scheme to progress to the design stage.A40 Benhall bus lane – SE unable to update further at this stage due to the Saturn Model not yet being in place.	

27/16	<p>Confirmation of confidentiality of items As proposed.</p>	
Matters for information		
28/16	<p>BID update Martin Quantock, the BID Project Manager explained the process and timeline for the potential implementation of the Business Improvement District proposal currently being voted on by the businesses in Cheltenham.</p> <p>In early 2015 a feasibility study concluded that a large proportion of businesses would support the introduction of a BID. Since then major consultation had taken place helping to develop the draft Business Plan projects. The BID would be led by the businesses as levy payers and the proposed BID area would cover Montpellier, Promenade, High Street (from Sainsbury's on Bath Road to the Brewery at Henrietta Street). Of the 613 potential voters within that area, for a BID to be successful over 50% of votes cast must be in favour.</p> <p>The vote would be a postal ballot, and voting slips had already been distributed. Businesses have until – 5pm on 28th April to vote. The Electoral Reform Society had been contracted to both manage the voting process.</p> <p>If the BID is approved it would raise c£2.5M over the proposed 5 year budget period, to be spent on projects approved by businesses. Those businesses who vote no' will still be subject to the levy of 1.25% rateable value - discounted for those within the Regent Arcade and Brewery to 1%. The levy would go direct to the BID company and managed through Board of Directors. It will take three months to set up positions within the company, and then from the beginning of August projects would begin.</p> <p>The future of the Late Night Levy (LNL) was queried. MQ explained that the LNL would be taken over by the BID so those businesses currently paying the LNL would only pay the BID levy if implemented. BT noted the potential impact on some parts of Cheltenham if the LNL ceased as the BID was not town wide. MQ highlighted that the boundary of the BID could not be extended but that businesses outside the BID area could become voluntary members and thereby make a voluntary contribution. Cllr SJ believed that merging the LNL with the BID would make more money overall. He acknowledged BT's point and stressed the importance of looking at projects that did not just sit in the town centre.</p>	

<p>29/16</p>	<p>Wider matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint Core Strategy <p>TC reported the JCS was finally reaching a point of closure. Stage 3 of the examination concluded the previous week. Key issues currently :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • economic development - finalising information from the Business Sector and developing that into policy, and • issues concerning gypsies and travellers. <p>Some positive information had been released by the Inspector prior to her anticipated report at the end of May, in that she felt the plan was sound but there were some caveats regarding retail, ie: a strategic allocation should have been made for retail, and she did not support it sitting under the Local Plan. The Inspectors view about retail was that there should be no shift in the market share from Cheltenham to Gloucester, a view supported by the JCS authorities.</p> <p>Gypsies and travellers was a local issue and the plots needed to deliver this area has consequences for the council's strategic allocations. Officers won't know about green belt release until the Inspector delivers her findings. TC had reservations about the green belt release around J10 but would need to wait for the Inspector's findings to understand her view on a possible four-way junction at J10.</p> <p>Regarding site apportionment, the Inspector was looking for more sites in and around Winnycroft Farm (south Gloucestershire) but had removed North Churchdown and considering Twigworth. There was a need to go through a series of council meetings to initiate these proposed modifications, so reports were scheduled to go to Cabinet in May then Full Council in July before going back into the Examination prior to modifications being put through public consultation. A further agreement from Councils followed by a final consultation process would need to take place prior to the Inspector's final report and adoption of the JCS. In terms of timescales TC was aiming at the end of year but it would be dependent on what comes up at stage 4 of the Examination.</p> <p>For information Cllr SJ stated Council had approved the Community Infrastructure Levy which would go out for consultation assuming TBC and Gloucester City also had their respective district models approved.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEP Strategic Economic Plan <p>With DS absent JW provided a brief update on the £1.8B allocation of funding to all LEPS nationally. Cllr SJ explained that the latest tranche of funding had been announced in the budget, although not pro-rata so still in the process of preparing Gloucestershire's bids to go into the pot. In response to the Chair's query regarding funding for exemplar high streets, JW reported that the LEP recently secured some funding for project Maybe* to be pursued, which Cllr SJ confirmed CBC had also recently made a commitment to support.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J10 SE confirmed that funding had now been secured to implement a study and model of 4 ways traffic movement at J10, but that modelling for the project could not start until the summer when the Saturn modelling device would be ready. By then a plethora of other projects would need modelling but SE would ensure the J10 project had priority. SE also hoped that by then the Inspector's thoughts on the level of growth in that area would be known, which would help the modelling process. <p>A Government announcement had been made the previous day about each LEP being able to bid for funding a single large local transport scheme. At the confidential pre-launch SE attended it explained that each LEP would be able to apply for schemes that are too big for the local growth fund to deal with. Guidance on eligibility of schemes for the £32M bid opportunity for Gloucestershire meant a 4 ways movement of J10 could potentially be funded so the County were keep to work with the LEP to formulate a bid. Although bids had to be for single schemes only, it would have to be carried out in two phases, ie: initial funding would be allocated for development of the scheme, which would then be passed to the DfT who would determine if they would fund the whole scheme. Justification for the scheme being carried out would need incorporating within the initial bid.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheltenham Plan TC reported that her team's capacity was currently focused on the JCS as a priority, but that the Planning Liaison Group would be added to the Forward Plan. TC envisaged consultation on the Plan during early autumn. All the development policies would be under Part 2. <p>As previously mentioned, Council agreed the Community Infrastructure Levy on 1st April and TC was looking for it to go out to public consultation in late May and applying it to both residential and future out of town developments.</p>	
<p>30/16</p>	<p>Public Realm update and plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promenade phone boxes – had recently been reinstated. Electrical connections and other reinstatement works were still to be carried out. The Wilson was planning the first exhibition for 1st May on the history of Cheltenham as a Spa Town. • Minster alleyways – On 16th April a poetry 'walking workshop' would be held to create a poem about the Minster alleyways and the surrounding area which would be incorporated into the final public art. The event was organised by the Cheltenham Poet in Residence, Angela France. St Mary's Action Group, led by Cheltenham West End Partnership, had organised a number of workshops aiming to provide the public with the opportunity to contribute to the new pieces of public art which will feature along the three Minster alleyways. Arrangements for a poetry festival were in hand where poems would be read out and painted on the ground as pavement art. Plans for wall hangings were being prepared but the final design was not yet finished. BT had a meeting with those involved at the end of April to see what other ideas the artist David Mackie had designed. 	<p>3:10 MR left</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees in pots – Task Force were shown images of the planters placed along the High street. • A meeting with John Lewis Partnership had taken place the previous day and a definite funding gap (circa £500k) had been determined between what they expect and the council’s ability to pay. JW was keen to address the two sections Winchcombe Street to Rodney Road and then onto Cambray Place. As there may be a shortfall in funding he had put a bid in to the LEP from CBC with GCC’s support for just under £500k but wouldn’t know until the new growth fund is allocated whether the scheme would be prioritised. <p>RD raised the issue of the appalling state of The Strand. Although the John Lewis Partnership would be raising the tone of the area outside the Beechwood Arcade he stressed the need somehow to utilise the public realm agenda to improve the area he described as a disgrace to the town. Mention was also made of 459 High Street – a completely derelict property owned by GCC in the Lower High Street. SE reported that he was taking a report to Cabinet the following Wednesday regarding the property as part of the LTP3. RD stressed that the two ends of the High Street were dragging the whole town down.</p>	
<p>31/16</p>	<p>Social sustainable Cheltenham TC highlighted the partnership work with CBH and Bromford Housing Association. The issue was about all the social community elements that make place shaping work by supporting community stewardship to help them thrive. In this case it was about using north west Cheltenham as a pilot study. The idea was still in gestation but TC asked for any comments to be emailed to her during the next few days. The Chair queried whether the CIL would help fund the issue, TC explained that part of north west Cheltenham had been very successful but that the intention was to invest in some community work through S106’s. BT questioned whether Richard Gibson’s team had been involved in looking at partners with community engagement in terms of social housing tenants? TC explained that the Barnwood Trust had been involved and that it was very much about how registered providers could contribute to these developments moving forward. BT stressed that the social renting section was not just vulnerable people, so there would need to be a range of people involved in that work. TC was using ‘best practice’ and would be visiting Cranbrook (a large settlement on the edge of Exeter) during May to see whether the interventions Exeter are putting in place within a second phase of work are proving successful.</p>	<p>All</p>
<p>32/16</p>	<p>Cheltenham Spa Station JW confirmed having secured £700k which would fund the extra car parking spaces. It had now been made public that National Rail had secured that money. JW stressed that five out of five funding pots had been secured and that it was now important to get the scheme progressed and out for public consultation. JW to liaise with rail industry</p>	<p>JW</p>
<p>Matters for consideration</p>		

<p>33/16</p>	<p>Permitted development rights JW talked to the circulated paper noting that attempts to secure an Article 4 direction had been made but rejected by government. RD stressed that the way the market was moving meant that rents were being pushed up to a level where people were having to think about £20ft² which may negate the impact of permitted development. JW suggested using the Cheltenham Plan to help protect key employment sites eg St James's.</p>	
<p>34/16</p>	<p>Lower High Street BT reported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'pocket parks' had secured funding , one at the end of St Paul's Street South and one at end of Park Street. • The railings on St James' Square were planned to come out during the next few weeks which would be a physical and visual improvement. • Woody's vegetable stall had been moved from the Church entrance in to Henrietta Street car park. <p>Other positive news was that there had been someone interested in the derelict toilet block by the bowling green, and students from the University were developing a scheme to hopefully overcome parking issues in that area.</p> <p>BT had asked GCC to hold back on implementing parking restrictions by the railway whilst local parking issues were being assessed, but some elected councillors had overturned the decision to go out for a second round of public consultation regardless. BT noted that the parking issue would get worse if restrictions were to be put in on the south side of town, as those who live there aren't in permit areas. RD also stressed that if parking restrictions were brought in it would cause quite an issue for people trying to use the railway station. Cllr SJ felt there was no reason why public consultation couldn't go ahead, but not necessarily implement any changes until issues such as extra railway station parking delivered. BT queried the LTP3 one way scheme; SE understood the scheme was not part of the Cheltenham Transport Plan so was looking at it as being part of the JCS and modelling which would take place once the Saturn model was available.</p>	
<p>Confidential items</p>		