

**Cheltenham Development Task Force Board Meeting**

Item 03/17(i)

**Friday 21<sup>st</sup> October 2016 - 2.00pm – 4:30pm  
Pittville Room, Municipal offices, Cheltenham**

**Open Minutes of meeting**

**Present:** Stephen Clarke (sub for Independent Chair)  
Cllr Paul Baker  
Simon Excell  
Michael Ratcliffe  
Robert Duncan  
Bernice Thomson  
Rosalind Andrews  
Tim Atkins  
Ross Simmonds

**Other:** Jeremy Williamson  
Cllr Steve Jordan  
Cllr Chris Nelson  
Fraser Reid  
Tracey Crews  
Howard Barber  
Wilf Tomaney  
Steve Macpherson (Bloor Homes) – for item 80/16 (taken as the first item)

No.	Item	Action
71/16	<b>Apologies:</b> Graham Garbutt, Cllr Nigel Moor, Cllr Andrew McKinlay, Diane Savory, Dorian Wragg, Mark Parker, Mark Sheldon, Jeff Brinley, David Roberts, Martin Chandler, Chris Riley, Joyce Clifford, Cllr Vernon Smith and Mike Redman.	
72/16	<b>Declarations of Interest:</b> SE confirmed declaration of interest as sponsor of GLTB projects but noted that these were now managed as part of the growth fund by the LEP; also interest in relation to the TRO issues.	
73/16	<b>Minutes of previous meeting 15/07/16</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open minutes – issues of accuracy: Page 1 (those present) – Martin Chandler to be added. Pages 2 – JCS item (52/16), third sentence, delete “relation to the Highways Transport Section of”. Otherwise approved as accurate.</li> <li>• Confidential minutes – Page 3 fourth para under West Cheltenham item (59/16) – replace the word “Environment” for “Highways”. Otherwise approved as accurate.</li> </ul>	
74/16	<b>Action Matrix and Matters Arising</b> Item 54/16: GCC Parking board reinstatement. SE agreed to pick up this issue under item 78/16.  Item 58/16: Honeybourne Place – planning permission had been given consent two days previously. JW had spoken to Nick King (Formal Investments) who was grateful for the support received, and was planning to go out to tender as soon as possible.	

	<p>Item 60/16: Cheltenham Transport Plan – JW had written to Cllr VSmith with observations and actions being carried out.</p> <p>All other items were either actioned or on the agenda for discussion.</p>	
<b>75/16</b>	<p><b>Confirmation of confidentiality of items</b> As proposed.</p>	
	<b>Matters for information</b>	
<b>76/16</b>	<p><b>Wider matters:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cheltenham BID update</b> Cllr SJ explained that the BID Company formally came into existence on 1<sup>st</sup> August with Kevan Blackadder as BID Company Manager; a Company Operations Manager has also been recruited. Early goals include - developing an ambassador role to contribute to the work of the BID and the introduction of discounted travel for BID organisation staff with Stagecoach from 1<sup>st</sup> November 2016.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Joint Core Strategy</b> TC explained how the JCS had been ‘in examination’ for over a year but that it was now at the stage where issues were being narrowed down for final decisions to be made. A key issue for CBC had been an additional 5% increase to the figure of 35,000 new homes expected by the inspector; however CBC had concluded that the 35,000 would include the additional 5%. Capacity had been reduced through local modifications at North West Cheltenham which would now incorporate more local green space. The proposal for Leckhampton had got planning consent for highways infrastructure work only, not housing development. West Cheltenham allocation is for 45 hectares of employment land and c1000 new homes.</li> </ul> <p>CBC Council approved the JCS (32 to approve; 1 abstention and 1 against) with the key issues being transport, the strategic allocation for West Cheltenham and concerns around the process from safeguarded to allocation and the level of public engagement.</p> <p>Whilst employment was critical, transport remained a key issue so additional strategic modelling work, referred to as DS5 had been completed. This high level modelling identified potential requirement for a new road and key interventions at junctions, significantly for West Cheltenham. The new Saturn model would be available from the end of October so GCC’s consultants would run the model as soon as practicable – currently estimated during February 2017. Gloucester’s Council would meet on 24<sup>th</sup> October and Tewkesbury Borough on 25<sup>th</sup> October where political concern lay around the Twigworth site being included within the strategic allocation. If all 3 Councils approve the document it would be subject to public consultation until the New Year. TC noted that representation from the Task Force, on the strategic importance of the employment land and wider economic impact would be helpful, when public consultation begins.</p>	<b>JW</b>

	<p>SE reinforced that modelling to date had not resulted in any 'show stoppers' but that situation might change once more detailed modelling starts. A key issue to understand was the financial liability of having a new by-pass for West Cheltenham or a four-way junction at J10, as Bloor and Persimmon Homes were not prepared to help fund, as part of NW Cheltenham.</p> <p>Cllr CN queried GCC's confidence of the February 2017 target date for DS5 works giving history of slippage. SE stressed only consultants Amey could answer that question, but that he would put pressure upon them to deliver to scheduled timescales. MR queried how we could maintain the timescale and TC reinforced that Amey were clear about priorities. The JCS would be the first piece of modelling on the updated Saturn model.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Growth Fund 3</b></li> </ul> <p>JW explained that further information on this was likely in the Autumn Statement on 23<sup>rd</sup> November, gFirstLEP may well secure an advanced steer for Gloucestershire before this date. Further update at next meeting</p>	<b>DS</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cheltenham Plan</b></li> </ul> <p>TC stated that this would be considered by Cabinet on 8<sup>th</sup> November with the recommendation to go out to consultation in parallel with the JCS, so a media statement will be put out to avoid confusion. The Local Plan includes the local economic strategy for Cheltenham and safeguarding of sites. TC again noted that Task Force representation to the consultation would be helpful. The start date for consultation would be 21<sup>st</sup> November (a week after the JCS consultation commences) and would run into the New Year.</p>	<b>JW</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>J10 – Large Local Major Transport Schemes (LLMTS)</b></li> </ul> <p>SE reminded the Task Force that at the last meeting he had reported a £1M bid being submitted to Government on 28<sup>th</sup> July with an accompanying letter of support for an outline business case for an 'all-ways junction' at J10. The result of the bid was anticipated in the Autumn Statement on 23<sup>rd</sup> November. Persimmon Homes were not prepared to fund as part of their scheme, but if successful the £1m would pay for the study and contribute towards a £20m scheme. SE would report on progress at the next meeting.</p>	<b>SE</b>
<b>77/16</b>	<p><b>A40 Bus Lane</b></p> <p>Further to the presentation provided at the last Task Force meeting SE explained that the consultants were now finalising the business case for consideration by the LEP's Business Board for consideration on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2016.</p> <p>In response to a query by Cllr SJordan as to how this scheme fitted in with West Cheltenham's requirements SE explained that it was all part of an overall package, to be modelled by the new Saturn model. This potentially included a West Cheltenham bypass and improvements to the A40. However a specific scheme incorporating all that information and dialogue would be submitted to the LEP for separate consideration.</p>	

<b>78/16</b>	<p><b>GCC Parking Consultation update</b></p> <p>SE reminded the Board that there had been around 1,300 responses to the public consultation exercise and that a number of senior officer meetings had subsequently taken place to discuss findings. Although Cllr VSmith was not in attendance SE confirmed that both the Lead Parking Manager (Jim Daniels) and Cllr VSmith would be attending the local Car Parking Member Working Group meeting on 7th November.</p> <p>Cllr S Jordan stressed the importance of the Borough's input into the process noting that consultation with the local Ward Members whilst very welcome did not constitute adequate consultation with CBC. He welcomed GCC's subsequent agreement to a separate meeting to discuss CBC concerns which had also given an opportunity to raise concerns from businesses there had been inadequate consultation. He noted that while changes had been made to the scheme seeking to address issues raised he was not happy with the recent statement from GCC that CBC had approved the scheme since this is clearly the responsibility of GCC. RD objected on behalf of Cheltenham's Chamber of Commerce, as the letter received by the Chamber stated consultation with the Chamber had taken place, but it had not. He felt it was wrong of the County to implement the scheme without first further consulting with the business community / LEP and to look at possible alternatives as he was aware of two companies that might leave Cheltenham putting at risk c200 jobs. Cllr CNelson reinforced those comments and felt closer communications between the County and Borough were needed as well as further discussions around car parking.</p> <p>JW confirmed he &amp; Mike Redman had met with Jim Daniels &amp; his team to clearly flag the business community were unhappy with the process as they felt their arguments had not been heard. Having recognised that the challenge was one of commuter parking it seemed illogical to focus the consultation on residents rather than residents and businesses. Much greater engagement was required with the business community and JW offered to facilitate meetings in an effort to address that. Whilst LTP3 had an objective to reduce the impact of commuters on the town, it had a parallel objective to support modal shift by providing alternatives; this had not been a factor in the consultation. An obvious shortfall was that the Park &amp; Ride did not currently go to the station.</p> <p>The Chair felt better co-ordination was required to bring together a number of conflicting issues. MR requested the County to take a step back and review the situation, whilst Cllr SJordan's noted that this was where the reinstatement of the CBC/GCC parking board was necessary; this had been requested by members of the Borough's Car Parking Member Working Group, Chaired by Cllr AMcKinlay.</p> <p>SE felt the next Member Working Group meeting on 7th November should be the vehicle to take the matter forward and agreed to relay in advance the debate to Lead Officer Jim Daniels and Cabinet Member Cllr VSmith.</p>	<p><b>SE</b></p>
--------------	---	------------------

	<p>Cllr SJordan stressed that part of the problem was that the County had not yet presented back to the Member Working Group prior to the scheme being implemented. TA asked that the issue be picked up with the responsible officer and felt it would be helpful if a representative from the County could attend the Member Working Group meeting on 7th November.</p> <p>With the project in progress there was need to make representation to those implementing the scheme, and for the Board to write to Cllr VSmith the responsible Member.</p> <p><b>Agreed action:</b> JW would draft a letter for the chair to Cllr VSmith highlighting the issues.</p>	JW
79/16	<p><b>Cheltenham Spa station update</b></p> <p>A revised analysis and master plan had come to the Board back in February but nothing had happened since. Whilst money had been secured there was significant risk of losing £1.5m Growth Fund 2 funding. David Owen (gFirstLEP) had written to JW as the Task Force sponsor seeking an update. In response a letter had been drafted to Mark Hopwood (MD at GWR) under the signatures of the Leader of Council, MR for the Chamber and JW for the Task Force expressing discontent about progress of the scheme. GWR appeared under resourced to deal with this size project.</p> <p><b>Agreed action:</b> JW to draft letter on behalf of partners to GWR to express concern over lack of action.</p>	JW
	<b>Matters for consideration</b>	
80/16	<p><b>North West Cheltenham</b></p> <p>Steve Macpherson (SM) presented Bloor &amp; Persimmon Homes' current proposal for the Elms Park site – hard copy hand outs were circulated. The site had originally been identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy, and in turn as a strategic growth site in the JCS. A large number of local stakeholders as well as TBC had contributed to this work.</p> <p>It is one of the few areas in Cheltenham with potential to grow, and has the M5 corridor, railway line and Tewkesbury Road forming strong barriers to that part of town. GCC, Bloors and Persimmon were major land owners of the site of c600 acres. The proposal was in line with the JCS offering mixed use including affordable housing, a transport hub, new infrastructure facilities, employment and green infrastructure. With primary access off Tewkesbury Road the site had three arterial routes with new cycle and pedestrian accesses across the whole site. Density of the site was a consideration so as well as providing green infrastructure within the first phase of development, key land use was allocated for new sports facilities. 20kms of cycle paths, segregated from traffic were also planned through the site from Cheltenham to Tewkesbury and modal shift work with Stagecoach had been on-going for 6 years.</p> <p>Cllr SJordan noted this was the largest JCS site so delivery was key. He queried the latest modelling approach including a possible four-way junction 10 and a western by-pass; did Bloor's consider that a requirement? SM advised that J10 had not been modelled as part of the planning application.</p>	

	<p>The transport model used covered committed sites in the JCS; not west Cheltenham. If a further modelling exercise were required it could take up to 2 years as that area extended to 45 hectares. He was fearful of such a proposal as the impact on the local transport network would alter the dynamics significantly.</p> <p>MR stressed that the density of older housing developments was no longer acceptable. SM highlighted that feathering of the development beyond the Gallagher retail park would significantly reduce the density. In terms of a start date if planning is granted it was anticipated at the start of 2018 and would be a 5-10 development programme.</p> <p>Cllr PBaker queried Bloor's confidence to deliver 40% affordable housing; SM advised this was in response to tenure and the old shared ownership model would be an integral part of that during the first stages of development. If planning is granted it was therefore key to recognise the need to balance infrastructure costs during the first 5 years. If there is no flexibility and only a standard s106 approach is taken it would be difficult to deliver due to cash flow implications. TC stressed the magnitude of the scheme but that other national examples exist of where good practice and good principles work. A massive s106 was anticipated with the application which it was important to get right. Cllr SJordan recognised the fear factor that comes with this size and scale of development but believed both Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Borough Council members were well informed as to how those fears could be allayed. Cllr CNelson stressed the usefulness of additional information sessions taking place moving forwards.</p>	
	<b>Confidential items</b>	