

Cheltenham Development Task Force Board Meeting

Item 26/17(i)

Friday 20th January 2017 - 2.00pm – 5:00pm
Pittville Room, Municipal offices, Cheltenham

Open Minutes of meeting

Present: Stephen Clarke (co-Independent Chair)
Graham Garbutt
Cllr Paul Baker
Simon Excell
Michael Ratcliffe
Robert Duncan
Bernice Thomson
Rosalind Andrews
Tim Atkins
Ross Simmonds
Cllr Nigel Moor
Cllr Andrew McKinlay
Diane Savory
Joyce Clifford

Other: Jeremy Williamson
Cllr Steve Jordan
Cllr Chris Nelson
Rob Vale (sub for Fraser Reid)
Howard Barber
Mark Sheldon
David Roberts

No.	Item	Action
01/17	Apologies: Cllr Vernon Smith, Dorian Wragg, Jeff Brinley, Chris Riley, Mark Parker, Tracey Crews & Wilf Tomaney. As this was the last meeting before Wilf Tomaney retires on 10 th March JW asked that formal thanks be noted for the significant input Wilf had provided the Task Force with over a number of years.	
02/17	Declarations of Interest: 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.	
03/17	Minutes of previous meeting 21/10/16 <ul style="list-style-type: none">Open minutes – issues of accuracy: Page 4 item 78/16: GCC Parking Consultation update – Cllr SJordan to provide clarity around the context of his remarks for the record. The minutes were otherwise approved.Confidential minutes – recorded as accurate.	Cllr SJ

<p>04/17</p>	<p>Action Matrix and Matters Arising JCS - public consultation on Local Plan not anticipated before 6th February earliest. GCC Parking Consultation - letter sent to Cllr VSmith expressing concerns. 7th November CBC member working group meeting and also update tabled about engaging with the community over travel planning.</p>	
	<p>Cheltenham Spa Station – letter sent to GWR and response dated 01/11/16 circulated to Board members. The stakeholder group being convened by GWR would include County officers. JW/WT and Cllr SJordan would represent CBC on the stakeholder group.</p> <p>Cheltenham Transport Plan – a joint press release about the monitoring exercise that took place had been issued mid-November.</p> <p>All other items were either actioned or on the agenda for discussion.</p>	
<p>05/17</p>	<p>Confirmation of confidentiality of items As proposed.</p>	
	<p>Matters for information</p>	
<p>06/17</p>	<p>Wider matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheltenham BID update <p>CllrSJordan reported that discussions had taken place about public realm within the town centre which the BID was happy to take forward. Kevan Blackadder (MD for the BID) had taken part in the town centre walkabout arranged by Ilman Young Landscape Design that focused on town centre improvements. Feedback on market research would be covered under item 07/17.</p> <p>Three ambassadors for the BID had successfully been recruited and started on 3rd December. Initially they would be liaising with companies and talking with the public about the work of the BID.</p> <p>The BID was also engaging with the Tour of Britain event taking place in Cheltenham later in the year.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint Core Strategy <p>Cllr SJordan explained that Cheltenham BC and Gloucester CityC had now approved alterations but that Tewkesbury BC had concerns about including Twigworth as a proposed site for 1300 houses, so had not yet agreed their final allocation. As the JCS requires a collective process this situation had caused progress to be delayed.</p> <p>TBC members had been involved in a seminar regarding Twigworth the previous Friday noting concerns of local stakeholders and potentially reducing the allocation to 1000 properties. This may be sufficient to reintroduce Twigworth into the plan.</p> <p>TBC had also taken the decision not to retain the site at Ashchurch as part of its allocation; leading to a total shortfall in figures of circa 3000. These decisions would need endorsement by all 3 councils and an early review of how to address the deficit was anticipated.</p> <p>TBC would be reporting their recommendation to a special Council meeting on 31st January and Gloucester and Cheltenham would then consider the final decision for ratification or otherwise; support would lead to the next round – 6 weeks public consultation before feedback sent to the Inspector and the last stages of the examination in public.</p> <p>Cllr AMcKinlay highlighted that the Local Plan was currently under 6 week non-statutory consultation. The plan looked at housing sites, green space strategy and minor amendments to the urban boundary so could become a strategic plan should the JCS or any alternative plan not come to fruition, although there would be an impact on timeframes. RS emphasised the value of any responses being part of the statutory consultation process.</p>	
	<p>Cllr CNelson pointed out that no mention had been made of the traffic modelling position in relation to current proposals. SE confirmed having attended Tewkesbury BC's meeting and advised of the current position.</p> <p>The County's consultants were continuing to model growth on the existing model but the 2013 version would be ready within a couple of weeks so once growth had been agreed through the 3 JCS council meetings that data could be built into the 2013 model. SE was reliant on the consultants doing that work as soon as possible. Cllr NMoor noted that the Inspector's view of the overall growth proposal was not significant in terms of transport.</p> <p>MR noted a recent chamber NW Cheltenham presentation and was encouraged that Bloor Homes were taking on board previous criticisms around narrow roads and inadequate cycle paths in developments around NW Cheltenham</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth Fund 3 <p>DS explained that Government had delayed an announcement but that hopefully news would be positive.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J10, Large Local Major Transport Schemes (LLMTS), A46 <p>Noted JW to attend the next 'Junction 10 Group' meeting but also reported that the LLMTS bid to help trigger an 'all-ways junction' at J10 had not been successful. Highways England focus also on the A46 as a strategic route between Ashchurch and Coventry; GCC had arranged for JW & Cllr AMcKinlay to join that group too given proximity to J10.</p> <p>SE had received feedback from the DfT regarding J10 confirming over 50 bids had been received nationally but only 12 were successful. Gloucestershire's bid was around 13th so only just missed selection. SE proactively working with Mike Dawson at TBC and the HCA to hopefully fund the £1.2m J10 business case.</p>	<p>JW</p> <p>SE</p>
<p>07/17</p>	<p>Town Centre & Tourism research</p> <p>TA provided an informative update relating to work carried out jointly with Illman Young Landscape Design linking to the research procured through the Cheltenham BID and previous findings from the Council's Civic Pride initiative; now Development Task Force around the Place Strategy.</p> <p>Sue Illman of Illman Young Landscape Design had been instrumental in setting up a charrette of the town centre promoting thoughts around how Cheltenham could be.</p> <p>Key issues included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicles seem to dominate – no strategic public focal point – is there scope to reduce vehicular domination? • Quality of public realm – need to build on strategic concept through the Task Force. • Winchcombe Street (and others) could make great public spaces if fewer vehicles. • Boots Corner – proposed trial as part of the Transport Plan. • Lower High Street / St Mary's - several options around Children's Library – opportunity to open up zones of new small businesses. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal Offices – opportunity to create central focal point with potential to improve both the front and rear of the building. • A transect from Crescent Terrace to the Promenade identifies 18 lanes of traffic and 3 gyratory systems. Long Gardens historically very important but potential an opportunity to create a more significant focal point given Council's long term management. • Perception of Cheltenham visitors – survey versus reality seriously skewed – only 23% actually came in by car. • Opportunity to increase economic activity – by increasing visitor numbers and dwell times. • Town Centre Survey – procured by BID – profile reflects a lower percentage shop in Cheltenham than live here. • Visitor perception using promoter score of NPS = +1 - good news as more younger people than expected. Key message: nice place but no real identity – raising questions around how Cheltenham should be marketing itself? <p>Over time tourism and the promotion of Cheltenham had fallen away so TA now looking to reignite branding for Cheltenham & promote consistent marking messages that can be transposed into the Place Strategy. So key messages moving forward would be to build on greater ambition, quality, strong heritage and emerging outcomes.</p> <p>Cllr CNelson queried Gloucester's promoter score, whilst not known, RD believed was skewed by the World Rugby events during last year. TA stressed that Gloucester City put significant funding into Gloucester's tourism but as part of Cheltenham's Tourism Strategy he intended working together and having a co-ordinated overview to make the most of Gloucestershire.</p> <p>Some queries raised over the survey basis and TA to clarify the exact mechanism used to undertake and score responses in the survey.</p> <p>RS felt this piece of work had been needed for some time and whilst TA's presentation did not connect to the report it linked to the public realm, transport and place strategy and what sort of place Cheltenham is and how best to market that. In 2014 Historic England had looked at the contribution tourism and heritage made to the economy but did not feel Cheltenham was capitalising on domestic & international spend in the SW region (circa £1.8bn). He noted that Bath has a place strategy and had used it with other initiatives to secure funding.</p> <p>Actions: TA to bring a more detailed presentation to the next meeting about work done with Illman Young Landscape Design and how to build on that for the next stage of work.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">TA</p> <p style="text-align: center;">TA</p>
	Matters for consideration	
08/17	<p>Planning update Item deferred until next meeting.</p>	RA
	Confidential items	