

## Cheltenham Development Task Force Board Meeting

Item 47/18

**Friday 20<sup>th</sup> April 2018 - 2.00pm – 4:30pm**  
**Pittville Room, Municipal offices, Cheltenham**

### Open Minutes of meeting

**Present:** Graham Garbutt (Independent Chair)  
Stephen Clarke  
Simon Excell  
Tim Atkins  
Cllr Andrew McKinlay  
Rosalind Andrews  
Bernice Thomson  
Robert Duncan  
Cllr Paul Baker  
Joyce Clifford  
Cllr Nigel Moor

**Other:** Cllr Steve Jordan  
Howard Barber  
Philip Williams

No.	Item	Action
21/18	<b>Apologies:</b> Michael Ratcliffe, Jeff Brinley, Rohan Torkildsen, Dorian Wragg, Mark Parker, Mark Sheldon, Cllr Tim Harman, Cllr Vernon Smith, Rob Vale, Diane Savory, Tracey Crews, Scott Tompkins, Fraser Reid & Jeremy Williamson.	
22/18	<b>Declarations of Interest:</b> SE confirmed declaration of interest as sponsor of growth fund projects managed by the LEP; also interest in relation to the TRO issues.	
23/18	<b>Minutes of previous meeting 19/01/18</b> Open minutes – approved as accurate except for minor amendment on page 1 (see below). Noted also were matters arising on page 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Page 1</b> – Apologies to include Rosalind Andrews who was not in attendance.</li><li>• <b>Page 2 – item 03/18: Lower High Street</b> – the Chair highlighted that the telephone box that was due to be removed by the end of January was thought to be still in situ.</li><li>• <b>Page 2 - item 03/18: Parking</b> – BT acknowledged the support provided by officers from the County's Parking &amp; Traffic teams with whom a couple of positive meetings had subsequently taken place.</li></ul>	
24/18	<b>Open minutes Action Matrix and Matters Arising</b> <b>03/18 Previous minutes: Lower High Street</b> – Dominic Stead (new Head of Property & Asset Management Resources) to liaise with HB over changing places facility at St Georges Square.  Other items were either on the agenda or actioned.	
25/18	<b>Confirmation of confidentiality of items</b> Agreed as proposed.	
	<b>Matters for information</b>	

26/18	<b>Wider matters:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cheltenham BID update</b> CllrSJ highlighted that the 'Light up Cheltenham' Event in February had been popular and would be run again next year.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Joint Core Strategy &amp; Cheltenham Local Plan</b> Post JCS adoption TA confirmed there being nothing of further significance to report.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Growth Fund 3</b> Confidentially TA had received positive feedback from GCC about the DfT's process &amp; needing to engage more-so to acquire local funding. A meeting with the DfT, GCC &amp; Glos LEP in early May would align discussions around the potential 'deretention' of the £22M. Presently the DfT was the accountable body and GCC were likely to be one also. The Risk &amp; Accountability sub-group would help determine responsibilities as well as mitigate risks moving forward and would roll on as an issue.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>J10</b> SE had previously briefed the Board about GCC's expression of interest of £249M for funding an 'all-ways' M5 J10, had been successfully shortlisted for the full amount. The bulk of the money would fund a Smart Motorway as well as an expanded Park &amp; Ride and Cyber Park. The next step identified by DfT senior managers was to produce an outline business case by November time for submission late 2018 / early 2019 to then progress with partners.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A417 consultation</b> SE reported that the consultation deadline had now concluded and that the Chamber of Commerce as well as the Borough Council had responded in support of the scheme. Government now had to analyse the response to this stage of consultation before further consulting on the preferred route. Cllr NM stated the timeline was to be on site by 2021 so putting the timeline in the consultation document was to his mind encouraging. RD was hopeful the final plan could change certain aspects of the scheme to improve the visual impact.</li> </ul>	
27/18	<b>Quadrangle update</b> Further to the presentation ABF Pension Fund provided on 19/01/18, TA confirmed planning permission had since been granted. Fund Manager, Kevin Seville had been positive about the support given by the Board for the scheme which was currently going through the judicial review period. The intention was to start on site in September 2018 for an approximate 12 month build. A number of conditions had been placed on the consent, but the project was progressing positively. The Vice Chair raised a query about potential linkages with the bar at the rear of the Town Hall. TA explained the intention was to make the two elements work together and would be picked-up by the business case for developing the Town Hall. Earlier that week he had meet with Mark Sheldon & Kevin Seville to discuss, but the issue was very much about funding.	
	<b>Matters for consideration</b>	

28/18	<p><b>Cheltenham Transport Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Outcomes of Phase 3 traffic monitoring</b>            SE stated that works in Royal Well Road had been completed in advance of Race Week and the last month of monitoring had concluded the scheme seemed to be working well with no adverse effects. As some reduction in traffic flows had been apparent there would be no delay with the experimental closure of Boots Corner going ahead as Phase 4 works in June 2018.         </li> <li> <b>Preparations for phase 4; Boots Corner</b>            Communications in place and FR concentrating on project starting in June 2018. Cllr AMcK asked for clarity about several proposed junction changes to the County's initial plans. SE would take away and provide a written position statement that would be copied to Board members for information.         </li> </ul> <p>SC suggested explanatory boards being erected during the Boots Corner experimental scheme implementation. Cllr AMcK highlighted that the £1.8M reported to be the cost of the scheme was actually the amount being spent on public realm improvements linking into the High Street. CllrSJ recalled that part of the £7.4M from North Place had been identified as financial contribution towards Boots Corner. CllrNM felt explanatory boarding similar to that produced for the Elmbridge roundabout works would work well and agreed to take forward at his next meeting on 23/04/18. Cllr AMcK stressed the need for all contributors of funding to be incorporated in that information.</p> <p>TA also suggested that the communications plan include dates when monitoring the trial would take place, to gauge success or otherwise of the scheme. Monitoring success was also about connecting the High Street together and enabling pedestrians to have greater dwell time and movement within the public realm. Engaging with businesses was thought to be a useful way of monitoring that shift in emphasis.</p> <p>HB suggested building a debate around public realm space; making it more appealing to pedestrians as part of trial. The Chair was willing to try anything to enable greater access to the High Street which he felt really important. In June HB was looking to set out the long term benefits of improved public realm which incorporated cycling and use of public transport to access those areas. CllrPB highlighted that the greatest experience was ultimately in the finished product, but felt discussions were needed with the MP to help drive the end-goal. SE stated a communications strategy was being produced &amp; would be issued in two weeks' time.</p>	<p>SE</p> <p>CllrNM</p>
29/18	<p><b>Cheltenham Local Plan</b></p> <p>TA confirmed the consultation process closed on 9<sup>th</sup> April, feedback from which was in the process of being summarised and sent to the Planning Inspectorate prior to an Inspector being appointed for the examination in public.</p>	

	<p>RD felt it unfortunate reference made to 'new sites' when in fact all old. SJ stated that the Local Plan identified non-strategic sites whether they already existed or not; whereas the JCS covered strategic sites. Both therefore created a total picture. Cllr AMcK added that officers were going through the 1,600 comments made during the consultation period to determine whether the plan goes to the Inspector as it stands, with no new land in Cheltenham but some new allocation land being re-badged which the plan actually states. The Chair stressed the importance of this issue in terms of County's economy.</p>	
30/18	<p><b>Cheltenham Spa station – progress update</b></p> <p>CllrSJ reported that a stakeholder meeting had taken place on 18/04/18 but Network Rail representative not in attendance. GWR still saying new trains would be phased in from June 2018 &amp; that a new hourly timetable to Paddington would be issued around the New Year. GWR dealing with disabled access but progress slower than anticipated. A £750k reduction in budget had impacted on the lift project; the status of which was still unclear. The decking option had also been taken out largely on cost grounds, so more of a bund now being built with only 78 car parking spaces; creating more space in the forecourt area.</p> <p>GWR's franchise would not last long enough to warrant the full £3.8M investment initially allocated so the extra cost of the project had been reduced to £2.9M; now signed off by the DfT. So going forward on a different basis than anticipated but would progress quicker as it now stands. PW explained that the footings for the revised car parking area had not been designed for a covering deck to be retro-fitted at a later stage. It was possible for a more rectangular decked car park to be built, but local residents in Kensington Avenue did not want to see a deck. RD had been invited to a meeting on 23/04/18 with GWR and Kensington Avenue residents to discuss various issues which would presumably include car park design.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> RA to check how the disability legislation applied to railway stations and particularly whether there was an obligation to upgrade the disabled access to the platforms at Cheltenham station as part of the other works.</p>	RA
31/18	<p><b>West Cheltenham Parking Restrictions</b></p> <p>PW explained the linkages between parking restrictions in West Cheltenham &amp; the station, culminating last August in a review of 6,000 households covering High Street to the railway bridge plus the Waitrose area down towards Lansdown &amp; the railway area. The review was done as a series of zones in &amp; around the town centre to manage parking demands, address concerns by residents about quality of life / parking needs as well as Traders' turn-over issues.</p> <p>Arup produced the strategy 18 months ago &amp; feedback from Members &amp; residents of all three areas had been positive. Still trying to address known issues within small pockets but experimental orders currently in place receiving mixed feedback. In railway zone some of long stay is discouraging but general rail use does not seem to be affected. Can see approx. 80 bikes parked up in the station each day &amp; before Christmas an increase in park &amp; ride so some evidence of modal shift.</p>	

	<p>Funding offered for yellow-lines around St Mark's / St Paul's to address obstructing driveways but could displace into Tivoli &amp; Hatherley Park but as yet no uniform view for parking in Tivoli. A number of parking surveys carried out in the station / Lansdown area where bays under-utilised &amp; about 15% of permits in those streets dependent on on-street parking; some off-street. Generally spare capacity between the station &amp; Lansdown Crescent. With 2.1 million passengers using the station looking how best to minimise problems during construction. Considering converting 4 hour limited waiting to 12 hours without residents' permits being compromised. Have also asked GWR / Stagecoach to look at providing interim transport systems that would assist during that time. PW to take back request for passenger info to be made available. Apps on iPhones needed to be complimentary to on-the-ground signage as parking key to supporting all sectors of the town and businesses in light of significant air quality directives and sustainable transport strategy. Digital parking would also enable offer of parking incentives.</p> <p>RD fed back criticisms from the Chamber of Commerce and felt the whole project had been badly handled and ill conceived. In his view the sort of issues being discussed should have been discussed before the scheme was implemented. BT expressed real concern about improved turnover for businesses and was particularly concerned that in the High Street / Waitrose area there had been no consultation. PW confirmed that every business on the County's marketing list had been sent correspondence but there was no way of knowing the correct people had received that information. BT had spoken with every business in Lower High Street; none of whom had seen that correspondence. TA was looking to commission a piece of work to manage all of the transportation issues Development Control needed to deal with.</p> <p>The Chair concluded discussion by affirming the message coming out of the debate about wanting car parking spaces to be released in order to address capacity issues as soon as possible.</p>	PW
32/18	<p><b>Place Strategy update</b></p> <p>TA confirmed approval of the strategy document by Council on 26/03/18 which made it a live adopted document to which projects were being aligned to achieve objectives. A number of key stakeholders would be working with the key ambitions and looking at steps to influence that through the Cyber Park &amp; Cheltenham's Transport Plan. A process had been set up to align those ambitions with the Corporate Plan which would demonstrate the importance of those issues to Council.</p>	
33/18	<p><b>Promenade – replacement bollards</b></p> <p>HB explained how the Tour of Britain had forced the temporary removal of bollards within the pedestrianised area in front of Cavendish House as 6 metres of clear space had to be allowed in that area of the Promenade. Clearly there was need to protect paving from emergency vehicles accessing that area, but rather use cast iron bollards he was looking to use easily dismantled street furniture that linked to raised tree pits, causing less disruption when accommodating similar events in future. The scheme would be funded from the small budget left over from the phone box project which carried a similar remit. This would uplift the quality of space in a sustainable way. Agreed.</p>	

<b>34/18</b>	<p><b>Quarterly update</b> A draft update had been tabled for approval. The Chair requested comments be sent to him by w/e 27<sup>th</sup> April.</p> <p>BT queried why the Comms sub-group had stopped meeting when the Editor role of the Echo ceased to exist. The Chair agreed to address with JW at the earliest opportunity. TA reported Marketing Cheltenham was now the mechanism to promote comms through and would be an opportunity to work together with comms related issues.</p>	<p><b>All</b></p> <p><b>GG/JW</b></p>
<b>35/18</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
	<p><b>Future meeting dates</b>  <b>To confirm date &amp; time of next meetings</b>  Friday 6<sup>th</sup> July 2018  Friday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2018  Friday 18<sup>th</sup> January 2019  Friday 12<sup>th</sup> April 2019  <b>All 2:00pm at the Municipal Offices, Cheltenham</b></p>	
	<b>Confidential items</b>	