

**COUNTY COUNCIL –15 February 2017
PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

<p>1. Questioner's name: Anna Mozol</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p>
<p>Will the Leader reaffirm his opposition to any building of any kind on the Clearwater Open Space in his Division? Furthermore will he commit to ensuring that Clearwater Drive is recognised as a legally protected public space before May this year?</p>	<p>Local residents will know that I am fully committed to public open space at Clearwater drive. I have been actively campaigning with residents on this since the initial announcement was made by the dioceses last year.</p> <p>One of the issues raised by residents has been what happened to the push to have the site designated as a Village Green, a process I believe you were involved in. I have received written confirmation from the parish council that the bid was never submitted to the county council and therefore was never considered. Due to changes in the law since that time, a village green application can no longer be considered while active planning uses are being pursued.</p>
<p>2. Questioner's name: Anna Mozol</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p>
<p>Can the Leader please confirm why only 80 surveys were sent out to Aspen Drive only, and did not include surrounding areas, i.e. Clearwater Drive (where the proposed school may be built), Deerhurst Place, Apperely Drive, Hasfield Road, and Pendock Close; surely these are the important areas?</p>	<p>The consultation relating to the proposed new free school at Clearwater Drive is being carried out by the school sponsor the Diocese of Gloucester Academy Trust. The Diocese devised their own plan to consult with local residents.</p> <p>According to the Dioceses it has undertaken the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was advertised on Radio Gloucestershire on 17 and 18 January • There is an article in the parish magazine of St James 'Around the Spire' • It was in the Citizen 15 January

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first delivery of leaflets was made to the following areas: Dunlin Close, The Causeway, Teal Close, Sandpiper Close, Clearwater Drive, Eldersfield Close, Aspen Drive and Acer Grove, Severnvale Drive was also leafleted as well as Mallard and Millers' Dyke.
3. Questioner's name: Anna Mozol	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
Can the Leader please advise me as to where the 106 money has gone which was allocated for play equipment of Clearwater Drive, and also that £30,000 was transferred from Green Farm to Clearwater Drive?	This is a city, rather than a county council issue. I'd suggest that Mrs Mozol might like to raise it with her city councillors, whose contact details are available on the city council website www.gloucester.gov.uk
4. Questioner's name: Anna Mozol	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
Can the Leader provide information on the take up of places for Primary Schools in Quedgeley 2016/2017, and also Secondary Schools in Quedgeley 2016/2017?	All 7 schools (Infant/junior/primary & secondary) in the Quedgeley Parish were full to capacity for September 2016 admissions.
5. Questioner's name: Anna Mozol	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
Will the Leader advise us of what activities the County Council will be organising to support the Festival of Learning 2017 which includes Adult Learners Week? Can he also confirm that Adult Education as well as Schools and Colleges will be expected to promote learning throughout the Festival of Learning in May and June this year?	GCC liaises with the organisers of Festival of Learning and will be promoting events organised in the county during the Festival by local colleges, private training providers, etc.

<p>6. Questioner's name: Gerald Hartley</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>Does Glos County Council accept that the adopted Waste Core Strategy's commitment to 60% recycling with a 70% aspiration, means that the contract with UBB needs to ensure that any such improvements do not cost GCC more in Waste Collection Authority credits than it would cost to have UBB continue to burn it?</p>	<p>GCC's residual waste contract has been specifically procured to support the County Council's aim of 70% recycling by 2030. This would make Gloucestershire one of the highest recycling areas in Europe.</p>
<p>7. Questioner's name: Gerald Hartley</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>Does Glos County Council now consider that making money from the sale or use of electricity generated from waste justifies abandoning recycling targets?</p>	<p>We aren't proposing to abandon recycling targets – Gloucestershire is pursuing ambitious recycling targets that would make us among the most successful recyclers in Europe.</p>
<p>8. Questioner's name: Dennis Parsons</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>I and residents of Albert Drive in Pittville in Cheltenham have been in correspondence with the Parking Team and have received assurances that finance will be available in 2017/18 to enable consultations to go ahead regarding a Traffic Regulation Order to bring about improved protection from inappropriate parking in Albert Drive and the approaches from Albert Road when the University of Gloucestershire Pittville Campus accepts nearly 800 students in September 2017 following construction of their student village.</p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member confirm that funding is included in the 2017/18 budget for this scheme? Will the Cabinet Member also give an indication of timescales and specifically the probability of the scheme, if approved, being in place for Fresher's Week 2017?</p>	<p>Funding for this scheme is included in the draft budget.</p> <p>I wouldn't want to talk about the timescale prior to any consultation taking place - in a legal process like this, it is particularly important not to have prejudged these issues in advance.</p>

9. Questioner's name: Dennis Parsons	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>I have been in correspondence with the Parking Team regarding parking in Albemarle Gate in Cheltenham where residents have expressed concerns that overflow parking during events at the Pittville Pump Rooms leads to cars parking in Albemarle Gate between Evesham Road and Saville Close making the sharp bend in the road at that point very dangerous. Can the Cabinet Member give any reassurance to local residents on the possibility of including consultation on introducing appropriate parking restrictions designed to reduce the risk of serious accidents there?</p>	<p>I am always happy to raise areas of concern with our road safety partnership to investigate.</p>
10. Questioner's name: Marcus Spencer	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>As residents of Market Street for fourteen years and who currently pay for a permit and visitors vouchers we will be hugely disadvantaged by the above proposed scheme.</p> <p>My working hours tend to be 8am to 6pm and it is often already difficult to park at 6pm. Should the suggested scheme go ahead including the four hour "shoppers parking", this essentially means anyone can, in theory, park in our street for free from the time of 4pm to 8pm in the evening blocking a space and not enabling me to park despite having paid for a permit. The suggestion is that it will just be shoppers parking there in the day is not realistic and may well include people going to the cinema or restaurants in town and worse still, perhaps people who refuse to purchase a permit but work only to 4pm therefore parking all night.</p> <p>The TRO report (Page 37) states:</p> <p><i>Market Street - The detail of the comments submitted indicates most objections were to the conversion of existing Permit Holder Parking spaces to shared use (allowing non-permit holders to park for 4hrs)</i></p> <p>This is a perfectly valid objection to which the report does not</p>	<p>We recognise that people in Market Street, Park Street and Great Western Road are concerned about being able to find parking near their homes in future. Currently there are some parking bays solely for the use of permit holders which are well used in the evenings but where spaces are available during the day. Most of the parking in these streets is not restricted and can be used by anyone. Under the new scheme all the spaces will be available to permit holders, however other motorists will be restricted to parking for no more than four hours.</p> <p>The underlying policy basis for this review is our Local Transport Plan. This sets out a parking strategy that supports economic activity, discourages long stay commuter parking in favour of more sustainable travel and recognises that parking zones are likely to be required in residential areas where there are conflicting needs. In practice this means that more restrictive parking controls, including parking charges, are found nearer the town centre and less restrictive ones are further out. In the new scheme a two hour restriction applies on New Street up to the bollards and a four hour restriction applies further from the town centre on Great Western Road, Market Street and Park Street.</p> <p>The process which the council has used to review parking here is no different to others which we have used in the town and has been independently scrutinised. It started in June 2015 with informal public</p>

<p>respond.</p> <p>Will the Cabinet member re-consider the decision to impose this scheme without local support, and force all residents to buy a permit and at the same time take away any benefit a resident only scheme offers"</p>	<p>consultation and concluded with formal statutory consultation last summer. The responses from this area were mixed with a wide range of preferred solutions suggested. In analysing the feedback we reviewed parking survey data and also took into consideration a residents' petition and sought the advice of local councillors before making a recommendation. Full details of this process are set out in the TRO Report published on the Council's consultation portal. Given the wide range of public preferences expressed during the consultation the decision to adopt a four hour waiting limit and shared use parking was considered to best accommodate these diverse views. Whilst we accept that some people will be concerned about the changes, the same types of parking restrictions have been applied successfully elsewhere in the town.</p> <p>I know that both Cllr Tim Harman and Alex Chalk have raised concerns about some aspects of the scheme, and we will keep working to see if there are ways to address those concerns.</p>
<p>11. Questioner's name: Fern Limbrick</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>The shared use permit parking scheme giving free parking for 4 hours is not suitable in our streets when we are so close to the town centre. In this entirely residential area, encouraging anything other than short term shared use will make the parking here much worse.</p> <p>With permit only and P&D (maximum 2 hours) being introduced in the very next road, Burton Street, less than a minutes walk from the middle of Market Street, and the 3 hours limit in Waitrose car park, shoppers etc. will soon see the advantage of the 'super cul-de-sac' of Market Street, Park Street and Great Western Road.</p> <p>Why is it considered appropriate to encourage free medium stay parking for 4 hours in our streets when it is considered demand will</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>

<p>be so high in the neighbouring street that charges are being introduced?</p>	
<p>12. Questioner's name: Sally-ann Rhodes</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review.</p> <p>I'm more than happy to pay for a permit for my one car, as I do now, but I'm totally against free parking for non- residents for 4 hours as it's difficult to get a space even now. Allowing non- paying non-residents to possibly park from 4pm till 12pm the following day is unacceptable .</p> <p>We are a 'super' cul-de-sac with only one access so it makes parking in other streets unreasonable and time consuming if we are forced to do so. Also, we are the last street before pay and display/town car parks are enforced so we'll attract a huge number of people who do not wish to pay for parking, it's unacceptable for us as permit-paying residents.</p> <p>The TRO report (Page 37) states: Market Street - The detail of the comments submitted indicates most objections were to the conversion of existing Permit Holder Parking spaces to shared use (allowing non-permit holders to park for 4hrs)</p> <p>This is a perfectly valid objection to which the report does not respond.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet member please explain how the needs of residents in this cul-de-sac are being safeguarded, in line with policy objectives, when competition for spaces may mean unreasonable travel distance via Gloucester Road to get to other streets, and any benefit from resident only permits is being lost?</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>

13. Questioner's name: Risa E-Collins	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Scheme</p> <p>The TRO report states</p> <p><i>'The waiting periods proposed for non-permit holders reflect the local context and requirements in each street. Close to the town centre, and in the most congested areas where residents most rely on on-street parking, a relatively short waiting period of 2 hrs is required to provide good accessibility.</i></p> <p>The Market Street, Park Street and Great Western Road cul-de-sac is close to the town centre, is in one of the most congested areas, and residents rely almost entirely on on-street parking. In spite of a 'full house' as regards meeting the criteria for a waiting period of 2 hours, a 4 hour free waiting period has been applied here, making our roads more attractive to non permit holders than the 2hr P & D and 3 hour limit in Waitrose, both very close by.</p> <p>Will the Council please tell me why this has happened, and agree to look again at the <u>detail</u> of the scheme and see if it can be changed to the more appropriate 2 hr free parking to give residents, who will pay for the scheme, a better chance to find a space near their homes?</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>
14. Questioner's name: Jenny Rooze	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>The problem for the residents in Market Street, Great Western Road and Park Street where there is <u>almost no off street parking</u> is not exclusively or even primarily commuter parking during the working day, but difficulty finding a space in the evening when <u>every</u> available space is needed for residents' vehicles.</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>

<p>This scheme will lead to the loss of spaces, and force residents to buy a permit to fund a scheme which will not benefit them, and is grossly unfair. This scheme will not make more spaces in the three roads that make up the 'super cul-de-sac' and having a permit is useless if spaces are not available.</p> <p>The access and egress only via Gloucester Road makes a mockery of concern shown by the council about unnecessary journeys, if residents are forced to seek spaces in other parts of the zone. There is no unrestricted parking anywhere within a reasonable distance of our homes, and the 'coralled' nature of our streets makes a case for a very specific solution, even including being omitted from this scheme until a better solution can be found.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please explain why the council parking team are unconcerned if there are more permits issued than spaces and what residents who do not have the luxury of off street parking are supposed to do in an area with no extra capacity?</p>	
<p>15. Questioner's name: Yasmin Wilson</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review.</p> <p>As a resident of Market Street who currently pays for a permit and visitors vouchers I will be greatly disadvantaged by this scheme. Not all residents in the existing resident only bays leave for work in the morning and return in the evening. There is considerable turnover during the day, and any empty spaces is in the large part due to low up-take, with most of the <u>eligible residents clearly not wanting to buy a permit</u>. We, along with all other residents, have difficulty finding a space after restrictions end at 5pm, and this scheme will mean the same difficulty during the day for possibly any 4 hour period up to 8pm.</p> <p>The TRO report (Page 37) states: <i>Market Street - The detail of the comments submitted indicates most</i></p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>

<p><i>objections were to the conversion of existing Permit Holder Parking spaces to shared use (allowing non-permit holders to park for 4hrs)</i></p> <p>I'm sure the Cabinet Member can see this is a perfectly understandable objection, given that the benefit permit holders now enjoy will be lost, so I ask:</p> <p>Why it was decided to have shared use, free for 4 hours throughout this cul-de-sac, and why some resident only bays were not retained, while still accommodating short term parking for visitors and shoppers, as in some other roads ?</p>	
<p>16. Questioner's name: John Cant</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>In response to residents' worry about the cap on visitors vouchers which will apply with this scheme, the 4 hour free parking was presented as a benefit to residents by giving flexibility for their visitors so they won't need to use purchased vouchers.</p> <p>The existing situation is far more visitor friendly in the unrestricted areas for longer stays, for example a day, over a week or a weekend. The 4 hour waiting will not make this any easier to manage, and any benefit from the removal of all day intruder parking is likely to be watered down by still allowing half day parking. A 2 hour waiting limit would still give access for a visit, and offer a better chance of finding a space as turnover would be quicker.</p> <p>We all have visitors but it is more important to retain reasonable access for residents to their homes.</p> <p>As the objective of the scheme was to remove long stay commuters, and improve access to short term parking for visitors and shoppers, why is this residential area close to the town centre designated as</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>

longer stay waiting of 4 hours?	
17. Questioner's name: Anne Brookes	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>In the TRO report the stated Policy background refers to obligations in the Local Transport Plan.</p> <p>It is the LTP objectives that this scheme relies on, aims to fulfill policy commitments to benefit short stay over long stay parking, to encourage shopping and support economic activity, discourage longer stay commuters, and the application of parking controls.</p> <p>However, within the LTP, there is also reference to the Resident Parking Policy (2010), which clearly lays out the criteria for a resident parking scheme to be considered.</p> <p>The policy states:</p> <p>All requests for a Residents Parking Scheme must be put forward by and fully supported by at least one County Councillor in the Division affected.</p> <p>A high proportion of residents surveyed within the scheme boundary (at least 70% of respondents) must support the introduction of permit controls for the scheme to go ahead with a minimum response of 50% of households within the area.</p> <p>It is very obvious that there is no regard to this policy in this scheme, it is just being imposed on residents as part of the policy to displace commuters, even in areas such as ours, where the report admits commuter parking is not significant, and with very little, if any, support.</p> <p>There will I'm sure be some clever reason why LTP trumps any</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>

<p>Resident Parking Policy, but I always believed that a permit scheme could not be implemented without support by residents, perhaps because they would be paying for it.</p> <p>So I ask the Cabinet Member why residents who would really like a resident parking scheme need to jump through numerous hoops and have an extremely high threshold of responses and support, yet the Council can impose this resident funded scheme on our area (Z12) when the response rate alone was under 10%?</p>	
<p>18. Questioner's name: Anne Brookes</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>The residents of Park Street submitted 2 petitions to the consultation on the Cheltenham West Parking Review, the second to the formal process, opposing the plans and wanting no paid permit scheme in their street.</p> <p>This is referred to in the TRO report thus: Page 51. 130. One petition was received signed by 51 individuals, representing 34 properties of Park Street, requesting Park Street be omitted from the proposed scheme (Zone 12) and the existing situation retained. This doesn't reflect the feedback received directly from that street, where more respondents supported the proposed scheme than opposed it.</p> <p>The actual direct responses from Park Street are 5 in support 5 support but with changes and 7 opposed. These are the only responses recorded for Park Street, and although the petition is mentioned and the request for no permit scheme rejected, the opposition was not recorded.</p> <p>Mr Daniels accepted the first petition at one of the 'events', and a second petition was submitted to the formal consultation. If the petition carried no weight, and their opposition to the scheme would not be counted, then the signatories should have been told.</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>

<p>Can the Cabinet member please tell these 51 residents why their views were not included in the analysis of responses on which the decision on this scheme was said to be made?</p>	
<p>19. Questioner's name: Alistair Randall</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Scheme - Zone 12 Westend</p> <p>I am in support of a permit scheme, but definitely not in support of allowing non permit holders to park for 4 hours. A shared scheme with 4 hour free parking is non-sensical and will create more problems than the scheme is promising to solve. The report says that the car parks in Cheltenham are underused, yet you are encouraging people to park for a fairly long period in residential streets where there is no off street parking. People who wish to park for 4 hours should use the car parks, rather than competing with residents, and the shared use space should be used for short term parking of no more than 2 hours. There is 3 hours parking at the nearby Waitrose, suitable for shoppers and visitors to the area, and I fail to see the thinking behind making the roads nearby available for a longer period. What can the Cabinet Member say to someone like me, who supported a permit scheme but not the waiting period, and now feel duped, as my views were not taken into account?</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>
<p>20. Questioner's name: Jeremy North</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Cheltenham West Parking Scheme - Westend Z12</p> <p>Residents in my area have no alternative but to park on the road and the single access through the very heavily congested Gloucester Road, makes this large 'super cul-de-sac' unsuitable to be included in the wider scheme. The 4 hour free parking will still allow half day parking and will attract shoppers forced out of streets slightly closer to the town, where charges are being introduced, meaning there is no advantage for residents, but a detriment to their pocket by being forced to buy a</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>

<p>permit. The distance to drive to access other, just as over capacity streets in zone 12, is unreasonable to seek a very scarce available space if none is available in Market Street, Park Street or Great Western Road. There is no available unrestricted parking anywhere in the surrounding area, and as the report states, unrestricted capacity for commuters displaced from this scheme can be found within 800m of the scheme boundary. I ask the Cabinet Member, is 800m (about half a mile) a reasonable distance for residents to be expected to park away from their homes if 'displaced' for possibly 4 hours or longer?</p>	
<p>21. Questioner's name: Kate Haigh</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou Gloucester City Council is proposing to half its funding of the City's advice services provided by the CAB and the Law Centre. These services support people with debt, threat of eviction and many other issues. What is the County Council doing to ensure these services, which it also supports financially, continue to be viable?</p>	<p>The County Council will continue to support the funding of the CAB and the Law Centre, despite the significant pressures on our budget.</p>
<p>22. Questioner's name: Nigel Wise</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Answering of correspondence - breaches of Council policy The Customer Care Policy at http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/customercare requires all officers to respond to emails within three working days. It continues that if it is not possible to answer the mail then a full response should be sent within 10 working days or at least the sender must be kept informed. In any event an automated response should also be sent informing the sender that the email has been received. In a matter concerning the Council's gross failures to comply with</p>	<p>The Commissioning Director has sent Mr Wise a letter explaining why his emails to an officer in the Parking team were not acknowledged or responded to in full within the timescales set out in the council's customer care policy. In both instances his emails were held up by our IT firewall. His first email was blocked and not delivered. Mr Wise has raised the main subject matter of these emails with the council on repeated occasions over the past year. Officers in several teams have spent a considerable amount of time corresponding with him. Mr Wise has been asked to only communicate with the Commissioning</p>

<p>prescribed parking enforcement procedure, the Parking Department has repeatedly and wrongly failed to respond to my emailed correspondence, not even acknowledging receipt of my emails. As the appointed, recognised and continuing representative of a motorist who received a number of improperly-issued penalty charge notices in Cheltenham where, among other things there were and remain manifestly-obvious noncompliances with parking signage legislation and the legislation on the processing of these PCN's, I emailed the Parking Department on 7th January 2017 setting out full details of the irregularities but received no response whatsoever.</p> <p>I emailed again on 24th January requesting a response to my unanswered email of the 7th January and quoted the Council's Customer Care Policy. Yet again no response has been provided. I have provided herewith copies of these emails attached to these questions.</p> <p>What steps will now be taken to cause officers of the Parking Department always to comply with the Council's Customer Care Policy in responding to customer correspondence and what steps will be taken to investigate any fuller extent of the misconduct in this respect reported by me?</p>	<p>Director and not to contact officers in the Parking team directly. If he is unhappy our complaints policy is set out on our web site.</p>
<p>23. Questioner's name: Nigel Wise</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Council punitive non-compliance with legislation in the processing of penalty charge notices.</p> <p>My unanswered email of 7th January 2017 to the Parking Department reported details of the unlawful processing of six PCN's issued by APCOA on behalf of the Council.</p> <p>What steps will now be taken to ensure that the processing of a set Penalty Charge Notices, being the subject of unanswered email correspondence and involving representations presented by me on behalf of the recipient, are properly revisited and conducted correctly for the first time fully in accordance with</p>	<p>This matter is covered in the letter which was sent to you yesterday, but the council maintains that it has acted legally and properly.</p>

relevant legislation?	
24. Questioner's name: Nigel Wise	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Enforcement of parking restrictions in Cheltenham</p> <p>The Council is fully aware of the extensively defective parking signage in Municipal Offices Road in Cheltenham. The gross unenforceable defects that do not comply with traffic signage Regulations past or present has been made known to the Council in full detail, via the Parking Department and otherwise, including bays that bear no resemblance to any form of lawful parking bay and some of which show no parking restriction whatsoever.</p> <p>The only restrictions in this entire road that are lawfully enforceable seem to be the short lengths of double yellow lines at each end of the road. The Parking Department has risibly claimed to the press that Municipal Offices Road signage is compliant with current Regulations.</p> <p>The several different restrictions in this road include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parking places along one side of the road with no upright sign plates stating any restriction, many road-marked with no resemblance in appearance or dimensions to any lawful parking bay. 2. Pay and display bays with upright signs having no resemblance to lawful P&D signs. 3. "No Parking" boxes on each side of the road outside the Municipal Offices that have no resemblance to restricted road markings. 4. A so-called "Mayor's Car" bay that is unknown to Regulations past or present. - all prohibited by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 <p>Will the Council please direct me to the separate specific parts of the provisions of Traffic Signs Regulations with which each of the restrictions in Municipal Road, Cheltenham is purported to</p>	<p>This matter has previously been raised by Mr Wise in a meeting with myself and officers and through the council's complaints process and Freedom of Information Requests.</p> <p>The Council is enforcing parking in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Order at this location and the Commissioning Director has responded to him to confirm this. There is nothing further to add.</p>

comply?	
25. Questioner's name: Nigel Wise	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Parking enforcement in Municipal Road, Cheltenham</p> <p>I informed the Council of the deficiencies in parking signage in this road early in July 2016. Despite these gross irregularities in the parking signage in this road that are known to the Council which, irrespective of the penalisation of visiting motorists, are in breach of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, penalty charge notices continue to be issued.</p> <p>When will the Council (a) cease and desist from parking enforcement in Municipal Road, Cheltenham pending the implementation of lawful parking signage, and (b) when will all of the existing gross signage defects there be corrected into compliance with the 1984 Act and current Regulations?</p>	<p>As explained in my response to question 24, the council is enforcing parking restrictions in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Order.</p>
26. Questioner's name: Nigel Wise	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>The unsatisfactory history of parking restrictions and enforcement in Municipal Road and elsewhere in Cheltenham, together with other irregularities in the Council's enforcement process, demonstrates that there is insufficient understanding of what is required to implement necessary corrections of the present situation. Two advisers with specialist parking regulation knowledge, and having experience in advising other enforcement authorities, both confirm that the current Gloucestershire situation is substantially inadequate in some respects, as also have independent parking adjudicator decisions.</p> <p>The Parking Department has recently claimed to the press that Municipal Offices Road signage is compliant with current Regulations, which it selfevidently is not. The Council's issuing of penalty charge notices that did not comply with the prescribed requirements of a penalty charge</p>	<p>As explained in my answer to the previous question, the Council's Commissioning Director has had significant correspondence with Mr Wise on this matter. There is nothing further to add.</p>

<p>notice, and the impermissible pre-judgement by APCOA of vehicle keepers' formal representations against penalty charge notices, that have both been found to be wrong and unlawful by parking adjudicators but ignored by the Council, were long ago reported by me but dismissed out of hand. However, unannounced, the Council has since corrected both of these major irregularities following my persistent complaints.</p> <p>When will the Council engage, presumably on an advisory basis, some parking specialist who has the requisite knowledge and experience to advise on the bringing of all aspects of the Council's parking restriction administration and enforcement into full compliance with parking legislation and other related laws so that it is not left, as it is at present, to members of the public to point out the breaches of legislation that have long persisted, including in respect of Municipal Road and elsewhere in Cheltenham?</p>	
<p>27. Questioner's name: Saadia Hall</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>Park Street is part of the "super-cul-de-sac" created by the placement of bollards in New Street immediately before Burton Street so that the only entry and exit point to and from Park and Market Streets with Great Western is at the beyond capacity end of Gloucester Road. This was achieved under Michael Smith of Cheltenham Borough Council in the late 1990's even though the residents of the area were resolutely against this scheme.</p> <p>Additionally, the majority of the residents of Park Street have several times stated that they do not wish to be part of the Permit Parking Scheme. Gloucestershire County Council began this most recent cycle of consultation the beginning of June 2015. During the meeting at Salem Church Hall, June 15, 2015, a petition</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>

was handed in to an officer of the council from the residents of Park Street. The petition stated, "we do not want the introduction of a fee paying residents scheme", and was signed by 46 residents. It was indicated that Park Street's view would be accepted. In the literature dated June 02, 2015, it was stated, "we will use your feedback to decide if a permit scheme or any other changes should be considered in your area". There was no indication in the information provided by the Council that the residents views would have no bearing on the decision forced on the residents.

In 2016, there was another approach from the Council regarding a Parking Permit Scheme for residents with time allotted free parking for vehicles of non-residents. Again the residents of Park Street rejected the proposal.

Burton Street which is the immediate parallel street to Park Street is to have a 2 hour metered paying Parking Scheme for non-residents with Residents Permit Parking. Park Street is to have a 4 hour free Parking Scheme for non-residents with Residents Permit Parking. Many residents of Burton Street and their visitors already use Park Street to park in rather than pay for Residents Parking or Visitors Parking (informally, Waitrose Car Park is also used). Since there are but a few metres that separate Burton Street and our "super-cul-de-sac", both areas are close to town centre. Residents may work regular or irregular, full-time or part-time hours, be retired or be chronically ill. If they return to their street and there is no available place to park because non-residents are more likely to avail themselves to free up to four hour parking than that up to free two hour parking, the resident, because of these and future assigned changes, will have to drive up to one and a half miles to commence to look for a parking spot within the designated parking zone.

If the existing parking on the pavement in Market Street comes into the Scheme, the area for residents Parking will be beyond capacity. I ask that if we must have this imposed upon us that the free visitors Parking be reduce to two hours and if not what other close by (less

<p>that a mile away), accessible parking for fee paying residents will be made?</p>	
<p>28. Questioner's name: R Dragojlovic</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>The petition from Park Street residents was overwhelmingly signed as against the proposed parking permit, which was NOT taken into consideration at any stage of this proposed parking permit and was totally ignored, why?</p> <p>A petition from 2002 for a similar parking scheme was taken into consideration against the proposed scheme and Park Street was excluded from the Parking permit scheme. A petition made in 2016, has even more residents signing against the proposed parking permit scheme and is not even considered but ignored.</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>
<p>29. Questioner's name: Gorana Amin</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>Why are officials involved in proposed parking permit scheme discriminating against individual residents inside one house or flat with more residents owning a car, limiting number of cars per household and discriminating against a second car (charging more) and limiting only to two cars per household and not being able to obtain parking permits for more than number available per household. I do not think this is legal. Is it?</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>
<p>30. Questioner's name: Sean Jenkins</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>Why officials involved in proposed parking permit scheme, are</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>

<p>presenting to residents incorrect information when replying. Park Street provided numbers supported by signatures. Officials reply with “more residents are for parking permit.....” or “lots of people contacting us asking for parking permit.....” Words like “more” and “lots” etc cannot be accepted as opposed to numbers and signatures (given from Park Street residents) and without back-up and proof from 100% surveys. This has not been done.</p> <p>Without number and proof, that is hiding the truth and bullying residents into submission.</p>	
<p>31. Questioner’s name: D Park</p>	<p>Respondent’s name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>Have other streets been offered the chance to “get rid of” the parking permit scheme?</p> <p>Do you (officials) have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of households which did not want to join the scheme which was introduced in their street/area. • Number of households which were asking for proposed scheme compering to number of households in their street/area <p>Please provide details with your reply.</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>
<p>32. Questioner’s name: A Brown</p>	<p>Respondent’s name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>Please can you provide details as to the destination of monies collected from the parking permit scheme and parking penalties?</p>	<p>By law, the council reinvests the surplus from parking in highways maintenance and transport, as it always has done.</p>

33. Questioner's name: Anne Brookes	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>When a scheme such as this goes ahead, regardless of the veracity of the evidence that has underpinned the decision, because the correct 'process' has been followed, what confidence can the public have in the elected members, unless they now request an independent review and amendment of the false conclusion drawn for this super cul-de-sac?.</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>