

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

TRAFFIC REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING – 16 December 2019

1. Klara Sudbury	Respondent:
<p>1) I have requested to address this committee meeting as one of the Gloucestershire County Councillors who has part of the area known as 'Boots Corner' and areas affected by displaced traffic in their division. This is important as highways is the responsibility of the County not Borough Council. Why is there is no agenda item for County Councillors to address the committee but there is for Borough Councillors who have no highways responsibility?</p>	<p>Anyone who wished to make representation to the TRC had to register their interest by the deadline of 4pm on Friday 6 December 2019.</p> <p>The reason that Cheltenham Borough Councillors are specifically mentioned is to accommodate that council's request that they speak as early in the process as possible so that they are able to attend the meeting of full council the same day.</p>
<p>2) At point 9.1 p. 33 it states that 'No formal responses were received from any other of the statutory consultees / GCC standard consultees regarding the Phase 4 Amendment ETROs'. As a County Cllr for part of the area known as Boots Corner and for other areas affected such as Rodney Road, St Luke's Road, St Luke's Place, College Road, Old Bath Road my formal representation sent via the online portal on Sunday 1st December should count as a representation from a standard consultee and published as such. I sent in other representations to the ETROs on behalf of my constituents via the online portal, by email to officers leading the ETROs and in discussions with them face to face, as well as raising my concerns in council meetings. Please can it be confirmed that my most recent representation as well as others sent for the ETROs were received and members of the TRC have had sight of them?</p>	<p>Your formal representation made on 1st December has been received and has been made available for inspection by TRC members along with all other formal representations.</p>
<p>3) At 3.7 of the report it states: 'The TRC met on the 15th January 2015 to take public comment and consider the proposed TROs. Following a day</p>	<p>The signal junction changes, whilst not part of the ETROs, facilitate them and signals are required here irrespective whether Phase 4 is implemented on a permanent basis to enable the two-</p>

<p>of public comment and considerable questioning of officers, TRC Members made the recommendation to confirm the TROs that made permanent changes to the Cheltenham inner-ring road, but to carry out the restricting of access at Boots Corner on an experimental basis through ETROs.’ In July 2015 (not June 2015 as it states in your meeting papers) the GCC Cabinet meeting agreed to Phases 1-3 of the Cheltenham Transport Plan being implemented as permanent changes with Phase 4 (area around Boots Corner) being four ETROs.</p> <p>The so called ‘amended’ part of the CTP ETROs – changes at Clarence Parade and Clarence Street which were implemented in June 2019 - were part of the package of measures agreed by GCC Cabinet at their meeting on 22nd July 2015; this is shown in blue at Appendix A of the papers for the July 22nd Cabinet meeting labelled ‘Junction works dependent on implementation of restrictions at Boots Corner.’ Given that the changes to Clarence Parade and Clarence Street junction had been part of the Cheltenham Transport Plan as agreed as part of the Phase 4 ETROs by both TRC and Cabinet in 2015, what was the reason for describing them as ‘amendments’ to the ETROs?</p>	<p>way working on Clarence Street and Clarence Parade. These changes help to mitigate concerns raised by some local businesses about access, e.g. by deliveries, as well as making it easier for car drivers to avoid passing through the bus gate at Boots Corner.</p>
<p>4) Since the Clarence Parade/Clarence Street junction changes were agreed in July 2015 by GCC Cabinet to take place when the Boots Corner changes were made, how credible is it to describe them as ‘amendments’ made to the ETROs in response to the formal comments made?</p>	<p>See response to question 3</p>
<p>5) What are the substantive differences between the ETROs as agreed by Cabinet in July 2015 and the ‘amendments’ to the ETROs that would enable any reasonable person to consider them sufficient to entirely reset the consultation process when they were implemented in June 2019?</p>	<p>In 2015 GCC’s Cabinet approved the principle of a trial using ETROs. It didn’t specify the detail of the ETROs as the report noted that they would likely be ‘new’ to work with and complement the first 3 phases.</p> <p>The decision to carry out another public consultation in June 2019 was taken in order to comply with legal requirements placed upon local authorities regarding ETROs. These state that an</p>

	<p>experimental order can stay in force for a maximum of 18 months while the effects are monitored and assessed. Changes can be made during the first 12 months of the experimental period to any of the restrictions if necessary. However if changes are made, as has happened in this case, a further formal 6-month consultation period is then required on the amended orders.</p>
<p>6) What was the justification for resetting the consultation process by finally implementing part of the ETROs that had been agreed by Cabinet in July 2015, particularly given that concerns raised about displaced traffic on St Luke's Road, St Luke's Place, College Road, Rodney Road, St George's Street, Ambrose Street, St James's Square were not dealt with in any way by the 'amendment'?</p>	<p>See response to Question 5: regarding legal procedures and requirements on local authorities.</p> <p>The amended ETRO consultation period has enabled further monitoring across the town to be undertaken to provide a more informed basis for decisions.</p>
<p>7) Consultation on the ETROs and amended ETROs have been captured using an online portal. Once submitted, how was the data recorded by this online portal and was it designed so that it was simple and not time consuming to create anonymised reports of representations?</p>	<p>The information provided to the portal was captured within the software's internal database. This was then exported for analysis. Some hard copy written enquiries were added into the portal manually.</p> <p>To anonymise the representations involves a manual process to read, identify and delete personal and personally identifiable data contained within the free text.</p>
<p>8) In what ways did the ETROs and 'amended' ETROs consultation pages explain clearly to all participants that to have their views considered when decisions were taken on the trial that they would need to tick the 'formal' comment box rather than the general comments box? If there was no explanation to participants about this difference how useful or valid is it to distinguish between the two types of representation when reporting on the responses received?</p>	<p>The web portal pages clearly stated the wording below. This was on the page before the user had to make a selection.</p> <p>Do you wish to make a general comment, enquiry or formal representation?</p> <p>A formal representation can be made to formally support all or elements of the scheme, object to all or elements of the scheme or to request additional elements.</p> <p>A general comment can alternatively be made, but would not be</p>

	<p>treated as part of the formal statutory legal process.</p> <p>An enquiry can also be made to ask a question.</p>
<p>9) Why were consultation responses made in response to the Cheltenham Transport Plan TROs published in the TRC meeting papers for January 2015 but the responses to the ETROs and amended ETROs not published for the TRC meeting of December 16th?</p>	<p>The representations have been made available to members of the TRC and elected members of GCC.</p> <p>Redacted formal responses to the original and amended ETROs will be published before the TRC meeting.</p>
<p>10) How were participants responding to the ETROs and 'amended' ETROs told that their responses would or would not be made public when the final decision was taken?</p>	<p>The web portal pages clearly stated the wording below on the information entry screen:</p> <p>In order for us to deal with your comments / enquiry we will need to capture your contact details. Your personal and contact details will not be published.</p>
<p>11) There were issues with the online portal which at times which meant people were worried that comments they had submitted in response to the ETROs had not been received. One way of ensuring all participants could have confidence that their submission had got through was by publishing redacted copies of all submissions. Having handled data for large surveys I know that if it is set up properly it is not a time-consuming exercise to anonymise responses. I am concerned to hear that GCC have not planned sufficiently to be able to anonymise all the ETROs and amended ETROs submissions so they can be published. What were the failings in the planning of this consultation which led to this?</p>	<p>All successful submissions were acknowledged in the portal with the final page stating:</p> <p>“Thank you for completing this survey. Your input is greatly appreciated.</p> <p>We will contact you in due course”.</p> <p>Submissions through the Portal were responded with a separate e-mail acknowledging receipt. This was not an automatic system, but was done manually when the information was taken from the Portal.</p> <p>Also see answer to question 9.</p>
<p>12) During what dates and times were there problems with the</p>	<p>There was a very short time at the start of the consultation on the amended ETROs when the portal was not functioning correctly</p>

<p>online portal that meant representations were not able to be submitted or were not received?</p>	<p>however this was addressed quickly.</p>
<p>13) How many complaints did GCC received about the online portal?</p>	<p>No formal complaints were received.</p>
<p>14) I understand that for periods of time people could submit comments without ticking either the formal or general comment box, how would these comments have been recorded by the portal?</p>	<p>A detailed explanation to this question was provided to you in November 2018. See below:</p> <p>E-mail responses to the CTP portal are generated separately once the data has been downloaded from the GCC website. We have had some delays in generating the e-mails due to staff availability. If people have pressed 'submit' on the portal and have seen the confirmation page, it will have been recorded and they will receive an initial e-mail acknowledgement.</p> <p>The CTP is a CBC sponsored project, which is being enabled in part by GCC, a partner authority. The GCC portal site has been used to provide a consistent, single point of contact for the project. The key objective of the use is to simplify the communication channel to improve the service for the public. Rather than people contact one of the two organisations only to be told to contact the other, they have a single contact point. Consequently, the portal is used for general enquiries, and to submit formal representations. The portal pages include text which set out the different categories prior to making a choice:</p> <p>A formal representation can be made to formally support all or elements of the scheme, object to all or elements of the scheme or to request additional elements.</p> <p>A general comment can alternatively be made, but would not be treated as part of the formal statutory legal process.</p> <p>An enquiry can also be made to ask a question</p>

	<p>We have been made aware that it is possible to progress without selecting a category, and have amended the webpage so that it is not possible to press the final submit button without selecting a category. The portal does record if someone has submitted without selecting a category. Since the start of the trial, we have received 16 responses which did not select a category. These have been reviewed and put into the appropriate category.</p>
<p>15) In response to a Freedom of Information request for redacted copies of all responses to the original ETRO in the summer (made by a member of the public), I understand GCC refused to publish this information as they said they were still using it to assess the amended ETROs. Contrary to this, people who had sent in comments to the ETROs had been told their responses would not be considered when the final decision was made and that they would have to write in again. Following an appeal to the FOI mentioned, when GCC were asked to provide this information, they responded by saying it would take too much time to 'find' the responses and then redact them.</p> <p>The number of responses in your papers has been reduced by a process of asking people to tick formal representation or general comment without explaining to them that their comments won't count unless it is a formal representation. In the public papers the responses have not been published except for a couple that are in favour. In what ways are these actions indicative of a fair and transparent decision-making process?</p>	<p>The Traffic Regulation Committee has had access to all formal representations submitted during the consultation on the original ETROs and during the consultation on the amended ETROs.</p> <p>Redacted formal responses to the original and amended ETROs will be published before the TRC meeting.</p>
<p>16) The brief description of concerns raised in formal representations omits any reference to detailed concerns I have raised via the online portal, in emails to GCC officers, in</p>	<p>The Traffic Regulation Committee site visit route specifically included St. Luke's Road and College Road. The concerns raised by Cllr Sudbury have been recorded on the portal and brought to</p>

person to GCC officers and at council meetings about issues relating to the impact of displaced traffic on St Luke's Road, St Luke's Place and College Road. I have raised many times the road safety issues being created by the last-minute left hand turn of vehicles turning into St Luke's Place to avoid queueing on St Luke's Road to get onto College Road. St Luke's Places is a very narrow street, with four properties facing directly onto the carriageway with no pavement or front gardens). Why is it not mentioned at all in this report? Did TRC members visit this location during your site visit? Are there plans to address these issues and if so when?

the TRC members' attention.

Traffic data has been collected along College Road as part of the CTP specific data collection exercise since November 2015. A total of 9 data collection points have been collected. Average 24-hour traffic volumes have increased by 8.1% over this time period. The DfT TEMPRO program forecasts background growth in Cheltenham of 4.4% between 2015 and 2018, indicating that there has been 3.7% additional traffic growth during this period. Given the proximity of Cheltenham General Hospital this additional traffic could be due to more than one factor.

In response to the concerns raised by Cllr Sudbury about St. Luke's Road and St. Luke Place, traffic counters were put in place in November 2018 and September 2019 during the wider traffic data collection exercise. These have shown no severe changes in traffic volumes, as shown below.

Summary	Average 24 hour 7 day flow	
	Nov-18	Sep-19
St. Luke's Road (one way section)	2899	2608
St. Luke's Road (two-way section)	2356	2419
St. Luke's Place (one-way)	484	401

17) In page 18 it says, 'A comprehensive network of survey sites within the town centre has been utilised across the CTP project'. A traffic monitor is on College Road but it is parallel to St Luke's Place so all south to north traffic moving through St Luke's Road, via St Luke's Place, then on to Bath Parade before turning left onto College Road completely avoids going past this monitor. How has the impact of displaced traffic on

See response to question 16 above.

<p>St Luke's Road and particularly St Luke's Place been monitored?</p>	
<p>18) How much money is left in the pot to create schemes to mitigate the impact of displaced traffic? How will it be decided how and where the money is spent?</p>	<p>In the current financial year work is in hand to provide a SCOOT link to coordinate traffic signals on the A4019 near the Brewery. Significant additional capital funding is in the draft budget for 2020/21 to refurbish signals on the A4019 and at the Gloucester Road/Alstone Lane junction. £50,000 has been allocated for other mitigation including works in Rodney Road.</p> <p>Decisions will be taken in accordance with the council's normal budget setting, decision making and consultation processes.</p> <p>These are GCC investments; other measures may be funded and delivered by CBC, which is the CTP scheme promoter.</p>
<p>19) Given the road safety issues in St Luke's, will the mitigation money be used to ameliorate the situation there? If not how can I as local County Councillor secure agreement and funds to improve the situation?</p>	<p>The Traffic Regulation Committee report includes an analysis of Personal Injury Collision (PIC) data before and after the commencement of the Boots Corner restriction. The data has been reviewed across the town centre.</p> <p>No Personal Injury Collisions have been reported in St. Luke's area. As noted in the response to Question 16, the traffic volumes in St. Luke's area have not significantly changed.</p> <p>All GCC members have a Highways Local budget with which to promote schemes in their division.</p>
<p>20) GCC officers are suggesting that a safety scheme for Rodney Road to deal with the increase traffic displaced from Boots Corner might possibly prohibit traffic. If that happens how will residents and businesses there access their properties? How will disabled drivers be able to get to Winchcombe Street?</p>	<p>Cllr Sudbury is aware that there are no proposals to prohibit traffic from Rodney Road.</p> <p>Through traffic has been raised as a concern in many of the formal representations so the council has developed proposals to reduce traffic speeds approaching the junction with the High Street.</p> <p>Access issues have been included as part of the design considerations and no material changes are envisioned.</p>

<p>21) If the 'amended' ETROs are made permanent how quickly will mitigation measures for Rodney Road take place?</p>	<p>A localised mitigation scheme is ready to be built in the fourth quarter of 2019/21 after local stakeholders have been engaged.</p>
<p>22) One of the stated reasons for the Cheltenham Transport Plan included in the meeting papers at p.10 is to 'Remove some of the existing frustrations – allow motorists to access car parks as they arrive into the town'. How will cars coming into town from the south via Montpellier or St George's Road get to Town Centre East or the CitiPark car park at John Lewis if Rodney Road is closed or made more difficult to use?</p>	<p>Cllr Sudbury is aware that there are no proposals to prohibit traffic from Rodney Road.</p>
<p>23) What traffic monitoring has been done on the section of the Promenade between junction with Crescent Terrace and Imperial Lane and what did it show? If none has been done why not? What is planned to help pedestrians cross The Promenade and Crescent Terrace which are now much more congested and unpleasant to be in as a pedestrian?</p>	<p>A large number of sites have been specifically monitored across the town for the CTP. As this requires a significant resource sites have been prioritised to places identified as most likely to experience changes in traffic and the council has monitored Personal Injury Collisions.</p> <p>The main approaches to the Promenade are from Royal Well Road and Clarence Street, both of which have experienced very large absolute reductions in traffic.</p> <p>There is good visibility between vehicle drivers and pedestrians crossing between the Municipal Offices and shops on the Promenade, including at the crossing point built opposite Ormond Terrace.</p>
<p>24) In the meeting papers it states that during the consultation on the original ETROs there were 775 formal representations made. During the period of the original ETROs how many of the following were submitted:</p> <p>a) Formal representations – broken down by opposing, supporting, neutral comments</p> <p>b) General or other comments – broken down by opposing, supporting, neutral comments</p>	<p>A summary of formal representations was published earlier this year after the consultation on the original ETRO's. The redacted formal responses will be published before the TRC meeting.</p>

<p>25) During the period of the 'amended' ETROs how many of the following were submitted:</p> <p>a) Formal representations – broken down by opposing, supporting, neutral comments</p> <p>b) General or other comments – broken down by opposing, supporting, neutral comments</p>	<p>A summary of formal representations made in response to the amended ETROs has been published in the TRC Report. Redacted formal responses will be published before the TRC meeting.</p>
<p>26) Please list the names of all roads, street or lanes that have been mentioned in any feedback sent in to the ETROs or 'amended' ETROs (in formal or any other representation) as places where people say congestion has increased?</p>	<p>This is not possible within the timeframe of the response period however Traffic Regulation Committee members have had access to the full text including road names of formal representations submitted during consultation on the original and amended ETROs.</p> <p>The extent of traffic monitoring carried out during the CTP is unprecedented for Gloucestershire. Its purpose is to provide the Traffic Regulation Committee with a robust evidence base from which to gauge the absolute and relative effects of the amended ETRO's on traffic levels and to inform its recommendation to Cabinet. This data has been published with the TRC papers.</p>
<p>27) How many businesses have sent in objections or raised concerns about the ETROs or 'amended' ETROs – either formally or informally in the 18 months since the trial began? What are the concerns raised by businesses (retail or other businesses) about the impact of the trial on their trade?</p>	<p>Please refer to the consultation summary in the TRC Report for the concerns and support raised by businesses.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the redacted formal representations to the original and amended ETRO consultations which will be published before the Traffic Regulation Committee meeting.</p>