

## CABINET – 23 November 2022

### PUBLIC QUESTIONS

<b>1. Questioner's name: Chris Chiswell</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Dave Norman</b>
<p><b>Agenda Item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy</b></p> <p>The proposed strategy sets priorities for education of vulnerable users, those walking, and those cycling. Why has the council not included a strategic priority on driver education, given this group has potential to cause greatest harm?</p>	<p>Education is a key aspect of our road safety strategy, and one where success requires effective multi-agency collaboration. Within Strategic themes 3 and 4, to improve safety for people walking and cycling, we have identified several education actions. These are not limited to the education of vulnerable road users but extend to driver education, reaching out to young drivers at schools and colleges, to older drivers and includes roads policing interventions such as Operation Close Pass (giving cyclists more space when overtaking).</p> <p>I am pleased to report that Gloucestershire Fire &amp; Rescue Service have recently appointed to a new Road Safety Education Officer post established in the 2022/23 budget. We are also fortunate to have in our police force officers who are at the forefront of national work to improve road safety in conjunction with insurers and other agencies. We have to work together to make our local roads safer.</p>
<b>2. Questioner's name: Chris Chiswell</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Dave Norman</b>
<p><b>Agenda Item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy</b></p> <p>The proposed strategy lists School Streets as a key intervention. However, at the recent School Street's scrutiny committee review, both the lead member and lead officer said they did not support their wider roll out. What is the council's actual position on school streets, and what is its level of ambition?</p>	<p>There are currently two school streets schemes in Gloucestershire, one in Tewkesbury and one in Cheltenham.</p> <p>The process of implementing, running and monitoring these schemes required considerable resources and was significantly affected by the disruption to travel and normal attendance patterns during the Covid lockdowns. Whilst both schemes have since been made permanent, we remain to be convinced that this is the most effective or practical approach to solving the challenges. That is why</p>

	<p>we have agreed to continue monitoring these sites to understand how sustainable and lasting the changes are, before we consider any further extension to the school streets approach in Gloucestershire.</p> <p>In the meantime, the council remains committed to tackling school gate congestion and supporting parents with measures to increase walking, cycling and scooting to school. This will improve the local environment for residents and help reduce carbon emissions under our Greener Gloucestershire programme.</p> <p>Resources permitting, we will also support other schools who have committed to School Travel Plans, as we believe that the school community are best placed to lead on changing behaviour through an active travel plan, and working with local champions and influencers.</p>
<p><b>3. Questioner's name: Chris Chiswell</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Dave Norman</b></p>
<p><b>Agenda Item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy</b></p> <p>The council received over 500 responses to its consultation, including many free text comments that are not presented anywhere in an entirely numeric consultation report (appendix B). However, despite this, the only change in the strategic priorities that the council has implemented is a minor wording amendment to ST1 to read review speed limits on 'A roads in Gloucester and Cheltenham', rather than 'those on hotspot list'. Given these minimal changes, how would the council evidence to citizens and community groups that the council is committed to coproduction, and that it is worth investing time in responding to consultations beyond popularity votes?</p>	<p>You are correct in that the consultation asked for free text comments to add to or supplement the responses from the member of the public. This was included specifically to help the team understand more detail and / or the context of the individual's replies and it also allowed an opportunity to learn from any areas of public feedback that might not as easily fit into the identified priorities that were consulted upon. This was done specifically to enhance the consultation and allow for additional changes or inclusions (into the final draft policy) that the consultation version might not have picked up; rather than anything to the contrary.</p> <p>The report is clear on those elements of public feedback that have specifically led to inclusions and improvements in the policy, predominantly in sections 80 and 81 of the report. However free text comments also provide insight into all of the more data focused</p>

	<p>responses; an obvious example being whether someone doesn't support an element of the policy because it is 'too ambitious' or 'not ambitious enough'.</p> <p>Appendix B (as you acknowledge) is a numerical representation of those responses rather than relisting the free text comments.</p>
<p><b>4. Questioner's name: Kevin Markey</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams</b></p>
<p><b>Agenda Item 8: Support to Refugees on the Homes for Ukraine (HFU) Scheme</b></p> <p>Equality Assessment</p> <p>Protected Characteristics Marriage and Civil Partnership</p> <p>Why is no data collected on this protected characteristic? Surely it would be good to do so to compare how effective Marriage &amp; Civil Partnership protection is against and if protection is needed.</p> <p>Is there any significant disadvantage faced by married &amp;/or civil couples compared to Solo people, Divorced &amp; widows or those couples who cohabit or are just "in a relationship"?</p>	<p>The Homes for Ukraine scheme is operated by central Government through the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC). Gloucestershire County Council's role is simply to administer the scheme locally on their behalf. As such, we rely on the data provided to us by DLUHC through the referral process. Until recently, data has not been collected on the marital status of the individual or family, and so we have not been able to analyse by this characteristic. However, this information has recently been added into the data being provided and we will therefore monitor this data going forward. Support is provided by a number of different organisations to both sponsors and guests on the scheme. This support is flexible and is tailored towards individual needs, regardless of how and why those needs arise.</p>
<p><b>5. Questioner's name: Kevin Markey</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Dave Norman</b></p>
<p><b>Agenda Item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy</b></p> <p>Is any consideration being given to parking on pavements and the dangers it causes by forcing wheelchair users Mothers with prams and child cyclists onto the road!?</p> <p>Also the effects of heavy vehicles parked on pavements causing structure damage to an area designed for pedestrians!?</p>	<p>Parking on pavements is something that currently falls to the Police to enforce and is one of the elements that we actively pick up with them through the Road Safety Partnership and through our own communications strategy.</p> <p>As you indicate, this has a benefit both from a road safety perspective (preventing people being forced into the road); from an</p>

<p>I give an example of a hearse fire only last year that caused much damage needing to be repaired to a pedestrian area on Cam high street!</p> <p>In addition a blind or visible impaired person coming against a land rover or vehicle parked on a pavement would be distressed and it leads to others following this bad example.</p> <p>Should a park and walk initiative be encouraged?</p>	<p>accessibility perspective (encouraging more cycling and walking and therefore decarbonisation) and also from a maintenance perspective (not only the surface damage but also the prevention of damage to the services under the Pavements).</p> <p>Whilst this doesn't form a specific element of this road safety policy, it is a issue that aligns with this policy; with our Local Transport Plan and our Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure plans and our wider approach to transport decarbonisation.</p>
<p><b>6. Questioner's name: Alick Miskin</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr David Gray</b></p>
<p><b>Agenda Item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy</b></p> <p>Given you're providing no budget or even plans to make walking and cycling safer in the Stroud District by improved LTN 1/20 compliant infrastructure, why are you insisting on ignoring pleas for a lower 20mph default speed limit wherever motorists and vulnerable road users mix and insisting on continuing the current long-winded and inefficient assessment process of each suggested local scheme using the outdated 2013 Dft Guidelines? Wales has done it, Oxfordshire is doing it, why is Gloucestershire so against any meaningful measures to support Active Travel?</p>	<p>Any of the infrastructure that is installed or proposed to support cycling and walking will consider the requirements of LTN1/20 and improvements within Stroud district are no different here. You may be aware of the Stroud Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan that the County Council has published as well as out proposals for the longer-term development for the cycle spine which proposes key connections within the Stroud area – both of which are published on our website.</p> <p>The policy sets out our approach to assessing and considering 20mph limits and this is consistent with the current national best practice. This doesn't advocate a 'blanket approach' to 20mph limits and does consider these requests where the approach and environment are appropriate – and of a base assessment here is to understand where vulnerable users mix. We will continue to work with DfT on their developing approaches and learn from others such as Wales and Oxfordshire, however I don't believe that their approaches necessarily represent a blanket approach either.</p>