

## Executive Director Report – 6 March 2024

Pre-submitted questions and written answers

### Cllr David Willingham

1. What level of support and co-operation is GCC getting from the Police to identify / share the identity of those who have caused damage to GCC highways infrastructure? E.g. are number plate / driver details recorded and shared with GCC as a matter of course? (If this isn't happening, has it been raised with members of the Police and Crime Panel to put pressure on the PCC?)

All highway gangs who attend road traffic collisions are aware of the need to record any damage to the highway and vehicle owner details where possible. Officers usually have good relationships with the police attending the scene and even if they do not attend, contact can be made with the police retrospectively to request these details.

2. Were details of the two taxi drivers, prosecuted following ITU work, forwarded to the relevant district licensing authority, and is the outcome of such referrals known?

GCC do not automatically contact the licensing authority in these instances as prosecution by the police should mean contact is made between the police and the licensing authority.

3. What is being done to make Road Safety Partnership (RSP) funding available to unparished areas, where there is no parish council to act as the community organisation leading the bids?

The Road Safety Partnership's Community Speedwatch programme can receive bids led by community groups, resident associations or local members acting as a community conduit in the absence of a town or parish council.

4. As mentioned at Council, the Police Operation SNAP seems to have had 100% NFA (No further action) rate in December 2023. What is the RSP doing to encourage the Police to do more with the submitted footage?

This was not an area within the remit of the Road Safety Partnership as it was a police led operation. Officers would always encourage individuals/communities/members to raise any particular issues directly with the police.

5. Are the MVO (moving vehicle offence) cameras, such as those on Alstone Croft, active yet, and if so what are the initial results looking like / if not, when will they be activated?

GCC applied for and had approved the ability to use the legislation for MVO and currently had four sites for enforcement that went live in December. It was a little too

early to see what impact the powers have had on the areas and the next challenge would be to see how this could be rolled out more widely.

6. When are post-implementation reviews of Cheltenham Zones Z12 (Westend) and Z14 (Railway) going to be undertaken?

There was no planned post-implementation review for Z12 or Z14 but members were encouraged to raise any particular nuances, challenges or individual changes that might be necessary with officers.

7. What liaison has Parking Enforcement had with CBC/GlosPol about joint and late-night working during the Cheltenham Festival?
  - a. Does the Council have any powers beyond issuing tickets, that can be deployed where high-value vehicles are parked illegally because the PCN is not a sufficiently high financial deterrent to the vehicle owners?

There is no specific individual engagement beyond the normal planning for the Cheltenham Festival. Parking enforcement and traffic management teams were all aware of the challenges this week brings and are entirely equipped to carry out enforcement at any time.

8. Can I get a commitment that all TROs funded by members from their Highways Local in the 21/22 municipal year will be fully delivered (order made, signs and lines *in situ*) before the commencement of the pre-election period for county council elections in 2025?

There has been a small number of TROs that have had to be reset because the two-year delivery deadline was missed. Officers were not aware of any other TROs from the 2021/22 programme that would not be delivered by 2024/25 but members were encouraged to make officers aware if this wasn't the case. The team should also be moving older TROs to higher priority in order to avoid missing the deadline again.

9. What is being done to ensure where GCC asks district LPAs for planning conditions or s106 agreements for things like parking restrictions, there is constructive partnership working to find viable and lawful solutions that work for both authorities and extant residents? (Cheltenham planning application 23/00625/FUL, being an example where further GCC work is needed to refute the applicant's parking data to secure either s106 or a planning condition to prevent future parking chaos)

GCC officers continued to work closely with district planning authorities and provide comment on planning applications where appropriate, as well as providing support to enforce on developers the legislative requirement for them to mitigate any adverse impacts of their developments.

10. How is GCC co-ordinating its waste campaigns with the district waste collection authorities, to ensure messages co-ordinate with districts and align with how waste collection is implemented locally?

The Gloucestershire Resource and Waste Partnership had a public engagement and communications group that met monthly. There are a number of quarterly campaigns planned, and all content and messages are reviewed by the Partnership to ensure a joined-up approach. Officers would be happy to provide more information this if required.

11. If the business case for traveller services provision is approved, is there sufficient capital budget to deliver it in the 24/25 budget, or would it need to be added to the 25/26 capital budget?

There had now been a budget provision approached of £254,000 for the next 4 years and officers would currently be working up where this spend would be allocated.

### **Cllr Roger Whyborn**

- 12.3.0 Where it says “GCC’s Cabinet approved the future (2023/24) expenditure on this project on 29th March 2023. The relevant Business Cases will be produced 2023/24 onwards”, can you confirm that following the announcement in the budget setting meeting, what actually will now go ahead over the next few months, and is that likely to recommend what is/are the preferred viable transport mode(s), and will the business case study what is/are the possible route(s)?

Officers advised that there was a cabinet report due to be considered at its next meeting on 15 May 2024 where further detail would be provided. The report will outline all future expenditure on the Mass Rapid Transport project for this coming financial year, it will seek to produce a Strategic Outline Business Case by autumn this year, and this will include viable options and routes for consideration.

- 13.3.0 “Cheltenham / Gloucester / Tewkesbury strategic local plan”: Six forms of housing development are put forward for consultation, ranging from urban extensions to building along transport corridors. Does the County have any views on this subject, and will it be inputting them to the consultation.

This local plan was currently out for public consultation with a deadline of 12 March 2024 for comments. The team at GCC were currently putting together a response to the plan and it was highly likely this would include concern for one of the development options, the rural dispersal option which officers did not feel was sustainable and would increase reliance on car-based journeys. Officers would ensure that future updates on this would be added to the Executive Director report and a copy of the full response could be provided on request.