

Cheltenham Development Task Force Board Meeting

Friday 13th July 2012 - 2.00pm – 4:00 pm
Pittville Room, Municipal offices, Cheltenham

Item 71/12 (i)

Open Minutes of meeting

Present: Graham Garbutt (Independent Chair)
Stephen Clarke
Cllr Andrew McKinley
Cllr Rob Garnham
Andrew North
Bernice Thomson
David Oldham
Robert Duncan
Andrew Willets
Sarah Pullen

Other: Cllr Steve Jordan
Amanda Lawson-Smith
Wilf Tomaney
Howard Barber
Jeremy Williamson
Mark Sheldon

G Garbutt opened the meeting by welcoming Andrew McKinley and Rob Garnham to the Board.

No.	Item	Action
44/12	Apologies: Cllr Chas Fellows, Cllr Antonia Noble, Nigel Riglar, Simon Excell, Andrew Vines, Diane Savory, Dorian wragg and Michael Ratcliffe	
45/12	Declarations of Interest As Borough Council Member representative, Cllr Rob Garnham declared a personal interest in relation to the JCS as he was promoting a site in Brockworth for a client. G Garbutt reminded the Task Force that in January 2013 the group would be three years old, and that this would be a good opportunity to review the core purpose and membership as representation from previous agencies such as the HCA and RDA had changed, and County representation was limited on this occasion therefore impacting on the Quorum. Members supported this proposal.	ALL
46/12	Minutes of previous meeting (20/04/12) – the minutes were approved for accuracy. Also under this item J Williamson had circulated for information as requested a letter from the Chair of the Gloucestershire LEP concerning response to the JCS consultation on the Preferred Options Document.	
47/12	Action Matrix and Matters Arising Items were either on the agenda or updated as follows: 26/12 Network Rail – meeting arranged in Swindon for 24/07/12. St Mary's Church – leaflet printed and tabled. St Mary's Church and	

	<p>B Thomson were disseminating the information within the leaflet. It was felt beneficial also to publicise through the media.</p>	<p>JW</p>
	<p>B Thomson confirmed having set up an action group from the Neighbourhood Co-ordination Team to look at what actions could be taken over and above litter and cleansing issues. The action group had broad membership which included local residents and they had carried out a visioning exercise based on the appearance of the Churchyard. A draft action plan has been pulled together with ideas such as seating (to discourage anti-social behaviour), improved signage, overshadowing trees, and unwelcoming alleyways. This would be forwarded to J Williamson for comment.</p> <p>J Williamson had met with Rev. Tudor Griffiths who confirmed that the Diocese was pleased to be associated with the leaflet. B Thomson reminded the group that Cllr Rawson had previously offered funding to do short term works such as painting alleyways, purchasing additional bins and getting existing bins moved. M Sheldon confirmed that £50k had been allocated for the St Mary's project from existing budgets.</p> <p>RD raised the issue of car parking within the area and B Thomson highlighted this as an issue for the Church also. A removable bollard had already been supplied by Glos Highways but was too heavy for use on a regular basis. J Williamson suggested W Tomaney could incorporate this issue as part of the landscape improvement works being planned, to minimise parking in the churchyard itself.</p> <p>Cllr Jordan mentioned how a bid for Church bells had been discussed at Cabinet recently; however B Thomson confirmed that she was only focussed on external elements such as up-lighters and trees. A North likewise mentioned potential churchyard funding being sourced from a scheme to aid development in the South West but was aware that GCC owned some of the land in question which may complicate the issue, but suggested a design strategy maybe helpful.</p> <p>J Williamson confirmed having spoken with GCC who had shown initial interest which he would pursue.</p> <p>28/12 LEP update. A joint LEP/JCS workshop had taken place on 21/06/12.</p> <p>32/12 Footfall cameras. Funds approved via High Street Innovation Fund; order now raised.</p> <p>33/12 M5 Junction 10. AL-Smith explained that a liaison meeting had taken place the previous week, confirming that a full report was due by the end of July. The Highways Agency would initially share the outcome with Laurence Robertson, MP for Tewkesbury prior to GCC.</p> <p>R Duncan questioned whether the Joint Core Strategy had any input? AL-Smith believed consideration would be given to estimated figures for housing and employment and for traffic modelling. G Garbutt asked if it would be best to wait until the JCS conclusions had been announced since these could influence road traffic requirements,</p>	<p>BT/JW</p>

	<p>including possible employment developments .</p> <p>AL-Smith explained that the decision would be taken in advance of the JCS being finalised but that a traffic model scenario would be run of Junction 10 based on figures from the housing options report. GCC hoped to see the report by August and would interrogate the assumed details before the Districts are notified.</p> <p>G Garbutt asked AL-S to take back concerns and level of interest from the Task Force as the chosen option could solve a lot of demands in the JCS. J Williamson would explore the topic at his meeting with Laurence Robertson MP the following week.</p> <p>39/12 Risk & Accountabilities Group. Having lost representation via Tony Bray of the RDA, the Director of Finance & Risk at Endsleigh - Jeff Brimley had agreed to join the group.</p>	
48/12	Confirmation of confidentiality of items – agreed.	
49/12	<p>Local Enterprise Partnership On DS' behalf JW updated on the following items:</p> <p>(i) Growing Places fund – LEP had developed a prioritisation matrix and would shortly be seeking bids for infrastructure support through revolving fund.</p> <p>(ii) Retail pathfinder – Glos LEP securing regular meetings with BIS and DCLG to promote the importance of retail within town centres. Funding now secured for research work to establish what makes a successful town centre. Discussions also taking place with Gloucester City Council.</p>	
50/12	<p>Joint Core Strategy Based upon previous request for the Task Force to have the JCS as a routine item for update, Steve Jordan provided a verbal update on current position.</p> <p>Although Cllr Jordan had not attended in person, a joint LEP/JCS workshop had taken place on 21/06/12. The key elements discussed largely related to employment and land issues. The current political debate revolved around the use of green belt and the accepted need for employment land allocations and a 700 page document of consultation feedback was currently being worked through. A seminar the previous evening had been focused on the updated independent housing evidence for the JCS area prepared by Nathaniel Litchfield Partners and a report including assumptions was anticipated imminently. The aim was to come up with a preferred option for consultation in the Autumn as the three Districts had a duty to co-operate, as prescribed in the NPPF.</p> <p>CBC's last Plan was formulated by the previous Administration in 2006 creating a grey area in terms of there being a 12 month transition period, but it would carry weight if an emerging option were established 12 months from the end of March. A North highlighted that green belt boundaries can be moved during the formulation of the Local Plan.</p>	

	<p>RD questioned whether the JCS was getting enough helpful input in terms of Gfirst providing effective steer as an economic driver for the County. A North noted dialogue between the JCS team and the LEP but more work is needed before conclusions could be reached.</p> <p>G Garbutt asked about the relationship to the JCS of the elements outside that area such as rural development within villages. Cllr Jordan highlighted linkages between Stroud and Gloucester but not from an overall County or regional perspective.</p> <p>Cllr R Garnham highlighted that opportunistic developers would take advantage if the Borough Council does not actively part take in the JCS. J Williamson explained how he was regularly approached by local employers desperate to remain in the area but needing employment land. S Clarke also stressed that Cheltenham could end up with the majority of residents being retired and insufficient employment causing a population imbalance.</p> <p>A North highlighted that whilst the debate was interesting he did not feel it added value to the agencies involved within the Task Force which was in danger of mission creep in terms of its core business. Whilst he could see an element of the JCS being relevant he believed the wider issues diverted from the group's cause. S Clarke pointed out however that the discussion was significant and relevant in promoting shops and retail space which within the remit of the Task Force.</p> <p>G Garbutt believed issues of employment land, the wider housing market and the definition of the Green Belt were relevant to the development of Cheltenham and some concerns relating to the lack of a County and/or Sub Regional Strategy, though A North's comments merited serious discussion and would be noted for future debate.</p>	
<p>51/12</p>	<p>Business Plan Update of Targets</p> <p>J Williamson talked to the document previously circulated noting that significant progress had been made on key targets.</p> <p>Following discussion members endorsed the recommendations that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the wider document is revisited at the next meeting before sign-off in January 2013 to ensure that targets are appropriate for the next period, and • to review the existing structures in terms of sub-groups and Task Force membership to ensure they are effective. 	<p>JW</p> <p>JW/GG</p>

The public part of the meeting concluded at this point