

E-mail: democraticservices@teignbridge.gov.uk

15 February 2024

FULL COUNCIL

To all Members of Teignbridge District Council

A meeting of the **Full Council** will be held on **Tuesday, 27th February, 2024** in the **Council Chamber, Forde House, Brunel Road, Newton Abbot, TQ12 4XX** at **10.00 am**



Phil Shears
Managing Director

Please Note: Filming is permitted during Committee meeting with the exception where there are confidential or exempt items, which may need to be considered in the absence of the press and public. By entering the Council Chamber you are consenting to being filmed.

AGENDA

Part I

5. **Public Questions (if any)** (Pages 3 - 14)
Members of the public may ask questions. A maximum period of 15 minutes will be allowed with a maximum period of three minutes per questioner.

If you would like this information in another format, please telephone 01626 361101 or e-mail info@teignbridge.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

**Full Council 27 Feb 2024
Public Questions**

Questions from Ms Hunt

Question 1,

Over an extended period, the residents of Teignbridge have observed numerous signs displayed on public premises indicating ownership by the Teignbridge council. However, it has come to our attention that access to several of these premises, such as the tennis courts, has been restricted to the public, with residents now required to pay an entry fee. In light of this, I would like to inquire about the ownership status of the supposedly public premises and seek clarification on the entity that owns the council itself.

Response from Executive Member for Open Spaces, Leisure, Sport, Resorts and Tourism

Green Spaces Project Officer notes: The authority owns the tennis courts within its green spaces. Refurbishment investment funding from the Lawn Tennis Association (DCMS) facilitated council tennis courts being brought up to a higher standard for play. The funding agreement stipulated a low-cost usage charge to generate income to cover annual servicing costs of the gate system and to contribute towards a 'sinking fund' to future-proof the facilities.

Question 2,

It has come to my attention that despite persistent objections from local residents regarding various new development projects, including the restoration of the "historic" market, the refurbishment of Queen Street, and other planning proposals, the council insist to proceed with their plans. Consequently, I kindly request the council to provide a comprehensive list of the governmental requirements that must be met by the council in order to justify and support any decision they undertake. Please also provide regulations that allow the council to override the residents' consultation, opinions, and demands.

Response from the Executive Member for Corporate Services

The structure of a District Council and the process(es) for decision making are detailed in the various Local Government Acts particularly those of 1972 and 2000, and to a lesser extent the Localism Act 2011. In addition to that, the Council has a Constitution which sets out how it operates and what it must do to make decisions efficiently, transparently and accountably.

All of which (including subordinate legislation) are available to and accessible by the public via the internet, local libraries and or the Stationary Office.

Question 3:

I kindly request the council to provide official confirmation regarding the mandatory nature of various housing emergency initiatives. Specifically, we seek clarification on the following matters:

Are programs such as the construction of numerous new homes and flats, the conversion of public architectural assets into accommodation, the transformation of green belts into development sites, and the repurposing of historic objects into living spaces obligatory government programs that the council is compelled to accept?

Are the initiatives related to climate emergency and immigration accommodation also mandatory government programs that the council must adhere to, or whether these proposals are presented with the option for councils to exercise their rights and

opt out in case of resident opposition or lack of evidence supporting the adoption of such proposals.

I kindly request prompt clarification on these matters to ensure a clear understanding of the council's obligations and potential flexibility in implementing these initiatives.

Thank you for your attention

Response from the Executive Member for Climate Change, Trees, Coast and Flood Risk Management

Climate Change *The Government imposes minimum construction standards in law through the Building Regulations. Standards which relate to climate change include Building Regulations Part L (Energy Efficiency) Part O (Overheating) and Part S (Electric Vehicle Charging). The Authority may at its own discretion construct housing to specifications outperforming these standards to achieve better outcomes for occupants (increased comfort levels and lower energy bills) and the environment (lower carbon emissions). The Authority may also set policies outperforming minimum standards set out in the Building Regulations for homes constructed by developers through the Local Plan, subject to providing a robust evidence base to substantiate such policies.*

In addition resident surveys we carry out show that Teignbridge residents recognise climate change as an important issue. A recent survey question asked residents whether they were concerned about climate change as an issue, 79% of respondents said they were. Therefore, we have a clear mandate to prioritise measures that tackle climate change across our District .

Response from the Executive Member for Homes, Communities and Human Resources

Housing comments

The Council has a duty to meet housing need in Teignbridge which includes residents living in substandard housing, the homeless and dealing with housing emergencies. This can include, fire, flood, refugees, households served notice to leave their homes and people fleeing domestic violence. These needs are met in a number of ways in the public and private sector. However, this does not include the conversion of public architectural assets into accommodation, the transformation of green belts (we dont have any in Teignbridge) into development sites, and the repurposing of historic objects into living spaces.

The only current schemes that we are aware of with regards to specific housing initiatives is the Local Authority Housing Fund (LAHF) which was optional for all Councils to bid for which we did to secure grant funding towards the purchase of suitable accommodation for refugees from Ukraine and Afghanistan.

The Home Office is responsible for sourcing and providing housing and support for asylum seekers whilst their asylum claim is being processed and, whilst they will notify the Local Authority of any accommodation they are using within the District, we have no ability to refuse.

Questions from Anthony James Dawlish Town Councillor

1. Does Teignbridge council have a policy which addresses the issues of family members, partners working together?
2. Does Teignbridge Council have a policy which addresses where a senior person forms or is in a relationship with a junior member of staff?

3. Does Teignbridge Council have a policy which addresses accountability, questionable professional conduct and decision making of employed staff members?
4. If there are no policies in place regarding the above questions, does Teignbridge Council have any plans in addressing this?

Responses from the Executive Member for Homes, Communities and Human Resources

1. The Officer Code of Conduct has clauses relating to conflicts of interest and personal relationships.

Specifically, sections 6.4 and 6.6 of the Officer Code of Conduct refer:

Section 6.4 Conflict of Interest outlines where an employee has a relationship of a business or private nature which may give rise to a conflict of interest, they need to notify their Senior Officer so it can be recorded.

Section 6.6 Management and Appointment of Staff outlines that employees must not be involved in making decisions on the appointment, promotion, pay and conditions of service for a relative, partner or individual they have a close personal relationship with. Any abuse by an employee to gain special favour for another employee because of a personal relationship may result in disciplinary action.

2. Yes, see answer to question 1.

3. Yes, the Officer Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Policy deal with misconduct concerns.

4. The Council has policies in place. See answers to questions 1 and 3.

Questions from Ally Locker regarding Queen Street, Newton Abbot

1. Why are you not listening to the local traders and residents?
2. Why have you not consulted with me and other traders?

Responses from the Leader-Executive Member for Strategic Direction 1 and 2

The consultation process has been comprehensive and involved several opportunities for businesses and residents to engage.

<https://www.devon.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/queen-street-newton-abbot-pedestrian-enhancements/#frequently-asked-questions>

The original desire to make the street more pedestrian or shopper and user friendly, came from the Community Plan for the town, where the desire to widen pavements in the street was the top local community suggestion.

These desires were then included in the current town's Neighbourhood Plan 2016, where "remodelling of the traffic priorities on Queen Street" was listed as one of the priorities of the Plan .

The FHSF provided the opportunity to deliver on that community wish.

The proposals were first consulted on back in Summer 2020. The results of that consultation were published and presented to the Councils Executive, a virtual public meeting .

The results of that consultation are still available online, but a key result was 55% of businesses taking part agreed or strongly agreed "with enhancing the environment along Queen St for shoppers, including wider pavements, outdoor

seating, greening in suitable locations, better disabled access , to enhance the town centre overall as a hub and destination”

Importantly also 59% of the public taking part agreed or strongly agreed that they “would visit Queen Street for shopping more often, and/or spend longer to visit more shops, if the improvements were implemented”

It is not surprising therefore that the decision was made unanimously by TDC Executive to continue to work up the details of the proposals.

As a result of detailed comments made during this first consultation and feedback received changes were made to the proposals and the revised scheme was consulted on again in Summer 2022.

Again these consultation comments are available and always have been online. Some of the responses conflicted in the sense that a majority wanted wider pavements and greening but a majority also wanted to keep more car parking. Both are difficult to achieve together.

But at the end people were asked “Overall to you agree with the proposed Queen Street Pedestrian Enhancement scheme”

434 people strongly disagree or disagree, 437 people strongly agree or agree. Whilst it is easy to say that this is not many people responding, these figures are better than many consultations that are held, and engagement with consultations has been growing with the online opportunities provided more recently.

The important thing to remember is that officers have spent time addressing many of the issues raised by those that made detailed comments about the scheme.

Consultations are not intended primarily to be referendums, they have an additional complementary purpose to gather comments which are then addressed through further work. Of course if there was a very strong negative feeling about the scheme overall, then additional work would be unlikely to address concerns to a significant level, and then it would be correct to abandon or significantly rethink proposals .

This does not apply to the Queen Street proposals where several changes have been made to proposals after consultations, to address concerns.

The Traffic Regulation Order consultation stage was next where comment is largely expected from those directly affected by proposals. TRO consultations are not meant as a referendum on the scheme, and DCC expect that comments will largely come from those who still have outstanding concerns , and those that are happy with the details are less likely to respond. DCC were pleased that comments received were relatively few, in spite of the consultation being widely advertised.

Changes were made to the scheme to accommodate comments about detail, in particular the introduction of another flexible loading bay at the west end of the street.

More recently a leaflet explaining the scheme to counter some of the misinformation that was being put out by others was delivered to local businesses. This provided yet another opportunity for businesses to engage with County and District officers regarding any concerns they had.

It has sadly been the case that misinformation from others has been rife, over the last year or so, which has understandably raised concerns amongst businesses and residents. Devon County and Teignbridge District have tried to counter this misinformation wherever it has appeared.

*Consultation exercises are not intended merely as a referendum. There was public support **overall** for the proposals and where concerns were raised on particular issues the proposals where possible have been changed to reflect those concerns. Evidence shows that schemes such as those proposed will lead to increased footfall and prosperity for a town.*

Questions from Gail Anderson regarding Queen Street, Newton Abbot

Newton Abbot - I live in school road next to Wolborough School.

1. What will be put in place for all the extra traffic that will use this road as short cut to go passed Lloyd's Bank to car parks? This road is dangerous at best of times and how will the mothers and fathers drop of children safely. Even though road is one way people reverse back up it to east street I can forsee accidents happening.
2. Also with permit parking what will happen for us in our zone with more cars trying to park? Has there been any consideration taken for this? The only part of scheme I agree with is the 20 mph. I also work in town and feel the town's economy will be destroyed by this scheme. Even my twelve year old granddaughter said we need to encourage more shops not destroy what we have. Losing on street parking not only effects the older generation, but young parents with handicapped or mentally challenged children who need to park close to shops they need especially children that can bolt at a drop of a hat. Please this scheme is so unviable in so many ways. Other enhancements should be considered and money better spent.
- 3.

Responses from the Leader-Executive Member for Strategic Direction

1. *There has been a transport assessment carried out that anticipates an overall reduction of traffic on Courtenay Street. This is available on the Devon County Council project 'Have your Say' webpage (see under the Proposals section): [Queen Street, Newton Abbot, Pedestrian Enhancements - Have Your Say \(devon.gov.uk\)](http://www.devon.gov.uk/queen-street-newton-abbot-pedestrian-enhancements-have-your-say)*
2. *School Road is residents parking zone B and it is not expected there will be any impact on parking availability in this location as a result of the Queen Street scheme. Union Street is pay and display parking and has no loss of parking as a result of the scheme. If you would like further information in relation to traffic movements, please do contact Devon County Council via their transportation planning email: transportplanning-mailbox@devon.gov.uk*

Question from Shaun Marshall Queen Street, Newton Abbot

As the owner of a very successful business located in Queen Street I understand traffic will be directed through Albany Street and Victoria Place is there a budget in place to improve street lighting and widen pavements in these places ? As those parking in Cricketfield car park then walking through either of these Streets will be put in more danger than they currently are in Queen Street.

Im not opposed to change however I think with a bit of consultation with those it affects an acceptable change could have been agreed on.

Responses from the Leader-Executive Member for Strategic Direction

Verbal response to be given at the meeting or a written response later

Questions from Hazel Trethewey Queen Street, Newton Abbot

I would like to know how the consultation exercise was carried out, by whom and when. When is very important as a lot has happened since if, as I believe, it was before the world was changed dramatically by Covid. Who was consulted as many of the traders say they were not approached. I am a resident of Newton Abbot and have been for over 35 years and I was not consulted. How was the question asked, as if poorly phrased the desired answer can be suggested.

Unfortunately I am unable to attend the meeting but I will be represented at the meeting by the Save Queen Street Association.

It is beyond belief that in the light of such opposition certain councillors still wish this scheme to go ahead - such arrogance is breathtaking!

Responses from the Leader-Executive Member for Strategic Direction

Detail of the consultation methods and questions and a link to the 2022 consultation reports is included in the answer above to Ally Locker. The 2020 consultation report can be found at

<https://democracy.teignbridge.gov.uk/documents/b6563/Future%20High%20Streets%20-%20updated%20plans%20and%20survey%20feedback%2021st-Jul-2020%2010.00%20Executive.pdf?T=9>

Questions form Roger Cox Queen Street, Newton Abbot

1. Having remortgaged and spent close to £100,000 buying the business, I spoke to the previous owner of Phoenix Sounds and he was never contacted or spoken to about any re-development of Queen Street until after Covid, when he read it in the Mid Devon Advertiser. Where, when and who carried out this consultation with local businesses and where is the evidence?

2. When the drains were being checked in October and the on-street parking was unavailable, I lost enough in takings to demote my part timer member of staff by a day a week until December. My full-time member of staff for 20 years is affected as the realisation her job is not safe is causing her anxiety. These are the small margins we need to survive. Considering you are making decisions affecting Queen Streets future why don't you know what shops are even in the street? As the realisation kicked in to me when you visited the shop and had no idea we were here! How can you justify any changes when you don't know what businesses are in the street?

Responses from the Leader-Executive Member for Strategic Direction

Please see above answer for link to the 2020 Consultation Report

Question from Calvin Endacott Queen Street, Newton Abbot

There is very finite evidence which links pedestrianisation with the increase in footfall of a relatively busy high street. I used the words relatively, but I don't see too many free car park spaces or shops on Queen Street, so maybe I am being prudent. What I do see is a vast amount data linking out of town shopping parks and centres with increased consumer footfall. When you look at big investment banks and pension funds, they are not buying retail shops on high streets, they are buying those last mile out of town business park assets, where the demand to let is. There is two keys

reasons for this, both linked to the consumer. The consumer wants, easy access (close parking) and free parking. Both of which will be removed if this ridiculous plan goes ahead. So my question goes mainly to Martin Wrigley, why does this feel like the classic politician move of putting your name on a project, “doing something”. I would like you to consider doing something different, why not use the budget to incentivise more/different retailers to Newton Abbot, or create free parking on both sides of Queen Street? That is if you do genuinely want a high street at all in the future.

Response from the Leader-Executive Member for Strategic Direction

Regarding evidence on the benefits of pedestrianisation to increase footfall, there is substantial evidence gathered over a few decades now, and hence why there are several government funding schemes that are promoting such schemes across the country and why many towns such as ours have bid for that funding.

You are of course right to say that shopping habits have changed. Firstly a massive growth in internet shopping which has hit many of our high streets retail premises hard. Secondly of course the growth and success of out of town convenient retail. It is difficult for town centre retail to compete with the advantages of out of town sites. This is exactly why it has been recognised for some time now that town centres need to be looking to provide something different. There is a recognised need to widen town centre uses to cover leisure, service, entertainment, eating out etc, and making town centres destinations to visit for a longer stay. There has been a decline in traditional retail use in most high streets and this is likely to continue. In order to make towns a destination to ensure their long term prosperity, it is recognised that improving the public realm and increasing pedestrian comfort is crucial.

Re parking, there isn't currently free parking, in the street or car parks except in the evening. Much of the parking east of the Albany Street junction will remain. Charges and limited stay periods in town centres serve to ensure a turnover of users. There will continue to be plenty of nearby parking with variable lengths of stay possible.

Re location of car parking, there will still be many parking spaces to the east of the Albany St junction in Queen accessible as now for customers. Sadly campaigners have often misrepresented this information and implied that Queen St will have no car access. This is not true for the majority of the street. Other nearby parking is located at Sherborne Car Park and Cricketfield Car Park. Blue badge dedicated parking in Queen St / Courtenay St will be increased in the proposals and blue badge holders can also drop off in the new partial pedestrianised section of the street west of Albany St junction.

In terms of support for this project, it has been through 3 formal consultation stages and another leaflet drop more recently with a chance for comments. The original mandate for this project came from the Newton Abbot Community Plan and the Newton Abbot Neighbourhood Plan, which received wide consultation. As a result of comments received over the last couple of years as a result of these consultations several changes have been made to the original scheme. All the consultations can be viewed from this link.

<https://www.devon.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/queen-street-newton-abbot-pedestrian-enhancements/>

Question from Rosemary Whitbread, Queen Street, Newton Abbot

In his interview with Spotlight last week, the head of TDC, Councillor Martin Wrigley, said that if they didn't start on part of the plan in their application for government funding, they would lose all the money. Does that mean that TDC is willing to sacrifice the businesses of the Queen Street Traders, a majority of whom are against these plans for Queen Street, in order to secure the funding for their plans for the Market Square scheme which have already made that area a wasteland of empty shops?

Response from the Leader-Executive Member for Strategic Direction

Evidence shows that schemes such as those proposed will lead to increased footfall and prosperity for a town.

Information given in my answer to Carmen, shows that many other towns are implementing schemes similar to the Queen Street proposals, to support the future of their town centres, using the same Government funding sources.

Question from Claire Quelvenec

I represent both Jackson's Fishmongers and Jacksons Fish & Chips who have traded on Queen Street for over 100 years. You have neither engaged with my businesses, nor listened to my pleas to revise the proposed plan.

If, as I anticipate, your implementation of the plan has a direct result in my losing trade (as it did when the road was partially closed for survey) and heaven forbid, results in me having to close my businesses, how do you intend to compensate me? I have traded personally on Queen Street for almost 60 years of my life and can assure you that we businesses, and our town as a whole, depend on accessibility and convenient parking. We are lucky to have busy traders both day and night on Queen Street and make no bones about this, on street parking is the key reason for this.

I can assure you that you will be held responsible for businesses losing trade if you implement the much opposed pedestrianisation part of the plan and I would like to know how you will compensate businesses who suffer loss of trade when this happens and rest assured, there will be many! I fail to see why you are not listening and working together to come up with an alternative part to the plan which would actually benefit the town rather than kill it.

Response from the Leader-Executive Member for Strategic Direction

Details of the consultations undertaken and opportunities to engage with District and County officers are detailed in the answer to Ally Locker.

Question from Richard Ford, Queen Street, Newton Abbot

"Queen Street works, it isn't broken, why are you not listening to the mounting groundswell of opinion among local businesses particularly those in Queen St, whose livelihoods will be seriously threatened by this proposed scheme? There are already enough pedestrian areas in the town and Queen St is far more vibrant than those, which demonstrates a point. If you are not taking into account the concerns of the likes of the town centre managers, shoppers, residents and local businesses particularly Austin's and Jackson's who are major anchors and such a large part of the make up of Newton Abbot being such a special town, then you are not fit to be representing the people of Newton Abbot by disrespecting the feelings and fears of this community".

Response from the Leader-Executive Member for Strategic Direction

Details of the consultations undertaken and opportunities to engage with District and County officers are detailed in the answer to Ally Locker.

*There was public support **overall** for the proposals and where concerns were raised on particular issues the proposals where possible have been changed to reflect those concerns.*

Question from Brian Sanders Queen Street, Newton Abbot

I would like to see a traffic test/trial carried out. I know there is not much time left but any change that you make is bound to be permanent so this should be a priority.

Response from the Leader-Executive Member for Strategic Direction

Verbal response to be given at the meeting or a written response later

Question form Ashley Dawes Queen Street, Newton Abbot

We are one of the many businesses who have objected to the Queen Street development (no reply ever received by the way) and you have ignored all the objections and acknowledged that you did not take into account the 40+ traders objections

Why do you insist on killing our town by pedestrianising Queen Street when we have made it clear that we the businesses, don't want it!?'

You are driving the shoppers to Trago Mills or Kingsteignton retail park " en mass " and deterring the people with blue badges to do their shopping, taxis and delivery lorries -please think again

Response from the Leader-Executive Member for Strategic Direction

Details of the consultations undertaken and opportunities to engage with District and County officers are detailed in the answer to Ally Locker.

*There was public support **overall** for the proposals and where concerns were raised on particular issues the proposals where possible have been changed to reflect those concerns.*

Evidence shows that schemes such as those proposed will lead to increased footfall and prosperity for a town.

3 new blue badge spaces will be provided opposite MDA offices and 2 new ones at east end of Queen St

There are significant improvements in the street for those with mobility problems including wider pavements, level raised tables at junctions and new crossings. Also benches to allow people to rest. One of the scheme drivers is to improve accessibility for those with poor mobility, as a result of responses to previous consultations.

Council surveys revealed that 60% accessed the town centre by car, 40% by non car modes. Those 40% are accessing the town centre largely on public transport, and on foot, mobility scooter etc. The proposals "remodel the traffic priorities on Queen Street" (a priority action from the Newton Abbot Neighbourhood Plan), whilst providing for nearby parking for those visiting by car.

Most visitors arriving by car are already using car parks but car access and parking will still be available in Queen Street up to the junction with Albany Street.

Question from Jacob Whitbread Queen Street

Why have you chosen to start with Queen Street part of the plan against strong opposition, when you could start with any part of the approved plan?

Response from the Leader-Executive Member for Strategic Direction

Verbal response to be given at the meeting or a written response later

Question from Carmen Hanif, Queen Street, Newton abbot

You are fully aware that there is not a single example of a successful pedestrian enhancement scheme in the whole of Devon and that in all cases where they have been introduced businesses have suffered.

Given the Governments advice on the importance of local authorities consulting with and listening to local businesses, why are you continuing to implement this scheme when the vast majority of businesses on Queen Street have advised you it will adversely affect their ability to trade and lead to business closures and loss of local jobs?

Response from the Leader-Executive Member for Strategic Direction
Below are examples of how the Towns Fund and FHSF funds are being used across UK to increase footfall through pedestrianisation, partial pedestrianisation, traffic restrictions and pedestrian enhancements in town centres.

Link to Towns Fund website with examples of what other towns are doing <https://townsfund.org.uk/towns>

Full list of towns awarded funds

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/town-deals-full-list-of-101-offers/town-deals-full-list-of-101-offers>

Examples -

Penzance Town Investment Document page 40 - aim to reduce town centre traffic by 70% to drive increased footfall. <https://penzancetownfund.co.uk/>

St Ives " we will also enable the pedestrianisation of the town centre at peak time, creating a less congested, cleaner space for residents and visitors" "Encouraging visitors to travel to St Ives via train and improving both residents and visitors ability to move around the town via walking and cycling infrastructure will reduce the reliance on cars, improve health and wellbeing, and reduce air pollution.

<https://www.stivestowndeal.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/FINAL-St-Ives-Town-Investment-Plan.pdf>

Camborne - "The centre itself will be pedestrian friendly with cared for plants, trees, and flowers that link to the architecture and spaces."

<https://cambornetowndeal.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/CTD0009-TIP-JANUARY-2020-FINAL.pdf>

Colchester "This project delivers an optimised package of quality public realm improvements which build on the initial £1m accelerated monies and previous investment, providing attractive public spaces which together dramatically improve the look and feel of the whole Town Centre and key gateways into it. Several key pedestrianised streets are made fully Kerbless to green and sustainable principles.

<https://cbccrmdata.blob.core.windows.net/noteattachment/CBC-null-town-investment-plan-bid-Town%20Investment%20Plan%20bid.pdf>

Hastings - outcome "Enhanced town centre experience, that prioritises the health, safety and mobility of pedestrians, improved townscape that is more attractive and accessible, improved perception of the area, increased footfall/visitor numbers" <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5f7f010070f9e842586da8d6/t/6022b5257b4c1d2bfb9da3ec/1612887351916/Hastings+Town+Investment+Plan.pdf>

Future High Street Fund projects

List of successful bids <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/future-high-streets-fund-successful-and-unsuccessful-bids/future-high-streets-fund-successful-and-unsuccessful-applications>

Yeovil Refresh project - “Improvements to core streets including Westminster Street, High Street, Borough, Middle Street, Triangle and Wyndham Street area. This will create a better shared space which will be greener and easier to navigate. A new events square will be created at the Triangle. “

<https://democracy.somerset.gov.uk/Data/SSDC%20Area%20South%20Committee/202303081400/Agenda/Yeovil%20Refresh%20Update.pdf>

Barnstaple Butchers Row and Cross Street - “This strand involves the permanent pedestrianisation of the most distinctive street in our town leading to increased footfall, allowing traders to spill onto the street and connecting the historic core to our river” front. <https://www.barnstaple.co.uk/market-quarter/butchers-row-and-cross-street/>

Trowbridge The projects being funded by Future High Streets Funding include pedestrian and public space enhancements in the town centre, and several pavement widening schemes.

“We are proposing to improve the pedestrian arrival points and access to the town centre to: Improve the experience of walking into and around the town centre, Facilitate safer and accessible movement through to the town centre, Improve wayfinding (how people navigate through the town centre)”

<https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/article/5882/Future-High-Streets-Fund-Trowbridge>

Kingswood - At the heart of the proposed business case for the wider project is a request for funding to fully restore Whitfield Tabernacle, acquire property in the town centre and pedestrianise Regent

Street. <https://sites.southglos.gov.uk/newsroom/business-and-economy/momentum-builds-for-kingswood-high-street-as-results-to-public-engagement-published/>

Kirkham “Providing more space for pedestrians in the town centre and better links to the town centre, while reducing the dominance of traffic and parking.” ...”the narrowing of roads and widening pavements to increase pedestrian space and creation of outdoor seating/dining areas.”

<https://www.kirkhamfutures.org/plans/public-realm-streetscape-interventions>

Consultation exercises are not intended merely as a referendum. There was public support **overall** for the proposals and where concerns were raised on particular issues the proposals where possible have been changed to reflect those concerns. Evidence shows that schemes such as those proposed will lead to increased footfall and prosperity for a town.

Questions from Geralyn Arthurs Teignmouth Hospital

In the light of the fact that last year Teignbridge District Council voted unanimously to save Teignmouth Community Hospital we are pleased to see that a Nomination of Motion has been registered in the hope that it will be debated in council chamber, if new council members are of the same mind as to the value of community hospitals for the local population.

If there is sufficient support for a debate I would like to ask two questions please:

1) Should Teignbridge District Council vote today for a referral to the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care over the issue whether the proposed closure of

Teignmouth Hospital is in the best interest of the health service provision for the local population?

2) Are the officers of Teignbridge District Council up to submitting all the evidence to enable the Secretary of State to determine this case swiftly?

As you are aware if Devon County Council Health and Adult Care Scrutiny Committee had referred the proposal of the closure to the Secretary of State under its 2020 Spotlight Review recommendation this issue would have already have been resolved. With construction costs increasing and the lease for Channel View expiring next year it is urgent that this matter is resolved rapidly.

Responses from the Leader-Executive Member for Strategic Direction

Verbal response to be given at the meeting or a written response later

Question from Geoff King Teignmouth Hospital

Regarding Notice of Motion 3 on the Agenda of the Full Teignbridge District Council Meeting of the 27th February.

The Motion is to refer the matter of saving Teignmouth Hospital from closure to the Secretary of State. Should the referral be successful, my question is:-

The Community have heard that the NHS Trust is unlikely to pay for the refurbishment of Teignmouth Hospital to bring it up to modern hygiene standards and it is even more unlikely to pay for the operational costs including, but not limited to, salaries, rates, heating and power to run the refurbished facility.

Who is going to be responsible and pay for all these costs?

Responses from the Leader-Executive Member for Strategic Direction

Verbal response to be given at the meeting or a written response later
