

GLOUCESTER HERITAGE URBAN REGENERATION COMPANY LTD

MINUTES OF GHURC BOARD MEETING

The Cory Rooms, The National Waterways Museum

Friday 30th May 2008 @ 2.00pm

Present:	(MS)	Mary Smith	(MB)	Maggie Bolt
	(PJ)	Paul James	(MT)	Michael Tallett-Williams
	(GS)	Greg Smith	(PF)	Peter Foyle
	(DB)	David Bush	(AG)	Cllr Andrew Gravells
	(IM)	Ian Mean	(MO)	Mark Owen
	(FM)	Franco Muccini	(JG)	Julie Girling
	(CH)	Chris Hallam	(CF)	Chris Foley
	(SPi)	Sally Pickering	(DE)	David Edwards
	(SP)	Dr Sally Pearson		
Observers:				
	(CFO)	Chris Oldershaw	(JW)	Julian Wain
	(MT)	Mike Tilt	(IW)	Ian Williams
	(BK)	Barry King		
	(NG)	Nicky Godding		
	(SE)	Simon Excell		
Minute Taker:				
	(JM)	Jo May		

245/08	Apologies	Action
	<u>Board Members</u> Antonia Shield, Stan Jones, David Warburton, Ian Jarvis, Bishop Michael Perham, Ian Knight, Martin Seccombe. <u>Advisors</u> Philip Staddon, Philip Cooke, Andrew Vines	
246/08	Declarations of Interest	
	Greg Smith, Gloscol Mary Smith as a member of the Gloucester City Council's Planning Committee Peter Foyle, EIG Chris Foley, Blackfriars, Docks, South West Bypass, St Ann Way Bridge	
247/08	Minutes of the Board Meeting held on 28th March 2008	
	The circulated minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a true and accurate record.	
248/08	Matters Arising	
239/08	A meeting was held with Dick Bishop on the 23 rd May, an architect has still not been appointed, but Dick Bishop has agreed to come back with their team on the 10 th July. If no progress is made on this crucial scheme a CPO may need to be pursued by the City Council.	

243/08	The recent Future of the City event saw 120 school children and 1500 members of the public over the 4 days, with 160 attending the VIP evening on the Friday.	
249/08	Programme Performance Update	
	<p>CFO gave a brief update on the issued Programme Performance Update :</p> <p>Greater Blackfriars report has been deferred until the July board meeting</p> <p>DE advised that unfortunately the Linden Homes agreement was not completed by the due date and the previously short listed parties are being contacted and asked to re-submit. If an agreement cannot be reached then it will need to be remarketed, but there are difficult times ahead with the current “credit crunch”. GS asked if DE would have to go back to the English Partnership Board for their agreement to this revised selection process. DE advised that this would be dependant on the submissions received, but was confident that the Board would understand their requirements.</p> <p>Marketing Gloucester will go live in September, operating from offices at the old Transport Museum at Bearlands.</p> <p>The GHURC new “EMU” (mobile exhibition unit) was now available for “hire”, any bookings are to be dealt with by Sam Hoad / Martin Wallace in the URC office.</p>	
250/08	City Employment Plan – Presentation by Shared Intelligence	
	<p>CFO outlined the report; the main objective for the URC is to ensure that local people are ‘prepared’ for the job opportunities created by the URC.</p> <p>Lee Shostak (LS) and Donna-Louise Hurrell (DH) from Shared Intelligence gave a presentation on the current status of the City Employment Plan.</p> <p>Questions were raised on how the city’s unemployment levels relate to the URC areas and potential employee skills levels and employer requirements.</p> <p>AG – unless the city employment plan targets are broken down to the URC wards (Barton and Tredworth, Westgate) how will we be able to measure the level of success?</p> <p>Ahmed Goga explained that the city was to be divided into three areas, that action plans would be prepared for each, and that clients and jobs created would be tracked on the basis of both ward and action plan boundaries.</p> <p>Further discussion was had on the areas shown in the illustrations. Ahmed Goga responded by advising that it was a city wide problem and not a problem limited to the URC area and therefore a city wide approach was required.</p> <p>GS asked how we can hold the LSC to account. CFO explained that at the start of the year GHURC will agree and sign off the City Employment Plan targets and this will be reviewed by the URC on a quarterly basis.</p> <p>FM asked if there were any figures available on the number of vacancies in the City, compared with the number of people that actually want to get back into work.</p> <p>CF supports GS comments: it is essential that the plan focuses on URC activity.</p>	

	<p>This will be a condition of SWRDA's contribution which is due to be considered next week.</p> <p>IM totally supports what we are proposing, but there seems to be a lot of information today that has not previously been available, it is a very important project but we need a lot more research on unemployment issues</p> <p>It was agreed that the Board note the report.</p>	
251/08A	<p>Gloucestershire County Council Funding for Transport Schemes – an overview by Cllr Julie Girling</p>	
	<p>JG ran through the report that had been submitted, and asked for it to be noted that some works are statutory and are non negotiable.</p> <p>The Community Infrastructure Fund is discretionary and does not afford any extra priority on having a URC in the city.</p> <p>No questions were raised from the report and GS thanked JG for a very informative and comprehensive presentation.</p> <p>IM also thanked JG for her report. Transportation is an increasingly worrying problem, particularly with the works that are currently going on around the Quays and the A40. This report makes it clear that there is no additional funding available for major improvements.</p> <p>SPI, on behalf of the Residents & Community Forum, indicated that however clear the facts are, the public do not believe what the County Council tell them. JG stated that this is not a Gloucestershire County Council problem, but a national problem, and that she is not prepared to spend the funding on marketing the Council to improve the publics view of the Council, but spend the money on trying to resolve the problems.</p> <p>DE asked JG to look further into the Community Infrastructure Levy to ensure that the County Council are receiving the top funding possible.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Board notes the report.</p>	<p>JG</p>
251/08B	<p>Gloucestershire Parkway Update – Potential for a new Railway Triangle Station</p>	
	<p>BK outlined his report and highlighted how important the decision on which option to take is for Gloucester and it cannot be taken lightly.</p> <p>CFO thanked BK for his first class report and asked that the Board take time before responding as there are still many unanswered questions. CFO recommended that a steering group be appointed to look into the report in more detail.</p> <p>MS asked if the cost of site acquisition had been factored into the costs and also asked if we could have the costs updated to 2008.</p> <p>DB welcomed the opportunity to review this decision on Parkway.</p> <p>SPI advised that the Residents and Community Forum welcome the idea of a steering group to review this decision.</p> <p>GS asked for volunteers; David Bush, Cllr Andrew Gravells, David Edwards, Peter</p>	

	<p>Foyle, Chris Foley and Chris Oldershaw agreed. JM to arrange a meeting and a report is to be prepared for the July Board meeting.</p> <p>MTW stated that whatever we agree, the whole county must support the preferred site, if not the project will not be successful.</p> <p>JW emphasised that in order for us to attract new investment then rail links must be improved.</p> <p>CH advised that a debate was currently being had in the Worcester Press about the links to Gloucester as currently there are only 2 trains, both of which are outside the rush hour service. CH feels that Parkway is a good option, but a central station is still needed.</p> <p>PJ recognises the importance of good quality rail links to the city's economy and, acknowledges GHURC's stated preference for Elmbridge Court but suggested exploring all possible alternatives.</p> <p>CF asked if CFO could write a brief agenda for the first steering group.</p> <p>It was recommended that the Board supports the need to enhance Gloucester Central station and access to and from the City Centre, recognising its positive effect on the regeneration of the central area and affirms its support for the provision of Gloucestershire Parkway Station at Elmbridge Court as its preferred option subject to the continued viability of Gloucester Central Station and taking on board PJ's request to look into all possible alternatives.</p> <p>The Board agreed this, subject to the steering groups findings.</p>	<p>JM</p>
<p>252/08</p>	<p>Greater Railway Triangle – Presentation by GVA Grimley of emerging Masterplan proposals</p>	
	<p>Gordon Isgrove and Edward Nash gave a presentation on the Masterplan proposals.</p> <p>CFO asked for a brief description of the suggested land uses and sizes under the option 3 proposal.; 1,000,000 sq ft of new floor space in 3 key areas, 700 residential units, 250,000 sq ft office/commercial space, including hotel and Medi/Science Park with 100,000 sq ft retail / leisure.</p> <p>AG asked if a strong letter could be sent from the GHURC Board requesting that Network Rail demolish the derelict buildings which would greatly improve the area for the interim period with very little cost to Network Rail. AG also asked why it was necessary to keep the Gas Works.</p> <p>EN advised that there are huge costs associated with the removal of such buildings.</p> <p>IM feels that this site is the “Hiroshima” of Gloucester, obviously the master plan is a work in progress but was expecting to see more of an iconic building which the city could be excited about. He considered the proposals 'bland'.</p> <p>DB asked for a clearer understanding of the road access from Metz Way down to the site and was there any reason behind Network Rails request to move the sidings; there were no major problems with the road access and it is understood that Network Rail would like to develop the area where the sidings are currently situated.</p>	

	<p>SPI, on behalf of the Residents and Community Forum, really liked the ideas proposed, and reiterated IM's feelings for an iconic building on the site. MO also agreed that an iconic gateway was required.</p> <p>PJ asked how LXB are involved, because when GVA presented their plans to the Council recently they gave the impression that they wanted to move forward quite quickly. GI advised that LXB are the developer and anticipate submitting plans shortly.</p> <p>MS felt that option 3a would not be an option as Allstones are particularly difficult to deal with.</p> <p>It was recommended that the Board notes the report and reviews the presented emerging preferred concept/land use options and subject to any requested changes, instructs the Railway Triangle Steering Group to progress the Masterplan to the next – detailed design and viability assessment and stakeholder consultation – stage. This was agreed.</p>	
253/08	Kings Quarter Project Update – CONFIDENTIAL	
254/08	Annual Report & Accounts 2007 / 08	
	<p>CFO briefly outlined Annex I, Annual Report to English Partnerships.</p> <p>Martin Howard of Hazlewoods presented the draft accounts for approval and thanked Janice Gurmin for her excellent work and confirmed that the accounts had been approved by the Audit and Governance Committee at their meeting on the 12th May.</p> <p>CH queried Dr S Pearson's appointment date of 2007, which should read 2008 and one other typing error.</p> <p>It was recommended that the 2007/08 annual performance submission to English Partnerships be approved and the financial accounts for 2007/08 be approved for submission to Companies House. The recommendations were approved subject to the above amendments.</p>	
255/08	URC Business Plan 2008 / 09 – Verbal Update	
	<p>CFO advised that the Business Plan is yet to be approved.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with the RDA regarding their long term financial commitment, particularly for Blackfriars, but funding has been confirmed from the RDA for £20m over the next 3 years. EP have suggested possible additional funding in relation to Blackfriars, but further discussion are to be had.</p> <p>CFO is hopeful to have the business plan approved by the next Board meeting in July.</p>	
256/08	Public Art Update	
	Deferred to the July Board Meeting – presentation required by Gerry Wall, IW to arrange.	IW

257/08	Marketing Update Report	
	<p>IM advised that the Urban Youth Forum is fully operational and the meetings he has attended are extremely encouraging for the future.</p> <p>Work on the hoardings is progressing, hopeful that the first hoarding should be displayed in June.</p> <p>NG gave a brief presentation on the press releases since the last Board meeting. Copies of which are available from JM by request.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Board notes the report.</p>	
258/08	Any Other Business	
	<p>GS advised that he had recently attended the URC National Conference organised by English Partnerships and that GHURC had appeared prominently in the promotional DVD, which will be shown at the next board meeting.</p> <p>MO asked for it to be noted that he was very disappointed with the Shared Intelligence presentation; this was unanimous from all board members. CFO advised that Shared Intelligence would not be presenting to external companies, this was to be done by Ahmed Goga and his team.</p> <p>JW wanted the Board to note that although the presentation was disappointing the content was potentially ground breaking.</p>	JM

Report Author: Chris Oldershaw