

GLOUCESTER HERITAGE URBAN REGENERATION COMPANY LTD

MINUTES OF GHURC BOARD MEETING

The Cory Room, National Waterways Museum

Friday 28 November 2008 at 2:00 pm

| | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Present: | (DB) | David Bush | (FM) | Franco Muccini |
| | (CF) | Chris Foley | (MO) | Mark Owen |
| | (PF) | Peter Foyle | (SP) | Sally Pearson |
| | (JG) | Julie Girling | (MP) | Bishop Michael |
| | (AG) | Andrew Gravells | (SPi) | Sally Pickering |
| | (CH) | Chris Hallam | (MS) | Martin Seccombe |
| | (PJ) | Paul James | (AS) | Antonia Shields (part) |
| | (IJ) | Ian Jarvis | (GS) | Greg Smith |
| | (SJ) | Stan Jones | (MS) | Mary Smith |
| | (IK) | Ian Knight | (MTW) | Michael Tallett-Williams |
| | (IM) | Ian Mean | (DW) | David Warburton |
| Observers: | | | | |
| | (CFO) | Chris Oldershaw | (RO) | Richard Owen |
| | (MT) | Mike Tilt | (MTh) | Mick Thorpe |
| | (NG) | Nicky Godding | (SE) | Simon Excell |
| | (PC) | Philip Cooke | (MW) | Martin Wallace |
| Minutes: | | | | |
| | (LG) | Liz Gissane | | |

| 287/08 | Apologies | Action |
|---------------|---|---------------|
| | <u>Board Members:</u> Maggie Bolt <u>Advisors:</u> Andrew Vines, Julian Wain | |
| 288/08 | Declarations of Interest | |
| | Antonia Shields – Railway Triangle Bishop Michael – University of Gloucestershire Peter Foyle – Ecclesiastical Mary Smith – Planning Committee Ian Jarvis and Franco Muccini – Gloucester Quays | |
| 289/08 | Minutes of the previous Board Meeting on 26 September 2008 | |
| | The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as true and accurate reflection of the meeting. | |
| 290/08 | Matters Arising | |
| 281/08 | <u>Community Regeneration Protocol</u> CFO confirmed that a report on involving “hard to reach” groups will be presented at the Board meeting in January 2009 and the report on “adding value” to URC investment will be presented at the March Board. | |
| 286/08 | <u>AOB - Llanthony Quay Hotel</u> Concern was expressed at the last board meeting about the design of the proposed hotel development. CO confirmed these concerns had been put into a letter noting the improvements and also the level of amendments the Board and its Design Review Panel expected to see. | |

| | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| | <p>CFO was confident that changes could be secured to the hotel scheme without increasing the costs significantly.</p> <p>The Board discussed the chances of the necessary changes being achieved, with many members of the view that if necessary the City Council should be encouraged to refuse the planning application if the scheme was not of sufficient quality. A number of Board Members believed it was fundamentally important to secure a deal with the hotel in this current economic climate.</p> <p>Cllr Mary Smith declared an interest, and took no part in the discussion.</p> <p>The Board agreed to delegate authority to the Executive Board to formalise the position of the GHURC in respect of the hotel development.</p> <p>F Muccini clarified to the Board that the term “Peels Architects” was misleading since the hotel was being designed by their own retained architects rather than those involved with the Quays.</p> | |
| 291/09 | Programme Performance Update | |
| | <p>Greater Blackfriars The Masterplan consultation process comprising the stakeholder workshops has been arranged and the 4* hotel operator has now confirmed its requirements for Blackfriars.</p> | |
| | <p>Gloucester Docks The Design Panel has met to review the proposals for EIG. CO commented on the opportunity to create a stunning contemporary building in the Docks and although concerns remain over the massing of the building the initial feedback was generally positive and constructive. An EIG representative had joined the Business Forum, and the company are interested in using the space in the Blackfriars Priory for events.</p> | |
| | <p>Gloucester Quays CO understood that 64% of the retail space had either been let or was in the hands of solicitors. It was noted that the new Bridge had opened last week. AG asked why there had been such short notice of the official opening. DW indicated that there had been a disagreement about the appropriate opening date, but that it had been brought forward to fit in with the closure of Llanthony Road.</p> <p>DB expressed concern that the cost of parking should be pitched correctly. FM commented that they were looking at introducing a type of Oyster Card system. IJ noted that there are recommendations re parking in the Section 106 agreement.</p> | |
| | <p>Canal Corridor CO commented that discussions on the Section 106 agreement for the Contract Chemicals site were very close to a conclusion. Social housing will constitute 15% and CO is optimistic that it will now go through planning.</p> | |
| | <p>Kings Quarter The City Council hoped to commence the OJEU process before the New Year. This would require the URC Board to consider disposal arrangements as required by the Members Agreement at the Exec Board on 10 December.</p> | |

| | | |
|---------------|---|------------|
| | | |
| | <p>Community Engagement Community Engagement plans for each of the Magnificent Seven sites are being worked on and will be ready in the New Year.</p> | |
| 292/09 | <p>Greater Blackfriars – Presentation by Patricia Broadfoot</p> <p>The Chair welcomed Patricia Broadfoot (Vice Chancellor) and Mike Cogger of the University of Gloucestershire to the meeting. The University has a strong commitment to the regeneration work of the URC in Gloucester. Their new strategy is to have more equal provision in Cheltenham and Gloucester and to enhance progression rates from local schools and colleges in addition to developing a new capacity and willingness to engage with local businesses.</p> <p>The University's interest in a potential new campus in Blackfriars requires significant external support. Following meetings with John Denham (through local MP Parmjit Dhanda), HEFCE and SWRDA it became clear that additional funding was not easily available.</p> <p>The project itself was deemed particularly risky by Buro Four who carried out a risk assessment and feasibility analysis on behalf of the URC. The conclusion of the work was that there had been a significant change in the economic context over the past three months. The government had made it clear that there would be a complete freeze in funding any expansion of student numbers from this year onwards. Buro Four felt that the University development in Blackfriars would be a risky project, given that it was currently based on increased student numbers plus selling parts of the University's estate. The development was always likely to have been staggered, but committing to one phase effectively meant committing to all in due course. The University therefore haven't closed the door on the project, but they consider it to be 'one step too far' at this stage.</p> <p>PB expressed her gratitude to the GHURC for funding the appointment of Buro Four to carry out a risk and options analysis.</p> <p>CO said that he thought that the benefits of bringing the University to Gloucester would be immense. He wanted to go through the report in detail, and to discuss with potential funders. IM also thought that the regeneration of Gloucester with the University would be extraordinarily exciting. IK challenged the Board. The RDA was cautious about the funding gap, but he pointed out that the Board had an indicative allocation of £20 million over three years. If the Board had a real desire to get a University, it should consider re-directing its funding. CO queried the position beyond three years: IK said that he predicted that the RDA would be under immense pressure at the next comprehensive spending review.</p> <p>AG emphasised the importance of the University to the city centre and requested the URC to consider alternative options to 'secure' the University.</p> <p>GS suggested to the Board that work should continue with the University, with a report back to the Board on progress.</p> | |
| | | CFO |

| | | |
|--------|--|-----|
| 293/08 | Economic Linkages | |
| | <p>William Wheeler and Frank Heggs made a short presentation to the Board There were many positive comments about the lighting and modernity of the scheme though concern was expressed about the affordability, durability and whether the links between the different types of scheme will be seamless. It was confirmed that the cost falls within the £4.2m budget allocated in the URC Business Plan. IM believes the public will really enjoy the new scheme.</p> <p><u>Recommendations</u> The recommendations contained in report 293/08 (and listed below) were accepted by the Board.</p> <p>The proposed economic linkage improvements to Route 1 comprising Southgate street, Kimbrose Triangle and Llanthony Road are approved at an estimated cost of £4,235,344 million</p> <p>A detailed application is submitted to the South West RDA for a contribution of £3,384,344 towards the cost of the proposed improvements from the URC's 2008/9 and 2009/10 funding allocation</p> <p>A further report is submitted to the Board on the outstanding Route 1 improvements – adjacent to the Victoria Basin dock edge, Kimbrose Steps and r/o 27/29 Commercial Road.</p> | |
| 294/08 | Greater Railway Triangle Masterplan | |
| | <p>Antonia Shield confirmed that BPE have been acting for Allstones for a number of months and since he has direct involvement in this she chose to step out of the meeting.</p> <p>Sandra Roebuck made a thorough presentation to the Board on the Peer Review findings and Delivery Strategy. It was agreed that the workshops were valuable and there now needs to be agreement on how to deliver the Masterplan. There should be a closer relationship with the statutory bodies and greater collaborations as the project moves forward. The priorities for the next steps should be: update the brief; finalise the land use mix and points of access; expand public open space; clarify assumptions about waste; Gateway opportunities and Regeneration outputs.</p> <p>Concern was expressed that the residential proposal in the Triangle would be located within a particularly noisy area (noise from Metz Way and the railway) and an area of considerable light pollution. MS expressed concern that the residential area seemed very close to Allstones and noted caution. There was a suggestion that other examples of gateways should be sought from other cities and consideration given to whether the buildings should be iconic or simply functional. It was agreed that CFO would arrange a site visit for Board Members to assess the potential impact of road/rail noise on the proposed development.</p> <p>GS thanked Sandra for her excellent presentation.</p> <p>MO noted that some members of the Board had received an email from Simon Ford of Allstones expressing concern about the future of his land and</p> | CFO |

| | | |
|--------|--|-----------------------|
| | <p>that adjacent to his property. CO confirmed that the URC and GVA Grimley had been involved in meetings with Simon over the last year though no formal consultations or correspondence had taken place at this stage, specifically on the Masterplan proposals. It appears that the local business is upset by the impact of the Masterplan proposals on their operation and as such it was agreed that CO would respond on behalf of the Board.</p> <p>ACTION: CO to respond in writing on behalf of the Board to concerns expressed by Simon Ford in his recent email.</p> <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <p>The following recommendations were agreed:</p> <p>4.01.1 The key findings of the EDAW Peer Review will be incorporated in the next stage of the brief.</p> <p>4.01.2 The preferred GVAG land use option set out in Annex 3 is amended to reflect EDAW's recommendation that a higher priority be considered for employment development at Great Western Road - incorporating a medi-science park - and that a greater residential emphasis be considered in progressing a mixed use scheme within the northern railway triangle site. It was agreed that CFO would arrange a site visit before Christmas.</p> <p>4.01.3 The funding application was agreed to be submitted to Homes and Communities Agency to permit the completion of the Masterplan</p> <p>4.01.4 The Board agreed the recommendation to encourage LXB to firm up proposals with the following amendment: "LXB are encouraged to "firm up" proposals for the Railway Triangle, alongside the emerging Masterplan"</p> <p>4.01.5 The Board agreed to further discussions being held with Network Rail and the Homes and Communities Agency over the terms of a Joint Venture which will secure the comprehensive regeneration of the Greater Railway Triangle and ensure the opportunities presented by the Medi-science park proposal are maximised.</p> <p>The Board also endorsed amendments to the Masterplan to explore the options available should Allstone remain in situ.</p> | <p>CFO</p> <p>CFO</p> |
| 295/08 | <p>Feedback from Directors' Away Day</p> | |
| | <p><u>Community Engagement</u></p> <p>There has been a very positive response to the mobile exhibition unit particularly as part of the Community Ambassadors Programme.</p> <p>The Board agreed a transfer of £20,000 from the reserves and £5,000 from the Marcomms budget to fund: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shop front improvements in Southgate; using / disguising empty shop fronts with posters / exhibitions etc. • A Business supplement in the Citizen (around 40-50,000 copies on | |

| | | |
|---------------|---|------------|
| | <p>good quality paper)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More coverage and exposure on GFM and Severn Sound to try to capture a younger audience. • More bus sides which were considered to be good value for money and will take marketing outside of Gloucester <p>A proposed new design for a logo was tabled and met with a mixed response. It was agreed that the Marketing and Communications Committee should submit a full proposal to the Board before considering changing the logo / strap line.</p> <p>ACTION: The Marketing and Communications Committee to put together a proposal for “re-branding”</p> <p>It was agreed that future Board meetings should start at 13:30.</p> | CFO |
| 296/08 | Bakers Quay | |
| | <p>CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION</p> <p>It is understood that architects have been commissioned to produce detailed proposals for the vacant blocks and there will be further meetings next week to explore long term plans.</p> | |
| 297/08 | Greyfriars | |
| | <p>DW advised the Board that terms of the deal with Linden have been agreed though this must stay confidential until details have been given to the stock market.</p> <p>The planning application should be submitted by the end of 2009. The key issue at the moment is the Four Gates centre. There has been a series of meetings with the community trust and their partners which has agreed to establish a project group to drive forward the proposal</p> <p>Certainty in the following areas needs to be reached by 01 July 2009 if the Four Gates Centre proposal is to move forward: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and spec of the Four Gates centre (Linden are working with the Community Trust) • Confirmation of both capital and revenue funding for Four Gates Centre • Agreement re a land swap arrangement <p>Procurement is inextricably linked to the overall Greyfriars development. Linden Homes have been appointed by English Partnerships to see through the whole scheme. English Partnerships remain the landowners. CO commented that if by 01 July 2009 there is no project then presumably the Greyfriars scheme will move forward without the Four Gates Centre. DW confirmed that this is the position.</p> | |
| 298/08 | Marketing Update Report | |

| | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| | A full report was circulated prior to the meeting | |
| 299/08 | AOB | |
| | <p><u>Intranet</u> Martin confirmed that he is working on an intranet to provide Board members with presentations, Board papers etc. Larger files can be downloaded instead of being sent by email. He confirmed that the site will be secure with different levels of access for the different levels of Board membership.</p> | |