

GLOUCESTER HERITAGE URBAN REGENERATION COMPANY LTD



MINUTES OF RESIDENTS & COMMUNITY FORUM MEETING

Venue: GAVCA, 75-81 Eastgate Street Gloucester

Wednesday 24th September 2008

Present	Residents & Community - Board Members	
	Sally Pickering	GHURC Board Member (Chair)
	David Bush	GHURC Board Member
	Mary Smith	GHURC Board Member
	Ian Jarvis	GHURC Board Member
Present	Residents & Community Forum – Members and Observers	
	Adele Owen (AO)	Philip Lowry (PL)
	Bryan Lyall (BL)	
	Ian Ellis(IE)	
	Mark Boyce (MB)	
	Helen Cook (HC)	
	Jenny Lappington (JL)	
GHURC	Chris Oldershaw (CO)	GHURC
	Martin Wallace (MW)	GHURC
	Sam Hoad (SH)	GHURC
Guest	Philip Cooke (PC)	The Destination Marketing Group

Refs.	Item Title	ACTION
115/08	Apologies	
	Dennis Collins, Louise Spira, Mahmoud Patel, Mavis Wall, Michael Pullen, Pat Culley	
116/08	Declaration of Interest	
	Mary Smith – as member of the City Council Planning Committee Ian Ellis – Kings Quarter	
117/08	Minutes of the Residents & Community Forum Meeting held 23rd July 2008	
	The minutes of the previous meeting were approved and agreed as a true record.	
118/08	Matters arising from the minutes 23rd July 2008	
	The possibility of extending this meeting's finishing time to 9.00 p.m. was discussed; it was generally felt that this should not be taken up. Members were given the option to begin the meeting at 5.30, this was agreed. MB queried GHURC's situation regarding the Railway Triangle, CO re-enforced 267/08 of last minutes. Meeting accepted that minutes should remain the same.	
119/08	Feedback from the Board meeting	
	David Bush (DB) gave the update. Public Art – the views of this forum were represented at the Board meeting. The Board were impressed with the presentation given and supported proposals. Blackfriars – CO outlined the report and a decision regarding HEFCE funding for the re-location of part of Gloucestershire University is expected in March 09. There will be a two-stage consultation exercise on the draft Masterplan. It is anticipated that the Courts will relocate within the next 3 years and it is proposed that the Crown Court building be used as a music venue. The Board felt that the Masterplan was an excellent document and that the Blackfriars area will be fundamental in the linkages proposed. The RDA are still concerned over funding requirements for the Blackfriars area and support the development taking place in phases. Railway Triangle – The Board is in support of the Parkway scheme and significant improvements to the central station. The services at Gloucester central need to be superior than at present. PL queried the Blackfriars Archaeology report, CO advised this has not been finalised. It is hoped to minimise the amount of archaeological excavation required. English Heritage are anticipating approximately £2-3 million. Updates will be given to the forum when available.	

120/08	Business Improvement District (BID) – Philip Cooke	
	<p>PC gave a presentation of the Business Improvement District for the Canal Corridor area.</p> <p>CO advised that the BID Management Group will act as the Steering Group for the Canal Corridor, with an officer of GHURC (Richard Owen) chairing the meeting for appropriate agenda items.</p> <p>MW Confirmed that Fred Reed, the BID development Manager, is also the GHURC Community Ambassador for this regeneration area.</p> <p>DB asked how the insurance for BID members works? – PC advised that ‘British BIDs’ - an umbrella organisation for BID’s, organise special rates for members which is financially attractive.</p> <p>AO enquired if there were any ‘get out’s’ for any organisation such as charities or public sector? PC advised any organisation paying business rates is included.</p> <p>PL asked, considering the BID’s location close to residential areas, whether there has been any consideration on the impact, such as traffic? PC felt that any impact on the neighbouring residential areas would be positive. SH advised that GHURC have facilitated a meeting of local residents groups and Fred Reed is to begin to link the BID and the surrounding residential areas. MW confirmed that discussions around local business’ putting on ‘training days’ and sponsoring local sports teams had been discussed as a way forward.</p> <p>MS enquired what impact residential accommodation on the Contract Chemicals site would have on the BID. CO advised that there should be employment usage adjacent to Bristol Road, but nothing had been finalised.</p> <p>MB enquired if the Canal Corridor site is the normal size of a BID? PC confirmed this and advised that BID’s generally cover a fairly small area, although there are approximately 160 business’ in this area.</p> <p>PL asked if progress on the BID will be reported back to the forum? CO advised updates will be included in the Programme Performance Update reports.</p>	
121/08	Annual Review Community Engagement Strategy	
	As no papers had been distributed it was agreed to carry over to the next meeting.	
122/08	Residents & Community Protocol – Mark Boyce	
	<p>It was agreed that MB would facilitate a meeting of forum members to discuss this item and report back to the November forum meeting.</p> <p>Meeting room costs to be met by GHURC.</p>	MB
123/08	Board Agenda Items	
	<p>279/08 GHURC Second Annual Report: CO advised that GHURC have 2000 copies of the latest annual report, forum members were asked to advise GHURC office how many copies they require each (maximum 10).</p> <p>280/08 Programme Performance Update: CO summarised the report. Advised that in relation to Blackfriars, we need to ensure that the RDA are OK with the funding gap before we undertake further consultation on the Masterplan.</p> <p>PL asked if this would present any difficulties? CO advised that it was hoped not.</p> <p>SP enquired what the plans for the old Ecclesiastical site are? CO advised that there are a series of options and that it will probably not be office use. Ultimately Ecclesiastical will decide upon this but will work closely with GHURC and the RDA.</p> <p>IE asked that if residential was planned for the old Ecclesiastical site, will this impact on the plans for the Greyfriars development? CO advised that it would be a different offer of residential that should compliment Greyfriars, student accommodation may be considered.</p> <p>IJ advised that the opening of the Designer Outlet Centre on the Quays site was still on track for May 09, but it was too early for an exact date. The glass roof and interior flooring are currently being installed and lettings are continuing.</p> <p>SP asked when work on the Fourgates Centre is going to begin? CO advised that we cannot give precise details at this stage as work is currently underway to identify ways</p>	

to bridge the funding gap, although the PCT want to be in by 2011.
 DB advised that there had been numerous complaints over the chosen venue for the LXB consultation on the Railway Triangle proposals. CO explained that LXB are under pressure by Network Rail. Currently the plans are not considered to be of a sufficient standard, but it is important to retain the developers considering the state of the current market.
 MB advised that the CCCP (City Centre Community Partnership) used the LXB display boards at a recent meeting that was well attended and attendees were invited to leave their comments that will be passed onto LXB/GHURC.
 MB asked if there was still funding available to proceed with the redevelopments of Kings Square considering the recession? CO confirmed that funding for the square is being met by English Partnerships, SWRDA and the City Council (involving the County Council in Highways alterations). The rest of the Kings Quarter scheme is subject to the 'Roanne' ruling and the City Council procuring a developer. By the time this happens it is hoped the market will be in a better state.
 MB stated that because of the imminent opening of the Quays development it is important that improvements are made in Kings Square to balance out the offer.
 CO advised that £5 million spent on linkage routes and £4 million on Kings Square should help the balance.

281/08 Community Regeneration Protocol:

CO gave the background to this document, explaining that it concerns the 'people' aspect of the regeneration process. The distributed document needs further work.
 SP explained that the Board felt that there was not enough Community Engagement activity. This may be that not enough Community Engagement is reported.
 CO explained that the partners in the Community Regeneration Protocol struggled with what was required for this document and had generally given details of what was already happening rather than what they were doing differently to support the regeneration process.
 PL advised that the £3 million bid for the planned nightshelter had not been successful. CO felt that there was not enough involvement of 'seldom heard' groups.
 SH advised that we do not capture information to record strands of diversity, but these groups would be identified as part of the Community Engagement Plans for each area. SH/MW
 CO suggested a presentation to the forums and the Board regarding our plans on how to engage with 'seldom heard' groups by SH/MW and the LSP (PL offered advice).
 IE advised that 7% of Gloucester population have literacy problems and does the GHURC website cater for this?
 SP advised that at the Board 'away-day' it was generally felt that GHURC literature is "too wordy".
 BL felt that GHURC information on the regeneration needs communicating to as many people as possible and people are still asking what is GHURC? And what do they do? The message needs to be strong.
 MS advised that the City Council has a Race Equality and Disability forum and that information could be left in the City Council reception.
 DB stated that using the mobile exhibition unit we can target our audiences more accurately.
 CO advised that Board members would like to see the mobile unit taken out countywide.

282/08 Kings Quarter Project Update – Confidential:

CO talked through the paper.
 MS asked that if Morley's did not like the developers chosen by the City Council, is that likely to cause problems? CO advised that the CPO process can be used but it shouldn't get to that.
 SP felt that the general feeling of this forum was "to get on with it".
 BL asked how soon work would begin on Kings Square? CO advised it would go to planning March/April 09 and should be on site in approximately 1 year.

283/08 Gloucestershire Parkway Station & Railway Triangle Masterplan Update:

CO discussed the paper.
 SP advised that whilst improvements are made to central station she would like to see

	<p>improvements made to the sub-way. DB stated that the sub-way is owned by Network Rail and the 'in principle' plan is to take away the steps and install a ramp. £2 million has been promised for central station, most of this will be spent on lifts either side of the track, MB felt "appalled" by Network Rails statement of "funds to be sought by others". Also felt that the Parkway scheme could not go ahead without Parliament support and not one MP was in favour of the scheme. He thought LXB's presentation was "terrible", original brief was for the structures and buildings to be of the best possible standards, not rows of terraced houses with no garden. CO highlighted point 1.15 of the report and advised that new proposals would be brought back to this group. IE raised concerns if not enough funding is available and suggested the GHURC Board go back to Network Rail and review conditions for match funding for improvements to the central station. MB advised that he had read in the local press that Stan Waddington (Councillor) had stated that S106 funding cannot be used. MS advised that a direct link needs to be shown for use of S106 funding. DB advised that the plans do not include the south side of the Railway Triangle. CO responded that Network Rail are retaining this area for their own use, but part of the project will include the area being upgraded.</p> <p>284/08 Bakers Quay – Confidential: CO talked through the report. PL enquired who would fund possible CPO action, including a public inquiry. CO advised – the developer. BL advised that there had been reports in the Citizen on how the Bishops land will effect the new Quays development and asked if the Bishops could be "publicly shamed" into action? CO advised that this would be better led by the general public than the URC. CB stated that nothing should spoil the opening of the Quays development and it would be beneficial for the general public to have access along the canalside. IJ advised that the Bishops have lease on that land until next year when it will revert back, although this will be after the opening of the Quays, the canalside will then be opened. HC asked how many of the Bishops buildings are listed? CO advised – all of them. MB enquired whether a developer will be on Board when seeking legal advice? CO considered this unlikely. SP felt that if the buildings were covered (wrapped up), then these coverings would provide a good opportunity for marketing.</p> <p>285/08 Best Practice Visit – Temple Bar, Dublin: BL/MB talked through the report. There was discussion over other areas of 'good practice' such as Plymouth and Montreal. PL asked what trips were planned next? CO advised Edinburgh, Liverpool and Belfast.</p>	
115/08	<p>AOB - It was asked if a tour of Gloucester Quays could be arranged prior to opening. MW will try to arrange this for January.</p>	MW
	<p>Dates of Future Meetings</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ *Thursday 27th Nov. 2008, 5.30 – 8:00pm - GAVCA, 75/81 Eastgate Street *Note date change of the November meeting to 27th due to room unavailability Wednesday 26th ▪ Wednesday 28th January 2008, 5.30 – 8.00 p.m. – GAVCA, 75/81 Eastgate Street 	

Author: Sam Hoad