

GLOUCESTER HERITAGE URBAN REGENERATION COMPANY LTD



MINUTES OF RESIDENTS & COMMUNITY FORUM MEETING

Venue: GAVCA, 75-81 Eastgate Street Gloucester

Thursday 27th November 2008

Present	Residents & Community - Board Members	
	Sally Pickering (SP)	GHURC Board Member (Chair)
	David Bush (DB)	GHURC Board Member (Vice-Chair)
Present	Residents & Community Forum – Members and Observers	
	Dennis Collins (DC)	Pat Culley (PC)
	Bryan Lyall (BL)	Louise Spira (LS)
	Mahmoud Patel (MP)	Mavis Wall (MWa)
	Mark Boyce (MB)	Barry Leach (BLe)
	Helen Cook (HC)	
	Jenny Lappington (JL)	
GHURC	Chris Oldershaw (CO)	GHURC
	Martin Wallace (MW)	GHURC
	Sam Hoad (SH)	GHURC

Refs.	Item Title	ACTION
124/08	Apologies	
	Ian Jarvis, Mary Smith, Adele Owen, Ian Ellis, John Price, Philip Lowry, Zaheera Nanabawa. Mike Pullen has resigned from the forum.	
125/08	Declaration of Interest	
	None.	
126/08	Minutes of the Residents & Community Forum Meeting held 24th September 2008	
	Page 4, line 4, referred to MB and should read DB. Otherwise the minutes of the previous meeting were approved and agreed as a true record.	
127/08	Matters arising from the minutes 24th September 2008	
	MB had facilitated a meeting of forum members to discuss the Community & Resident Forum Protocol. Matters arising discussed under the relevant agenda item. The suggested tour of the Quays development prior to opening will be arranged in the near future.	MW
128/08	Feedback from the Board meeting 26th September 2008	
	David Bush (DB) gave the update. Two main areas of feedback:- 1. The Community Regeneration Protocol was emphasised. SH has been in post since 01/08, the mobile exhibition unit is being extensively used, the forums are active and well attended. All 7 Community Ambassadors have now been appointed. The Regeneration News print run has now increased to 2500. It was felt that more work is needed to involve 'hard to reach' groups. SP added that there has been some concern over the accessibility of GHURC information such as the website. SP also added that there is much 'engagement' activity that the Board are not aware of. SH will give a presentation to the Board in January on engagement plans, focusing on the 'hard to reach' sectors of the community. 2. DB reported that the proposals for the proposed Ramada Encore Hotel on the Quays had been discussed. Plans had previously been presented to the Design Review Panel who felt that the standards were not high enough. It was felt that it would like to be suggested to Peel that they appoint new architects, but also a general feeling of not wanting Ramada to pull out of the scheme. SP added that there was a split opinion amongst Board members, some felt it did not matter what the design details were and others felt this should not be compromised. BLe added that Ramada Encore's initial plans to change the layout of the hotel and to increase it's height, had been passed by the Gloucester City Planning committee just	

	<p>days before this forum meeting. MWa added that Malvern had an example where an Abbey had been turned into a hotel and the scheme was not of a good standard.</p>	
<p>132/08</p>	<p>Board Agenda Items</p>	
	<p>SP Suggested bringing forward these agenda items to ensure forum members had the opportunity to comment on Board papers. 291/08 Programme Performance Update CO summarised the report. Advised that it is planned to put the Blackfriars Masterplan through a process of 'enquiry by design' in January. The Princes Trust have a facilitation scheme for this. It is now anticipated that the opening of the Quays development will be June 2009 and will tie in with the next Tall Ships festival. Linden Homes are expected to sign up with the new Homes and Communities Agency (formally EP) the first week in December in relation to the Greyfriars development. BLe stated that the body of the report refers to 3 new lettings in the retail units in the Docks and asked if there is any further update on the remainder of the units or whether this will depend on the footfall from the Quays opening? CO – much will depend on the Quays opening, although discussions are underway with potential restaurant owners, but they would not intend to open prior to the Quays opening. With the improved signage and linkage routes it is hoped that the other units would be filled. DC asked what the plans are for the area around the existing Longsmith Street car park? CO explained that it is planned that the car park itself would be demolished and the spaces re-allocated in the proposed new car park on the lower car park site within Blackfriars along with a 4* hotel. The plans for the surface level car park on Ladybellegate Street is for a new public square with a new block wrapping round it. This would have active ground floor uses and house either offices or university space above. The police station will also be re-located to the building at the end of Ladybellegate Street on the other side of the road to the URC offices. Details of these proposals will be worked through in the proposed workshops, the idea being based on the historic street patterns. DC stated that the plans for Kings Square look excellent, but the assumption is that this is based on capital funding, have the future costs of maintenance been considered? CO – the City Council has the primary responsibilities for maintenance, but there can be a management agreement with a developer to share or take on maintenance costs. DB felt that careful consideration needed to be given to the cost of parking at the Quays development. If the cost is too expensive people will not leave their cars on site and go into the city centre, but if it is cheaper than the city centre then cars will be left for long periods taking up the spaces at the outlet centre. Perhaps the answer is for the City Council to lower the cost of parking in the city centre. LS wondered whether this would encourage more people to use public transport. CO advised that the City Council have a Car Parking Strategy. LS questioned what the plans are for the existing trees in Kings Square? CO advised that there are a range of issues over the selection of trees. Also a major consideration for this area is the allocation of taxi provision and blue badge parking. The preferred plan for Kings Sqaure is the least amount of traffic possible, but there may have to be a link in front of Debenhams for taxi's and blue badge holders only. All options need exploring and the issue of the trees cannot be solved until other issues have been resolved. LS advised that there is much public feeling over keeping valuable trees. MWa asked whether forum members would have the opportunity to comment before any decisions are made. CO advised that there would be workshops run to work through these and other issues.</p> <p>293/08 Economic Linkages – Proposed improvements to Southgate Street and Kimbrose Triangle (Route 1) - Report CO talked through plans presented on the screen. DB asked how this would effect the No. 14 bus?</p>	

CO explained that the Park & Ride services would run through Southgate Street. All plans have involved the bus operators.
 HC stated that she believed buses would turn right into Parliament Street from Southgate Street.
 SP – there is a good example of a wall incorporating ‘public art’ in Sheffield that has a poem built into it.
 CO advised that there is £20 million of funding available from the RDA over the next few years, £5 million will be spent on the linkage routes.
 MWa asked if there is any other financial contribution being made?
 CO – some funds will come from S106, County and City Councils.
 BLe asked if any funding had been ‘built in’ to improve ‘tatty’ areas and upgrade frontages?
 CO advised that the Business Forum had the same query. GHURC will suggest to the City Council that they target this area of concern.
 MP asked if there were any plans for the Kimbrose Hotel?
 CO advised that a CPO had been looked into, but it was too expensive.
 MP enquired about the old Severn Sound building.
 CO – Need to consider available budget. There will be the art wall and creative lighting in this area.
 DC asked how the amendments to Southgate Street and the top of Commercial Road will tie in with plans further down Commercial Road?
 CO – The lower section of this road will be reduced to add an extra 7m to the waterfront at the Quay.
 BL stated he would like to see more greenery along these routes.
 CO explained this can cause issues because of surface cleaning and service cables, but will try to ensure some flexibility.
 BL suggested the use of planters and suggested that more imagination is needed to do more on this subject.
 CO explained that there would be some street furniture, but keen to avoid too much ‘clutter’.

294/08 Greater Railway Triangle – EDAW Peer Review report:

CO talked through report and images, explaining the land ownerships.
 LS asked if the existing railway lines would continue to be used.
 CO – yes, including plans to upgrade the Central Station.
 LS asked if it was considered a good site for residential use considering the railway lines?
 CO – confident this would be managed through the design process. A noise survey showed more noise was created by the road traffic.
 MWa asked if GHURC were adding any additional funds to Network Rail on the planned improvements to the Central Station?
 CO explained the only funding available is through EP and this would have to be discussed.
 MWa asked why there were plans for 4 new hotels across the areas when one has just closed down (New County)?
 CO – Reports show we will need more than the 3 planned.
 DB stated that due to previous uses of this land he felt it would need ‘cleansing’.
 CO advised that the whole site would need to undergo this process.
 DB stated that in theory ‘eco-homes’ promoted ‘non-vehicle’ households. The 3 railway lines are in close proximity to this site and would create some noise and the use of trees would help.
 CO advised that the designs would be built around the noise issue as much as possible but that is the nature of the site. The scheme still needs to be worked up.
 MB asked what was meant by workspace?
 CO – Probably small business units. They may link with the proposed medi-park, it will depend on the hospitals requirements.
 BL asked that due to the obvious restrictions of the 3 railway lines is there going to be work towards better access into and from the site?
 CO – that level of detail hasn’t been reached as yet. The main vehicle access will be from Metz Way. There maybe use by emergency vehicles using Blinkhorn Bridge. There

	<p>will be other walking/cycling routes. The infra-structure requires public sector funding. SP summarised the main points as noise and access issues.</p> <p>295/08 Feedback from Company Directors ‘Away Day’: CO talked through report. MWa stated that the City Centre Community Forum felt that the empty shops should be made to look better. CO advised that there is a potential tenant for the Hawkshead shop. DB stated that the Chamber of Commerce support the improvement of empty shops. MWa advised that Cabot Circus is a good example of where empty shops have been made to look attractive. SP confirmed that these comments would be taken to the Board and shared with the City Council representatives. MB queried the emphasis on Gloucestershire rather than Gloucester. SP advised that the feeling was that the regeneration should attract people from across the county, but agreed with concerns over the limited resource of the Mobile Exhibition Unit. CO confirmed that the main emphasis would remain Gloucester. MWa felt that there was still much work to be done in reaching and re-visiting areas within Gloucester.</p> <p>296/08 Bakers Quay – CONFIDENTIAL (verbal): CO explained the concern of the Board over the derelict buildings on Bakers Quay with the imminent opening of the Quays Development. Various options had been considered:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could building regulation powers be used? – these are limited - Possibility of using wrap-around screening - £50 per sq.m - Compulsory purchase order? – this would take a long time, the general view is that this could be successful, but would need financial backing. This would be a last resort. <p>The Bishops are quoting a sale price of £10-12 million, but due to the credit crunch the value is now much lower. DB felt it is important to complete the walkway along the canalside. CO advised that Ian Jarvis confirmed at the last meeting that this land would return to BW next year. LS enquired about the possibility of a ‘float & ride’ feeling that it would be unique and keep cars out of the city centre. CO advised that £25,000 had been earmarked to come up with a water based strategy. It would not be the right time to introduce this at the moment. HC advised that BW first needed to create the infra-structure before this could be considered. MB advised that CCCP had looked into this and it didn’t stack up financially. BLe confirmed that the findings of the CCCP report had been forwarded to all interested parties. URC have responded to this. They are awaiting a response from the City Council. The Travis Perkins site is up for sale and would provide a good opportunity to begin the infra-structure work.</p> <p>297/08 Greyfriars/Four Gates Centre – Position Statement – CONFIDENTIAL: David Warburton is due to give a report to the Board, feedback will be given at the next meeting.</p>	
<p>129/08</p>	<p>Residents & Community Forum Protocol Review Notes from the members meeting on 11th November were circulated and each point was discussed in turn:</p> <p>1 There was a strong feeling that forum members did not feel they were representing the wider community as stated in the Protocol document. It was agreed this was outdated and the following changes should be made to the Terms of Reference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. delete the word ‘wider’. 2. Deleted the words “representatives of” 	<p>MW</p>

	<p>3. Add the word 'reflect'</p> <p>SP advised that there were different reasons for the invited membership and confirmed that membership was decided by the GHURC Board, not the Forum members. Confusion around membership had arisen because the Protocol document had not been amended.</p> <p>CO advised that the number of members must be 'manageable', there are already 25 members and we would want to ensure everyone has an opportunity to input.</p> <p>SP confirmed that SP/MW had been through an exercise of looking at geographical areas and areas of interest with a view to ensuring as much diversity as possible within the membership. Any recommendations for new members would be considered taking into account the numbers already on the forum and the differing perspectives they may bring.</p> <p>DC questioned the statement in the Protocol "Respond to the needs of the wider communities". MW and SP confirmed that this is a GHURC role and not forum member role.</p> <p>DC queried if he should be bringing others views to this meeting and are members just a URc publicity stunt? SP confirmed that any member could bring the views of others if they wished to, but were not expected to as part of their role. This forum's role is to provide a 'sounding board' to ideas.</p> <p>CO advised that he has used forum's in other areas and they were very successful. The structure is put in place to ensure local people 'test' ideas and proposals.</p> <p>2 It was agreed that, since members are not representatives of any particular community, the members' "areas of interest" should be deleted from the list of members of the Forum.</p> <p>BLe felt that he would bring his own views and experience to forum meetings and these would be influenced by his communities.</p> <p>MW asked what would happen if forum members views differed from the general views of the community? BLe felt that he would put across opinions and views and state where they came from, i.e. "these are my views" or "the community feels.."</p> <p>3 The Protocol also stated that minutes from Forum meetings would be available on the URc website, this is currently not the case. MW advised that historically this did happen but there became an issue with confidential papers, but the Business Forum also felt minutes should be available on the website, this will now happen, with caution over confidential items.</p> <p>4 Members felt that Community Ambassadors should be full members of the Community & Residents Forum. MW advised that all Ambassadors were offered full membership of either the Business or Community & Residents Forum.</p> <p>It was agreed that this would be included in the Protocol.</p> <p>5 Members proposed that those who do not attend a minimum of 50% of meetings be removed from the forum. It was agreed the Protocol will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>6 Members asked for minutes to be distributed within 3 weeks of the meeting. This was agreed</p> <p>7 Members requested that the Chair and Vice-Chair of the forum be elected annually from the forum membership, removing the requirement of these positions to be held by Board members. SP advised that this was not possible because the forum is part of the GHURC structure so needs to be chaired by Directors. SP also asked if there were reasons for this request?</p> <p>MWa asked if the role of Chair involved work between meetings? SP advised that any issues arising between meetings were dealt with by the Chair, also preparing for meetings and agreeing minutes.</p> <p>CO advised that the forum could be Chaired by any member of the Board and forum members could influence this.</p> <p>DC felt that there would be stronger links between the forum and the Board if the</p>	<p>MW</p> <p>MW</p> <p>MW</p> <p>MW</p> <p>MW</p> <p>MW</p> <p>MW</p> <p>MW</p>
--	--	---

	<p>guests may be asked to leave the room if confidential items are discussed and cannot participate in forum discussions.</p> <p>MWa would like to bring along the new Chair of the Three Bridges Partnership. This was requested for this meeting, but was declined due to the item agenda of the Forum Protocol.</p> <p>SP asked if the Board meeting was open to observers.</p> <p>CO – No.</p> <p>SH confirmed that this forum is not self-selecting and members are invited by GHURC.</p> <p>BL felt that understanding the process of regeneration takes time for forum members to get used to.</p> <p>CO suggested a separate session on how the organisation operates.</p> <p>SP suggested a presentation on the process of regeneration.</p> <p>BL felt the most important part was highlighting key points where contributions and influence can be made.</p> <p>CO confirmed that there are timelines in the Business Plan and suggested a series of training workshops for the forum next year.</p> <p>SH advised that the Community Engagement Plans would also hold this information.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Protocol should state that meetings will be held 6 times per year.</p>	MW CO
130/08	Gloucester Heritage URC Intranet	
	<p>MW advised that there is now an intranet to run alongside the URC internet. Each forum member would have their own log-on and password. The intranet will hold all forum papers and there would be different levels of security. This gives the URC the ability to upload larger files than on the internet.</p> <p>SP asked if this forum's papers would still be sent in hard copy?</p> <p>MW – yes.</p> <p>It is hoped the intranet will go live in January 09.</p> <p>Members were asked to be aware of confidentiality issues.</p>	
131/08	Community Engagement Strategy Review	
	This item was deferred to the next forum meeting.	
133/08	Any Other Business	
	<p>MWa thanked SH and Fred Reed for attending the Three Bridges AGM.</p> <p>BLe advised that he had been in meetings with LDA and asked what the timescale for the development around Kimbrose is?</p> <p>CO advised a report would go to the Board in January.</p> <p>MB stated that the Robert Raikes House is "terrific" and suggested a letter could be sent to them from the URC recognising the quality of the development.</p> <p>MB requested e-mail address' for the Community Ambassadors. SH to send with the minutes.</p> <p>LS thanked URC members for attending the GANet Art exhibition at Gloucester Library.</p> <p>LS stated her regret of the imminent closure of 'Made in Gloucestershire' and asked if anything could be done to help with the rent increase? LS felt we should avoid only bringing in chain-stores and smaller individual business' need targeting and supporting.</p>	CO SH
	Dates of Future Meetings	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wednesday 28th January 2009, 5.30 – 8.00 p.m. – GAVCA, 75/81 Eastgate Street ▪ Wednesday 25th March 2009, 5.30 – 8.00 p.m. – GAVCA, 75/81 Eastgate Street 	

Author: Sam Hoad