

GLOUCESTER HERITAGE URBAN REGENERATION COMPANY LTD

MINUTES OF RESIDENTS & COMMUNITY FORUM MEETING

Venue: GAVCA, 75-81 Eastgate Street Gloucester

Wednesday 28th May 2008

Present	Business Forum - Board Members	
	Sally Pickering	GHURC Board Member (Chair)
	David Bush	GHURC Board Member

Present	Residents & Community Forum – Panel Members and Observers	
	Brian Lyall (BL)	
	John Price (JP)	
	Dennis Collins (DC)	
	Jenny Lappington (JL)	
	Mark Boyce (MB)	
	Mavis Wall (MW)	
	Philip Lowry (PL)	
	Guests	
	Barry King	Mick Thorpe
	Nicki de Gruyther	

GHURC	Mike Tilt (MT)	GHURC
	Martin Wallace (MWc)	GHURC
	Sam Hoad (SH)	GHURC
	Ian Williams (IW)	GHURC

Refs.	Item Title	ACTION
100/08	Apologies	
	Chris Oldershaw, Adele Owen, Lou Spira, Marilyn Champion, Gerald Tween, Gill Shelley, Ian Ellis, Andrew Maliphant	
101/08	Declaration of Interest	
	None.	
102/08	Minutes of the Residents & Community Forum Meeting held 26th March 2008	
	The minute of the previous meeting was approved and agreed as a true record.	
103/08	Minutes of the Residents & Community Forum Meeting held 26th March 2008	
	Any matters arising from the previous minutes would be raised at the end of the meeting due to the length of the agenda.	

<p>104/08</p>	<p>Feedback from the Board meeting</p> <p>David Bush gave the update.</p> <p>Matters arising from previous Community and Resident Forum meetings had been taken to the main Board i.e. concern over too many houses and apartments planned for URC sites, the sensitive nature of the frontage building of the old GlosCat site and the retention of as many trees as possible within the URC sites. DB confirmed CO had accepted the sensitive nature of the GlosCat front building also confirming that this is not a listed building.</p> <p>DB confirmed that the AGM had taken place on 25th April.</p> <p>The issue regarding locating a railway station at the Railway Triangle site had been raised with the Board and was noted as an agenda item for the next meeting, 30th May.</p>	
<p>105/08</p>	<p>Future of the City Event</p> <p>PL felt that, in parts, the event was inspiring. There were a lot of people for a small place for the Friday evening event and it was overwhelming with the 'great and the good'. Thoroughly enjoyed it.</p> <p>BL said the Saturday of the event was very good with lots of members of the public. The layout enabled people to move around easily. There were lots of questions and much interest. The event was well received and the venue was good as many people had not had the opportunity to visit Blackfriars Priory before.</p> <p>MT said that the Saturday was more relaxed and felt over the two public days that the objectives had been achieved.</p> <p>GHURC has received lots of positive feedback, with a strong emphasis on 'getting on and delivering' the regeneration.</p> <p>MWc gave an update of the event with visitor numbers.</p> <p>SP asked if this would be an annual event. MWc confirmed this was the intention as per the Community Engagement Strategy.</p> <p>DB felt that the Radio Gloucestershire presence was a wonderful addition to the event and also congratulated all Friday evening speakers whom he thought were excellent.</p> <p>MT noted the contribution made by MWc and SH for this event. DC was in agreement.</p> <p>MWc showed examples of the 'comment cards' and said that feedback was gathered through these at the event. The cards will be used up until the end of September when a draw will take place of those completed and received by the URC to win an IPOD Touch.</p>	

106/08	Ambassador Programme Update	
	<p>SH confirmed that 5 Community Ambassadors had now been officially appointed and outlined the process this had taken, in that a sub-group of the Community & Residents Forum had been set up to make the final decisions. This group consisted of SP, MB, PL and SH. This group met 12th May 2008.</p> <p>The Ambassadors appointed are: Canal Corridor – Fred Reed The Docks – Helen Cook Greater Blackfriars – Lou Spira Kings Quarter – Mike West Greyfriars – Maxine Overbury</p> <p>All of these and the unsuccessful applicants have now been notified. SH confirmed that there will be an official launch on 2nd June where the Ambassadors will meet each other, the URC staff and have photos taken for a press release.</p> <p>Each Ambassador will have a place on the relevant steering group for their area and also a seat on either the Business or Community & Residents Forum.</p> <p>SH confirmed that work is underway to fill the two missing vacancies of the Railway Triangle and the Quays. The sub-group next meet on 16th June.</p> <p>MB felt it was a fair process. PL said the sub-group had benefited from the preparation carried out by SH. SP felt it was good the sub-group had a choice of applicants. DC thanked SH for attending the Hempsted Residents meeting to talk about the Ambassador Programme.</p>	
107/08	Review forum operating protocols and membership	
	<p>SP advised that MB had concerns over protocols and membership and a review has taken place.</p> <p>SP opened the discussion to the group on how they would like to receive information.</p> <p>MB said that this forum meets every other month with little business going on in between and some issues ‘bog down’ the meetings. MB distributed a list for people to note down their contact details, if they wished to, so that members can communicate outside of these meetings and then be more succinct at the forum meetings.</p> <p>SP advised that GHURC cannot distribute individuals contact details. MWc confirmed he had also requested contact details by e-mail.</p> <p>DC said that although forum members were not officially expected to gather the views of their communities he feels that this is part of the role and has difficulties in doing this considering the minimum amount of time that</p>	

	<p>paperwork is received prior to a meeting.</p> <p>PLK felt that members should bring the ‘feelings’ of their communities rather than specific feedback.</p> <p>DC advised that some residents in the Hempsted area went to the Future of the City event and until then had not heard anything about the regeneration.</p> <p>JP said that receiving papers further in advance would be better, for example the railway triangle papers distributed for the discussion at this meeting needed longer to be considered.</p> <p>SP advised that papers should be received one week before meetings and this should be re-iterated.</p> <p>MWc said he hoped this situation had improved, but some papers are received late by GHURC and then in turn are distributed late.</p> <p>MT confirmed that the papers needed to be distributed even if they are late to tie in with the Board papers.</p> <p>MB asked the group if they were comfortable with the attendance of the group, saying that on average there is a 46% attendance level. SP had a list of members and confirmed that 9 had never attended. MWc confirmed that the protocols state that the minimum attendance is 50% and a register is kept from each meeting, MWc asked for agreement from members that those below this figure could be contacted to withdraw their membership. This was agreed.</p> <p>DB said that some members were the same as the Gloucester City Community Forum and that maybe other members of this group could be invited to fill the gaps.</p> <p>SP proposed that MWc make contact with those with low attendance and then look at the gaps in terms of diversity of both geographical communities and communities of interest that this leaves. The rest of the forum could then make recommendations to ensure that there was diversity within the group.</p> <p>MB seconded this proposal. MWc to make contact and report back to the forum at the next meeting regarding the number of vacancies and considered gaps geographically and by interest.</p> <p>This was agreed by the group. Point raised that Board Members were treated with the same consideration. Agreed.</p> <p>PL raised the query of how many advisors there needs to be. SP felt this should remain open and be dictated by the agenda.</p> <p>MW asked if there was a Vice-Chair of this forum. PL felt that DB would be a good candidate. DB happy to stand, all agreed.</p> <p>SP confirmed forum vacancies would be an agenda item for the next</p>	<p>MWc</p> <p>MWc</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------

	meeting.	
	Board Agenda Items	
	<p>249/08 Programme Performance Update Paper not received SP made copies for members.</p> <p>250/08 City Employment Plan MT – gave background. DC asked if there is sufficient time to complete training in time for the job opportunities at the Quays. MT advised that there is time and that it is also planned to build on existing skills and that bespoke training would be available.</p> <p>DB said that the first big intake into the Outlet centre will be the test of the City Employment Plan.</p> <p>JP asked for clarification in the paper that 13.5% of Gloucester’s population is ‘workless’. MT advised that this does not mean ‘unemployed’ and this is the language used by the industry. PL said that this does not take into account migrant workers. MT advised that ‘deprived’ areas will be directly effected by the URC regeneration areas.</p> <p>251/08 County Council Funding for Transport BK reported on the distributed paper. DB said in Europe, lots of money is put into many schemes, do we, as a country, not publicise money received from Europe or do we not apply for it? BK advised that we are not eligible. The only Counties eligible for European funding are Cornwall and some areas of Wales due to deprivation levels. Although Gloucestershire has received some funding due to the floods.</p> <p>MT asked if we are bidding against other south west areas are our chances of receiving funding limited. BK confirmed the chances are limited.</p> <p>PL cited paragraph 106 of the paper and asked if large amounts of money are being spent to stand still.</p> <p>MB asked what the objective of the paper is and whether a founder member of GHURC are stating they are ‘short of money’. BK advised the paper was produced in response to a GHURC Board request on how the County Council is funded and that it remains in support of the URC programme. MT advised that the majority of funding is from English Partnerships and SWRDA and that GHURC needed to know the financial situation of the County Council so resource and contribution levels can be assessed.</p> <p>MB proposed not to accept the paper.</p> <p>DC did not agree and felt the paper stated the County Council’s limited resources and where they come from, also felt it is important for members to realise that money may not be available.</p> <p>MT pointed out that the County Council are a 4* authority.</p> <p>MW asked for clarification on 1.19 ‘roof tax’. BK referred to the Regional</p>	

Spatial Strategy that runs up until 2026. This looks at the number of planned dwellings in the county and a suggested 'tax' on these properties for services such as public transport, roads etc. This was referred to as 'Community Infrastructure Levy'. This is not yet confirmed. MT confirmed that Section 106 will still apply and the levy will not be appropriate for all developments.

DC asked if there was a commitment in the Capital Budget to implement the objectives of the URC. BK confirmed that finance has already been committed for transport infrastructure around the Kimbrose Triangle and Llanthony Road.

MB asked that if 50,000 dwellings were planned for the county with a potential £5000 levy on each, this equates to £250 million, where will this money go. BK confirmed this will go into the infrastructure to support these dwellings, such as schools, roads, affordable housing etc The money will not go directly to the County Council it will go to the districts.

In conclusion, there were divided views about the implications of this report and the Chair suggested that if individual members wished to follow this up further, they should contact Barry after the meeting.

251/08 County Council Parkway Update

BK gave outline of the report.

SP said that this issue had been discussed at length at previous meetings and asked that it be noted that the majority of the forum members wanted to keep a central station although they may be divided on how this will be achieved.

DB advised that there is plenty of manoeuvrability on the Bristol to Birmingham line and quoted recovery times. Felt that the most important issue was to enable tourists and visitors to reach Gloucester city centre by train. This could not be achieved by the ITEC proposals. A new railway station on the Railway Triangle site could be supported by a 'sponsored' bus service into the centre of Gloucester, incorporating the Outlet centre. The citizen has published the public's view and 98% are against a station at Elmbridge Court, this needs to be taken into account.

MW said that a station located on the Railway Triangle site it could incorporate shops, hotels etc. As access into the Railway Triangle site is going to happen, development can occur on some of the site leaving room for a station.

JP asked what the position of the City Council was on this matter. Also as members of the forum who are in favour of a station on the Railway Triangle site, why is this not happening.

MB quoted GHURC mission statement and quoted Parmjit Dhanda's position regarding this. MB summarised:

- integral part of GHURC
- low support from MP
- no Government support

- no public consultation
- URC statement that a station on the Railway Triangle is not an option.

JL said that those living in the South of Gloucester are wondering how they will get to a station at Elmbridge Court if they have no private transport.

SP brought main points together, whilst noting that only 6 forum members were present:

- No time for the trains to stop, is this really the case?
- Preference is a station at the railway triangle and not Elmbridge Court
- The Citizen quote that the people of Gloucester would prefer the station to be located on the Railway Triangle.

MW advised that this issue needs a full public consultation. MT advised that Chris Oldershaw has stated that he will suggest to the Board that a sub-group is formed to fully investigate all aspects of this issue.

It was advised that Grimleys would be presenting their Masterplan to the Board, MT felt that no decisions would be made until all avenues were explored by the proposed sub-group.

SP confirmed points raised would be passed onto the Board by herself and DB.

252/08 Greater Railway Triangle – Draft Masterplan

MT presented report.

MT confirmed there would be vehicular access from Metz Way.

SP advised that conference facilities, green areas and family housing suggestions had come from this forum and been incorporated into the plans. SP suggested that subject to the review of the railway station location, these proposals be agreed.

All agreed.

253/08 Kings Quarter Position Statement

MT advised the delay in the development of this area due to a European ruling.

IW gave details of the two remaining entrants for the Kings Square design competition, (for the purpose of these minutes, design 1 is the Niall McLoughlin design and design 2 is the Townshend design).

SP asked if the concerns over design 2 could be addressed. Also that design 1 is more radical but risky. Design 2 is more traditional.

PL felt design 2 was dull.

JP was not sure if design 1 would work in Gloucester.

DC preferred the simplicity of design 2.

PL liked the imaginative design of 1.

MW felt design 2 was beautiful.

PL raised concern that Gloucester City Council had a terrible track record of maintenance and was not confident that any design would be maintained.

	<p>DB asked if there will still plans to demolish the Chambers building. IW confirmed this is the case.</p> <p>SP confirmed that opinions were split and that there are concerns over the maintenance of any design.</p> <p>MB felt that both designs were exciting, but that it is the opportunity for GHURC to make a statement.</p> <p>254/08 Annual Report & Accounts 2007/08 No need to discuss.</p> <p>255/08 URC Business Plan 2008/09 No need to discuss.</p>	
106/08	AOB	
	<p>SH advised that the new mobile exhibition unit is due for delivery this week. Members were asked to consider opportunities for this unit.</p> <p>SP asked if members wanted to add any future agenda items to contact MWc in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>PL would like to discuss 'green issues' especially in relation to Alney Island (future agenda item).</p> <p>JL would like future agenda items to include, GlosCat Building, old Dunelm, old sorting office.</p> <p>DC asked if this meeting needed to be lead by the Board meetings.</p> <p>SP suggested more regular meeting, one to discuss Board meeting agenda's and one for other issues. MT suggested that the 'other issues' meeting was held without GHURC officers.</p> <p>SP suggested MWc e-mail members for issues to be discussed.</p> <p>MT advised of Civic Awards being run.</p> <p>PL advised that £30 million was due to be spent on new court buildings in Great Western Road and that a member of GHURC should be on the steering group for this project. MT to look into. (Next meeting 4th June, 1.00 p.m. Conference Room, Southgate House).</p>	MWc
	Dates of Future Meetings	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wednesday 23rd July 2008 – 6:00pm - GAVCA, 75/81 Eastgate Street ▪ Wednesday 24th Sept. 2008 – 6:00pm - GAVCA, 75/81 Eastgate Street ▪ Wednesday 26th Nov. 2008 – 6:00pm - GAVCA, 75/81 Eastgate Street 	

Author: Sam Hoad