

Time Commenced – 6.00 pm
Time Finished – 7.55 pm

Regeneration and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Board

24 June 2014

Present: Councillor Stanton (Chair)
Councillors Dhindsa, M Holmes, Jackson, Troup, Turner and Wood

01/14 Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor MacDonald.

02/14 Late Items

There were no late items.

03/14 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

04/14 Call-in

There were no items

05/15 Minutes

The minutes of the Planning Housing and Leisure Overview and Scrutiny Board held on 8 April 2014 were noted.

06/14 Forward Plan

No items were requested.

07/14 Scrutiny Briefing

The Board considered a report which presented a brief overview of the scrutiny process. The Board had the opportunity to study its Terms of Reference and Remit for the forthcoming Municipal Year and the relevant rules of the constitution. The Chair reported that the Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board had referred a motion from Council on Fracking to the Board to consider as it fell within the Boards remit. This would be considered at the next meeting.

Resolved

- 1. To receive the briefing presentation on the scrutiny process from the Scrutiny Officer.**

- 2. To agree the Board's Terms of Reference set out in paragraph 4.1 of the report.**
- 3. To note that the Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board had referred a motion from Council on fracking to the Board and add this to the Board's work programme.**

08/14 Local Sustainable Transport Fund Programme

The Board considered a report which updated members about the progress made on the local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) programme since the previous report in June 2013 including:

- the current scope of the LSTF programme and developments since it was approved by Council Cabinet on the 5 December 2012;
- the latest financial position of the programme, highlighting progress for both capital and revenue projects;
- what had been achieved to date against short and longer term targets.

It informed Members about what the LSTF programme intended to deliver in the future, outlining new funding proposals and bid timescales.

The report also recommended areas that Members could be involved in, or help influence, to ensure a legacy of sustainable transport in Derby.

Members of the Board asked if consideration had been given to making the pavements on pride park dual use, pedestrians and cyclists. Whilst this was the ideal it was not always possible to provide dual use lanes due to the size of the paths and /or the funds required to change them. In some cases members of the public did not know what the various lines meant in respect of cycle lanes. Members asked if more clear signage could be provided to make users aware that shared access paths were for use by both cyclists and pedestrians. They were informed that although officers were aware this was an issue there was currently no funding to address this.

It was noted that Wifi on buses had been targeted at the south east area of the city.

The Board were updated on the progress with Park Bikeworks, where the Council leased the building on a profit share basis. It was community interest company, where any surplus went back into the community interest.

Resolved

- 1. To note the report.**
- 2. To commend the progress made in delivering the Local Sustainable Transport Fund Programme and request a further update by March 2015 including a monitoring framework and measureable outputs.**

- 3. To request the Cabinet Member for Planning, Environment and Regeneration ensures that the Council receives a share of the commercial benefits/profits from the Park Bikeworks venture and that any such income was fed back into the delivery of sustainable transport initiatives.**

09/14 Osmaston Vision Delivery Update

The Board considered a report which stated that Regeneration of Osmaston was a key priority for the Council and was supported through the Council Cabinet process.

On 22 November 2011 Council Cabinet approved proceeding with the OJEU competitive dialogue process to procure a developer partner to join the Council in a private joint venture vehicle to drive and deliver regeneration across Osmaston.

The procurement of the developer partner was complete, with Keepmoat Ltd being the successful tenderer. A Members Agreement had been signed and the Osmaston Regeneration Partnership had been formed.

A Collaboration Agreement was in place with Rolls Royce which committed to the transfer of 30 acres of vacant land from Rolls Royce to the Council. In addition it committed to the transfer of the grade 2 listed Marble Hall, with a contribution towards the refurbishment of the building.

Members raised concerns about green space being used for development and requested that if this needed to happen that there be other green space made available in compensation for using such land. Members also requested that the Clinical Commissioning Group be engaged to ensure that there was medical provision in Marble Hall.

Resolved

- 1. To note the report.**
- 2. To commend the work completed to date and ask for special consideration to be given to providing green space to compensate for any green space used during development.**
- 3. To recommend that the Cabinet Member for Planning, Environment and Regeneration ensures that work is carried out on a strategic level to engage with the Clinical Commissioning Group to ensure that medical provision is integrated in Marble Hall.**

10/14 Core Strategy Transport Mitigation

The Board considered a report which updated Members on the transport strategy testing that had been undertaken as part of the development of the Draft Core Strategy.

Members recalled that, in order to meet Derby's overall growth requirement, a number of strategic sites had been allocated within the City and on the edge of the City in South Derbyshire and Amber Valley. The sites had been chosen for a range of planning reasons including education and linkages to the existing urban structure such as existing district centres, employment and amenities and their ability to be delivered.

The options available to the three Councils to meet these needs within the 'Derby Urban Area' were relatively limited. Therefore, while the development of a transport strategy had been an important part of the process and had influenced the selection of sites, decisions had had to be made taking a variety of issues into account. In some cases, there may have been negative transport impacts associated with the development of a site, but in meeting the City's growth requirement, some difficult decisions had had to be made. In the main, therefore, consideration had been given to determining a package of measures to mitigate the impacts of the housing development as far as possible. This was within the boundaries of affordability and deliverability.

Testing of transport options to mitigate the impact of the Core Strategy sites had been undertaken using the Derby Area Transport Model (DATM). The modelling was carried out in the summer of 2012 against all the emerging strategic housing sites at the time. This included sites that were not ultimately chosen for the final strategies for the three HMA authorities. What had been tested so far was, therefore, was a 'worst case scenario'. Out of the initial mitigation testing, the combination of local highway mitigation, new public transport services and smarter choices was the best performing package overall. A significant contributor to the performance of this package was the South Derby Integrated Transport Link, SDITL, joining Rykneld Road to T12.

There was potentially considerable improvement in the performance of the network through the mitigation package, especially in terms of congested route kilometres. However the model predicted there would be parts of the local highway network that would still see a reduction in performance, in particular, Stenson Road. This had been balanced, however, by the benefits development had in this area in terms of proximity to local services and employment and the opportunity it provided for network wide mitigation.

The extent of this impact would be better understood through the analysis of modelling that was currently being undertaken of the final Plan's proposals.

It should be noted that between now and 2026 that background growth and the delivery of existing housing and employment commitments would result in overall peak hour highway trip growth. It was anticipated that network conditions would deteriorate even without the additional Core Strategy growth.

With anticipated available funding being limited and deliverability being a key consideration, the most likely mitigation package represented the minimum requirements for transport intervention. This level of intervention would not fully mitigate the impact of the Preferred Growth Strategy but should allow the local transport network to continue to function.

Members asked questions about the A38 corridor and it was noted that this was part of the Highways Agency route based strategy. There was no specific programme or timescale set for any works to be done to the A38. Members of the Board expressed preference for both the Stenson Road and the Goodsmoor Road bridges to be left as current and not upgraded.

Resolved

- 1. To note the findings of the report and the transport mitigation package that had been developed to support the Preferred Growth Strategy and in particular, the results associated with the Southern Derby Integrated Transport Link, or SDITL.**
- 2. To continue to work on the mitigation and press central Government to contribute particularly to the A38 corridor.**

11/14 Residential Travel Planning

The Board considered a report which updated Members on the application of residential travel plans in Derby. It further discussed the potential that residential travel plans had in reducing the highway impact of new housing and sites proposed as part of the core strategy.

Residential Travel Plans were relatively new and guidance was first published by the Department for Transport in 2005. There was less evidence on the success of residential travel plans, however, developers claimed that a 10% reduction in car trips could be achieved.

Managing the demand for travel by integrating residential development with other land use, such as schools, shops, health and employment, would achieve far more in terms of reducing car trips than trying to manage them once they had been created.

Derby City Council had set out the requirement for a residential travel plan on a number of developments in Derby. This had been achieved by placing certain requirements through S106 Agreements on the development to produce, implement and monitor their residential travel plans.

However, the success of residential travel plans remained to be seen in Derby because although a number had been conditioned as part of a planning consent, to date none of these developments had been constructed.

Transport modelling of the potential Core Strategy housing allocations suggested that all of the potential sites tested would benefit from mitigation measures such as traffic management improvements and the promotion of smarter choices to improve the provision and accessibility of pedestrian and cycling facilities and public transport. These could be tailored to each site as appropriate and would be key features of any residential travel plan.

For many of the core strategy housing sites, mitigation was limited because the opportunities to provide viable and frequent public transport and travel choice

enhancements were constrained both by the peripheral nature of many of the sites and the dispersed pattern of development. The economies of scale required to provide step changes in service provision were less achievable with the proposed pattern of development than if it were possible to focus growth in one or two key areas.

To this end, where a new development required a completely new bus service it needed to achieve higher levels of development patronage to become commercially viable. Where existing services could be extended this provided greater possibilities for serving the new developments. This was the case for strategic housing allocations towards the south of the City, which were more sustainable than options considered to the North West of the City, as they had greater opportunities to extend existing bus services and better access to existing amenities.

Resolved

- 1. To note the findings of the report and that for new housing sites there were moderate benefits for residential travel plans. However, developments were more likely to achieve higher proportions of none car trips if they were integrated into the existing public transport and mixed land uses such as district centres and schools.**
- 2. To request that the Cabinet Member for Planning, Environment and Regeneration ensures that the Core Strategy includes a policy to determine when a Residential Travel plan was required as part of a housing development.**

12/14 Vibrant City Centre Strategy

The Board considered a report which stated that city centres were undergoing a period of fundamental transformation largely driven by the changing nature of retail.

Derby benefitted from the pull of Westfield, the Cathedral Quarter brand and a relatively resilient economy. Positive approaches by the City Council, Marketing Derby and the BIDs were further benefits. It was important to recognise that the city centre needed a new vision and strategy.

Resolved

- 1. To note the emerging Vibrant City Centre Strategy.**
- 2. To fully endorse the proposals and request that quantifiable and tangible targets be set that could be measured to ensure the strategy worked.**

MINUTES END