

Time commenced 6.00pm
Time finished 7.00pm

**CORPORATE SCRUTINY AND CLIMATE CHANGE BOARD
25 MARCH 2013**

Present: Councillor Tittley (Chair)
Councillors Afzal, Redfern and Wood

50/12 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hickson, Hillier, Whitby and Wood.

51/12 Late Items Introduced by the Chair

There were no late items.

52/12 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations.

53/12 Minutes of the Meeting held on 28 January 2013

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2013 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

54/12 Council Cabinet Forward Plan

The Board received an update on 02/12 citywide highspeed data network. The Board requested reports on 15/12 procurement of a contractor for the refurbishment and conversion of the Marble Hall and 53/12 appointment of the preferred delivery partner for Osmaston regeneration and an update on the progress of 75/12 property rationalisation.

55/12 Call-in

There were no items.

56/12 The Case for Trams in Derby

The Board considered a report which set out the position in relation to the case for trams in Derby.

There was a strong logical argument that as congestion on the roads increased, causing a range of associated social and environmental impacts, that a modern, reliable and fast, mass public transit system was critical to maintaining the future

vitality of the city and in providing equitable travel choices for its residents and visitors. In addition, there was also an argument that a high quality public transit system would support Derby's image as a high tech transport manufacturer.

However, the current case for a mass public transit system in Derby above and beyond a conventional bus system was not compelling. The construction costs of systems such as trams or trolleybuses for Derby would be unaffordable. For example, the average cost of a tram system in the UK had cost £285.4 million and the Leeds NGT trolleybus system would cost around £250.7 million. It was likely that with Central Government's devolvement of major scheme capital and the way that they were trying to remove the over-reliance on central public funding, these types of schemes would become more difficult and risky to fund in the future.

It was difficult to predict patronage forecasts without detailed appraisal and transport modelling demand forecasting. However, existing public transport demand and the potential mode transfer from car suggested that there was not the passenger demand to underpin the jump in both construction and operating costs for either a trolleybus or tram system in Derby.

An important issue to consider was that in order to maximise patronage capture for a tram or trolleybus system, it would require a much wider transport planning strategy to deliver. A new mass public transit would invariably compete with the bus network and this would have to be reorganised. The private car would be the major competitor to a tram network and would need to be restricted to ensure maximum patronage transfer. Indeed, Nottingham had introduced a work place parking levy to discourage commuter car trips and to help pay for their public transport system. Demand management, such as work place parking levies and congestion charging, was not part of the current long term transport strategy for Derby City.

Resolved to note the findings of the report and the extent to which the construction of a new tram or trolleybus system was currently not an affordable option for Derby. In addition the current patronage demand for public transport was not a sufficient level to justify such a significant step change in capacity or operation and maintenance costs.

57/12 One Derby One Council Programme Progress Report

The Board considered a report which provided a review of the One Derby One Council transformation programme and the progress being made across the Council in delivering the Target Operating Model.

It was noted that there were only two teams still to move into the Council House and that the other buildings had been cleared and either released to the landlord or cleared for redevelopment.

The Board congratulated the Council on being awarded the LGC award for business transformation.

Resolved

- 1. To note the report and the progress being made in transforming the organisation and in implementing the Target Operating Model.**
- 2. To congratulate the Council on winning the LGC award for business transformation.**

58/12 Review of Challenging Regeneration Sites

The Board considered a report which stated that there were a number of sites in and around the city centre that had been vacant for a number of years such as the Friar Gate Goods Yard and Duckworth Square. The Board felt these were having a detrimental impact on the city and therefore conducted a detailed review. The Board held a number of special meetings and received evidence from a wide range of witnesses including senior regeneration officers and major developers. The report set out the findings and recommendations to encourage development of these sites.

The Chair thanked all those who had been involved in the review.

Richard Williams gave an update on the progress to date on each of the recommendations.

Resolved

- 1. The note the report and submit the recommendations to Council Cabinet.**
- 2. To review progress against the recommendations in six months.**

59/12 Urgent Item Considered by Council Cabinet

The Board noted an urgent item considered by Council Cabinet.

60/12 Response of the Council Cabinet to Scrutiny Reports and Recommendations

The Board considered a report which stated that in January 2012 the Council made a series of recommendations to strengthen the overview and scrutiny process. This included asking for regular reports to be presented to Scrutiny Management Commission on the actions taken by the Council Cabinet in response to overview and scrutiny reports and recommendations. The report listed the responses of the Council Cabinet to scrutiny reports it received up to February 2013.

Resolved to note the report.

MINUTES END