

Time Commenced – 6:00 pm  
Time Finished – 8.25 pm

## **Regeneration and Housing Scrutiny Review Board**

**20 March 2018**

Present: Councillor Bayliss (Chair)  
Councillors Grimadell, Stanton, Webb and West

In Attendance: John Forkin – Marketing Derby  
Kathryn Allen – Marketing Derby  
Ian Fullagar – Head of Strategic Housing  
Karen Brierley – Housing Development and PFI Manger  
Greg Jennings – Acting Director Regeneration, Property and Housing Projects  
Sam Rosillo – Regeneration Manager  
Verna Bayliss – Strategic Partnership manager  
Andrew Gibbard – Transport Strategy, Policy and Development Team Leader  
Ruth Sadler – Communications Officer

### **28/17 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S Khan and Naitta.

### **29/17 Late Items**

There were no late items.

### **30/17 Declarations of Interest**

Councillors Bayliss and Webb declared that they were Members of Derby Homes Board.

### **31/17 Minutes of the meeting held on 23 January 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 January 2018 were agreed.

### **32/17 Inward Investment – Marketing Derby**

The Board considered a report and presentation from John Forkin of Marketing Derby on the work of Marketing Derby and inward investment in the city.

The presentation included economy, opportunity and experience. Derby had the highest salaries outside London. Opportunities were created, cultivated and converted. Investors had a choice as to where they decide to locate their businesses

and often attracting one business could be a catalyst to encourage others to the area.

There were some issues with efficiency particularly in relation to getting applications through the planning application process. There was particular concern in relation to conservation and conservation areas and tall buildings. It was felt that investors had to appeal to get what they needed.

Marketing Derby Board had recommended that efficiency be improved and that a balanced strategic 'ring holder' be established and a sustainable design and regeneration group be established.

Members of the Board suggested that Marketing Derby looked at how Osnabruck had been developed so that authenticity could be maintained without detracting from new developments. It was felt that there was not enough staff to deliver the turn round in planning applications needed. The University was important to the city and there was a need to accommodate students, but student flats did not attract income to the City Council.

There was a difficulty in blending heritage along with modern buildings. The projects needed to be financially viable with a reasonable return to attract investors. There was a need to build housing on brownfield sites.

A Member of the Board referred to the Conservation Area Advisory Committee and the passion the Members of the Committee had for their particular areas of interest. There was a need to counterbalance that with other needs for the city.

Members of the Board suggested that Marketing Derby be formally consulted on planning applications to give an inward investment comment / perspective.

There needed to be a metro planning promise to enable Derby to be equal to or better than Nottingham.

The University was keen to develop the University quarter and students needed to see Derby as a place to live.

It was noted that there had been a lot of achievements particularly with more housing being built in the city centre over the last few years. Derby had a good story to tell and had attracted inward investment. Companies had a choice on where they located their businesses so Derby needed to be attractive to them. The process needed to be smoother to encourage investors to come to Derby.

Progressive development was needed, at the right density, at the right time. It needed to be imaginative to mix the old with the new.

**Resolved to recommend to Council Cabinet that Marketing Derby be made a formal consultee on planning applications to champion regeneration and encourage inward investment.**

### 33/17      Redevelopment of Britannia Court Site to Provide New Affordable Homes

The Board considered a report which stated that Britannia Court was a vacant Council owned site situated between Duke Street and the River Derwent. It was within Phase 1 of the Our City Our River (OCOR) masterplan which had required a flood defence wall to be constructed across the site.

A residential development of 26 2 bedroom affordable apartments had been designed to accommodate a free standing flood defence in accordance with Environmental Agency and Our City Our River (OCOR) requirements.

It was proposed that these apartments be used as affordable homes owned by the Council and managed by Derby Homes. It had yet to be determined whether these homes would be affordable rent or shared ownership.

Members asked about a shortage of single bed accommodation and whether this development could incorporate any. It was reported that the scheme was at a too advanced stage to change the type of accommodation because this would require a redesign of the whole scheme.

**Resolved to note the report.**

### 34/17      Derby – Nottingham Metropolitan Strategy

The Board considered a report which gave an update on the progress with developing the Metro Strategy. This included background to the Metro Strategy, a challenge from partners, the Metro Dynamics Economic Study, The 2018 Metro Summit, the Metro Growth Board, the current strategy and actions plans and engaging other Local Authorities.

**Resolved to note the report.**

### 35/17      HS2 Update

The Board considered a report which gave an update on the progress on the HS2 Growth Strategy. The report included information on the East Midlands Gateways Connectivity Plan which identified a number of wider transport connectivity options such as city centre to Toton rail shuttle services from Nottingham and Derby, a mass transit link between Toton and East Midlands Airport and a mass transit link between Derby and Toton.

A new rapid transit link would provide a dedicated high quality, fast and reliable connection to Toton. This could be some form of light rapid transit (LRT) such as a tram, or bus rapid transit (BRT) such as a guided bus expressway. Cost and passenger capacity were the main differences between these two systems, however BRT was cheaper and could be integrated with other transport interchanges more

easily by using the existing road infrastructure. The report set out potential costs for the various schemes.

The report stated that the HS2 East Midlands Gateway Project would provide the transport and economic evidence base, with quantified outputs and benefits, to tackle existing strategic transport problems and support connectivity options.

Members asked about the potential numbers of passengers and where they would come from. It was anticipated that there would be around 16,000 passengers per day with two thirds coming from Nottingham, one third from Derby and a small proportion from Leicester.

It was reported that the masterplan expected 10,000 jobs at the employment hub, and there would be research and development and housing on the site. There would be a study to look at passenger numbers and connectivity. Consideration needed to be given to the demand and what would best fit that demand.

Members raised concerns about the potential routes for connectivity, particularly along the Derby / Sandiacre canal route. Members also asked about how the technological development of transport would affect the need for infrastructure. It was reported that a growth corridor was likely to be created between Toton and Derby. There was concern about any degrading effect the proposals may have on the line from Derby to London.

**Resolved to note the report and request updates to future meetings.**

## **36/17      Derby Performance Venue**

The Board considered a report which stated that in February 2017 a report was taken to the Regenerating Our City Scrutiny Board to provide an update on the Assembly Rooms and the cultural offer.

Since that report Council Cabinet had received the conclusions of the feasibility work undertaken to date and noted that the Music and Performance Venue (3,000 capacity flexible venue with a commercially driven programme focusing on live music and comedy events) emerged as the Council's preferred option for a new performance venue in the city centre. All of the above was subject to a public consultation exercise which ran from 16 November to 15 December 2017.

The delegated decision was taken in early January 2018 to progress the Music and Performance Venue option onto the next stage. At Council on 24 January 2018, the Council approved the addition of the budget for the project to the Council's capital programme. Work was progressing to develop the key work packages for the project, which were design development and seeking tenders for operators of the venue. Once this work was complete, a further report would be brought back to Council Cabinet containing the business case.

The Board also received a presentation on regeneration which included information on the Performance Venue.

A Member of the Board asked if the Assembly Rooms could be reopened temporarily until such time as the Performance Venue came on stream. Whilst this option had been considered it would be very expensive and the building would still be demolished and there would still be the need to provide the new venue. The Arena was being used to capture some of the events that the Assembly Rooms would have hosted. There was also a commitment to the Guildhall Theatre.

It was reported that the Council was in the process of procuring an operator for the Performance Venue and it was anticipated that a planning application would be submitted around May 2019. The target date to start building the venue was early 2020, it would take around 30 months to demolish and build the venue, therefore it was anticipated that the venue would open in the autumn of 2022.

**Resolved to note the report.**

### **37/17      Update on Regeneration**

The Board received a presentation from the Acting Director Regeneration, Planning and Housing Projects which gave an update on the latest position with regeneration in the city. It included Connect Derby, Infinity Park, the City Centre Masterplan, Becketwell, Osmaston, Performance Venue, Accelerated Housing and Inward Investment.

Members of the Board asked about the expansion opportunities for Small to Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and whether there was sufficient capacity in the city for companies to expand.

It was reported that there were some gaps in the capacity but that this was being considered.

**Resolved to note the presentation.**

### **38/17      Items Referred from the Executive Scrutiny Board**

There were no items referred from the Executive Scrutiny Board.

### **39/17      Remit, Work Programme and Topic Reviews**

The Board considered a report which allowed the Board to review its terms of reference, remit and work programme.

**Resolved to note the report.**

### **40/17      Midland Mainline Electrification - Update**

The Board considered a report which stated that the original proposals for widespread electrification of the mainline rail network around the country had been

gradually scaled back by government over the last two years by a series of announcements that had either postponed or abandoned electrification projects. The current proposal was for partial electrification of the midland mainline to the north of London, but probably not beyond south Northamptonshire.

There still remained a case for midland mainline electrification to the east midlands in terms of track speed, beneficial costs to rail operators (which it was perceived could slow down or halt escalating ticket prices) and that electrification would require new investment in state-of-the-art rolling stock.

**Resolved to continue to support the campaign for Midland Mainline Electrification and support the work of Transport for the East Midlands and Midlands Councils.**

MINUTES END