

Time Commenced – 6:00 pm  
Time Finished – 7.20 pm

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

**23 January 2018**

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

In Attendance: Claire Davenport – Director of Leisure, Culture and Tourism  
Ben Clawson-Chan – Head of Leisure  
Ian Fullagar – Head of Strategic Housing  
Chris Morgan – Regeneration Manager  
Andy Thomas – Head of Partnerships and Communities  
Greg Jennings – Acting Director Regeneration, Property and Housing Projects

### **19/17 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **20/17 Late Items**

There were no late items.

### **21/17 Declarations of Interest**

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

Councillor Bayliss declared that he worked for the police.

Councillor S Khan and Webb declared that they were Members of the Board of the Liversage Trust.

### **22/17 Minutes of the meeting held on 29 November 2017**

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 November 2017 were agreed.

### **23/17 Derby Arena Commerciality**

The Board considered a report which set out information in relation to the commerciality at Derby Arena. The report included information pertaining to the current and previous subsidy levels and future operating options, next steps for seeking sponsorship and advertising opportunities and programme and event development.

It was reported that the subsidy level of £656,528 was made up of £621,000 business rates.

Members of the Board asked about projected subsidy for 2018/19 and 2019/20. It was reported that this would be included in the budget report to be considered at Council on 24 January 2018.

It was noted that the pantomime had made a profit.

Members of the Board asked if the Arena had been designed to compete with London and Manchester and what impact this had had.

It was reported that the cycle track had been designed so that the track was not disrupted when setting up and taking down events. London was Olympic standard, Manchester was Commonwealth standard and Derby was pitched at national level.

Members of the Board asked how the Arena sat within the cultural offer in the city.

It was reported that the Arena had worked very well with the Assembly Rooms being out of action. Derby had been able to continue to host with events which would otherwise have gone to other cities. It was hoped that the Arena would complement any future performance venue.

Members of the Board were complementary of the Arena and in particular felt that the introduction to track cycling was fantastic. Members of the Board asked if the subsidy was sustainable and what the impact of the new performance venue would be.

It was reported that the subsidy was dependent upon decisions yet to be taken. The effect of the performance venue would depend upon the programmes developed for both venues. The Arena could be marketed as the largest dinner dance venue in the area. It was hoped that the two venues would complement each other.

The Arena was built as a community facility for local people to replace the dry side of Moorways. It had won 9 awards for design and was in competition with Rio Olympic venues on the world stage and was one of only 2 which won in Britain.

The Chair requested that the table at paragraph 4.1 of the report have another column added to split out the NNDR subsidy and the actual subsidy. He asked about the naming rights for the Arena and if the capacity of the Arena would allow the Arena to compete for events for the Commonwealth Games.

It was reported that the naming rights had gone out to tender but the returns did not fit the criteria. The work had been refocused and someone would be employed to look at both sponsorship and advertising. In respect of the Commonwealth Games any opportunities would be explored.

## **Resolved**

1. To note the report.
2. To include the revised table relating to subsidy with the minutes.

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Actual Subsidy Received (£)</b>	<b>Actual NNDR (£)</b>	<b>Actual Subsidy minus NNDR (£)</b>
14/15 (Pre-opening and March opening date)	720,083	153,514	566,569
15/16	753,861	616,250	137,611
16/17	664,271	621,250	43,021
17/18 (Estimated)	656,528	632,280	24,248

## 24/17 River Gardens – Anti Social Behaviour Issues

The Board considered a report and a verbal update on the current position with anti social behaviour in the River Gardens.

It was reported that historically there had been issues around crime and robbery in the area. There was a difference between the reality of crime and the perception of crime. Over the last 12 months there had been 17 police recorded crimes and 22 recorded cases of anti social behaviour. The figures were low in comparison with the rest of the city centre. The area was not a hot spot. There was good coverage from CCTV. CCTV was monitored on Fridays and Saturdays and recorded the rest of the time.

Proposals for regeneration in the area would help design out crime and increase footfall to the area which in itself would reduce opportunist crime.

Members of the Board were concerned about crime in the area and suggested that the regeneration include extra lighting. It was anticipated that regeneration would take place in 12 to 18 months.

A Member of the Board asked about the rules in relation to CCTV and public open space. It was agreed to advise the Member directly.

The Acting Director Regeneration, Property and Housing Projects gave an overview of how the proposals fitted in with the city centre masterplan. Consideration needed to be given to protecting the cycle routes through the area. There was a potential

expansion to the bus station with living accommodation above it. Consideration of how the river could be used needed to be incorporated in any plans and designs. Members of the Board asked if the scheme would be sympathetic to the Silk Mill and Cathedral Green redevelopment. It was reported that the River Gardens would follow through. He also referred to how redevelopment could trigger further redevelopment and encourage people into the area.

#### **Resolved**

- 1. To note the report.**
- 2. To refer the plans to the Communities Scrutiny Review Board for consideration.**

### **25/17      Former Derbyshire Royal Infirmary (DRI) Site**

The Board considered a report which set out the current position with regards to the former Derbyshire Royal Infirmary (DRI) site. The report focussed on 4 key areas, the background, housing and regeneration benefits, planning and next steps.

It was reported that it was expected that parcels of land would come forward for development within the next 12 months. Progress of the development of the site would be monitored.

Members of the Board referred to the development of Castleward and felt that phase 2 was taking time to come on board. The Acting Director Regeneration, property and Housing Projects reported that the Castleward development was progressing but a number of issues had to be addressed. It was hoped that the DRI site would be developed quickly but the Council had no control over timescales. Members of the Board were pleased that the site would be developed for housing rather than the original proposal of a supermarket.

#### **Resolved to note the report.**

### **26/17      Items Referred from the Executive Scrutiny Board**

There were no items referred from the Executive Scrutiny Board.

### **27/17      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**

- 1. To note the report.**

2. To add Britannia Court and Marketing Derby – supporting regeneration in the city to the work programme for March 2018.

MINUTES END