

Time Commenced – 6:00 pm  
Time Finished – 8.40 pm

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

**20 November 2018**

Present: Councillor Hassall (Chair)  
Councillors Care, Hussain, McCristal, Potter, Rawson and West

In Attendance: Councillor Webb  
Greg Jennings – Director of Development and Growth  
Catherine Williams – Head of Regeneration  
Peter Ireson – Head of Culture and Business Development

### **08/18 Apologies for Absence**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Bayliss.

### **09/18 Late Items**

There were no late items.

### **10/18 Declarations of Interest**

Councillors Care declared that her husband worked for Rolls-Royce.  
Councillor West declared that the site referred to in item 6 was in her ward.

### **11/18 Minutes of the meeting held on 3 July 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 July 2018 were agreed as a correct record.

### **12/18 Derby City Centre Masterplan 2030**

The Board considered a report which stated that Derby City Centre Masterplan 2030 was approved by Council in July 2016. The masterplan was a long term 15-year plan, comprising a vision, ambitions, and delivery plan with priority actions for the first 5 years. At the end of the first five years the Masterplan and Delivery Plan would be reviewed to assess progress and agree priority actions for the next 5 years.

The City Centre Masterplan 2030 was being and would continue to be used to determine priorities for Council resources and external funding bids, and may be regarded as material consideration when determining planning applications in the city centre.

The Board received a presentation to update members on progress with projects in the Delivery Plan, resources and funding and governance arrangements.

The presentation included, why the city centre was important, structural economic change, the city centre masterplan, capturing investment, the new Assembly Rooms, progress and challenges.

Members of the Board asked about what the plans were in relation to the hippodrome and the next steps in relation to the Debenhams site. It was reported that the hippodrome was in private ownership and a trust had been set up to try and find a suitable use. In relation to the Debenhams site, it had been marketed as a cleared site to help bring a developer forward.

Members of the Board stated that the development at Bold Lane was good and city centre living had made a positive contribution to the economy.

In relation to the Assembly Rooms a Member of the Board was going to speak to the Cabinet Member about the hurdles to refurbish the building.

In relation to Becketwell regeneration it was reported that the council was in a 12 month exclusivity to work up a specific scheme. This would be a mixed use of commercial on the ground floor with residential above. It was hoped that a planning application would be submitted in spring 2019.

Members of the Board wanted to see the details as quickly as possible and expressed concern about not wanting the hippodrome to sit for another 30 years.

A Member of the Board asked about migration from Pride Park to the city centre. It was reported that Pride Park was now full and therefore did not offer many opportunities for development. Market research had shown that developments such as Bold Lane gave companies that leased on Pride Park to move to city centre property.

A Member of the Board expressed concern about businesses being displaced from Castleward to allow for housing to be built. Reassurance was given that businesses would be offered help with relocation. It was also reported that Castleward Phase 1 was complete, phases 2a and 2b were either on site or in planning and phases 3-5 would be subject to Council Cabinet approval.

A question was raised on the St James Street / Sadler Gate scheme. It was reported that the development had an evening economy objective.

A Member of the Board asked about funding particularly in relation to the transforming cities fund but gave an example where it was suggested that S106 money was the preferred money to use for the particular project. It was suggested that any outside funding that could be used should be where possible so that S106 money could be used for other projects.

It was suggested that Derby needed to play to its strengths particularly as transport access to the city was very good.

**Resolved to note the report and presentation and request a short report on the innovative Council Regeneration Fund to the next meeting of the Board.**

## **13/18      Exclusion of Press and Public**

Resolved that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting during discussion of the following items of business on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act and that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

## **14/18      Derby City Centre Masterplan 2030**

The Board considered exempt information in relation to the New Assembly Rooms.

At this point the press and public were readmitted to the meeting.

## **15/18      Osmaston Main Works Site**

The Board considered a report which stated that the Council had committed to a long term programme of economic and physical regeneration in Osmaston, centred around the regeneration of vacant Rolls Royce sites. Osmaston was identified in the Local Plan as a priority location for Community Regeneration. The regeneration of the area was expected to deliver a minimum of 600 new, high quality, mixed tenure homes. At the same time, the transformation of the area would also provide a legacy for Rolls-Royce, recognising the historic and cultural significance of their presence in Osmaston. Community engagement was an essential part of this regeneration.

In 2013, Keepmoat were selected as development partner for this regeneration and in 2017 submitted a planning application for the development of around 400 new homes on the Rolls Royce's former Main Works site.

The council was continuing to work with Keepmoat to address viability issues relating to the development and an update was given to the Board about progress on this.

It was noted that a bid had been submitted to the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) to fund the gap to decontaminate the land, but this had not been successful.

A member of the Board expressed concern that no progress had been made with this huge vacant site which had frustrated residents for a number of years.

It was noted that there was a keen developer who was still interested in the site, planning consent was in place and the cost of remediation was known.

The funding gap still needed to be filled. It was unlikely that and funding would be provided by the HIF and other sources of funding had been explored. A meeting had been arranged with the land owner to try and resolve the position.

**Resolved to note the progress on delivering new housing on the Main Works site in Osmaston.**

## **16/18      Remit, Work Programme and Topic Reviews**

The Board considered a report which allowed the Board to study its Terms of Reference and Remit for the forthcoming Municipal Year. The report also allowed officers to inform the Board of any key work areas, issues or potential topic review subjects within the service areas for discussion or inclusion in the work programme.

The Board agreed a number of changes to the work programme.

**Insert revised work programme – currently out for comment.**

## **17/18      Items Referred from the Executive Scrutiny Board**

There were no items referred from the Executive Scrutiny Board.

MINUTES END