

Meeting Minutes: Roman Road Implementation Group**Location: Room 57, Level 5 Anchorage House****Date: 9am, 4th March 2009**

Attendees:		
Cllr Josh Peck	Lead Member for Resources and Performance	JP
Cllr Marc Francis	Lead Member for Housing and Development	MF
Chris Horton	Town Centre Project Coordinator	CH
Lorna Hughes	Neighbourhood Manager, LAP 5	LH
David Saunders	Head, Markets Services	DS
Bryan Jones	Service Head, Environmental Control	BJ
Cecilia Clarke	Communications Officer	CC
John Chilton	Head of Parking Services	JC
Jonathan Nichols	Development, Design & Conservation Officer	JN
Gavin Dooley	Lap 5 & 6 Director	GD
John Stewart	Parking Development Manager	JS
Neil Crump	Senior Environmental Officer	NC
Apologies		
Sue Hinds	Access to Employment Manager	SH
Chris Chubb	Group Manager LETs Teams	CCh
Marissa Hernandez	Planning Policy Officer	MH
Pat Holmes	Business and Investment	PH

	Item	Action
1	Introductions and apologies a) JP asked all attendees to introduce themselves and describe their role with the Council b) Previous Meeting Minutes (21 st January, 2009)	
2	<u>Tesco/Gladstone Place Application Update</u> a) CH briefed the group as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The Council has been served with a claim for Judicial Review on the Council's decision to grant planning permission for the redevelopment of the former Safeway supermarket site at Gladstone Place▪ The claim is based on a technicality relating to the Council's Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Opinion which deemed that an EIA was not required in support of the planning application▪ Officers are fully confident that the Screening Opinion was correct and are fully confident of defeating any legal challenge▪ The developer has submitted a new application to demonstrate their commitment to the redevelopment and to safeguard against the Judicial Review process causing unnecessary delay to the project.▪ The developer has submitted a new application to demonstrate their commitment to the redevelopment and to safeguard against the Judicial Review process causing unnecessary delay to the project.▪ There is to be a conference with Counsel on Thursday of this week (i.e the day after the Roman Road Implementation Group) at which options for best protecting the Council's position in securing the regeneration of this site will be discussed. In advance of this conference it would be premature to discuss the matter in detail.	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) MF expressed concern that he had not been briefed by Development and Renewal concerning the possibility of JR action being taken much earlier. He also stated that he had not been informed that a new application had been submitted and the reasons for this. c) MF also stated that updates on matters relating to the application should be provided on a more regular basis, including through the Roman Road Implementation Group. 	
3	<p><u>Shop front Improvement Project</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) CH stated that he and JN had drafted specification criteria, using documents provided from Hammersmith and Fulham for a similar shop front improvement scheme. CH stated that this was necessary because, although LBTH had carried out shop front improvement projects in the past, the criteria needed to be updated. b) CH stated that the funding for the project would come from LABGI (Local Area Business Growth Initiative). In order to 'ring fence' this for the project, a full director's report was necessary. CH to begin drafting of report. c) JN informed the group that he has considerable experience in managing and advising for shop front improvement projects. The experience of the Brick Lane project had been to lift the burden from businesses and to raise the whole level of the operation. d) JP noted that there were two inconsistencies that he had spotted within the criteria relating to the response time frame and the percentage of costs covered. CH thanked JP for making him aware of this and confirmed that these would be amended in future drafts. e) GD stated that the project would help to bolster the shopkeepers association, providing a reason for attendance and consultation. JN agreed that briefing and involving the shopkeepers association was essential to the process. MF also stressed the importance of consultation with shopkeepers and landlords. f) JP asked CH when the project would be delivered. CH stated that the aim was to have the project actively running by June 2009. 	<p>CH</p> <p>CH/JN</p>
4	<p><u>Shop Local</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) LH informed the group that she had organised initial meetings for the Shop Local Project which is intended to promote and market the town centre offer to local residents, working alongside shopkeepers and market traders. The amount of funding allocated to the project is £38,000. b) This funding is sourced from planning gain from a new residential development on Ordell Road and therefore is aimed within a mile radius of the development (this radius covers the whole of Roman Road Town centre). c) MF wanted to know when delivery would start. CH confirmed that as the project did not exceed £50,000, the requirement was that at least three candidates submitted cost estimates. As soon as these were received and a criteria for assessment followed, a consultant could be appointed. d) JP stated that he felt particular attention needed to be paid to the creation of a successful brand identity to engender customer loyalty. 	CH/LH
5	<p><u>Section 106 Project Initiation Document</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) CH informed the group that approximately £158,000 had been secured in total from the Ordell Road Development for enterprise and economic development related activities. Of this, approximately £38,000 was being used to fund the Shop Local Campaign and a further £120,000 to support the Roman Road Town Centre Advice, Support and Training Programme. b) Whilst the Shop Local project was not required to undergo an official tender, the Roman Road Town Centre Advice, Support and Training Programme would now have to be subject to this. 	

	<p>c) In response to JP's query in relation to how long this would take, CH stated that he had been informed by the Procurement Department that on average the tenure process took four months. CH also stated that the project proposal allows for six months but he hoped to have the consultant appointed well within this time frame.</p>	
6	<p><u>Street Market Strategy</u></p> <p>a) BJ stated that Environmental Services with CLC had commissioned a Street Market Strategy for the whole borough.</p> <p>b) The Strategy is to look at current issues as well as recommendations for the next 15/25 years. It is intended to inform both the Core Strategy and the Town Centre Strategy. DS stated that his team were looking to appoint a consultant imminently.</p> <p>c) MF asked how much the strategy would cost and when it would be prepared by. BJ responded that it would cost approximately £25,000 and that he hoped that it would be in draft form by the end of June.</p> <p>d) BJ stated that he would send to JP and MF a scoping for the project.</p>	BJ
7	<p><u>Farmer's Market</u></p> <p>a) DS informed the group that the farmers market would be located to Ewart place from Saturday 7th March and that, although he thought this would prove to be beneficial to the town centre, there may be issues in the short term in relation to van access, etc. DS to report back to the group at next Roman Road Implementation Group.</p> <p>b) He also stated that the Art Market would remain in its current location of Gladstone Place.</p> <p>c) MF asked whether or not the farmers' market would be fortnightly from this Saturday. DS stated that this was something to consider when it becomes more established in its new location. MF asked if it was possible to promote it more effectively and whether this could be in place by the beginning of April, including the use of a banner.</p> <p>d) CC stated that she would look to identify a budget for this and seek to action better promotion alongside the Markets Team. DS to consult further with CC.</p>	<p>DS</p> <p>CC</p>
8	<p><u>Parking Changes</u></p> <p>a) JC that parking services had previously allocated 51 parking bays for use by market traders in order to minimise parking congestion on market days. However, due to under use of the bays by market traders, this policy was now being revised.</p> <p>b) MF stated that he felt that taking 51 spaces from local residents was excessive and that these changes had not been ill thought out, particularly in relation to Tuesday and Thursday market days. JP agreed that there was considerable under use of the market trader bays and there was a need to revisit the scheme in order to identify the number of traders that needed by traders.</p> <p>c) GD stated that there would remain a need to prevent the market traders from congesting the market with their vans. MF stated that he did not feel that residents had been adequately consulted and that there was the need to have the uncertainty resolved within the next two weeks. JP stated that 51 spaces may have been a disproportionate number but that there would remain a need for market trader parking.</p> <p>d) JP stated that there should be a report provided to the group in relation to the revised approach in time for the next Roman Road Implementation Group Meeting</p>	JS/JC/BJ
9	AOB	

	<p>a) MF asked what progress had been made in relation to setting up a meeting with representatives of Iceland in advance of their location to Roman Road. GD stated that no meeting had taken place with Iceland as yet but that he had been in discussion with Sue Hinds on the matter and that Skills Match were to be involved in providing staff for the new store. GD to re-contact Iceland with regard to a meeting and to communicate progress to MF.</p> <p>b) DS stated that a resident had asked him to raise the issue of empty properties. CH informed him that this was an important issue and that would ask Jonathan Arnold to brief on this for the next meeting. JP also felt this issue needed to be given a higher profile.</p> <p>c) JP asked that Chris Chubb attend the next meeting to feedback to the group on the points raised in the minutes for the previous meeting of 4th March.</p>	<p>GD</p> <p>GD/SH</p> <p>CH</p>
12	To be arranged	