

**Plymouth Waterfront Partnership
Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
22 February 2017
The Duke of Cornwall Hotel**

Present: Josh McCarty (JMcC) (Chair), Jon Morcom (Main Board Director) (JM), Sarah Gibson (SG), Sky Cole (SC), Carla Williams (CW), Clare Phillips (CP), David Stolton (DS), Jean Lightfoot (JL), Thecla Keizer (TK), Hannah Harris (HH), Mike Kitt (MK), Michael Connor (MC) (ENTE), Richard Taylor (RT), Cllr Sue Dann (SD), Alex King (Observer) (AK), Robbie McVicar (Observer) (RMcV), Jim Pascoe (Observer) (JP), Emily Malcolm (Work Experience Student) (EM)

Apologies: Marc Nash (MN), Stacey Allen (SA), Cllr Chris Penberthy (CPe), Keith Davis (Observer) (KD)

ITEM	NOTES and ACTION POINTS	BY WHOM	BY WHEN
AB 02/22- 1.	Apologies and Introduction Apologies were tabled. Observers to the meeting, Emily Malcolm and Jon Morcom were welcomed to the meeting.		
AB- 02/22- 2.	Minutes to the last meeting The minutes to the previous meeting held on 12 December 2016 were approved		
AB- 02/22- 3.	AOB CW – Car Park at the back of Pier Street. SG confirmed that she had emailed officers within Plymouth City Council and was awaiting a response. SMcD to chase Adrian Trim. ACTION CW to become a champion for the ask regarding parking, including the Pier Street car park being brought back into use for residents and visitors. CW agreed. ACTION JL – BID Street Operations Manager JL thanked EB and team for help with clearing a drain that had blocked outside the Salumi premises and caused flooding – EB and team responded on the day when JL asked for help. NOTED SMcD shared that a new contractor would be taking over from Amey – SG/SC to invite the new contractors to the April Advisory Panel meeting. ACTION JL – Business Rates appeal JL shared that it was not an easy process to speak to PCC regarding business rates. RT to share contact details for the Valuation Office and recommended that JL speak to them. ACTION SMcD recommended emailing queries also. NOTED SG to investigate adding an option for rates queries to the BID Hotline. ACTION	SMcD CW SG/SC RT SG	March BID2 April March March



	<p>RMcV – Vandalism in the West Hoe area RMcV felt that there had been an increase in vandalism in the area and gave a couple of examples of issues. MC not aware of an increase in vandalism, but working with the Police to improve CCTV coverage and signs to say that CCTV in action. SG to raise the issues at the Safety Group meeting on 23.02.17. ACTION</p> <p>HH – Expanding Pre-Degree site PCAD now purchased Hawkins Pub and expanding their pre-degree site.</p> <p>SG – BID Ballot SG reminded all that there were only five days left to post votes back to ERS in London – All to nudge their communities and connections to cast their vote. ACTION</p>	<p>SG</p> <p>ALL</p>	<p>23.02.17</p> <p>February</p>
<p>AB-02/22-4.</p>	<p>BID Street Operations Manager Update EB’s report was in the packs. The drain clearance at Salumi was included in the report of works completed. NOTED</p>		
<p>AB-02/22-5.</p>	<p>Advisory Panel Constitution and PWP Operations Proposal As the two agenda items were linked, it was agreed that they would be covered together.</p> <p>RT ran through the revised Advisory Panel Constitution, updated following the previous presentations of the document on 15 October 2016 and 21 December 2016.</p> <p>SG then ran through a draft proposal for the way the BID could be delivered (2017-2022), but shared that the draft proposal had not yet been signed off by the Main Board. NOTED</p> <p>SG asked for comments or questions on the proposed delivery structure</p> <p>Visionary Team – Board Operational Team – Advisory Panel Delivery Team – Task & Finish Groups</p> <p>Needs to be clear from the outset what the commitment and role of Advisory Panel members would be. SG to include more detail. ACTION</p> <p>Liaison time with Levy payers to be added to the time commitment slide to ensure transparency of time commitment required. ACTION</p> <p>There was a mixture of views about the proposed delivery structure, with some feeling that it was ambitious and many feeling that it was a structured and delivery focused approach, which BID2 would need. NOTED</p> <p>It was recommended and supported by the Advisory Board that we implement</p>	<p>SG</p> <p>SG</p>	<p>March</p> <p>March</p>



	<p>the plan for delivery presented by SG and have a regular review of the process to ensure the plan is successfully delivery. SG to include in this process within the delivery plan. ACTION</p> <p>All agreed that the community needed to get involved in and take ownership of the delivery of projects. ACTION</p> <p>Clarity requested regarding the decision making levels. SG referred to the notes within the delivery structure and the proposed decision making process from Board through to delivery. NOTED</p> <p>SG to do a SWOT analysis on the proposed new approach. ACTION</p> <p>It was felt that the plan increased engagement at business level and a greater time commitment from the Advisory Panel members would improve communications. A more robust communications strategy would be needed for BID2. NOTED</p> <p>It was felt that rotation of members would need to be every two years minimum. NOTED</p> <p>The conversation then moved back to the Constitution: Membership and Procedure. RT to include a note to sat that when in meetings, all members must be representative of the whole Waterfront. ACTION</p> <p>It was proposed and discussed that there be a maximum of circa fifteen members of the Advisory Panel at any time – seven or eight ‘area’ representatives (number of areas and specific geography yet to be agreed for BID2), with a further circa seven members selected based upon skills. This would ensure that there was a democratic process in place for area representation and the Advisory Panel would have the right level skills in order to drive/champion project delivery. NOTED</p> <p>JMcC asked for a show of hands to understand the level of support for the proposal from RT in principle – The proposal was unanimously supported with all members raising their hands. However, there was a caveat from some that further discussion would be needed about how to deliver it. NOTED</p>	<p>SG</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>SG</p> <p>RT</p>	<p>BID2</p> <p>March</p> <p>March</p>
<p>AB-02/22-6.</p>	<p>Transport and Coach Tourism (Andy Sharp)</p> <p>AS gave an overview of the work done to date on coaches and coach parking and shared that the project undertaken by the city regarding coaches had been nominated for an award.</p> <p>The plan for the Barbican was to remove three parking bays and continue the yellow line of the bus stop. This would create capacity for three coaches/buses at any one time – the space would be for multi-use between coached and buses. NOTED</p>		



	<p>There was a sign advising a fifteen minute maximum stay (for drop off and pick up only), but this was not currently being monitored/enforced and was advisory only. AS confirmed that the fifteen minute maximum stay would be monitored/enforced by PCC parking attendants. NOTED</p> <p>The 'triangle' was intended to have a parking meter for buses and coaches to park for two or three hour's maximum at a time (duration to be decided) and would have space for up to five vehicles. For longer stays, buses and coaches would still be encouraged to use the main depots. NOTED</p> <p>AS confirmed that the short stay spaces would be first come first serve for visitor coaches. NOTED</p> <p>It was reiterated to AS that enforcement would be essential to ensure rotation of buses and coaches. ACTION</p> <p>There had previously been a request of AS that Barbican Approach become one-way due to the health and safety risks to pedestrians when coaches were traveling in both directions/using the area at the bottom of Barbican Approach as a turning circle. AS had raised the request for the one-way access which had been declined by PCC as the health and safety aspect had not been conveyed by AS. AS to re-raise the health and safety issue with PCC Cllrs and include the one-way system change in the traffic order to remove three parking bays. ACTION</p> <p>AS confirmed that there would be no bus shelters. NOTED</p> <p>As asked for a steer as to whether to parking on the 'triangle' should be two hours or three hours. Through a show of hands, ten members supported a maximum two hour stay as this would allow ample time for river cruise passengers etc. ACTION</p> <p>AS confirmed that cross-transport ticketing was being explored to improve connectivity in line with the BID2 ambitions for the city. NOTED</p> <p>The number 34 service would continue to serve the Waterfront with adjustments to the timetable once the 34a service stopped in May. NOTED</p> <p>AS to share details of information on coach parking areas available across the city. ACTION</p> <p>SG thanks AS for joining the meeting and all congratulated AS on the award nomination.</p>	AS	March
AB-02/22-7.	<p>Next Meeting Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

Next Meeting:
Wednesday 22 March 2017 2pm-4pm at Duke of Cornwall Hotel