



	<p>Coach Parking The metered bays were due to go in, but the timeline was not known as yet.</p> <p>Barbican Waste Issues CPe shared that, as a result of SG’s meeting with LH ref reducing the number of bins in the Barbican (which CPe had requested he be invited to, but was not included in), all residents’ bins had been removed and residents now had nowhere to put their rubbish. All agreed that SG should speak with LH again as this was not a satisfactory or fair solution. ACTION It was suggested that Ward Cllrs should be involved in meetings ref bins in the Barbican. NOTED JMcC requested that SG provide an email update next week. ACTION The Advisory Panel agreed that there was a need for a clear strategy for commercial and domestic waste, which would need to be agreed by the public and the Local Authority. NOTED</p> <p><u>Plymouth Seafood Festival</u> MK requested information about the Seafood Festival and the budget. MK believed that it had been agreed that there would be more seafood, less takeaway’s and the event was moving toward being self-financing. SC reminded all that the Events Project Group, including MK would need to discuss the budget and prioritise – Events Project Groups were due to be discussed later in the agenda.</p> <p><u>Dinghy Race Event</u> MK passed a hard copy of an invoice to SC in the amount of £600 – this was the £500 agreed by PWP + VAT. SC to pass to SG. ACTION</p> <p><u>RWY Ferry</u> MK provided an update on the current status of the RWY Ferry service.</p> <p>CPe had received feedback that the parking and events programme were causing issues for traders at the RWY – CPe was receiving complaints and there were concerns that businesses were going to leave the RWY. NOTED</p>	<p>SG</p> <p>SG</p> <p>SC</p>	<p>05.07.17</p>
<p>AB-06/28-4.</p>	<p>Events Strategy JMcC noted SG’s request via her email that the group review the DRAFT PWP Events Strategy document before it was taken to the Board.</p> <p>In order to strengthen the document the following was discussed.</p> <p>It was noted that the anticipated return on investment for the Waterfront (footfall, boosts to economy etc) was needed as the BID would be using limited budgets to support events. SG to add ROI to the ‘Events Proposals Should’ section. ACTION</p> <p>The anticipated scale of an event should be indicated by those putting forward proposals, i.e. the number of day visitors expected and the duration of the event. SG to include scale of event under the ‘Reporting’ section. ACTION</p>	<p>SG</p> <p>SG</p>	<p>19.07.17</p> <p>19.07.17</p>



	<p>It was agreed that the document should be reviewed annually at 31 March in order to refine the document where necessary. NOTED</p> <p>All agreed that the Events Strategy was now signed-off subject to the above inclusions.</p> <p>CPe asked if anyone was aware of a delegated decision on the criteria for events on the Hoe and if the BID had been consulted, as residents had not been – it was not apparent that the BID was aware. CPe would follow up to find out who had been consulted.</p> <p>It was agreed that consultation with key stakeholders was needed. NOTED</p>		
<p>AB-06/28-5.</p>	<p>Project Groups</p> <p>Some volunteers had already come forward, but it was agreed that more commitment was needed and projects groups needed to move forward.</p> <p>MK was already on the Events group and offered to put himself forward for others if needed.</p> <p>JL volunteered for Events and would also assist with Public Realm if needed.</p> <p>MN volunteered for Public Realm.</p> <p>It was suggested that Ward Cllrs should sit on all project groups – Cllrs to discuss this offline and decide between them which groups they could commit to.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>All Advisory Panel members needed to look again at the information that had been circulated regarding the project groups required/the amount of time commitment involved and the timeline. SC reminded all that they had received the information in a spreadsheet on a couple of occasions, including in preparation for this meeting, but it was felt that the information would be easier to follow if pulled into an email.</p> <p>SC to recirculate the information in email format to give all Advisory Panel members a last chance to consider which groups they could commit to and reply to SC – SC to receive replies within 7 days of the email going out. ACTION</p> <p>All to think about others they could recommend the executive team invite to join the groups and email SG/SC. ACTION</p> <p>Ward Cllrs suggested that the Advisory Panel should have one accountable PCC officer at all meetings so that they can respond to or convey issues raised to their PCC colleagues. NOTED</p> <p>If the project groups were not populated as a result of SC’s email, it was felt that the Advisory Panel may need to look at a recruitment process for getting new members onto the Advisory Panel/the project groups. NOTED</p> <p>It was agreed that the focus would start with 2 or 3 key groups – Events and Public Realm – for these to be populated over the next month. NOTED</p> <p>The lead of each project group, once identified, would then need to co-op</p>	<p>CPe/SD/SMcD</p> <p>SC</p> <p>ALL</p>	



	<p>experts in from outside the Advisory Panel. NOTED</p> <p>SD suggested that in her experience it was effective to put volunteers to work as soon as they put themselves forward - swift responses to volunteer was recommended and agreed. NOTED</p>		
<p>AB-06/28-6.</p>	<p>Update from the Board</p> <p>JMcC gave an update from the Board meeting</p> <p><u>Sutton Harbour Lock Bridge</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a shuttle ferry service which would be in action from 1 July. • It was felt by the Advisory Panel that the £1.50 return fee was too expensive and it was noted that the NMA and Rockfish were refunding the fee. • SG to put more pressure on Sutton Harbour Holdings to subsidise the tariff rather than a charity organisation having to subsidise it. ACTION • It was felt that the price for the distance of travel was too high and the ferry operator should charge circa £0.50p return or £1 return for adults with children and pensioners going free. All supported this. NOTED • It was thought that SHH had section 106 money available – JMcC explained that a meeting had been held ref the lock bridge with SHH. SHH were looking to put 9/10 monoliths in for a trail and SG was lobbying for action sooner. <p>It was noted by the Advisory Panel that the original trail had been funded by Co-op and recommended that SG go back to Co-op to ask them if they would like to update and extend the trail. ACTION</p> <p>SG to provide an update on monoliths. ACTION</p> <p><u>BIDs Operations Manager Role</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board were supportive of the role and SG to move forward with PCCC to recruit to the role. <p><u>SG Training and Accreditation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board supported the funding of SG attending BIDs Training and Accreditation courses, but suggested waiting for 12 months for the Accreditation. • MK requested that transparency regarding BID spend had been agreed and therefore communication and an update to all businesses was required. All supported this and JMcC tasked SG and SC with producing a mailshot to BID Voters. ACTION <p><u>City & Waterfront Awards</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All had been invited to the awards launch on 4 July 	<p>SG</p> <p>SG SG</p> <p>SG/SC</p>	<p>19.07.17</p> <p>19.07.17 19.07.17</p> <p>31.07.17</p>
<p>AB-06/28-7.</p>	<p>Hoe Foreshore Presentation</p> <p>SG had provided an update in her email and confirmed that good progress was being made in advance of the DMT meeting on 5 July.</p>		



	<p>SG's email asked if there were any other areas which should be included in the presentation. CPe suggested that Ward Cllrs should be included in discussions ref the Hoe Foreshore as CPe had information on conditional surveys conducted etc. All to feed back to SG with any information and any other ideas for SG to include in the presentation by 30 June. ACTION</p> <p>It was noted that Devil's Point was not included but was part of the BID foreshore – SC explained that this presentation focused on a section of the BID area, specifically the Hoe Foreshore. It was suggested that Luke Pollard was looking to create a Plymouth Sound Marine National Park and that it would be appropriate to invite Luke Pollard to an Advisory Panel meeting in the next few months. SG/SC to invite Luke Pollard to a future meeting. ACTION</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>SG/SC</p>	<p>30.06.17</p> <p>Sep 2017</p>
<p>AB-06/28-8.</p>	<p>Next Meeting Agenda No requests</p>		

Next Meeting:
Wednesday 19 July 2017 2pm-4pm at Duke of Cornwall Hotel