



**Plymouth Waterfront Partnership  
Board Meeting  
31 MAY 2016, 10am-1pm  
Duke of Cornwall Hotel**

**Attendees:** Chris Arscott (CA); Gavin Marshall (GM); Sarah O'Leary (SOL); Charlotte Malcolm (CM); Jon Morcom (JM); Comron Rowe (CR); Chris Robinson (ChR); Ben Shearn (BS); Charlie Jones (CJ); Josh McCarty (JMcC); Ian Bowyer (IB) (Part); Glenn Jordan (GJ); Patrick Knight (PK); Sky Cole (SC); Michael Connor (MC);

**Apologies:** Roy Martin (RM);

ITEM	NOTES and ACTION POINTS	By Whom	By When
	<p><b>Welcome</b></p> <p>CA opened the meeting by welcoming Cllr Ian Bowyer (Leader of Plymouth City Council) and Cllr Glenn Jordan (Portfolio Holder for the Waterfront).</p> <p>IB shared that the change in administration of PCC would not mean changes to the support of PWP – IB recognised the importance of the partnership and PWP's offer to the city.</p> <p>IB wanted to see the Waterfront have a higher profile to visitors and would support the BID to achieve this.</p> <p>GJ confirmed that he was familiar with the BID and was fully on board.</p> <p>SG and CA had previously met with IB and GJ on 27 May and had given an overview of the PWP BID Plan delivery, BID renewal, Waterfront Masterplan and signage needs.</p> <p>All welcomed IB and GJ.</p>		
<p><b>MB-05/16-1</b></p>	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>Apologies were tabled</p>		
<p><b>MB-05/16-2.</b></p>	<p><b>Conflict of Interest Policy</b></p> <p>No conflicts of interest were declared at the start of the meeting.</p>		

	<p>GM declared a conflict of interest during the discussion regarding the City &amp; Waterfront Awards as his business hosts the event. <b>NOTED</b></p> <p>GM declared a conflict of interest during the discussion regarding the possible use of the Cooperage building. <b>NOTED</b></p>		
<p><b>MB-05/16-3.</b></p>	<p><b>Minutes to the last meeting</b></p> <p>The minutes to the last meeting were signed-off as a true record of the extraordinary meeting held on 14 April 2016.</p> <p>Plymouth Giants – Gog and Magog  Since the last meeting, ChR, PK and SG met with Dom jinks to discuss the possible project. The project was also explored with PCC and the feedback was that the city’s focus on the Waterfront should be Mayflower 400 and there was no support for the proposed ‘Plymouth Giants’ proposal.</p> <p>ChR had subsequently established that the Giants had been present on the Hoe when the Mayflower sailed from Plymouth in 1620 and there were two documents which supported this. This meant that the Giants were one of the last things that the Pilgrims saw.</p> <p>It was suggested that the Native Americans could do a piece of work in preparation for Mayflower 400 celebrations in 2020 and the two projects could complement each other.</p> <p>DP had no budget for anything other than Mayflower 400 – ChR wanted to see a heritage piece.</p> <p>ChR confirmed that the artist proposing the Plymouth Giants project has suggested that it would take six months to complete. There has been a suggestion that if the piece was non-permanent, it may be an option.</p> <p>The Plymouth Giants project had been put to Nicola Moyle, the Barbican Theatre and the History Centre, but no clear steer received. SG confirmed that over three days of BID Renewal Consultation there had not been much support from Waterfront businesses, neither was there support for the proposed visual arts project.</p> <p>Following the discussed regarding the Plymouth Giants project, the Main Board confirmed their support for the project and ChR to continue to pursue it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ChR and CA to discuss at a Mayflower 400 meeting.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ChR to develop the educational angle. <b>ACTION</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>ChR/CA</b> <b>ChR</b></p>	<p><b>26.07.16</b> <b>26.07.16</b></p>

<p><b>MB-05/16-4.</b></p>	<p><b>Progress Update</b>  SG confirmed 93% delivery of the original forty two project Waterfront BID1 Business Plan</p> <p>It had been agreed during a previous Board meeting that at the end of May, SG and SC would draw a halt to project delivery and focus on BID Renewal.</p> <p>SG explained that the remaining 7% included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Waterfront Privilege Card</li> <li>- Additional free berthing and additional pontoons</li> <li>- Some member benefits not achieved such as PARC membership</li> </ul> <p>All recognised that the Waterfront BID1 Business Plan had had a lot of projects that BID voters couldn't physically see on the street and therefore may not truly appreciate had been delivered.</p> <p>Projects that members could see 'on the ground' would be key for Waterfront BID2.</p> <p>CA requested a tube-style map be created for connectivity and SG had started work to explore with Citybus whether or not a unified ticket for transport could be developed.</p> <p>A suggestion was made that we share the Hills Balfour reports with BID Voters – SG to investigate. <b>ACTION</b></p> <p>SG confirmed that work had begun with a BID focused communications team (involving OnShore Media, Scott Grenney, Bracken Jelier, Charlotte Malcolm, Josh McCarty, Vicky Gunston and the PCC Comms Team) on a PR Plan – would share the message that the BID had delivered strongly in each of the seven focus areas of the BID Business Plan: Marketing, Visitor Welcome, Events, Environmental Improvement, Clean, Safe and Investment &amp; Regeneration.</p> <p>Main Board gave SG a steer that comms should tackle the 7% head on, explaining why these hadn't/wouldn't be delivered; back up with rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– PWP stood out amongst other BIDs across the UK and the delivery had only been possible due to the partnership working together.</li> <li>– As part of listening to voters, the BID had been drawn into delivering additional projects on top of the forty two in the Business Plan</li> <li>– Voters had changed the priorities via the Advisory Board as the BID went along and PWP reassessed the priorities accordingly</li> </ul> <p><b>NOTED</b></p>	<p><b>SG</b></p>	<p><b>26.07.16</b></p>
---------------------------	---	------------------	------------------------



	<p>position and reported a conservative £30k reserve cash position. This was to be verified during the forthcoming audit by contracted accountants Bromhead.</p> <p>SG shared the budget forecast for 2016/17 including a £21k expenditure from cash reserves.</p> <p>SG had renegotiated the PWP contribution to the ENTE role, reducing it from £20k to £11k.</p> <p>From the increased cash reserve position of £30k, 5k would be added to PR costs for the BID renewal campaign.</p> <p><b>AGREED</b></p> <p><b><u>City &amp; Waterfront Awards</u></b></p> <p>GM declared a conflict of interest in the subject as his business would host the event. <b>NOTED</b></p> <p>SG asked for a final steer regarding PWP's £5k investment in the event for 2016 – Main Board unanimously agreed the £5k with the following rationale/steer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It would be detrimental not to go ahead</li> <li>- The event would support BID communications</li> <li>- The event celebrated our members' businesses</li> <li>- We must not lose our logo on this</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION</b></p> <p>CJ suggested that PWP need to consider the exit costs for the business. <b>ACTION</b></p> <p>A potential 'NO' vote was discussed and it was confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There would be no redundancy costs</li> <li>- We would need to settle any outstanding bills</li> <li>- The business could be left dormant</li> <li>- PWP could be filed only as long as there was one named Director listed</li> </ul>	<p><b>SG</b></p> <p><b>SG</b></p> <p><b>SG</b></p>	<p><b>26.07.16</b></p>
<p><b>MB-05/16-5.</b></p>	<p><b>Advisory Board Update</b></p> <p><u>Consultation</u> The Advisory Board had reviewed the consultation document and JMcC confirmed that the Advisory Board were engaged.</p> <p><u>The Transat</u> There had been rumours regarding The Boathouse being paid for use for The Transat – this had been discussed and PCC had given an explanation of what had been agreed by OC Sports.</p> <p><u>Planters</u> The Advisory Board were extremely pleased with the planters and were looking at how to fund further planters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a project within PCC which was looking at street</li> </ul>		



	the next meeting to ensure nothing imperative had been missed. <b>ACTION</b>	<b>JMC</b>	<b>22.06.16</b>
<b>MB-05/16-6.</b>	<p><b>Waterfront BID2 Renewal</b></p> <p>SG shared that we had seven hundred and eight voters and twenty four forms had been returned to date – the target was to have three hundred forms back by 6 June 2016</p> <p>The key projects so far were:  2 – Walking trails  3 – Integrated transport  13 – Access to the water</p> <p>Project 15 – Cruise ship benefits had received a full spread of scores. The feedback had been:  - Plymouth would need to be a turnaround port  - We would need to develop Plymouth trips  - Cruise operator offers are developed/agreed/promoted up to five years in advance of a ship arriving – PK to investigate this with Destination Plymouth. <b>ACTION</b></p> <p>Project 16 – Annual funding pot – this had been labelled as divisive by traders</p> <p>Other suggestions and feedback:  - A QR code be created for existing trails and new trails  - An App should be created for trails  - Insurance costs could be considered as a member benefit  - Threats of a 'No' campaign had been received  - Holiday Inn came through as a key supporter of the BID</p> <p><u>Boundary</u>  SG to speak with Mount Batten Businesses regarding the possibility of coming in. <b>ACTION</b></p>	<b>PK</b>	
<b>MB-05/16-7.</b>	<p><b>AOB and Next Meeting Agenda</b></p> <p>The Cooperage  A story was being run in the Herald and the date for objections was 30 May 2016</p> <p>It was reiterated that PWP did object and a condition of any development would be an integrated bin store</p> <p>PK's team to draft a letter of objection on PWP's behalf.  <b>ACTION</b>  CA/ Main Board to sign-off the letter and PK to submit on behalf of PWP. <b>ACTION</b></p> <p>GM declared a conflict of interest at this stage regarding the possible uses of the Cooperage building. <b>NOTED</b></p>	<b>PK CA/Main Board</b>	

	<p><u>Main Board Membership</u>  CJ confirmed that she would be stepping down from the Main Board, but would remain for the Annual Review and until the end of July.</p> <p>This was discussed and CA requested that CJ not step down, but instead remain a Board member but step back from the meetings until the end of Waterfront BID1 (31/03/17). CJ agreed to discuss this with her employer and feed back at the July meeting. <b>ACTION</b></p> <p>CM also suggested she would likely be stepping down at the end of Waterfront BID1.</p>	<p><b>CJ</b></p>	<p><b>26.07.16</b></p>
--	--	------------------	------------------------

**Next Meeting:**

Tuesday 26 July 2016, 10am – 1pm, Duke of Cornwall