Plymouth Waterfront Partnership
Board Meeting
30 May 2019, 10am-12pm
Executive Boardroom, 1st Floor, Crowne Plaza Hotel

Attendees: Nick Buckland (NB)(Chair); Chris Robinson (ChR); Andrew Brewerton (ABr); Mervyn Orchard (MO); Jon Morcom (JM); Ben Shearn (BS); Josh McCarty (JMcC); Penny Tarrant (PT); Sarah Gibson (SG); Sky Cole (SC); Victoria Allen (VA); Paul Vann (PV)

Presenters: Richard Bara (RB); Karen Gallacher (KG)

Apologies: Craig Moore (CM); Andrew Bullivant (AB) Patrick Knight (PK); Cllr Pete Smith (PS); Marc Nash (MN); Charles Hackett (CH); Paul Barnard (PB)

ITEM	NOTES and ACTION POINTS	By Whom	By When
MB-05/19-1.	**Apologies and Introductions** VA and PV were welcomed to the meeting and introductions were made around the table. Apologies were tabled. **NOTED:** • NB acknowledged that PS was not able to attend and therefore the meeting was not quorate. VA was attending on behalf of PCC, but was not able to cast a vote.		
MB-05/19-2.	**Conflict of Interest Policy** No conflicts of interest were raised.		
MB-05/19-3.	**Minutes to the last meeting** The Minutes of the previous Board meeting held 28 March 2019 were approved as a true record of the meeting. The actions log was updated accordingly **NOTED:** <u>Hoe Foreshore</u> • NB was expecting to meet with Tudor on Monday 3 June and will update the Board following that meeting.		

	<u>Waterfront Investment</u> • Conversations with several potential investors were continuing. <u>Council and BID Communication</u> • Now have a better understanding regarding communications between PWP and PCC. SG working with the central comms team more closely. <u>BID Members – Gift Card</u> • On hold until the autumn; invitation from PCCC still open. Divided feedback from the Advisory Panel members who supported putting the idea on hold for the time being. <u>Plymouth Giants</u> • On the agenda for discussion today. <u>Nominations Committee</u> • On the agenda for discussion today. <u>Visitor Plan 2020-2030</u> • Action ongoing. Waiting for proposals on the business plan and the marketing plan. <u>Marketing</u> • Work underway to create a strategic overview of marketing budgets across the city – SG will report back in July. **ACTION:** • SG to provide an update to the Board via email regarding progress on securing investment.	**SG**	
MB-05/19-4.	**Millbay Boulevard (Richard Bara, PCC)** RB was welcomed to the meeting and gave a presentation to the Board. **NOTED:** • RB shared that the Millbay Boulevard is a strategic link between Millbay and the City Centre and supports Waterfront Masterplan aim to “repair the disconnect”. • Budget of £5.58 million. • Boulevard due to be complete by end February 2020, but the art installation may take a little longer. • IUDM to follow once the Boulevard is complete – connecting to Western Approach, then Royal Parade and Union Street. • Informing Plymouth’s public realm elements – including street furniture, street lighting, bins, paving, art, ornamental lighting and signage. Looking for consistency, robustness in style and character. Support intelligent and innovative technologies. • RB highlighted that context and character are important as well		

	as the historic core of areas of the city – the most successful cities have the richest public realm. Character = richness = interest = value. • Robustness and longevity are being taken into account also. • Question raised about how this project fit in with the Mackay vision – vision forms part of the Plymouth Plan and therefore being included – growing the city. • How do we take it from strategic design to operational delivery? – RB confirmed that the plan is that we identify materials and character that we want. • Boulevard doesn't address the disconnect between the entire Waterfront and the City Centre – addresses the disconnect between Millbay and the City Centre. • RB confirmed that the aim is to improve the connection between Millbay and The Hoe. CR suggested that the tapestry being created for the Giants project could be the connection as it provides a narrative. • SG noted that Ian Hutchinson (Plymouth College of Art representative for the PWP Advisory Panel) sits on the Millbay Boulevard group and can provide a steer on behalf of PWP. • RB shared that there are some resistances from residential communities to creating pathways around the Waterfront – PT noted that there are communities who do support the plans for connectivity. **AGREED:** • Public Realm Design Code – Board asked that they be included in the consultation process so that PWP is actively involved in the process and informs the final document. • Need to ensure that PCC have control over what is delivered by Highways to ensure that the strategic design is delivered. **ACTION:** • RB to put the first draft of the Design Code document together and share with the Board for comment • SG to ensure that Ian Hutchinson is briefed on the views of the Board for the Millbay Boulevard.	**RB** **SG**	
MB-05/19-5.	**PWP Planning Sub Committee – West Pier Planning Application** Karen Gallacher (KG), PCC Planning Officer was welcomed to the meeting and thanked for her time. **NOTED:** • The PWP Board had already expressed views on the West Pier proposals in January 2019, when Charles Hackett and Catherine Arthurs presented the Mayflower 400 proposals to the Board. • With the planning application now live, PWP has been asked by DP and PCC to take a view on the proposals. • Following discussion NB and SG had agreed that it should follow		

	due process and the PWP Planning Sub Committee should review the proposals and make recommendation to the Board.
	• The PWP Planning Sub Committee meeting was held with Catherine Arthurs and PK in attendance. There was a lot of challenge to the application that came out of the meeting, which SG has since shared with the Mayflower 400 team.
	• There are three weeks remaining to make comment on the live application.
	• KG invited from PCC to take views of the Board back to the Council.
	• CR and PT summarised the view of the PWP Planning Sub Committee on the West Pier Application:
	  ○ The issue that the cobbles have Grade II listed status and are not being replaced correctly – it's the historic quarter of the city.
	  ○ It was noted that the Pier was apparently being designed for events, but events are temporary and what we need is for an historic area that will attract people year round – the cobbles form part of that attraction. This design was too modern.
	  ○ The need for access for wheelchair users was noted, though it was felt that an entirely flat surface wasn't essential for access.
	  ○ Suggestion was that some of the cobbles could be retained and combined with Scottish Granite for a blended surface.
	  ○ The cost:benefit analysis showed that maintaining cobbles was a more cost effective approach.
	  ○ In order to retain our status as having the highest concentration of cobbles in the country, it was questioned whether we could afford to lose a proportion of the cobbles.
	  ○ It was felt that the project was being pushed through at speed and the BID should have been consulted much earlier before planning had begun.
	  ○ The work being conducted on the Barbican was due to be ongoing into the Mayflower year, causing concern about the visitor experience of the area.
	  ○ The plans for the Pier currently only focused on Mayflower, though there is a far richer history that we could and should be celebrating.
	  ○ The agreed recommendation from the Planning Sub Committee is that the Board should object to the current scheme and instead work to inform a revised plan.
	  ○ It was the recommendation of the PWP Planning Sub Committee that the Board should record an objection to the design proposals for West Pier.
	• KG shared that the Heritage Statement was not available sooner and therefore is only now able to be considered.
	• KG explained that work needs to be done to understand the		

	heritage significance of the cobbles.
	• KG noted that the belief is that the cobbles were replaced in the 1990's – CR agreed that they may have been lifted to install the lock gates, but the cobbles had been there originally and put back.
	• If the cobbles are original, then there will need to be a decision made about whether the removal/retention will be of public benefit – KG will make a recommendation based on her assessment of the Heritage Statement and the Council will make a decision based upon that.
	• KG asked what the opinion was of the balcony – there was no strong feeling or objection to the balcony.
	• KG shared that the applicant (PCC) has written a 100 page document on the historic importance of the Pier, which KG will review.
	• A pre-application enquiry had been made with little information, which is why KG has requested the Heritage Statement.
	• Modernising the area for a handful of events and subsequently losing the historic element that visitors come to see year round was viewed to be illogical.
	• BS shared that there are questions in the business community about why this project has been prioritised above other improvements on the Waterfront, particularly as the community don't support it.
	• Concern that the legacy of Mayflower could be to pave over the wider heritage legacy and history of the Barbican.
	• RB suggested that the designers could be brought in to present to the Board and provide more information. The Board felt that a place management discussion for the Waterfront would be preferable earlier. It was felt that the matter should have been raised far earlier and the designers should have met with the Board in the earliest stages of the process. Even in January it appears the Board's comments on the designs had not been considered. This was now being presented as a done deal.
	• It was understood that the work could start in July if the planning application was approved and didn't go to Planning Committee.
	• Karen shared that she won't know until mid-June whether the application is going to committee.
	• The objection of the Board is not to the project, but rather to the modern materials and designs that are proposed.
	• Concerns also raised that the delivery timeline is too tight and the potential for negative impact on the business community was significant.
	• It was acknowledged that the relationship with the Council was important to the Board. It was also acknowledged the structural repair works are necessary.
	• NB summarised that there were two key issues
	    o The Pier needs fixing – all in support and agreed, but is the timing correct (i.e., the leak has been there for 26 years)?
	    o The materials to be used and the public interest are still in		

	question, i.e. the need for a modern event space versus the need for an historic visitor destination. • MO expressed concern that anything which is likely to disrupt the access to the bridge will receive huge objection from Mitch Tonks and the NMA. • NB noted that PWP putting forward a letter of concern rather than a formal objection to the application at this stage would not preclude individuals from making objections, but PWP would preserve the relationship with the Council by providing a letter of comment. • KG explained that the notices would go up next week and there will be three weeks to provide feedback. • PT reminded all that the recommendation of the Planning Sub Committee was to submit an objection. • NB noted that we were not quorate and could therefore not conduct a vote to make a final decision at the meeting, but asked all to await his draft of the letter of concern and provide feedback. **AGREED:** • It was noted that the Pier did need to be repaired, but there was not support for it being paved over. • NB suggested that the next step be to construct a letter back that expresses concerns regarding the modern designs rather than submitting a formal objection. Letter could help support the need to repair the Pier and separate the need to completely replace the surface. • It was agreed that PWP must ensure that the opinion of the BID members is taken into consideration in how we respond to the application. **ACTION:** • NB to compose a letter of concerns from PWP to the West Pier proposal and share with the Board for input.	**NB**	
MB-05/19-6.	**National Marine Park** **NOTED:** Update from JMcC (Blue Marine Foundation) • Feasibility due next month. • Have found preferred consultant and now going through the recruitment process. • Large portion of the city is disconnected from the marine and maritime sectors – the team will be running groups throughout the summer to improve those connections. Waterfront BID priorities and contributions • JMcC asked the Board to consider if there's a project in the current Waterfront Masterplan that could be incorporated within the NMP work and where potential grants could be identified.		

	<u>Sailing events</u> • VA explained that Transat was pulled from Plymouth and Plymouth had had no control over that – organisers had a lot of sponsorship offers made if they moved to France. • Offshore sailing now becoming an Olympic sport and opens up opportunity to apply for funding from Sport England – Plymouth needs to decide if we want to put our hat in the ring. • Transat was due to be the headline of the Mayflower Ocean Festival in 2020, so now looking at what could be put in place to replace that event. • VA asked for the view of the Board about how the BID might contribute. • BS shared that a Port of Plymouth Sailing Regatta is being arranged in the summer – it had first been held in 2018 and this year it has scaled up with J class. Have gig racing and triathlon taking place also. Mount Batten Centre also doing sailing taster sessions this year. • PWP is financially supporting the Port of Plymouth Regatta this year, but PCC could support next year. • The Regatta has 300 participants so far and will be a flotilla on the water. • VA meeting with Alex King to discuss the sailing event. • The Regatta is an organically grown event that could be expanded if the Council was able to invest and support. • Advice that Plymouth should look to host races that start in Plymouth rather than ending in Plymouth – large events can attract thousands of people and the teams come for up to two weeks prior to the start of the event – VA noted this. • VA shared how disappointed she was that the Transat was moving to France – it was agreed that this is a loss of sailing heritage. • VA due to pick up conversations again with RORC regarding the Fastnet race. • VA also working with the NMA to ensure that events are community inclusive and to ensure support. • ABr noted that the Waterfront is a centre for activity on the water for Devon and Cornwall and suggested that a carnival on the Waterfront for example would be an impressive finale for the sailing season in the South West. VA shared that the conversation around this was happening with the Isles of Scilly and it was being explored. • PT queried whether there are any electric powerboat races that could be considered. VA was not aware of any. **AGREED:** • A discussion developed about whether we should look to home grown or the major international events for our support or if it's a blend of the two. It was agreed that there needs to be a mix of events in Plymouth.		

	• Elite offshore racing positions Plymouth globally. **ACTION:** • The NMP team are looking at what activities are planned and what could be planned – JMcC to share an email with the PWP Board for comment. • BS to introduce VA via email to the Port of Plymouth Regatta event organisers.	**JMcC** **BS**	
MB-05/19-7.	**Plymouth Giants** SG was going to bring a crossroads decision to the table – should we proceed with temporary installation this year or postpone until March 2021 (post Mayflower). In brief summary, at this stage PWP would not have the funds to cover all costs due to the increase in processes for the project – current forecast is £54k for a temporary installation (increase from £36k) due to health & safety and event launch requirements. Also timescales are tight as 'green lights' still had not given by MOD. SG had received an email from the artist yesterday and this necessarily changed the focus of today's conversation. **NOTED:** • The email from the artist explained that he has spoken with the gallery he works with and is abruptly requesting a £50k copyright fee. • SG asked for support to go back to the artist to explore further and discuss the option of postponing the project to 2021. • CR suggested that he doesn't think it will be an upfront fee, but rather a fee that would come into effect once the art is in place. • There is currently no contractual requirements upon PWP in place. **AGREED:** • The timescale of three months is tight and all supported delaying the Plymouth Giants project until March 2021 and looking toward a 12 month installation. **ACTION:** • SG and CR to go back to the artist to explore postponement of the project and gain clarification regarding the new £50k copyright fee.	**SG / CR**	
MB-05/19-8.	**Advisory Panel Update** MN sent his apologies for this meeting, so SG and SC gave a summary update. **NOTED:** • The Advisory Panel are supportive of the Board and its overall		

	approach to BID delivery – they also support the comments of the Board on the West Pier proposal. • Regarding Plymouth Giants they would like a longer term installation and requested that there should be community engagement work arranged alongside the installation. • The Advisory Panel were pleased that the proposed Gift Card was on hold until the autumn for further review as this had been their advice. • MN and AK were unable to attend the meeting as MN was on leave and AK had to deal with an asbestos issue on the Mount Batten beaches – Mike Kitt volunteered and acted as chair for the meeting.		
MB-05/19-9.	**Financial Report 2019/2020** SG gave a brief update. The latest Financial Report was included within the Board pack for reference. **NOTED:** • Final end of year position for FY 2018/19 was provided. • These accounts and the company's cash reserve position will be audited by Bromhead in September 2019. • During FY 2019/20, it was expected that a £15k sum would leave the PWP accounts to fund new Waterfront monoliths; it was expected that a £25k sum would leave PWP accounts toward the city's digital trails app this year – SG will keep all informed and share details of the app for the Board's consideration in due course. This was being driven by DP. • The digital Mayflower 400 Trails app that has recently been released is being trialled and was funded by the Discover England fund. This is not the app that PWP will assist in funding. • SG will be bringing the Christmas Lights proposal to the table in July – investment will be included. **ACTION:** • SG to send a link to the national trails app that is being trialled by Destination Plymouth.	**SG**	
MB-05/19-10.	**Nominations Committee** **NOTED:** • SG speaking to Brittany Ferries about the potential of their offering an accountant as a Finance Director for the Board.		
MB-05/19-11.	**AOB** **NOTED:** • PT – 5th June is second anniversary of Environment Plymouth and all welcome. • Abr – Degree shows happening in June – 13th and 14th are private showings – around 600 artists exhibiting. Business viewing on 13th • CR – Graduations not happening on The Hoe in 2020 is		

	disappointing. VA explained that the timing of the Mayflower commemorations couldn't be changed and the university couldn't move the timing of the graduation, but measures were being put in place to make the graduation event a success with photo opportunities on The Hoe • BS – Could be an opportunity to incorporate NMP and Plastic Free Plymouth information in the Regatta – VA agreed to take this forward. **ACTION:** • PT to circulate the Environment Plymouth Anniversary invitation. • All to let Abr know if they would like to be on the PCA mailing list. • SC to share the PCA Degree Shows invite on behalf of ABr.	**PT** **ALL** **SC**	
MB-05/19-12.	**Next Meeting Agenda** • Christmas Lights Proposal		

Next Board Meetings:
Friday 16th August 2019, 10am – 12pm, Duke of Cornwall Hotel **(moved from 25th July)**
Thursday 26th September 2019, 12.30pm – 3pm, Duke of Cornwall Hotel

Meeting	Action	By Whom / When	Notes	Status
	Hoe Foreshore Work with PCC to create a steering group and move the Hoe Foreshore report work forward. Meet with Leader Cllr Tudor Evans to put forward the Hoe Foreshore proposal and seek partnership approach to seeking funding.	**NB** **NB/MN/SG**	Needs setting up MN has met with Anthony Payne	**Ongoing** **Ongoing**
  30.05.19	**PWP Investments** SG to do a detailed analysis of the BID expenditure across the Waterfront for BID2 to assess the spread of investment SG to provide an update to the Board via email regarding progress on securing investment.	**SG** **SG**		**Complete**
  30.05.19	**Plymouth Giants** Continue to seek 'green lights' for temporary installation from Historic England and the MOD. SG and CR to go back to the artist and explore postponing the project and gain clarification regarding the artists' new request for a £50k copyright fee.	**SG** **SG / CR**	Revert to Board.	**Ongoing** **Complete**
	Nominations Committee Continue to pursue a suitable Finance Director	**NB/BS**	SG approaching Brittany Ferries – mtg September	**Ongoing**
	Visitor Plan 2020-30 Include education within the Gateway, Public Spaces & Public Realm. Look into prospect of creating 'Unesco City of Gastronomy'. Discuss how to work with the British Arts Show curators offline. Share information on national campaign to create a level playing field regarding Airbnb.	**AL** **AL** **Abr / CH** **AL**		

	Mayflower 400 Discuss Mayflower Makers offline.	**JM / CH**		
	Marketing NB and SG to explore a holistic strategic overview of marketing budgets across all bodies in the city and provide to the Board.	**NB / SG**	**Underway, will report in July.**	**Ongoing**
30.05.19	**Millbay Boulevard** RB to put the first draft of the Design Code document together and share with the Board for comment SG to ensure that Ian Hutchinson is briefed on the views of the Board for the Millbay Boulevard artwork project.	**RB** **SG**	**Pushed back to December 2019** **Boulevard artwork not going ahead**	 **N/a**
30.05.19	**Planning Sub Committee** NB to compose a letter of concerns from PWP to the West Pier proposal and share with the Board for input.	**NB**		**Complete**
35.05.19	**National Marine Park** The NMP team are looking at what activities are planned and what could be planned – JMcC to share an email with the PWP Board for comment. BS to introduce VA via email to the Port of Plymouth Regatta event organisers.	**JMcC** **BS**		 **Complete**
30.05.19	**Financial Report** SG to send a link to the national trails app that is being trialled by Destination Plymouth.	**SG**		**Complete**
30.05.19	**AOB** PT to circulate the Environment Plymouth Anniversary invitation. All to let Abr know if they would like to be on the PCA mailing list. SC to share PCA Degree Shows invite on behalf of ABr.	**PT** **ALL** **SC**		**Complete** **Complete**