

**A BID for Bridgend Town Centre**  
**Steering Group meeting**  
**Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> February, 2016 5.45pm – 8:00pm**  
**Evergreen Hall, Angel Street**

**Attendees**

Rotimi Adegoke, Bridgend Osteopath (chair) (RA)  
Rachel Bell, The Rhiw Shopping Centre (RB)  
Felicity Ladbroke, Felicity's (FL)  
Stuart Morrel, The Wyndham Arms/Wetherspoon (SM)  
Kate Scourfield, Bridgend Business Against Crime (KS)  
Simon Scourfield, The Phoenix (SS)  
Steve Watkins, Watkins Menswear (SW)  
Natalie Gordon, Bridgend Cycles (NG)  
Steve Bletsoe, Ella Riley's Sweet Shop / Bridgend Traders' Forum (SB)  
Freya Sykes, Ella Riley's Sweet Shop / Bridgend Town Council (FS)  
Steve Easterbrook, Fizzy Foam (SE)  
David Easterbrook Fizzy Foam (DE)

Cllr Bob Burns, Bridgend Town Council  
Cllr David White, Bridgend Town Council / Town Mayor / Bridgend County Borough Council (DW)

Mandy Jenkins, The means (MJ)

**Apologies**

Peter Williams, The means (PW)  
Beth Daniel, Beth Daniel Hair Design (BD)  
Rhiannon Kingsley, Bridgend County Borough Council (RK)  
Cllr Charles Smith, Bridgend County Borough Council (CS)

Item	Detail	Action
1.0	<b>Welcome and introductions</b>  RA opened the meeting and welcomed all attendees.	
2.0	<b>Apologies for Absences</b>  Apologies were given as above.	



<p>3.0</p>	<p><b>Minutes of the last meeting</b> (Thursday, 4<sup>th</sup> February 2016)</p> <p><b>3.1 Confirmation of approval</b></p> <p>RA explained that KS and SS should have been listed as representing their own business, The Phoenix and that the minutes would be changed accordingly.</p> <p>NG made the following two requests to amend item 3.2, under the <i>Boundary</i> second bullet point, of the previous minutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To add ‘that would benefit Five Bells Road in its present form’</li> <li>• A ‘potential’ list of directors</li> </ul> <p>The group agreed these changes.</p> <p>NG asked to be on the circulation list for the minutes.</p> <p><b>3.2 Matters arising (Action plan updates)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Baseline agreement sub-meeting, Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> January</b></li> </ul> <p>RA asked SB to give an update on his discussions with his neighbours on Nolton Street.</p> <p>SB said that the feeling on the street was very negative, that he has tried to explain the situation to them but they did not want to pay anything in as they felt they were already paying too much in business rates.</p> <p>SW suggested it would be right to include all of Nolton Street to give them a vote as to whether they wanted a BID and with a £6,000 threshold some would be above the threshold and some below.</p> <p>RB proposed the group make a decision on the threshold at that point. The group had decided on a £6k threshold at the meeting in January but had subsequently queried it.</p> <p>FS said she felt certain areas shouldn’t be excluded on the basis that they would vote ‘no’.</p> <p>RB said that she felt if Nolton Street was to be included the group should stick to the £6k threshold as that was the small business rate relief threshold. She suggested the group vote on the matter at that</p>	<p><b>MJ: Amend the minutes of the previous meeting to reflect the agreed changes and ensure NG is on the circulation list</b></p>
------------	---	--

	<p>point.</p> <p>BB seconded the motion that the £6k threshold be kept and that Nolton Street be included.</p> <p>SB said that as a trader and as FS was a town councilor they could not vote on the threshold as they did not want to be accused of setting a threshold that they would deliberately be below, and therefore not liable to pay the levy.</p> <p>RB said that she understood why SB was nervous about being included in the vote and understood the sensitivities of the situation.</p> <p>RA said he felt the group had spent ample time discussing around the threshold and that it was time for members to be bold enough to make the decision and take the risk and suggested a £5k threshold might be more suitable.</p> <p>The group took the vote and chose a £6k threshold (5 yes, 2 no). SB and FS abstained from voting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Clr David White information</b></li> </ul> <p>RA asked DW for an update on when the relaxation of pedestrianisation report was going to be presented to the cabinet.</p> <p>DW said that he had checked and there was no date given yet.</p>	
<p><b>4.0</b></p>	<p><b>Concluding BID boundaries</b></p> <p><b>4.1 Discuss Five Bells area</b></p> <p>NG asked about the inclusion of the Five Bells area. She said that she had been a part of the steering group throughout the process and it was her alone that campaigned for the area to be added for inclusion but now felt that it wasn't right for the area to be included.</p> <p>RA reminded the group that originally, before Natalie campaigned for the Five Bells area to be included, that, the boundary on this side of town ended where Nolton Street met the A473 and that any extensions to the map was intended to only include the area Natalie had campaigned for.</p> <p>RB proposed that the boundary stop at the end of Nolton Street.</p>	



<p>NG said she has spoken to her neighbor in Cabo Roche who did not want to be included.</p> <p>MJ said she had spoken to the managers of the Five Bells pub, Cartridge World and the Turkish Barber and all had expressed no desire to be included.</p> <p>The group unanimously agrees that the Five Bells area would not be included in the BID. NG left the meeting.</p> <p><b>4.2 Discuss Asda, Aldi and rest of Cheapside</b></p> <p>RB asked why this was being discussed as the group had previously agreed that Asda and Aldi would be included.</p> <p>RA said that at the previous meeting PW had told the group that Asda tended not to vote favourably towards BIDs, and that they had a very high rateable value.</p> <p>RB asked why Tom Evans of The Means had advised the group to include them if that was the case.</p> <p>RA confirmed that the Cheapside area had been discussed in previous meetings and the group had decided that including it was a good idea.</p> <p>MJ said that PW has met with Asda during the afternoon of the previous meeting and had given some information on that meeting and Asda and BIDs generally to the group.</p> <p>FS said that she felt that the boundary was being manipulated in order to achieve a yes vote and that she wanted no part of it. For this reason she explain, she would have to leave the meeting and then left.</p> <p>SW said on behalf of the traders still present that “I'm sure we all feel similarly” and that the group formulate a proposal that is fair and right that the towns traders can vote on.</p> <p>DW said he felt that Asda should be included as it was a part of the town centre.</p> <p>SB asked why this conversation was only being had now as the Heggartys, Asda, Tesco and Dunraven Place should have been engaged with. He said that if they were all negative what happened</p>	
---	--



	<p>with Nolton Street would not make a difference.</p> <p>MJ said that she had tried to speak to the Heggartys on a few occasions but had been unable to engage with them.</p> <p>SW said he felt Asda should be included because he believed they had been given incentives to come to the town centre.</p> <p>BB said that Asda and the parking there, had affected the parking income in the town. He also said that they were a difficult company to engage with, but emphasised, they definitely hadn't been given any local government incentive to come into town.</p> <p>The group decided that Asda/Aldi and the Cheapside should remain within the BID boundary.</p> <p>SW asked if the group thought the idea of caps should be considered although he was not in favour of one.</p> <p>RA reminded the group, that capping had been discussed on a number of occasions in the past and that partly based on the negative effect Penarth's cap for Tesco's produced, the group had decided against capping for Bridgend.</p> <p>RG said she didn't feel she knew enough about them to make a decision on the issue at that point.</p> <p>MJ said she would ask PW for some information on caps and circulate it to the group.</p> <p><b>4.3 Conclude on all remaining Bid boundaries</b></p> <p>The group discussed the BID boundary map in detail and for those who had not been present at the meeting when the boundary had been agreed SW drew the original boundary (as decided by the group) onto the map.</p> <p>The group all agreed the map to be accurate.</p>	<p><b>MJ: To ask PW for some information on caps and circulate to the group</b></p>
<p><b>5.0</b></p>	<p><b>Finalising BID budget</b></p> <p>RA showed the group the example budget put together by The Means based on their experience of other BIDs. RA said that PW at the last meeting had said that money could be moved around within themes but not between themes so the group were being asked to consider the theme allocations and not the individual lines</p>	



<p>within themes.</p> <p>MJ said that the broad allocation/percentages of the themes needed to be agreed, as the final figures were not available due to the threshold and boundary decisions only just taking place.</p> <p>The group pointed out that RK had said she would cover the software costs and that these should not be included in the core costs budget line.</p> <p>MJ said she would check with RK that this was definitely the case.</p> <p>SB asked if the portion allocated to core costs was normal.</p> <p>MJ confirmed that 20% was the recommended guideline.</p> <p>RA also confirmed that British BIDs' guideline stated within 20 percent and The means had mentioned in an email they had budgeted core costs to this guideline.</p> <p>SB commented on the amount allocated to relaxing pedestrianisation and said that this was something that was perhaps not an issue for other BIDs. He said that the report had not been seen at Cabinet yet and it was the single biggest item in the year 1 costs.</p> <p>RA it was a very important observation SB had noted, but added, The means needed us to decide on the percentage allocation to given themes today, as time was pressured for finalising our BID Proposal. The sub categories can be looked at later. As a percentage theme, the group has focused heavily on improving access.</p> <p>RB asked if the group needed to agree costs now.</p> <p>BB said he was concerned about what was happening at the meeting. Improving access featured heavily in the first and second year budgets for the BID but BCBC had no budget set aside for access so there would not be enough movement for the BID budget to be spent.</p> <p>SW asked what happened if all of the money allocated for the first year was not spent.</p> <p>MJ said that this could be rolled over into the following year/years.</p> <p>SB expressed concern about presenting the budget to other</p>	<p><b>MJ: To check with RK that she would cover the software costs</b></p>
--	--

<p>businesses and gave the example of £5-£10k towards car parking. He said he was concerned the BID was not coming up with things they said they would do.</p> <p>RA it was good that all concerns have been expressed as they will be noted for the record; he then asked the group, with this in mind, to vote on percentage allocations to each theme, not the sub – categories.</p> <p>FL said she didn't really understand BB's comments and asked him to explain.</p> <p>BB said that the BID proposal document talked about transparency but he felt that items in the budget didn't tie up with what was happening in the outside world. Elected representatives had approved a budget that had nothing in it for relaxing pedestrianisation or car parking.</p> <p>RA said that the section of the baseline dealing with car parking was not complete.</p> <p>RB said that car parking did not always have to include the Council. She said the BID could work with private car parks.</p> <p>SW said that it was all theoretical and the group had to decided what they were comfortable with.</p> <p>RA asked if the group felt that there was not enough information to decide on the budget.</p> <p>SM said that the budget was more of an example and that the details would be fine-tuned once the BID was set up.</p> <p>SB said that he felt BCBC should have been more helpful with the relaxing pedestrianisation costings.</p> <p>RA said that he felt everyone's concerns had been heard but was pushing the group to make decisions as after the last meeting there were some concerns raised about decisions not being made. During the last meeting, it was the first time, those present had seen the budget.</p> <p>SE said he felt the group was being asked to make decisions for other businesses.</p> <p>SW said he felt the group should prepare something that traders</p>	
--	--



	<p>would then vote on.</p> <p>BB said he felt there would need to be a strong BID manager. He felt the Board could end up doing something different to what the steering group intended and how could it be ensured that this wasn't the case.</p> <p>MJ said she would ask PW for some information on this.</p> <p>RB said that she felt that whoever sat on the Board would try and get the best value for the BID and that recruitment of the BID manager would be a Board decision. Certain things couldn't be set in stone now.</p> <p>SM asked the group if they were going to vote on the example budget that would go into the manifesto.</p> <p>The group approved the following allocated percentages:</p> <p>19% - core costs</p> <p>17% - marketing and promotion</p> <p>33% - improving access</p> <p>16% - safe and welcoming</p> <p>12% - developing strategy</p> <p>3% - contingency</p>	<p><b>MJ: To ask PW for information on how steering group intentions were carried forward by the Board</b></p>
<p><b>6.0</b></p>	<p><b>Finalising BID proposal</b></p> <p>RA took the group through the updated text version of the document page by page. He then asked two members to write down and email their suggested changes, approved by the group, to him. He reminded them an editor would go through the final text.</p> <p>MJ asked the group if anyone would be willing to appear in the document with a photograph and quote and said that SM's hotel manager at the Wyndham Arms had agreed.</p> <p>There were no volunteers.</p>	
<p><b>7.0</b></p>	<p><b>Crime prevention – improving safety and community (DISC &amp; MRS radio)</b></p>	



	<p>KS talked the group through DISC as she had at the previous meeting. She said that there was £500 set up fee and a £75 per month charge. She suggested the BID could fund this as part of her Business Against Crime Coordinator role.</p> <p>The group agreed that this could be good for the BID and a good way of linking the day and night economies.</p>	
<p><b>8.0</b></p>	<p><b>Reassessing ballot date and timelines</b></p> <p>RA said that discussions had taken place regarding where our BID process had reached in relation to our current working ballot date of March 31<sup>st</sup> 2016. The ballot date could be pushed back and presented the following three options to the group:</p> <p>17<sup>th</sup> March – notice of ballot</p> <p>31<sup>st</sup> March – ballot papers issued</p> <p>28<sup>th</sup> April – ballot date</p> <p>May 12<sup>th</sup> – notice of ballot</p> <p>May 26<sup>th</sup> – ballot papers issues</p> <p>June 23<sup>rd</sup> – ballot date</p> <p>May 19<sup>th</sup> – notice of ballot</p> <p>June 2<sup>nd</sup> – ballot papers issued</p> <p>June 30<sup>th</sup> - ballot date</p> <p>MJ explained that the first date 28<sup>th</sup> April would be before the Welsh Government elections and might be too soon to get everything finished. She said the second date of 23<sup>rd</sup> June was one of the rumoured dates for the EU referendum and so felt that the 30<sup>th</sup> June would be the best option.</p> <p>RB said she had been telling her landlord that the ballot would take place on 31<sup>st</sup> March and asked what reason she should give for the postponement.</p>	



	<p>SS asked for the reasons behind the date blocs.</p> <p>MJ explained that the notification of ballot had to be sent out at least 42 days before the ballot date but could be done sooner, and that the ballot itself was open for 28 days.</p> <p>FL said that she felt the group would be better prepared and better armed to achieve a positive result if the ballot date was postponed.</p> <p>The group decided on the 30<sup>th</sup> June ballot date.</p> <p>RB then asked what the group planned to do next.</p> <p>SW said even though he was against it the group needed to speak to Asda and make a decision on a potential cap.</p> <p>SB said that a meeting was needed with the Heggartys.</p> <p>RB suggested someone senior from The Means and RA meet both.</p>	<p><b>MJ: To arrange a meeting with Asda and The Heggartys (once the proposal document was finalised)</b></p>
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Baseline agreement</b>  Not discussed.	
<b>10.0</b>	<b>Town centre update</b>  Not discussed.	
<b>11.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>  Nothing discussed.	
<b>12.0</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>  TBC	