

A BID for Bridgend Town Centre
Steering Group meeting
Thursday 26th November 2015, 5.15pm – 6:30pm
Carnegie House, Wyndham Street

Attendees

Rotimi Adegoke, Bridgend Osteopath (chair) (RA)
Rachel Bell, The Rhiw Shopping Centre (RB)
Beth Daniel, Beth Daniel Hair Design (BD)
Steve Watkins, Watkins Menswear (SW)
Steve Bletsoe, Ella Riley's Sweet Shop / Bridgend Traders' Forum (SB)
Steve Easterbrook, Fizzy Foam (SE)
David Easterbrook, Fizzy Foam (DE)
Felicity Ladbrooke, Felicity's (FL)
Julie Chunuonsee-James, Bauhaus coffee shop (JCJ)
Natalie Gordon, Bridgend Cycles (NG)

Cllr Olivia Byrne, Bridgend Town Council (OB)
Rhiannon Kingsley, Bridgend County Borough Council (RK)
Cllr Charles Smith, Bridgend County Borough Council (CS)
Cllr David White, Bridgend Town Council / Bridgend County Borough Council (DW)
Cllr Edith Hughes, Bridgend Town Council / Bridgend County Borough Council (EH)

Peter William, The means (PW)
Mandy Jenkins, The means (MJ)

Apologies

Megan Bailey, Top Spot
Freya Sykes, Ella Riley's Sweet Shop
Kate Scourfield, The Phoenix
Simon Scourfield, The Phoenix

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



<p>3.0</p>	<p>Minutes of the last meeting (Thursday, 15th October 2015)</p> <p>3.1 Confirmation of approval</p> <p>The group approved the minutes of the last meeting as an accurate record of the evening's discussions.</p> <p>3.2 Matters arising (Action plan updates)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Developing HQ RB confirmed that the HQ space was ready and that CF31 posters would be put up the following day. PW would be meeting representative of the centre's owner on Monday 30th, after which a press release about the HQ would be issued.• BID proposal paper PW confirmed that a draft had been produced and would be discussed later in the meeting.• BID exemptions paper PW had circulated this and it would be discussed later in the meeting.• Pedestrianisation timeline RK said that she could not provide a definitive timescale but could provide a sequence of events: Capita had been commissioned to do an independent risk assessment. They would then make some recommendations around safety measures. The Council/ Cabinet would then decide on the next step and look at finances to fund the improvements. <p>RA said that a more detailed timeline/order of events, (from initial consultation request to final vote/conclusion), was still required so that people could see that things were progressing and asked if the Council officers could give a timeline. This would encourage confidence and trust from traders/businesses as well as lessen the likelihood of rumours.</p> <p>RK said that the timeline would need to come from her colleagues in the Highways department and it was proving difficult to get precise information. Not least as any</p>	<p>PW: Meeting and press release</p> <p>RB: Posters, Meeting</p>
------------	---	--



- Pilot parking data results and report

RK gave the following update for October 2015.

Footfall

4.7% down on the previous year

Sales performance

3.8% up on previous year

Free After 3 foot fall count compared with October 2014

Hours of day covered	15:00-15:59	16:00-16:59	17:00-17:59	18:00-18:59
Footfall count for October 2014	43,859	35,892	18,964	8,089
Free After 3 Footfall count October 2015	52,377	40,024	21,305	10,030

SB pointed out that this data was inaccurate as the camera had been moved from outside Blockbuster where it had been situated when the October 2014 data had been recorded to Caroline Street where the October 2015 data had been recorded.

RA asked RK if she would be able to circulate the November figures to the group the following week. RK confirmed she would.

RK to circulate November figures to the group first week in December

4.0 Pedestrianisation update

Covered under item 3.2 above.

5.0 BID Proposal Outline

PW introduced the proposal. The group felt that the list of pledges on page three would immediately cause problems as 'Improve access, parking and gateways' as it was felt, without a clear statement of commitment from the council towards pedestrianisation, they could not comfortably pledge this central



<p>commitment to fellow businesses/traders in the town.</p> <p>After a detailed and passionate discussion, it was suggested that, this be moved to second on the list and the wording be rephrased.</p> <p>RA asked the group, after continued discussions, if they thought this should be taken off the list.</p> <p>NG recalled a conversation from a previous meeting, around if one of the key BID objectives is not achieved in the first 12 months, the BID would be void. PW said that he had never heard of such a provision.</p> <p>RA asked the group, due to the detailed and passionate discussion with continued, if they felt the rest of the meeting should focus on pedestrianisation and the parking/access pledge.</p> <p>RB said that she thought it would be a good idea to agree on it now rather than move on and come back to it again at the next meeting.</p> <p>RK stated that the BID had acted as one of the pressure groups to get focus on this issue, and if established, could provide a pot of money to negotiate and maintain pressure. She contrasted this with the example of the Traders' Forum who were also a pressure group but had no money.</p> <p>RK said she had spoken to Welsh Government and that the timeline for funding of the BID campaign could not be extended and with little chance of alternative resources, a ballot needed to take place by March 31st.</p> <p>SW pointed out that the group would be making decisions on behalf of the rest of the town.</p> <p>SB said that he did not feel comfortable moving forward with an issue being used as a bargaining chip. He asked why CS believed that a review of pedestrianisation would not go ahead if the BID didn't.</p> <p>CS said that he believed that the BID steering group acted as a pressure group on the subject and would make a review more likely.</p> <p>FL said that she was concerned that the whole BID seemed to rest on this topic and that this should not be the case.</p>	
---	--



	<p>contribute and that the figure should be reasonable and above the cost of collection. SB pointed out that in many of these cases, this would result in more than 1.25%. PW was asked to prepare a paper with 2-3 options and send to the group.</p> <p>SB to find out the implications of this for first part of Nolton Street.</p> <p>PW went through the other options and the group agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 1.25% levy • 5 year BID term • No reduction for empty units • Charities would pay full for retail and office premises • No discounts for shopping centres • No inflation increase • Business rate valuations to be fixed on day of ballot • Car parks to be included • ATMs to be excluded • Telecommunication masts not included • Places of worship not included • Annual billing 	<p>PW to prepare a paper with 2-3 threshold options for the group to consider.</p> <p>SB to find out what this would mean for first part of Nolton Street.</p> <p>PW to circulate list of exemptions to the group.</p>
7.0	<p>Ballot date</p> <p>Last day of ballot to be 31st March.</p>	
8.0	<p>Discuss – possibility of extending time for spending Feasibility Study to Ballot date, funding</p> <p>Covered under item 5.0 above.</p>	
9.0	<p>Ideas for reaching night time traders/businesses</p> <p>Not discussed.</p>	
8.0	<p>Town centre update</p> <p>Partly discussed above, under item items 3.2 and 5.0.</p>	
9.0	<p>AOB</p> <p>To cover all that is required before the ballot date, it was agreed that the meetings from now on will need to be held much more</p>	

	frequently.	
9.0	Date of next meeting Thursday, 7 th January, 5:15pm at Carnegie House	