

Attendees	<p>Board: Amanda Burnside (AB) - left at 12.25pm / George Gill (GG) / Shahina Johnson (SJ) / John Mortimer (JM) / Simon Patten (SP) / David Renard (DR) / Adam Schallamach (AS) / Baroness Scott of Bybrook OBE (JS) – left at 12.20pm / Peter Wragg (PW)</p> <p>Advisors: Dr Carlton Brand (CB) – left at 11am / John Gilbert (JG)</p> <p>Observers: Fleur de Rhé-Philippe (FdRP)</p> <p>Secretariat: Paddy Bradley (PB) / Sally Burnett (SB) / Alistair Cunningham (AC) and Parvis Khansari (PK) – both left at 11am</p> <p>Others: Ian Durston (ID) / Vanessa Joseph (VJ) / Colette Mallon (CM) / Debby Skellern (DS) / Leanne Sykes (LS)</p> <p>Guests : Alex Crook, BEIS (ACr) / Matt Croston, Wiltshire Council (MC) / Jonathan Eddy, BEIS (JE) / Stephen Hitchcock (SH) – representing Col James Coote DSO OBE / Tim Martienssen, Wiltshire Council (TM) / Matt Barnes, Great Western Railway (MB)</p>
Apologies	Col James Coote DSO OBE / Andy Evans (AE) / Vic O'Brien (VO) / Garry Perkins (GP) / Marc Richard
Chair	John Mortimer (JM)
Minutes	Deborah House (DKH)
Venue	Ceres Hall, The Corn Exchange, The Market Place, Devizes, SN10 1HS
Start time	9.30am
Finish time	12.40pm

Item	Summary of Issues Discussed and Decisions – Part I	Deadline
1	Welcome and Introductions, Conflicts of Interest	
	<p>The Chairman welcomed all those present to the meeting, in particular, Matt Croston and Tim Martienssen of Wiltshire Council and Matt Barnes of Great Western Railway, who would be presenting the item on the Chippenham Station project, Stephen Hitchcock representing Col James Coote and Jonathan Eddy and Alex Crook from BEIS. JE was attending in his capacity as temporary cover and introduced ACr who would be taking over the role from 20 February 2017. Apologies were noted.</p> <p>Conflicts of Interest - none declared.</p>	
2	Board Minutes, Action Log, Chairman update, Vice-Chair recruitment update	
	<p>The minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2016 were presented for consideration and it was,</p> <p>Resolved: To APPROVE and sign the minutes as a true and correct record.</p> <p>Matters Arising</p>	

	<p>Business Support Administrator PB updated the Board on the status of the recruitment process for the Business Support Administrator. The process had to be re-started when the preferred candidate declined the role.</p> <p>The Board considered the Action Log of Board activities up to 16 January 2017 and items were noted as follows :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Items 1 and 2 were to be discussed later on the agenda, and Item 3 would be brought to Board Meeting in May 2017 <p>The Chairman updated the Board on his activities undertaken since the last meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9 Dec – attended the Growth Hub Governance Review with BEIS lead; • 15 Dec – attended the Joint Strategic Economic Committee (JSEC); • 9 Jan – attended the launch of the ESIF low carbon programme; • 10 Jan – chaired the Growth Hub Governance Group; • 11 Jan – was interviewed by BBC Wiltshire, chaired Commissioning Group Meeting and gave evidence in London to the EFRA Select Committee enquiry into rural tourism meeting; • 16 Jan – attended the first meeting of the Growth Hub portal development with contractor appointed for this review, and met developers wishing to build a hotel in Wiltshire ca. £45m investment; • 24 Jan – attended Switch on to Swindon evening event which was a good launch with an excellent film showcasing Swindon. <p>JM reported that he would be holding a telephone conversation with Lord Prior (SWLEP ministerial sponsor) on 26 January.</p> <p>Vice-Chair Recruitment The Chairman advised the Board that the panel would like to appoint Adam Schallamach as Vice-Chair and asked the Board members to ratify the decision.</p> <p>The Board resolved: To APPROVE the appointment of Adam Schallamach as Vice-Chair with immediate effect.</p>	
3	Submitted questions	
	<p>Questions were received from Mrs Charmian Spickernell, Campaign for the Protection of Rural England North Wilts and Swindon Group Committee Member. A copy of the questions and responses given is attached to these minutes. At the meeting Mrs Spickernell asked supplementary questions. These questions and responses are also attached to these minutes.</p>	

	<p>Industrial Strategy</p> <p>An additional paper was tabled regarding the Industrial Strategy. The Government Green Paper was launched on Monday, 23 January 2017 in the North West. Board Members were provided with an infographic detailing the ten pillars and a summary table of the paper. The discussion highlighted need to review the key sectors mentioned for the SWLEP area and to develop partnerships with other LEP areas. The Industrial Strategy would be a major piece of work for the March Board. JE commented that the spirit of the Green Paper was as a consultative document with an overall message to drive growth and productivity across the whole country. The Industrial Strategy stretches across departments in Whitehall, not solely BEIS, with Place as a key theme. The Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) would be the starting point for debate for a working group made up of the five Subgroup Chairs together with the policymakers from the UAs. The Budget Date is 8 March 2017. If we could have something drafted by beginning of March and circulated via email for agreement, it could be submitted prior to the March Board. Any ideas could be submitted by JE and ACr to BEIS stakeholder team prior to formal submission for feedback.</p> <p>Action : draft programme timetable for rapid response (PB / DS).</p>	<p>26/01/2017</p>
4	Papers for approval	
	<p>Assurance Framework</p> <p>The Assurance Framework is an essential document for working with Government. The existing Framework had been updated following the issue of guidelines from Government. The Quick Guide would be uploaded onto the SWLEP website.</p> <p>Questions were asked as to the process for cross-LEP schemes as it was felt the detail of how these might operate were not reflected in the Framework. In response, PB stated that issues of detailed methodology would be covered in the criteria for assessing future schemes managed through the open call process.</p> <p>The SWLEP would fund independent assessment of scheme proposals. It was noted that SMEs might face difficulty in assembling proposals, in which case, support mechanisms through the Growth Hub and Unitary Authority economic development teams would provide assistance.</p> <p>The Board resolved: To APPROVE the Assurance Framework as presented.</p> <p>The Board extended its thanks to Debby Skellern for completion of a complex task and PB added his personal thanks.</p>	

Finance Report

The paper provided to the Board shows the direction of travel. Subsequent discussion has highlighted the need for additional work and so this paper is now provided “for information” only. The paper at the March Board Meeting will be brought “for approval”.

Local Growth Deal 1 and 2 Funding Profile

This paper was provided as an update of the paper already seen by the Board at the Meeting in November 2016. The Chairman welcomed the layout of the report where the budget and actual spend were clearly defined. JE advised the Board that the information was clearly presented and that the work carried out by ID and LS was exemplary and held up as an example to other LEPs.

The SWELP Board APPROVED the approach outlined to managing LGF profiling.

LGF3 Update

PB gave a verbal update to the Board on the status of the LGF3 announcement. The Government was announcing the LGF3 in stages and the Northern Powerhouse announcement had been made the previous week. It was still uncertain when funding for the south west LEPs would be announced. JE advised that BEIS had received £6bn worth of submissions vs £1.8bn in the fund. He was certain that no LEP had received the full amount it had requested. He did confirm that SWELP’s submission was of high quality.

Chippenham Station Hub – Phase I Presentation

MC, TM and MB presented the Chippenham Station Hub project to the Board. The presentation described the history of the project and how it had reached its current scope. The proposal to the Board was to develop a business case, seeking the approval of the SWLEP to release earlier than originally planned up to £2m of the provisional £16m in the DfT retained scheme. The business case would be brought back to the May Board Meeting. MC indicated he would meet with the MP and local councillors in the next two weeks to brief them about the proposed GWR scheme. (A meeting had been held with Cllr Caswill the previous week.) It was also suggested that a presentation should be given to the Chippenham Area Board. A consultation during the design phase would give the SWLEP Board an indication of the level of public support. In addition, MC will discuss the proposed scheme with the Department of Transport at a meeting arranged for February 2017.

The Board resolved

To APPROVE the development of a business case for GWR scheme, and to assesses the business case and, if approved,

	<p>recommend the release of funding by Department for Transport.</p> <p>SWLEP support for culture and the arts, use of LGI monies The Salisbury Plain and Heritage Centre's (SPHC) bid had been submitted to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF). The outcome may be known by May 2017, but certainly by July 2017. If successful, the SPHC would receive £1.35m from the reallocated LGFI monies. If not, the monies should be reallocated. The Swindon Museum & Art Gallery (SMAG) had delayed its submission until this year (2017). The original Board support for the two projects was until submission to the HLF in November 2016. DR requested that the SWLEP Board continued to support SMAG until April 2018. The MOD was itself looking at its support of military museums, so leeway was sought on the issue of timing. Although the money was secure, a question was raised on the impact of tying up £2.7m over this period. The option of using the cash to support other projects until cash was drawn down by the museum projects was discussed.</p> <p>The SWLEP Board resolved: To support the two projects to the conclusion of the current, and currently proposed, applications to the HLF and to authorise the SWLEP Director to work with the Chair of the Place-shaping Subgroup to bring to the SWLEP Board Meeting on the 19 July 2017, or earlier if all the information is available, a report on the outcome of the HLF bid by the Salisbury Plain Heritage Centre.</p> <p>Action : A formal amendment note to be made to SMAG owing to its delayed submission. (PB)</p> <p>If either currently proposed application to the HLF was unsuccessful, project promoters would be allowed the opportunity to bring alternative proposals to the Board for further consideration. It was noted that the Board had been flexible on timescales with other projects, but there was concern about money not being spent.</p> <p>The Board noted the additional financial information for the Salisbury Plain Heritage Centre and the Swindon Museum and Art Gallery schemes.</p>	<p>Feb 2017</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Papers for discussion</p>	
	<p>Higher Futures SP, as Chair of the Higher Futures programme board, advised the Board that it had been presented with an interim paper with a full paper to be provided for the March Board Meeting. The programme had been in place 12 months and had experienced some substantial challenges during that time, with the funding model currently not working. At the deep dive at the Commissioning Group in November 2016, the team had been asked to</p>	

review the model. The Higher Futures programme board met 24 January 2017 and one of the actions from the meeting was to hold a full day's strategy review. The need to maintain employer focus had been noted, and with two years funding left, it was felt that the programme needed to be self-sustaining at the end. Following the change in the MOD's procedures to only allow engagement through the Army's Careers Transition Partnership (CTP), there was no longer a definitive link to the number of Service Leavers, so increased contact would be required with the 28,000 businesses in the SWLEP area. A revised proposal would come to the March Board Meeting.

JE commented that the world had changed significantly since the Higher Futures City Deal project was first agreed, noting, for example, changes made by the MoD, introduction of the Apprenticeship Levy and at DfE. BEIS wanted to be flexible and helpful in the circumstances. At the Annual Conversation, the Chairman had suggested extending the market area beyond the SWLEP boundary.

Commissioning Group – Project Highlight Reports

The Board noted the receipt of the papers from the Commissioning Group and comments were made on particular projects where there were concerns as follows:

- **Swindon Bus Exchange** was rated Red. Although the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) challenge had been resolved in SBC's favour, the revised programme had led to a change in schedule with details to SWLEP Programme Manager expected in February 2017; and
- **A350 Yarnbrook / West Ashton Relief Road** was rated Red owing to an ecology planning application underway for bats. A redesign of the area requires a revised plan to be submitted to the appropriate planning committees.

GPIF

- The Kimmerfields project had also been affected by the CPO challenge. As this had been resolved, the project could push forward with rescheduling and the loan deferred until March 2018. This rescheduling has been notified formally to Swindon Borough Council.

JE advised the Board that the Programme Management of the SWLEP projects was classed as gold standard and held up as an example to other LEPS. He also advised that in future Ministers would be increasingly interested in the outputs of projects.

6 Papers for information and discussion

- **Marketing and Communications**
VJ updated the Board on the increased digital activity. There was more work needed to increase communication to local businesses.

It was felt that the forthcoming new Growth Hub portal and embedded CRM would make this process easier. JS commented that there was little understanding about the work of LEPs in the area and that more LEP presence would be beneficial at events. A structured response was needed with a formalised process. Communication needed to be targeted. GG offered to meet with VJ to discuss.

Action : GG and VJ to meet

Feb 2017

- **Skills & Talent Subgroup**

AB, Chair of the Subgroup, updated the Board with emphasis on Point 3.1 of the Action Plan which was to:

“improve educational attainment, exceeding the national average at 16 and 19”.

They wished to establish a pilot programme whereby they would engage with primary school children and follow them into secondary education to see why there was a drop off in the take up of STEM options. Thereafter they could flesh out the detail of the actions required to improve the number of students choosing STEM options. They were keen not to duplicate the work already being undertaken by SBC in this area.

- **Transport Infrastructure Subgroup**

AS, Chair of the Subgroup, updated the Board. Additional Board Member recruitment would increase the size of the Board and potential membership of the Subgroups, as this group would like a Vice-Chair. The group was looking to bring on three business members, but also to extend to wider stakeholder engagement as and when appropriate. DR highlighted the work already undertaken with A420 and rail to Oxford and beyond with the National Infrastructure Forum.

- **Digital Capability Subgroup**

GG, Chair of the Subgroup, updated the Board. Digital Capability is a theme which cuts across all Subgroups. A budget had been allocated to undertake a gap analysis and feed into the overall technology strategy. DR made the meeting aware that Swindon had been selected to be a pilot area for 5G and requested that Swindon officers be involved in this Subgroup. PB advised that no officers from either UA had yet been identified for this Subgroup and would follow up on this issue.

Action : PB to identify LA officers to join the Digital Capability Subgroup.

Feb 2017

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place Shaping Subgroup PB updated the Board in VO's and AC's absence. DR commented that Planning Officers from both UAs needed to be involved and that Masterplans already drafted needed to be taken into account, for example for Salisbury and Swindon. FdRP added that Town Centres generally should be considered and that the concept of the original retail high street should be reviewed for the future. • Business Development Subgroup JM, in his role as Chair of the Subgroup, updated the Board on the work of the group so far. The focus was on developing the structure to support delivery of the SEP priorities. This included establishing an overarching Business Development Subgroup, with a number of task groups, such as the Rural Economy Sector Group reporting into it. <p>Regular Subgroup updates will be brought to the Board.</p>	
7	Papers for information	
	<p>Update on European Investment and Structural Fund 2014-2020 programme FdRP commented on the paper. In December 2016, Low Carbon calls went out and submissions were expected for review by the Committee in April. The launch of programmes funded by the European Agricultural Food and Rural Development Fund (EAFRD) would take place on 8 February 2017 at the Corn Exchange in Devizes.</p> <p>Action : Board to receive regular updates on the ongoing developments of ESIF programmes</p>	On-going
8	Any Other Business and date of next Board Meeting	
	<p>FdRP wished to make the Board aware of the consultation taking place regarding the A303 options around Stonehenge.</p> <p>SH asked whether an update of the status of the military in the SWLEP area would be beneficial information for Board Members, to which he received an affirmative response.</p> <p>Action : SH to advise Col Coote of the request</p> <p>AS asked when there would be further recruitment for Board Members as there were currently vacancies. The Chairman responded that this recruitment would now go ahead as the Vice-Chair was now in post.</p> <p>Action : Initiate Board recruitment process (JM / PB)</p>	<p>May 2017</p> <p>May 2017</p>



swindonwiltshire

Local Enterprise Partnership

**Minutes of the Board Meeting
Wednesday, 25 January 2017**

The next Board Meeting was scheduled for 22 March 2017 commencing at 9.30am at Wiltshire College, Chippenham Campus, Cocklebury Road, SN15 3QD.

Future Meetings :

Thursday, 25 May 2016

Tidworth Garrison Theatre, St Andrew's Road, Tidworth, SP9 7EP

Wednesday, 19 July 2016

Salisbury City Hall, Malthouse Lane, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP2 7TU

Wednesday, 20 September 2016

Location to be advised

Wednesday, 29 November 2016

County Hall, Bythesea Road Trowbridge, BA14 8JN

Close of Meeting at 12.40pm

22.03.17

Public Participation

From Mrs Charmian Spickernell, CPRE North Wilts & Swindon Group Committee Member

To SWLEP Board

The Assurance Framework, para 87 states.

“To date, the majority of candidate schemes have been identified as part of the Strategic Economic Plan, Local Plan, and Local Transport Plan processes undertaken by Swindon Borough Council, Wiltshire Council and the SWLEP. Henceforth candidate schemes will be identified by the SWLEP running a formal open call for schemes against its priorities in its strategic economic plan. In advance of a call, the SWLEP will publish the full methodology and criteria against which schemes will be assessed Broadly each scheme will need to meet the following criteria:”

The criteria includes

“Consultation and public acceptability: an outline of what consultation has taken place and the degree of consensus that has been achieved.”

Question One

Will the Assurance Framework be debated in both Councils before it is adopted?

Response

The Assurance Framework will be discussed by the Joint Strategic Economic Committee (JSEC), which is a joint committee of both councils, at its meeting on 14 February 2017. There is no current intention to debate the Assurance Framework in full Council meetings as an additional measure by either Swindon Borough Council or Wiltshire Council.

Question Two

Will the methodology and criteria cover social and environmental issues as well as economic ones?

Response

Appraisal of business cases involves a range of criteria including social and environmental impacts. The aim of calls for projects will be to attract projects which will aid economic growth.

Question Three

Will there be statutory consultation? How will the public be involved and how will their comments be taken into account?

Response

The methodology will include seeking information from prospective scheme developers about the extent of public support for their project. If a scheme requires statutory consultation then that will need to happen and follow the standard procedures for such a consultation.

Question Four

Will public transport schemes take priority?

Response

The priorities of the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) will determine the selected projects and public transport will be part of that mix. At this stage, there is no thinking about giving an aspect of a SEP priority greater weighting than something else.

Supplementary Questions Received at Board Meeting

1. It is noted there are Government Guidelines for Assurance Frameworks and that each LEP writes its own Assurance Framework.

Where is the government guideline that states LEPs should take over the planning of road schemes from the Councils without this being debated in the Full Councils? If schemes are not debated in full Council, could there be a perception that those in position of power may be tempted to follow their own agenda?

Response

The SWLEP is not taking over the planning of road schemes from Councils. Its role is to promote transport improvements which would assist sustainable economic growth.

2. Given the stated aim to attract projects that will aid economic growth, how will social and environmental issues be resolved? Will each scheme have an environmental impact assessment? Will people who will be affected by the scheme be consulted and their concerns addressed?

Response

The assessment of schemes includes an appraisal of value for money.

3. When assessing schemes will the question be asked "Can it be made to work without incurring further costs?"

Response

Please refer to the answer to written Question 2.

4. Will the seeking of information by prospective scheme developers be perceived to be impartial?

Response

Scheme developers have access to a range of information in the public domain. LEP supported schemes are discussed in public session of the LEP Board unless there are matters of commercial confidence.

5. Who will conduct the statutory consultations if LEPs have taken over the identification of transport schemes?

Response


Please refer to the answer to Supplementary Question 1.

6. Until LEPs are subject to the Freedom of Information Act, how can it be known that the assurance given by LEPs to Ministers over the money they receive are being honoured?


Response

SWLEP complies with the terms of the Freedom of information Act.

Chippenham Station Hub



SEP Submission




- concept masterplan produced in partnership between the LEP, WC, and NR
- enhancing car parking
- meeting needs of growing town
- creating sense of arrival
- improving commercial attractiveness
- aligning with the electrification programme
- aligning with masterplan for Chippenham
- aligning with partner objectives
- Costed at £34m


DFT Retained Scheme

- Scheme successful in being awarded conditional funding
- Retained Scheme - Further requirements to be met prior to receiving full grant allocation
- Development of a business case which takes into account the methodologies used by central government and clearly shows economic impact and benefit
- DFT agreed to allocate £350k for project development
- Needed to revise scheme – local changes (Langley Park, Hathaway Retail Park, Wiltshire College, etc.).

Project Development

- Support the enhancement of current car parking provision around Chippenham station
- Releasing land for development (retail, commercial and residential)
- Public realm improvements by creating a station square
- Access improvements between the station and the town centre
- Address north south severance issues created by the railway






D1 - Residential Development


D3 - Remains as surface car park

A/B - Underground car park with retail/office development above

Public realm and access improvements

C1/C2 - Small scale commercial developments






D1 - Residential Development

D3 - Remains as surface car park

A/B - Underground car park with retail/office development above

Public realm and access improvements

C1/C2 - Small scale commercial developments



Viability Assessment

High level analysis of SOBC scheme completed by GVA Bilfinger indicates further work is required to improve viability. Focus will centre on:



- Development mix - office, retail and residential mix
- Residential vs Office
- Parking solutions – underground, surface, multi story
- Affordable housing element
- Expectations of residual land value from land owners
- Return on Investment / attracting a development partner

Delivery


- Business Case 2017/18
- Planning application 2017/18
- Start of works 2018/19
- Completion 2019/20

DFT Requirements/approval

- Compliant Business Case indicating the project is value for money.

GWR Proposal

- GWR investing in ticket gatelines in 2017. Opportunity to complete gatelines as part of wider station improvement with improved ticket office, retail, and access
- Station improvements are a key part of the Hub project and the proposal secures their early delivery – getting the ball rolling on the Hub project at same time
- Joint funding package proposed using retained scheme funding (*part of existing allocation*)




Outputs

Station Improvements

- 1. Gatelines
- 2. Ticket office relocated
- 3. Retail unit relocated

Access Improvements

- 4. North side lift
- 5. Forecourt works



Business Case

- DfT has agreed in principle to joint funding using retained scheme funding
- A standalone Business Case for SWLEP, but not DfT, approval will be required
- The Business Case would still follow the SWLEP Assurance Framework. A summary of the 5 case approach is to the right.

Five Cases	Scheme Contribution
Strategic Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Station improvements will be a catalyst to successful regeneration of the area (eg Exeter Central). • Improved security, retail and customer experience will help demonstrate market and improve Hub viability. • Reduced severance across the railway with a new lift on the public footbridge and improved access to the station itself.
Economic Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WebTAG compliant appraisal to be undertaken and independently assessed
Financial Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding package of £1.1m from GWR and circa £2m from retained scheme funding. • Approx. £1.9m from GWR and LGF for station improvements in 2017/18. • Approx. £1.1m from LGF towards access improvements – circa £0.2m towards design in 2017/18; remainder in 2018/19.
Management Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GWR will manage the design and implementation of the works. Delivery of station improvements in 2017/18. Access improvements follow in 2018/19.
Commercial Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding agreements will be entered with GWR in two stages as costs become clear. • GWR will undertake procurement of consultants and contractors.

Process

