

Attendees	<p>Board: Amanda Burnside (AB) / Doug Gale (DG) / George Gill (GG) / Shahina Johnson (SJ) / John Mortimer (JM) / Vic O'Brien (VO) / Alex Reed (AR) / David Renard (DR) / Adam Schallamach (AS) / Mark Smith (MS) / Jonathan Webber (JW)</p> <p>Advisors: Alistair Cunningham (AC) / John Gilbert (JG)</p> <p>Observers: Oliver Donachie (OD) / John Thomson (JT)</p> <p>Supporting the Board: Tom Bown (TB) / Paddy Bradley (PB) / Sally Burnett (SB) / Ian Durston (ID) / Parvis Khansari (PK) / Tim Martienssen (TM) / Debby Skellern (DS) / Leanne Sykes (LS) / Philippa Venables (PV)</p> <p>Guests : Lt Col Guy Benson (GB), representing Col Andrew Dawes / Alex Crook (ACr), BEIS / Martin Revill, (ITA)</p>
Apologies	Col Andrew Dawes / Baroness Scott of Bybrook OBE / Peter Wragg
Chair	John Mortimer (JM)
Minutes	Deborah House (DKH)
Venue	Committee Rooms, Wiltshire Council, Monkton Park, Chippenham, SN15 1ER
Start time	9.55am
Finish time	12.30pm

Item	Summary of Issues Discussed and Decisions – Part I	Deadline
1.0	Welcome and Introductions, Conflicts of Interest	
	<p>The Chairman welcomed all those present to the meeting, in particular to John Thomson in his new role as Wiltshire Council Observer to the SWLEP Board and to Lt Col Guy Benson representing Col Andrew Dawes. As ever, welcome was extended to Alex Crook in his role as BEIS representative. Congratulations were offered to Shahina Johnson for her MBE in the New Year's Honours and to Tim Martienssen as newly appointed Director of Economy & Planning for Wiltshire Council. Apologies from those unable to attend were noted.</p> <p>The Chairman advised the meeting that Paper No. 1.7 under Item 5.2 was withdrawn.</p> <p>Conflicts of Interest – All members had sight of the SWLEP Conflicts of Interest policy with print outs on the table. The Chairman declared his interest with Item 4.4 on the agenda owing to a personal relationship with the owners of the land under discussion and advised that at that point of the meeting the Chairmanship would be handed over to AS. AB declared her ongoing interest in LGF3 funding for Wiltshire College.</p>	
2.0	Board Minutes and Chairman's update	
	<p>The minutes of the meeting held on 29 November 2017 were presented for consideration. It was,</p> <p>Resolved: To APPROVE and sign the minutes as a true and correct record.</p>	

Matters Arising

- **Investment & Export Manager** – PB advised that 11 applications had been received for the role, with a short-list of five candidates interviewed on 19 January 2018 with a Panel comprising the SWLEP Chairman, Director and representatives from both UAs. The final interview with two candidates would take place on 9 February 2018.
- **Better Business for All (BBfA)** – PB advised that Peter Wragg had attended the last meeting of the Steering Group. Nicky Bailey of FSB was also the Business Representative Organisation Group member. Regulatory Services from both UAs were very supportive. A second stage workshop was due shortly.
- **Digital Platform for TEN** – TM advised the meeting that options were still being investigated and no decisions yet taken.

The Chairman updated the Board on his activities undertaken since the last meeting.

- 30 Nov – attended and spoke at Swindon & Wiltshire Programmes Event at Wiltshire College, Lackham
- 5 Dec – met with MP Michelle Donalan’s staff team in Parliament, with the Deputy Head of Local Growth Unit at BEIS to discuss Rural Productivity and with David Renard to discuss SWLEP progress
- 6 Dec – met with Justin Tomlinson MP in Parliament and attended the DIT Christmas Reception at Lancaster House
- 12 Dec – met with Baroness Scott to discuss SWLEP progress
- 13 Dec – Chaired the SWLEP’s Rural Economy Sector Group
- 14 Dec – attended the SWLEP’s Annual Conversation with Government at BEIS
- 10 January – chaired the SWLEP Commissioning Group
- 11 January – joined Ian Durston in visiting the New Eastern Villages project, with thanks to David Renard and John Gilbert for arranging
- 16 January – Chaired the Growth Hub Governance Group
- 19 January – attended the interviews for the SWLEP Investment & Export Manager
- 23 January – Together with George Gill, met with Rachel Newman, CEO of Corsham Institute (Ci) and Catherine Knivell, Ci’s Head of Partnerships

3.0 Submitted questions

Several questions were received from members of the public and were dealt with as follows:

The Question from St Modwen regarding Chippenham Gateway would be handled under Item 4.4 and the representatives would be able to address the Board Members.

Two questions were received from Mrs Charmian Spickernell (CS), Campaign for the Protection of Rural England North Wilts and Swindon

	<p>Group Committee Member. A copy of Question One and response was provided to Mrs Spickernell ahead of the meeting. A response to Question Two was provided verbally at the meeting and would be followed up in writing. In Supplementary, Mrs Spickernell asked the Board to consider the transport links to Swindon Town Centre.</p> <p>Questions from Dr Nick Murry, Wiltshire Councillor (Chippenham Monkton) and Chippenham Town Councillor (Monkton Ward), regarding the Chippenham Station Hub had been received too late for a written response, but Dr Murry would be invited to address the Board during the discussion of Item 5.1.</p> <p>All responses to the Questions available at time of writing are attached to these minutes.</p>	
4.0	Strategic Developments	
4.1	<p>The Mary Ney Review into accountability and transparency PB advised the meeting of the two reviews carried out into LEPs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mary Ney Review’s recommendations had been accepted by Government and LEPs needed to be compliant by the end of February 2018. Final checks were underway of the Government new guidance against the SWLEP’s existing Assurance Framework. The Section 151 Officer of the Accountable Body is required by Government to confirm LEP compliance with regulations. • The Ministerial Review of LEP structures may be delayed owing to the recent Cabinet reshuffle. The suggestion was that a Working Group be established to investigate the various options for a LEP structure in order that work commence ahead of the report’s final publication. <p>The SWLEP Board RESOLVED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to delegate to the SWLEP Chairman final Board approval of the revised Governance Framework; • to require the Director of the SWLEP to ensure the updated Governance Framework is made available to all Board members by the March meeting of the Board; and • to require the Director of the SWLEP to ensure Board members are notified when the section 151 Officer’s letter to the Principal Accounting Officer and the statement by the Chairman and Director are published on the SWLEP website. • to approve the establishment of a Working Group on the Ministerial Review of LEP Structures and require it to report back to the Board on the implications for the SWLEP. 	<p>Feb 2018</p> <p>Mar 2018</p> <p>Feb 2018</p> <p>May 2018</p>
4.2	<p>Industrial Strategy</p> <p>PB spoke to the paper and advised that the Government White Paper had designated LEPs to lead on the preparation of Local Industrial Strategies in</p>	

areas outside Mayoral Combined Authorities. SWLEP was in the process of building up its evidence base. The focus of the next four to five months was to build a rich evidence base of economic performance data, local business intelligence and information arising from current SWLEP strategy development in Energy, Digital Capability, Higher Education and Rail. The local industrial strategy would be developed with Government and would include cross-LEP partnerships to support development of specific business sectors, such as cyber, life sciences, energy and creative and automated vehicles.

The Chairman said that, in his view, the critical feature of a “local” industrial strategy was that it should reflect our plan for how we intend to grow the whole of the LEP’s economy and quoted from page 13 of the White Paper that to achieve the ambition of being the world’s most innovative economy, providing good jobs, being the best place to start and grow a business and creating prosperous communities across the UK “we must ensure that every part of the country realises its full potential”.

The SWLEP was seeking volunteer Board Members to participate in a Working Group and to bring back the direction of travel to future Board Meetings.

Mar 2018

The SWLEP Board:

- **APPROVED** the proposed approach;
- **APPROVED** the indicative headline milestones timeline;
- **APPROVED** the establishment of the **Industrial Strategy Working Group** as a task and finish group with two private sector Board Members to sit on it; and
- **AUTHORISED** the Director of the **SWLEP**, in consultation with the two private sector Board members, to develop the terms of reference for the **Industrial Strategy Working Group** and circulate to all Board members by the **March Board meeting**.

4.3 Institute of Technology (IoT)

AB gave a verbal update on progress with the IoT bid.

- Government investment would be in the order of £170m allocated between 10 and 15 bids;
- There had been around 100 Expressions of Interest;
- Bids would need to be put forward by partnerships of FE, HEI and business with the support of stakeholders such as the LEP and local councils; First stage submission was required by 1 March 2018 and the outcome should be known April / May 2018;
- The second stage required much greater detail, with submission in Summer 2018; and
- SWLEP had ensured that a cohesive group of partners and

	<p>stakeholders had been assembled to prepare the Swindon & Wiltshire bid.</p> <p>The SWLEP Board: NOTED the details and would be updated on progress.</p>	<p>Mar 2018</p>
<p>4.4</p>	<p>Spatial Planning – overview of potential development</p> <p>JM advised that the discussion would be for Members to become better informed about employment land in the area, and would also allow for representatives of St Modwen to address the meeting. At this stage, JM handed the chairing of the meeting over to AS for this item of the agenda owing to a conflict of interest.</p> <p>Owing to the importance of spatial planning to local economic development, the SWLEP Director would work with LA Leads to bring forward a workshop session to be arranged for Board Members.</p> <p>St Modwen addressed the meeting and advised of the current plans for Chippenham Gateway at Junction 17:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of 1m sq ft of distribution space, prioritised owing to the location enabling easy access to the M4 motorway; • St Modwen reported a high level of interest and confidence in the scheme; • St Modwen anticipated 790 new jobs as a result of the site with more employed within its construction; • St Modwen had already engaged with Wiltshire College regarding training for students/future employees. There would be a bus link to Chippenham; and • Construction would start in 2018, providing approvals were in place. <p>Members of Swindon Borough Council questioned the possible displacement of existing companies along the M4. There was also concern from Members that this site should not detract from existing employment land deeper in the County.</p> <p>The Deputy Chairman (AS) thanked St Modwen for their contribution and after considerable discussion,</p> <p>The SWLEP Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REQUESTED that the lead officers to the SWLEP from Swindon Borough Council and Wiltshire Council work with the Director of the SWLEP to organise a workshop for Board Members on strategic spatial planning for the area; and • AUTHORISED the SWLEP Deputy Chairman to write to the relevant planning committee of Wiltshire Council providing support from the Board to the strategic 	

	<p>development of land at Junction 17, with the proviso that development focuses on new business take-up and is able to demonstrate that it will not lead to displacement or detriment to existing business and strategic land allocation.</p>	<p>Jan 2018</p>
<p>5.0</p>	<p>Local Growth Deal</p>	
<p>5.1</p>	<p>Chippenham Station Hub Scheme – Outline Business Case ID spoke to the paper. The scheme was now taking a phased approach to the project and updated Outline Business Cases would be brought to the Board when appropriate. The seven phases were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase i) Station Capacity Improvements – new booking hall, improved retail unit, gatelines, new north side lift onto public footbridge (providing step-free access across the railway line), additional cycle parking, improvement works to bus interchange; • (Phase ii) Wiltshire Council Land – high quality commercial building and decked car parking; • (Phase iii) Station Car Parking Capacity Improvements – decked car parking; • (Phase iv) Rationalisation of Station Car Parking – high quality commercial building and decked car parking; • (Phase v) Infrastructure Improvements – station square public realm and footbridge; • (Phase vi) Commercial Development – high quality commercial and residential units; and • (Phase vii) Residential Development – high quality residential units. <p>The scheme was also now de-retained from the Department for Transport (DfT).</p> <p>Cllr Nick Murray was then invited to address the meeting about his concerns for the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the south side of the station was becoming increasingly cramped and that more thought should be given to improvements on the north side; • Station Hill and Cocklebury Road were already congested and increased traffic would cause increased stress to local residents; and • Selling off the existing car parks meant decked carparks had to be constructed. These multi-storey carparks would be in a conservation area and would overlook the green space of Monkton Park. <p>The Chairman thanked Cllr Murray for his contribution and confirmed that the points raised would need to be addressed as Full Business Cases for each of the phases and brought to the Board for approval.</p> <p>The Chairman noted that Wiltshire Core Strategy Policy 9 indicated that the area around the station was designated for civic and academic uses and</p>	

	<p>accordingly questioned the inclusion of housing development within the scheme adding that it was important to consider the vision of what the completed development would offer the area in strategic terms. Such detail should be for further consideration and the Board could investigate further with questions back to the promotor when these schemes come through. TM commented that the scheme needed to be commercial, and was part of an ongoing development consultation.</p> <p>The SWLEP Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APPROVED the OBC to enable the development work for phases ii to vii to progress and the project to meet the agreed timescales. • REQUIRED a report from the scheme promotor on the vision for the use of the land around Chippenham Station to help inform consideration of the next and subsequent phases of the project. 	Ongoing
5.2	<p>Corsham Mansion House The Paper was withdrawn. To be re-submitted at a future meeting.</p>	
5.3	<p>Quality Bus Corridor (Rapid Transit) – Full Business Case The Chairman welcomed Martin Revill, Independent Technical Advisor, to the meeting. ID spoke to the paper. The Rapid Transit project was broken down into small schemes connecting the three main urban extensions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wichelstowe, 2. Tadpole Farm and 3. New Eastern Villages. <p>The three schemes at Wichelstowe were for consideration at this meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pipers Way, • Regent Circus and • Mannington Roundabout. <p>Costings for Pipers Way and Regent Circus schemes were available so the Board was asked to approve the Full Business Case in order that work could commence immediately. Costings for the Mannington Roundabout scheme were not available. The scheme was delayed in order that it did not conflict with the works at Junction 16, thus avoiding major road disruption. The Mannington Roundabout part of the scheme potentially has the highest cost-benefit ratio and is needed to make the whole scheme of suitable value for money</p> <p>Costs would be circulated to Board Members once known seeking their approval. The Section 151 Officer of Swindon Borough Council confirmed in a letter to the SWLEP that any overrun in costs would be met through developer funds and council resources as necessary.</p> <p>PV thanked ID and the ITA for their help in bringing this to the Board.</p>	



	<p>The SWLEP Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APPROVED the Full Business Case for Rapid Transit – Wichelstowe Quality Bus Corridor, enabling the release of funding to support the construction work on the Pipers Way and Regent Circus schemes; and • AGREED to the approval by email of the Mannington Roundabout scheme, subject to the final costs falling within the agreed limits. 	<p>When available</p>
<p>5.4</p>	<p>SWLEP Programmes Highlight Reports</p> <p>ID spoke to the meeting and advised the Members that this had taken a different format with a link to the full report on the website. This paper detailed specifically the projects which were deemed “at risk” by the Steer Davies Gleave Review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chippenham Station Hub Phase 1a progressing. SWLEP was awaiting the Full Business Case for Phase 1b, which involved the lift on the platform and the overall scheme had been de-retained from DfT. • Yarnbrook / West Ashton Currently in consultation. Applied for Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) funding to cover the increased cost owing to ecology. Results due end Feb/beginning March. • The Maltings There had been delays on timescales. The LA was still talking to the developer and the agreement was still with the lawyers for signature. • Swindon Bus Exchange SBC had applied to HIF for the increased costs. If HIF was not forthcoming, alternative funding must be sought or the design amended. • New Eastern Villages (NEV) Southern Connector Road Costs had increased. HIF applied for, but secondary to developer funding. • A420 Gablecross Design now selected. • Wichelstowe Southern Access The Outline Business Case was due to come to the Board Meeting in March 2018. Draft was about to go to ITA. <p>The SWLEP Board: APPROVED the Commissioning Group’s assessment that the highlight reports were an accurate representation of the current status of all LGF projects.</p>	
<p>5.5</p>	<p>Finance Report - LGD Budget and profiling</p> <p>ID spoke to the paper and advised that after the Steer Davies Gleave</p>	

	<p>Review the Delivery and Performance Team (DPT) was working on drawing a list of back-up projects that could be brought forward should any on LGF not be deliverable.</p> <p>Another suggestion would be to use any released LGF monies to roll into Growing Places Infrastructure Fund (GPIF) projects. These would be more immediate with less lead time. The GPIF Working Group was investigating the possibilities.</p> <p>The SWLEP Board: APPROVED the paper as an accurate summary of the current LGF financial position.</p>	
6.0	SWLEP Core Activity	
6.1	<p>Growing Places Infrastructure Fund (GPIF) Open call update</p> <p>The paper was provided for information and AS, as Chair of the Working Group, advised the Meeting that the loan agreement was close to signature and expected within the next 7-10 days</p> <p>Previously allocated GPIF funds had come back into the process and the Working Group was reviewing the options for future calls. A draft strategy was being drawn up and would be brought back to the Board for its review. Lessons learnt from the process would be used to streamline future calls, being more rigorous on disclosure from the outset to avoid blockages and that deploying the ITAs in a different way could potentially save money.</p> <p>The SWLEP Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOTED the progress toward the issue of a the loan agreement from the June 2017 call; • NOTED that the existing loan allocations had been or were in the process of being returned, re-establishing the original fund for allocation against an investment strategy; • NOTED that the GPIF investment strategy and a linked future GPIF call programme were in development; and • NOTED the recruitment process and timeline for the Head of Investment and Export position. 	
6.2	<p>Swindon and Wiltshire Digital Platform Development</p> <p>ID gave a verbal update to the meeting on the current status of the development.</p> <p>Since its launch in October 2017, the Growth Hub had seen 1,600 individual users with 150 businesses registering in the Community section. Growth Hub had received positive feedback from businesses and the website had been put forward for an award by Progress Site Finity, whose software was used to build the site. It was one of five websites identified each quarter by the business and goes into consideration for the annual best website award. SWLEP was now in the process of adding the main website to the platform, which was being revamped in line with the recommendations from the Mary</p>	

	Ney Review, and transferring Higher Futures into Growth Hub. This would allow use of the same CRM system across all platforms. SWLEP continued to work with the TEN team to improve responses and was also investigating a different approach.	
6.3	<p>Marketing and Communications report The paper was provided for information and the Chairman thanked TB.</p> <p>The SWLEP Board: NOTED the contents of the paper.</p>	
7.0	Other SWLEP Programmes	
7.1	<p>Update on European Structural and Investment Fund 2016-2020 The paper was provided for information.</p> <p>The SWLEP Board: NOTED the contents of the paper.</p>	
7.2	<p>Finance Report – other SWLEP Programme Budgets and General Account, including Subgroup spending The paper was provided for information. A letter recently received from Jake Berry MP, Minister for Local Growth (MHCLG) and Andrew Griffiths MP, Under-Secretary of State at BEIS advised that the Government had agreed to two years’ core funding of the LEP and to two years of Growth Hub funding, both at currently existing levels.</p> <p>The SWLEP Board: NOTED the contents of the paper.</p>	
8.0	Any Other Business and date of next Board Meeting	
	<p>DG asked how the Board might be better equipped to monitor project outcomes and benefits as well as the overall effectiveness of SWLEP activities.</p> <p>Action: PB to draft a means of measuring outputs for the Board Meeting in March.</p> <p>The next Board Meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, 21 March 2018 commencing at 9.30am in the offices of WRc plc, Frankland Road, Blagrove, Swindon, SN5 8YF</p> <p>Future Meetings :</p> <p>Thursday, 24 May 2018 Aspire Business Centre, Ordnance Road, Tidworth, Wiltshire, SP9 7QD</p> <p>Wednesday, 25 July 2018 Alamein Suite, City Hall, Malthouse Lane, Salisbury SP2 7TU</p> <p>Wednesday, 19 September 2018 Location to be confirmed</p> <p>Wednesday, 28 November 2018 Location to be confirmed</p>	Mar 2018



Close of Meeting at 12:30pm

Draft



From Charmian Spickernell, CPRE

Question One

What reason did the Steer Davies Gleave Review give for including the Wichelstowe Southern Access in the high risk projects that warranted specific attention?

Response

The Wichelstowe Southern Access project was deemed by the Steer Davies Gleave review to be on track from a schedule perspective and from a cost perspective. It was highlighted as a higher risk project due to the engineering complexities of the project and the fact that technical issues could potentially arise during the construction phase of the project. The project team is confident that it has a risk management plan in place to address any risks that do materialise.

Question Two

If land south of the Wroughton Road came into the Local Plan when it is rolled forward, would it be more appropriate for distribution warehousing development than land in West Wichelstowe?

Response (given verbally at the meeting)

The adopted Swindon Borough Local Plan at Policy NCI (Wichelstowe) states that Wichelstowe should provide, inter alia, 12.5 hectares of employment land within Class B1 and B2. Therefore at present no land is allocated within Wichelstowe for warehousing (B8). Land south of Wichelstowe will be assessed for potential uses to meet the identified needs through the Local Plan review (as will other land on the edge of Swindon), taking into account the existing known constraints including the mitigation area for the Wichelstowe development

From Mark Thorne, Senior Planning Manager, St Modwen

Question

St. Modwen should be grateful if the SWLEP Board would confirm that the location of the site falls within both the 'Swindon-M4 Growth Zone' and the 'A350 Growth Zone' identified within the Swindon and Wiltshire Strategic Economic Plan and that the development potential at Junction 17 is specifically identified as being an important focus to facilitate inward investment (as at Page 19, Swindon and Wiltshire Strategic Economic Plan, January 2016).

Response

The Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership Board is in receipt of a report to its meeting on the 24 January 2018, which confirms that the proposed development at Junction 17 of the M4 is located "at a key intersection of two of the SWLEP's growth zones – Swindon and the M4 corridor and the A350." The Strategic Economic Plan, revised in 2016 specifically mentions the importance of the development of Junction 17 to draw out investment from Bath and Bristol to the west.

In addition, the question was also dealt with further at the meeting under Item 4.4 of the agenda. Section 4.4 Spatial Planning – overview of potential development of the minutes refers.



**From Dr Nick Murry, Wiltshire Councillor (Chippenham Monkton) and
Chippenham Town Councillor (Monkton Ward)**

Question One

For the proposed scheme to achieve the overall net benefit aspired to, it is dependent upon a key assumption about traffic, namely that Station Hill and Cocklebury Road (and adjoining roads such as Monkton Hill and New Road) are capable of taking significant additional volumes of vehicles. Given the existing congestion on these roads, which at peak times can mean vehicles queuing beyond the former College building and into Sadlers Mead, plus the projected increased traffic as a result of other development, it is concerning that this assumption seems not to have been tested, and could be seriously flawed. Will the LEP Board please take this into account in revising its cost benefit analysis and risk assessment, and give its assurance to existing residents, businesses and rail users (who will disproportionately bear the social and economic costs of the scheme) that traffic congestion and air pollution in this part of Chippenham will not be made worse than it already is?

Question Two

The Risk Assessment highlights the possibility of planning permission being refused due to shortcomings in the application and/or local opposition. Has the possibility of planning permission being refused for the Phase 2 multi-storey car park been sufficiently considered, particularly given that it would be in a Conservation area, adjacent to and overlooking a riverside park, which is Chippenham's most valuable centrally located, public open green space? Have Wiltshire Council's Conservation and Archaeological teams been consulted and the probability of actually obtaining planning permission for this phase been assessed? Would it not be more sensible to restrict the amount of physical development on the existing carparks and retain some of these spaces, thereby negating the need for a potentially highly controversial multi-storey replacement?

Response

The questions were received too late for a written response, but Cllr Murry was invited to address the Board at the meeting during discussion of Item 5.1 of the agenda. Section 5.1 Chippenham Station Hub Scheme – Outline Business Case of the minutes refers.