



swindonwiltshire

Local Enterprise Partnership

Wiltshire Council
Where everybody matters



SWINDON
BOROUGH COUNCIL

AGENDA

Meeting: Joint Strategic Economic Committee (SWLEP)
Place: Council Chamber - County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge,
BA14 8JN
Date: Thursday 13 December 2018
Time: 9.00 am

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Tara Shannon of Democratic Services, County Hall, Trowbridge, BA14 8JN direct line 01225 718352 or email tara.shannon@wiltshire.gov.uk

All public reports referred to on this agenda are available on the Wiltshire Council website at www.wiltshire.gov.uk .

Press enquiries to Communications on direct lines (01225) 713114 / 713115

Membership:

Cllr David Renard	Leader of Swindon Borough Council
Cllr Baroness Scott of Bybrook OBE	Leader of Wiltshire Council
Cllr Russell Holland	Swindon Cabinet Member for Finance
Cllr John Thomson	Deputy Leader, and Cabinet Member for Communications, Communities, Leisure and Libraries
Cllr Oliver Donachie	Swindon Cabinet Member for Economy and Skills
Cllr Toby Sturgis	Cabinet Member for Spatial Planning, Development Management and Property
Cllr Pauline Church	Wiltshire Cabinet Member for Economic Development and South Wiltshire Recovery

Non-Voting Membership:

John Mortimer Chairman of the SWLEP
Adam Schallamach Vice-Chairman of the SWLEP

Substitutes:

Cllr Richard Clewer Wiltshire Cabinet Member for Housing, Corporate Services, Arts, Heritage and Tourism
Cllr Toby Elliott Swindon Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Sustainability
Cllr Brian Ford Swindon Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
Cllr Garry Perkins Swindon Cabinet Member for Regeneration
Cllr Bridget Wayman Wiltshire Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Waste

Recording and Broadcasting Information

Wiltshire Council may record this meeting for live and/or subsequent broadcast on the Council's website at <http://www.wiltshire.public-i.tv>. At the start of the meeting, the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being recorded. The images and sound recordings may also be used for training purposes within the Council.

By entering the meeting room you are consenting to being recorded and to the use of those images and recordings for broadcasting and/or training purposes.

The meeting may also be recorded by the press or members of the public.

Any person or organisation choosing to film, record or broadcast any meeting of the Council, its Cabinet or committees is responsible for any claims or other liability resulting from them so doing and by choosing to film, record or broadcast proceedings they accept that they are required to indemnify the Council, its members and officers in relation to any such claims or liabilities.

Details of the Council's Guidance on the Recording and Webcasting of Meetings is available on request. Our privacy policy can be found [here](#).

Parking

To find car parks by area follow [this link](#). The three Wiltshire Council Hubs where most meetings will be held are as follows:

County Hall, Trowbridge
Bourne Hill, Salisbury
Monkton Park, Chippenham

County Hall and Monkton Park have some limited visitor parking. Please note for meetings at County Hall you will need to log your car's registration details upon your arrival in reception using the tablet provided. If you may be attending a meeting for more

than 2 hours, please provide your registration details to the Democratic Services Officer, who will arrange for your stay to be extended.

Public Participation

Please see the agenda list on following pages for details of deadlines for submission of questions and statements for this meeting.

For extended details on meeting procedure, submission and scope of questions and other matters, please consult [Part 4 of the council's constitution](#).

The full constitution can be found at [this link](#).

For assistance on these and other matters please contact the officer named above for details

AGENDA

Part I

Items to be considered while the meeting is open to the public.

1 **Apologies**

To receive any apologies or substitutions for the meeting.

2 **Minutes (Pages 7 - 56)**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 27th June 2018.

To receive the minutes of the SWELP Board held on 24th May 2018, 25th July 2018 and 19th September 2018.

3 **Declarations of Interest**

To receive any declarations of disclosable interests or dispensations granted by the relevant Standards Committee.

4 **Chairman's Announcements**

To receive any announcements through the Chair.

5 **Public Participation**

The Council welcomes contributions from members of the public.

Statements

If you would like to make a statement at this meeting on any item on this agenda, please register to do so at least 10 minutes prior to the meeting. Up to 3 speakers are permitted to speak for up to 3 minutes each on any agenda item. Please contact the officer named on the front of the agenda for any further clarification.

Questions

To receive any questions from members of the public or members of the Council received in accordance with the constitution.

Those wishing to ask questions are required to give notice of any such questions in writing to the officer named on the front of this agenda no later than 5pm on 6th December 2018 in order to be guaranteed of a written response. In order to receive a verbal response questions must be submitted no later than 5pm on 10th December 2018. Please contact the officer named on the front of this agenda for further advice. Questions may be asked without notice if the Chairman decides that the matter is urgent.

Details of any questions received will be circulated to Committee members prior to the meeting and made available at the meeting and on the Council's website.

6 **Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership (SWLEP)
Commissioning Group Highlight Reports** *(Pages 57 - 70)*

To receive highlight reports on SWLEP projects.

7 **Date of the Next Meeting**

To confirm the date of the next meeting as 21st February at 9.30pm.

Part II

Items during whose consideration it is recommended that the public should be excluded because of the likelihood that exempt information would be disclosed.

This page is intentionally left blank



swindonwiltshire
Local Enterprise Partnership



SWINDON
BOROUGH COUNCIL

JOINT STRATEGIC ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (SWLEP)

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT STRATEGIC ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (SWLEP)
MEETING HELD ON 27 JUNE 2018 AT COMMITTEE ROOMS A&B, MONKTON
PARK, CHIPPENHAM, WILTSHIRE, SN15 1ER.**

Present:

Cllr Baroness Scott of Bybrook OBE (Chair), Cllr Russell Holland, Cllr John Thomson, Cllr Oliver Donachie, Cllr Pauline Church and John Mortimer and Peter Wragg.

9 Apologies

Apologies were received from Swindon Cllr David Renard.

Apologies were also received from Paddy Bradley, SWLEP Director and Adam Schallamach, Vice Chairman SWLEP. Mr Peter Wragg, also from the SWLEP, was in attendance.

10 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2018 were presented, along with the minutes of the SWLEP Board meeting on 21 March 2018.

Resolved:

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2018 as a true and correct record.

To receive the minutes of the SWLEP Board on 21 March 2018.

11 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

12 Chairman's Announcements

There were no announcements.

13 Public Participation

There were no statements or questions submitted.

14 **Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership (SWLEP) Board Updates**

A report was received summarising the status of each Local Growth Fund project and other SWLEP projects, assessing their management in accordance with the Assurance Framework and their level of progress. It was explained that technical advisers to the SWLEP had assessed each project and identified six projects in particular as being 'focus' projects that warranted special attention in the summary, and the Committee sought details on those projects, as well as overall progress for all projects as detailed in the report.

Production of the business case for phase 1b of The Chippenham Station Hub project had been delayed due to the availability of Network Rail resource. The SWLEP looked at re-arranging phases, bringing forward stage 5 work, to try to limit overall delays. A letter had been sent from John Mortimer to GWR to request that the issue was addressed. Delays to the project could result in funding being lost, as it must be used by March 2021, and therefore the Committee would lend their support to a more strongly worded letter being sent and requested that this suggestion should be taken back to the SWLEP board.

The A350 Yarnbrook/West Ashton project was reported to be progressing well. Funding to cover cost increases had been successfully granted by the Housing Infrastructure Fund and planning permission had been awarded. Discussions were taking place on progressing development work at a faster pace with an associated acceleration of the LGF spend on the project.

The Head of Terms for the land deal with THRE for Salisbury Central Car Park and the Maltings were in a mature state. However the recent incident in Salisbury had prompted a review between the developer and Wiltshire Council. New approaches were being investigated, such as the change of use of some buildings. Discussions were underway with Central Government. The planning application was due to be submitted in August 2018.

The application to the Housing Infrastructure Fund to cover increased costs for the Swindon Bus Exchange was unsuccessful. However the SWLEP Board agreed that LGF funding would continue based on new plans and profiles submitted by Swindon Borough Council. Construction was unlikely to be completed by May 2021, however this would not create issues regarding the funding as this would be used in earlier stages of the project.

Work was progressing on the New Eastern Villages projects. Costs were reported to have increased on the Southern Connector Road project due to design requirements to mitigate archaeological discoveries. These increased costs would be covered by developer contributions. However an application had also been made to the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF). If this was successful the developer contribution could be released for other elements of the project. The result of the HIF application would be known in Summer 2018. Swindon Borough Council's Cabinet had approved potential compulsory purchase orders for the project.

A design option had been selected for the A420/Gablecross and land assembly was underway. Osborne were appointed to provide early contractor involvement.

The Wichelstowe Southern Access outline business case was being submitted to the May 2018 SWLEP Board meeting. The procurement process for the project would be carried out in June 2018.

Summary updates were provided on other projects. The Junction 16/17 project had been completed. The updated business case for Wiltshire College works had been agreed at the last SWLEP board meeting. The Porton Science Park project had been completed. The opening of the park was to be considered with the possibility of asking a government minister to attend the opening. The Swindon Art Gallery bid for Heritage Lottery Funding was not successful.

Resolved:

To approve the SWLEP Board's assessment that the highlight reports are an accurate representation of the status of all LGF projects.

15 **Joint Planning Updates**

An update was provided by Philip Smith, Service Manager – Planning Policy at Swindon Borough Council. Government consultations on a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) had been completed. The revisions were due to be published before parliamentary recess on 22 July 2018 and would go out for further consultation over the summer. As drafted the revisions contained a number of changes to policy that would affect joint working between Swindon Borough Council and Wiltshire Council.

These included a standardised methodology for calculating the scale of housing need of each local authority. Using the new standardised methodology the assessed local housing need for Wiltshire would remain roughly the same, however the figures for Swindon would be significantly lower (approximately 30%). The implications of this would mean that it would be easier for Swindon Borough Council to achieve a 5 year housing supply.

The draft NPPF does not refer to Strategic Housing Market Assessments, which use 'housing market areas' as the identified geography by which housing need must be assessed. However the SHMA still contained locally important evidence about the pattern of need as the new method does not take account of growth or economic trends.

Under the draft NPPF the role of the Joint Spatial Framework would change. There was a move back towards a strategic plan and subsequent plans to address local issues which in combination would make up the development plan. The draft NPPF stated that these strategic policies could be a joint statutory plan or individual local plan. It was felt that the joint statutory route was not the most prudent and that both authorities would continue to produce local plans.

A further implication of the draft NPPF was an effect on the timetables of the Joint Spatial Framework and the review of the Local Plan. The two authorities were considering what the revised timetable would look like and would update JSEC at the next meeting, this would take into account any further revisions to the NPPF.

Resolved:

To note the update on joint planning work.

16 Date of the Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 11 October 2018.

(Duration of meeting: 9.30am – 10.35am)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Tara Shannon, of Democratic Services, direct line 01225 718352, e-mail tara.shannon@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line (01225) 713114/713115



Membership	Amanda Burnside (AB) / Col Andrew Dawes (AD) / 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) / Baroness Scott of Bybrook OBE (JS) / Mark Smith (MS) / Jonathan Webber (JW) / Peter Wragg (PW) – Deputy Chairman
Advisors	Alistair Cunningham (AC)- left at 11.30am / Susie Kemp (SK)
Observers	Cllr Pauline Church / Cllr Oliver Donachie (OD)
In attendance	Paddy Bradley (PB) / Parvis Khansari (PK) / Tim Martienssen (TM) / Leanne Sykes (LS) / Philippa Venables (PV)
Guest(s)	Sally Burnett (SB) / Ian Durston (ID) / Jason Humm, SBC /
Apologies	Amanda Burnside (AB) / Cllr Oliver Donachie(OD) / George Gill (GG) / Vic O'Brien (VO) / Adam Schallamach (AS) – on sabbatical / Mark Smith (MS)
Chair	John Mortimer
Guest(s)	Sally Burnett (SB) / Phil Clement (PC) / Alex Crook (ACr), BEIS / Ian Durston (ID) / Jason Humm, SBC / Debby Skellern (DS) /
Minutes	Deborah House (DKH)
Location	Auditorium, Aspire Business Centre, Ordnance Road, Tidworth, SP9 7QD

Item	Narrative	Deadline
1.0	Welcome / Apologies / Conflicts of Interest	
	<p>The meeting opened at 9.30am. JM welcomed attendees to the meeting. Apologies were noted.</p> <p>JM reminded attendees of the Conflict of Interests policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He re-iterated his own standing Conflicts regarding Junction 17 and with a potential beneficiary of a GPIF loan; • PW stated his Conflicts regarding a potential beneficiary of GPIF and the LGF General Account for the Royal Artillery Museum (SPHC); • DG stated his Conflict regarding the Institute of Technology (IoT) submission with Dorset LEP and Qinetiq; • SJ stated her Conflict regarding the IoT as Create Studios is a named partner; • AR stated his Conflict regarding the IoT as Catalent was also a named partner; and • PCh advised the meeting that she had retail premises in Salisbury. <p>Welcome was extended to Pauline Church, Cabinet Member for Economic Development & Salisbury Recovery for Wiltshire Council, and Susie Kemp, Interim Chief Executive for Swindon Borough Council, to their first SWLEP Board Meeting. And as always to Alex Crook from BEIS.</p>	
2.0	Review of Minutes and Matters Arising	



Re-election of Board Members

SJ and AB were standing for re-election to the Board for a second term.

- PW proposed and GG seconded SJ's re-election; and
- JM proposed and PW seconded AB's re-election.

The Board

APPROVED the re-election of both members.

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 March 2018 were reviewed and approved.

Matters Arising

Mannington Roundabout (Quality Bus Corridor)

The full business case had been approved at the previous Board meeting, with the caveat that the final costs were still outstanding. PV would supply these costings in phases. This is an ongoing action and ID would continue to monitor via the Delivery and Performance Team (DPT).

The Central Car Park and the Maltings

An update had been given on the current situation by AC regarding the Salisbury incident prior to the meeting.

Remuneration Committee

The Chairman was in discussions with Wiltshire Council regarding several matters and when agreed, the Remuneration Committee would meet.

Local Industrial Strategy Working Group

The last Board meeting agreed to the formation of this group, which met for the first time on 30 April 2018. It would meet again immediately following the Board meeting.

Chairman's update

The Chairman's list of activities since the last Board meeting was available in the Board pack. In addition, the Chairman advised of the following:

27 April – joined PB at Boscombe Down for a meeting relating to plans on future possible developments on the site;

30 April – chaired a Local Industrial Strategy Working Group meeting and attended an ESIF Committee, both in Chippenham; and

22 May – Chaired the Growth Hub Governance Group meeting in Chippenham.

A question was raised about the reason for the Chairman's meeting with Stephen North of the DfE. JM advised that this related to the Higher Education (HE) Strategy and the feasibility of creating a new University and would be discussed during 4.2 of the agenda.

Director's Report

No questions raised.



3.0	Submitted Questions Questions were received from Mrs Charmian Spickernell (CS), Campaign for the Protection of Rural England North Wilts and Swindon Group Committee Member regarding the Wichelstowe Southern Access. A copy of the questions and responses given was attached to these minutes. In addition, Mrs Spickernell stated that a previous consultant for the project in 2008 had indicated a traffic build up on Wharf Road and the requirement for traffic lights at the junction with Hay Lane. The transport modelling since 2008 would have changed, and with the multi-modal forms of transport in and out of Wichelstowe, traffic lights were not deemed necessary at this stage of the project but would be a future consideration. SBC indicated it would supply more detail to Mrs Spickernell if required. Mrs Spickernell then asked whether there was any conflict of interest for SBC as it owned the land for the project. PB cited from SWLEP's Assurance Framework which referred to the role of elected officials in this capacity. Any project where there is a capital gain to the UA was a recognisable Conflict of Interest. SBC declared that there was no capital gain for the Authority on this project. The Chairman thanked Mrs Spickernell for her continued interest in the work of the SWLEP.	
4.0	Strategic Developments	
4.1	Industrial Strategy – initial findings Local Economic Assessment (LEA) PB introduced the paper and DS presented to the meeting. The LEA was undertaken every two years and informed the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). This year, the LEA would also underpin the Local Industrial Strategy (LIS). A range of businesses had engaged with SWLEP, over 200 had been involved across the different stakeholder events, and also there had been a sizable online response. There were questions raised following the presentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The existing data for the strategic plans for Salisbury and Swindon should be pulled together for coherence across the area;• The LEA had not picked up the immediate impact of the Salisbury incident in its findings, but because of SWLEP's involvement in Salisbury recovery, this information would be used in the decision-making process;• ACr commented that Government would be looking to see that these strategies fed back to each other;	



- Questions were asked what defined regarding East / West and North / South connectivity;
- Consider the growth along M4 and look back to reflect the outcomes for our investments;
- Comparison made with GVA, employment and productivity, but employment figures should also be included. DS explained that the figures were available, but that were too detailed to show during the presentation;
- With regard to sector specialisms, defence in the area is twice national average but does not feature in the growth zones;
- There appeared to be a gap within the Aerospace sector;
- The need to stress the social care sector;
- Work out how we would describe our ageing population as the figure of 65 is now not the retirement age and this would probably increase in the future;
- The Creative Industries had been split off from Digital and IT in this piece, but there was a significant synergy across all these industries. DCMS stated that Creative Industries were growing at twice the rate of any other industry, but this new figure would not feature in these past statistics and SWLEP should not forget this potential growth.

The Board

NOTED that the Swindon and Wiltshire Economic Assessment has been submitted and was available for review and consideration by Board Members as part of the evidence base for the development of an industrial strategy for Swindon and Wiltshire and that there was on-going analysis of the data provided.

4.2 Draft Higher Education (HE) Strategy

PW introduced the paper and SB presented to the meeting. A Direction of Travel paper was presented to the Board last year. The presentation today was the result of the work carried out since then. The presentation could be found on the SWLEP website or by using the following link.

https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/24-may-2018/swlep-he-strategy-slides-for-slwp-board-may-2018-final-v2.pdf?sfvrsn=abf5b798_8

The shortened version of the strategy was issued in the Board packs. The full version was available to view on the SWLEP website.

The final strategy would be submitted at the September Board Meeting and the team was asking the Board whether it should go out to consultation before or after this final work.

Comments following the presentation were:

- There was a need to attract the brightest and best from outside the



area to study, work and live;

- The concept should be linked to employment possibilities and make urban centres exciting places where young people would want to be;
- Current Government policy was that any new HE provision needed to be provided and funded by the private sector and sponsored by a University, for example, like the Dyson model via Warwick University, which was thought would continue to grow;
- Before money was spent, private sector partners and interested Universities needed to be sought, so SWLEP should start finding these big finance partners with a narrative to attract significant private sector funding;
- The “modern” way of learning was for students to dip in and out throughout their lives for life-long learning;
- The offer needed to be creative and innovative as Universities at Reading, Bath, Gloucestershire and Bristol were within commutable distance;
- Establishing our own University was an expensive route and we should inform people what is already available in our FEs etc;
- Universities had evolved over the years and a large campus with 10,000 students was no longer the only option;
- For example, one option could be a multi-campus University of Wessex where Life Sciences and Aerospace were based at Boscombe, Digital & Cyber were based at Corsham and Advanced Manufacturing based out of Swindon;
- University of Wales was now placed in the Carriage Works for archaeological studies;
- The University market was very competitive, so unique research facilities should be integral to the offer;
- The Institute of Technology (IoT) announcement of Stage 1 submissions was imminent. And if SWLEP were not successful, could those named partners be taken forward to work towards the University aim?

The Chairman summarised the debate outlining three main aspects to consider:

- Had SWLEP the will to start this process with this collective ambition?
- How did SWLEP drive up aspiration? and
- Look at FE provision of HE in the area.

The team was asked to return to the September Board meeting with the proposals taking into account comments made.

The Board

AGREED to the vision, overall strategic aims and the emerging



	strategy and actions presented.	
4.3	<p>Digital Strategy The Digital Strategy paper was provided for information.</p> <p>The Board NOTED the progress made on the production of the Swindon and Wiltshire Digital Capabilities Strategy.</p>	
4.4	<p>Regional Collaboration</p> <p>PB spoke to the paper. Specific areas for collaboration were given as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborate more closely with the South West LEPs of Dorset, Heart of the South West and Cornwall & Isles of Scilly on rural, trade, transport and innovation. • Work across boundaries within sector specific collaborations. JW cited an example to create a regional area of interest regarding aerospace solutions, for example, drones etc which was a strength of the region. He was working with the National Air Traffic Service on a paper and with the Civil Aviation Authority, local LEPS, industry and academic partners to submit an application to The Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund in order to get a marker down as a potential candidate for a large part-funded enterprises and experimental user zone. Nesta was a global innovation foundation and was looking at the use of drones to deliver pharmaceuticals along the M4 and down to Solent. This was at an early stage, but we would be working towards a Central Hub. • Collaborate with the LEPs involved in the Great West Way proposed route. <p>The Board AGREED to support SWLEP on the range of regional collaborations identified above.</p>	
4.5	<p>Governance SWLEP operating models</p> <p>PB spoke to the paper. The Ministerial Review of the future role of LEPs was due publication before the summer recess, but there was a move for LEPs outside mayoral and combined authorities to become incorporated. The Working Group suggestions outlined were to be discussed. The proposals would be brought back to the Board, in July if possible, but definitely by September 2018.</p> <p>The Board was supportive of the work moving forward but sought clarity on the future liability for Local Authorities and the liability of the Directors of limited companies. The Director advised that SWLEP was seeking legal and financial advice to offer these assurances and all points raised would be</p>	



	<p>covered in the proposal model.</p> <p>ACr advised that 15 LEPs already operated within these models, so there was already a lot of best practice available to adopt.</p> <p>The Board agreed for the SWLEP to proceed and to bring the full proposal back in due course adjusting some of the contentious wording accordingly.</p> <p>The Board ENDORSED the presumption that the Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership (SWLEP) changed its operating model from a voluntary partnership without legal status to one of an incorporated status with a legal identity; REQUIRED the Director of the SWLEP, working with the Commissioning Group, to report back to the Board on a full analysis of options and seek Board approval for a preferred option; and APPROVED the indicative timeline to determine the future operating model of the SWLEP as shown.</p>	
<p>4.6</p>	<p>Local Growth Deal Commissioning Group Project Highlight Report ID spoke to the paper and was pleased to report that the projects at Porton Science Park and Junctions 16 and 17 of M4 were now complete. A video clip of the M4 Junction 16 was available on-line. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b99q9bBRtA</p> <p>Chippenham Station Hub At the last Board meeting, delays on Phase 1b were highlighted and a letter had been sent by the Chairman as directed. A meeting with GWR and Network Rail had been arranged for 11 June 2018. Work within the Public Realm would be brought forward and discussions with a potential occupier of Phase 2 Sadlers Mead car park were underway.</p> <p>A350 Yarnbrook / West Ashton Planning had been granted with monies from Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) awarded. There was potential to accelerate the project spend profile.</p> <p>The Maltings The situation in Salisbury had affected this project. Discussions were ongoing with Central Government regarding the make-up of the project, rescheduling the phasing and altering the mix of residential and commercial space. The developer, THRE, was involved in the discussions.</p> <p>Swindon Bus Exchange (Bus Boulevard) There had been a discussion at the last Board Meeting regarding the Bus Boulevard and the project had been reviewed again at the Commissioning Group on 9 May 2018. A presentation on the project would be given later in the meeting.</p>	



	<p>Southern Connector Road Outline Business Case expected to come to the September 2018 Board meeting for approval.</p> <p>Gable Cross Outline Business Case expected to come to the Board in November 2018 for approval.</p> <p>Southern Access Wichelstowe Full Business Case expected for Board approval in mid-2019.</p> <p>The 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>4.7</p>	<p>Swindon Bus Boulevard</p> <p>ID spoke to the paper which summarised the recent Commissioning Group's review of the project. There was a strong strategic case for this project which was fundamental to the Kimmerfields project overall. The LGF monies allocated would be used for enabling works with expenditure complete by March 2021.</p> <p>PV and JH presented to the meeting. The presentation could be viewed on the SWLEP website or by following the link</p> <p>https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/24-may-2018/bus-boulevard-slides-240518.pdf?sfvrsn=444c6e48_4</p> <p>There was a £8.3m shortfall for this project, which SBC had already tried to fill with alternative sources of funding. Although SBC had been successful in the overall bid for Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF), it did not receive the money sought for the Bus Boulevard. The overall project spend is predicted to be £15-18m. As the scheme is critical to the Swindon Town Centre regeneration, the Board was assured that the remaining funds would be found to complete the project.</p> <p>The meeting sought reassurance regarding the start date and was reassured that it would begin on time.</p> <p>The Board AGREED with the Commissioning Group's recommendation that the LGF allocation of £3m to the Swindon Bus Boulevard project remained in place and to bring an Outline Business Case to a future Board meeting.</p>	
<p>4.8</p>	<p>Wichelstowe Southern Access Outline Business Case (OBC) ID spoke to the paper and explained that the project was moving to the next stage of developing a Full Business Case.</p>	



	<p>The Board APPROVED the OBC to enable the development work for the project to continue (detailed design and procurement) and a Full Business Case (FBC) to be developed in order that construction work can commence in October 2019. The FBC to come to the Board in November 2018.</p>	<p>Nov 2018</p>
<p>4.9</p>	<p>Wiltshire College, Salisbury Campus Full Business Case (FBC) ID spoke to the paper.</p> <p>The Board APPROVED the FBC to enable the construction work to begin in September 2018.</p>	
<p>4.10</p>	<p>Finance Report – LGD Budget and profiling</p> <p>ID spoke to the paper and highlighted an error regarding the spend for Chippenham Station Hub cited as £2.8m should be in fact be £2.2m. This meant that the underspend was £13m and not £13.6m as quoted.</p> <p>ACr had been kept up to date of the situation and all projects had been advised to tackle the underspend and accelerate spending where possible. The projects retained within DfT were generally spending to profile and SWLEP had more flexibility with the spending profiles on these projects.</p> <p>More detail was requested on how long the projects were going to take and to tighten up on the language used, as “underspend” to the public might mean there was more money available and not be understood as an “underspend against grant profile”.</p> <p>The allocation of monies to Swindon Museum and Art Gallery (SMAG) and Salisbury Plain Heritage Centre (SPHC) of £1.35 each and £1m to the Ultrafast Broadband project of £1m was as a result of SBC releasing £3.7m from the M4 Junction 15 project. But the allocation to the two cultural projects was dependent on Heritage Lottery Funding (HLF) monies being granted or alternatively funded viable projects being brought forward. As this funding was not forthcoming, the projects had been requested to come back with alternative proposals. A paper from the SPHC project had been circulated to the Board prior to the meeting detailing its suggested options. As SMAG had only received HLF’s decision two weeks ago, it had not had sufficient time to provide suggestions, but the Board’s continued support was requested and the need for cultural hubs was stressed. The previously allocated monies of £2.7m from both cultural projects could be re-allocated into the GPIF fund, used to accelerate spend in an existing project or be used towards another shovel-ready project. The SMAG Trust and SBC were meeting on 25 May 2018 to discuss the HLF outcome and would return to</p>	



	<p>the July Board with some proposals and options for consideration.</p> <p>The Chairman stressed that the monies however needed to be allocated and consumed by March 2021. AR requested more information on the evolution of the reforecast underspend.</p> <p>Action : ID and AR to review</p> <p>The meeting was advised that Wiltshire Council was already putting transport and planning teams in place for the Royal Artillery Museum project so had confidence in its instigation. Some members of the meeting were not supportive of the fund going into GPIF and preferred another use for the monies.</p> <p>The Chairman reassured the meeting that if the SMAG funds were re-allocated into GPIF the money would be spent in Swindon because it was as a result of SBC's generosity in the first place.</p> <p>The Board APPROVED this paper as an accurate summary of the current LGF financial position; and the decision on moving the money would be deferred until July, when the Board would expect to hear options from both projects.</p>	<p>June 2018</p>
5.0	SWLEP Core Activity	
5.1	<p>Finance Report – SWLEP General Account and other Programmes</p> <p>PB spoke to the paper and explained that the overspend within Marketing & Communications was owing to the cost of the annual conference. No sponsorship had been sought for last year, but was one of the main criteria for this year's conference, which should reduce overall costs.</p> <p>The Board NOTED the report for SWLEP General Account and other programmes.</p>	
6.0	AOB	
	None.	
	Part Two of the meeting (the public not present)	
7.0	<p>Growing Places Infrastructure Fund (GPIF)</p> <p>AR, as chair of the GPIF Working Group, introduced the item to the meeting. Five applications had been received in this round of funding, each requesting between £700k-£2m. After Stage One of the latest call, the situation was as follows:</p>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One existing strong application from the previous call; • Two strong candidates to move forward; • Two mid-level candidates, which were not as strong, but still fitted within the strategic objective and would require further work; and • One weak application which the Group was not looking to take forward to Stage Two. <p>The Board APPROVED that the existing strong application from the previous call move into Stage 2; APPROVED that the two strongest applications from this call move into Stage 2 of the process for further consideration; AGREED further due diligence was undertaken for the two mid-level submissions of this call to assess if they should be proposed for inclusion in Stage 2, with the decision to be made by the GPIF Working Group; AGREED that one application from this call should not be taken further at this stage, but to remain in dialogue with the applicants; APPROVED a further £50,000 be taken from the GPIF capital account to use as a capital-only fund in support of grant applications of up to £5,000 for businesses affected by the Salisbury incident that supports the development of their business.</p>	
Date of next meeting / Closing remarks		
	<p>The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, 25 July 2018 at 9.30am in the Alamein Suite, City Hall, Malthouse Lane, Salisbury, SP2 7TU.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 12.40pm.</p>	
CLOSE		
	<p>Future Meetings</p> <p>Wednesday, 19 September 2018 Location to be advised.</p> <p>Wednesday, 28 November 2018 Committee Room 6, Swindon Borough Council Civic Offices, Euclid Street, Swindon, SN2 2JH</p> <p>Meetings for 2019</p> <p>Wednesday, 23 January 2019 – PLEASE NOTE AFTERNOON MEETING Committee Rooms, Monkton Park, Chippenham, SN15 1ER</p> <p>Wednesday, 20 March 2019 Kennet Room, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, BA14 8JN</p> <p>Thursday, 23 May 2019 Location to be advised</p>	



Wednesday, 24 July 2019

Ceres Hall, The Corn Exchange, Market Place, Devizes, SN10 1BN

Thursday, 26 September

Auditorium, Aspire Business Centre, Ordnance Road, Tidworth,
SP9 7QD

25 July 2018



From CPRE Wiltshire, Charmian Spickernell, CPRE Wiltshire Vice-Chairman

Question One

Experience has shown that without a flourishing town centre the economy dies and without all important links to it, the centre ceases to flourish, so how is it proposed that the Wichelstowe Southern Access Route will help Swindon town centre?

Response

The design and access strategy for Wichelstowe has prioritised sustainable modes of travel, promoting walking, cycling and a quality bus corridor. Due to the close proximity of the site to the town centre the potential is there for a significant number of non-motorised journeys that will support the local economic aspirations.

In addition, we continue to see significant investment in the town centre that is both improving and diversifying the offer. Developments like Wichelstowe increase investor confidence because they recognise a growing market of potential customers and visitors to the town centre. Public transport connections into the town centre are excellent as is availability of parking for those wishing to travel in by car.

Question Two

It is noted and supported that it is important to encourage the use of public transport. The link from Wichelstowe to the town centre via Red Posts Drive will be bus only at peak times so in order to go to and from Wichelstowe to the rest of Swindon will other road traffic have to go round through Junction 16 at peak times?

Response

When the peak hour bus restriction is introduced at Redposts Drive, other road traffic will be required to use one of the other three exits from the Wichelstowe site (Croft Road, Mill Lane South and the Southern Access).

Question Three

Given the interest of TransWilts Trains for a stop at Blagrove, what connection is proposed to a future Blagrove Rail Station?

Response

Swindon Borough Council currently has no plans involving a station at Blagrove.

Question Four

Given that traffic from Wichelstowe will have right of way, will the junction on Wharf Road have traffic lights to allow traffic from Wroughton to access the motorway?

Response

The new junction at Wharf Road will be a roundabout. As such, none of the three incoming roads will have right of way over the others, and it is not currently anticipated that the junction will require traffic lights.

This page is intentionally left blank



In attendance:	Paddy Bradley (PB) Cllr Pauline Church (PCh) Alistair Cunningham (AC) – arrived 10.20am, left 12.30pm Col Andrew Dawes (AD) – left 12.30pm Doug Gale (DG) George Gill (GG) Susie Kemp (SK) Tim Martiensen (TM) John Mortimer (JM) - Chairman Alex Reed (AR) Mark Smith (MS) Cllr Gary Sumner (GS), representing Cllr Renard and Cllr Donachie Philippa Venables (PV) Peter Wragg (PW) – Deputy Chairman
Apologies:	Amanda Burnside (AB) Cllr Oliver Donachie (OD) Shahina Johnson (SJ) Parvis Khansari (PK) David Renard (DR) Adam Schallamach (AS) – on sabbatical Baroness Scott of Bybrook OBE (JS) Leanne Sykes (LS) Jonathan Webber (JW)
Guest(s):	Phil Clement (PC), SWLEP Allan Creedy (ACre), Wiltshire Council Alex Crook (ACr), BEIS Ian Durston (ID), SWLEP Ross Gill (RG), SQW Joe Manning (JMa), BEIS Debby Skellern, SWLEP
Chair:	John Mortimer
Minutes:	Deborah House (DKH)
Location:	The Crown Court, The Guildhall, Market Place, Salisbury, SPI IJH

Item	Narrative	Deadline
1.0	Welcome / Apologies / Conflicts of Interest	
	<p>The meeting opened at 9.30am. JM welcomed attendees to the meeting. Apologies were noted.</p> <p>JM reminded attendees of the Conflict of Interests policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PW stated his Conflicts regarding the LGF General Account for the Royal Artillery Museum (RAM); and • AR stated his Conflict regarding the IoT, as Catalent was a named 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>partner.</p> <p>Welcome was extended to Mary Webb from the Federation of Small Business (fsb), Amanda Newbery, Dean Speer and Steve Godwin of Salisbury Business Improvement District (BID), to Alex Crook from BEIS and his colleague, Joe Manning, from the Cities & Local Growth Unit who would be speaking later about the Ministerial Review of LEPs. Welcome and congratulations were offered to Susie Kemp on her appointment as CEO at Swindon Borough Council. Cllr Gary Sumner was representing Swindon Borough Council and would vote on its behalf and Cllr Pauline Church would vote on behalf of Wiltshire Council. Adrian Ford from Wiltshire College was present representing Amanda Burnside, but without voting rights. Ross Gill of SQW was to present on Item 4.3, Digital Capabilities Strategy and Allan Creedy of Wiltshire Council was to present on Item 4.5, the Sub-national Transport Body. Alistair Cunningham was expected to join the meeting later.</p>	
2.0	Review of Minutes and Matters Arising	
	<p>The minutes of the Board Meeting held on 24 May 2018 were reviewed and approved.</p> <p>Employment of SWLEP Director The Remuneration Committee, chaired by Peter Wragg, had met and made recommendations regarding the employment and terms of the SWLEP Director. The contract had been a fixed-term contract and had had several extensions. The discussions in private session with Board voting members were whether and how the Director's employment should continue. In public session, the Chairman asked the members to confirm their decision and announced the Director's continued employment.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the headline terms of employment of the SWLEP Director as recommended by the Remuneration Committee; AGREED that the Director will continue to report to the SWLEP Board Chairman; AGREED to the publication of the details of the Director's terms and conditions of employment on the SWLEP website and to review arrangements on an annual basis, or before if the SWLEP becomes an incorporated body.</p> <p>Matters Arising not on the agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reforecast underspend in Local Growth Deal Projects. AR and ID were to meet on 23 August. ID was collating historical information for the discussion. 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Chairman's update The Chairman's list of activities since the last Board meeting was available in the Board pack. In addition, the Chairman advised of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> that he had attended a number of briefing meetings regarding the recovery situation in Salisbury and the Royal visit. <p>Board Membership The Chairman announced the resignation of Vic O'Brien from the Board owing to increasing work commitments. Thanks were extended for his contribution made to the Board over the two years of his membership.</p> <p>Further recruitment would start for additional board members. The current membership stood at 13, although there was scope cited in the Assurance Framework to increase the membership to 20 members, which was also mirrored in the Ministerial Review to be discussed later in the agenda. In particular, it mentioned setting aspirational targets for gender diversity and balance. SWLEP would reach out to the business community to broaden the sector scope and diversity of applicants. Board Members were requested to use their network contacts to inform of the Board vacancies. The aim was to have the additional Board Members in place for the November Board Meeting.</p> <p>The question was raised as to the overall skill set and sector involvement of the current Board Members and to map that against the SEP to ascertain what knowledge and skills may be missing. Co-opted Board Members with particular sector expertise could be used.</p> <p>Director's Report The paper was provided for information. Appendices had been included for Marketing & Communications and Inward Investment. No questions were raised.</p>	Nov 2018
3.0	<p>Submitted Questions No questions were received from the public prior to the meeting.</p>	
4.0	<p>Strategic Developments</p>	
4.1	<p>Towards a Local Industrial Strategy for SWLEP</p> <p>Introduction – Methodology to produce our Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) The Working Group, chaired by Doug Gale, had so far met three times. Timelines have been calculated and the Commissioning Group had also been updated on progress.</p> <p>The Government had declared that every LEP must have its own Local</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Industrial Strategy completed by early 2020. The roll out of the next tranche of LEPs took place on 24 July to include the West of England, Heart of the South West, Cheshire & Warrington, Leicester & Leicestershire, North East and Tees Valley. The original pathfinder LEPs had included OxLEP, which had already been in touch because of the economic and strategic links with Swindon and Wiltshire, and the West of England LEP was in the next tranche. Given that Swindon and Wiltshire sits in the middle of both these LEP areas, SWLEP needed to be involved in both of these discussions.</p> <p>The LIS would require a deeper evidence base. Adding to the Local Economic Assessment were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South West Rural Productivity Study – an implementation plan was being drafted by the four LEPs involved to produce a rural-type sector deal; • Energy Strategy – an update was to be given later in the agenda, • Higher Education Strategy – the strategy had been adopted in principle, • Digital Strategy – presentation was to be given later in the agenda, • Cyber Resilience Science Innovation Audit – had recently been submitted to BEIS; and • the recently commissioned Rail Strategy, which was being managed by ID. <p>These would all add to the broadening of the work. A Board Member sponsor was still required for the Rail Strategy.</p> <p>There had been 300 attendees at events for these strategies and the especially formulated Four Grand Challenges workshops of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growing the AI & Data-driven Economy; • Clean Growth; • Ageing Society; and • The Future of Mobility, <p>and more than 200 online questionnaire responses had been received to the HE Strategy. The Ageing Society and Clean Growth topped the list of business interests at the Grand Challenges workshop.</p> <p>The “big ideas” from the events were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • business-led multi-campus university; • electric vehicles and battery storage; • hydrogen as an alternative source of clean energy – USP • Cyber resilience and the trust in the use of big data; • Immunology development and med tech; • Defence and aerospace supply chain development; and • Autonomous vehicles land and air. 	<p>Aug 2018</p>



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>The point was raised that the LIS should reflect the ways people would work in the future, not how they worked at present, recognising that the spread and speed of technology would continue to increase and would impact on the work force. With more people able to work from home, equality of access was crucial in these circumstances, although commercial space would still be needed for those that wished to work together. Projections for employment needs and skills levels should be investigated in the growth areas. It was acknowledged that the LIS needed to be agile and fluid to deal with any changes.</p> <p>The meeting acknowledged the complexity of the process. Working with Unitary Authority development plans was crucial and needed to be reflected in the LIS. The Chairman stressed the need to move from strategy and strategic language to an action plan in order to ascertain when / how this could be implemented.</p> <p>Joe Manning thanked the Board for the invitation to the meeting and stressed that the LIS should be evidence-led and show genuine understanding of the businesses, achieved through consultation. The LIS needed to be focussed long-term for a 10-15 year period and to stress the importance of productivity and distinctiveness. It would be a joint endeavour between government and places and to work together to develop. The reason that Government was carrying out LIS in waves was in order that LEPs could get maximum engagement with officials.</p> <p>The Board: AGREED to refresh the Strategic Economic Plan in the first instance and include the local 'big ideas' within it which could be developed with government into a Local Industrial Strategy pending further guidance; and NOTED the progress made on the collation of local evidence and business consultation sessions to underpin development of the Swindon and Wiltshire Local Industrial Strategy. AGREED the proposed timeline for the refresh of the SEP/LIS.</p> <p>4.2 Local Energy Strategy – progress update</p> <p>MS made the introduction to the paper. The Working Group had met three times. The evidence base was being collated to ascertain the appropriate level of SWLEP involvement. Seven priorities listed in the paper were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accelerating clean growth; • improving Business and Industry efficiency; • Improving Our Homes; • accelerating the shift to low carbon transport; • delivering Clean, Smart, Flexible Power; 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhancing the Benefits and Value of our Natural Resources; and • leadership in the Public Sector for change in approach. <p>The Energy Strategy is a key part of the LIS. The Group wanted it to be ambitious in concept, but requiring proper delivery targets, being deliverable and measurable, to advise the allocation of SWLEP money. It was considered a challenge to get the full strategy ready in time for a September Board approval, and MS was therefore asking for the presentation to be moved to November.</p> <p>Smart controls and grid structure needed to be aligned with the Government's targets. There were significant differences between Swindon and Wiltshire, and the opportunities were more commercial in Swindon.</p> <p>The question was raised about clean energy in rural communities, particularly in farming. The agricultural infrastructure has the ability to produce localised energy supply by generating power for itself and out to the grid by solar arrays in fields and on farm buildings and by using advanced battery storage technologies. There was however the question about how to power the tractors.</p> <p>PB advised that mapping was being carried out on grid connectivity, Broadband connectivity and water resources which could be overlaid on the Swindon and Wiltshire area to give a better picture of requirements and potential opportunities.</p> <p>The Board NOTED progress on the Local Energy Strategy and noted / commented on the priorities at 2.9.</p> <p>It was requested that Ricardo attend the November Board Meeting to present the findings, rather than at the September meeting.</p>	28/11/2018
4.3	<p>Digital Strategy</p> <p>GG made the introduction to the paper which was building a strong evidence base and forming a good foundation for SWLEP to build on. The Digital sector is not a vertical silo, but operates horizontally across all aspects of life. For example, the Internet of Things would revolutionise all our lives.</p> <p>Ross Gill presented to the Board. The presentation can be found on the SWLEP website or by following the link below.</p> <p>https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/25-jul-2018/swlap-board-presentation-24-07-18.pdf?sfvrsn=b3eb101b_4</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Two workshops had taken place with good attendance and SQW had also held bi-lateral consultations with individual companies. The headlines were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Digital Creation – to create a dynamic ecosystem in which businesses at the forefront of digital innovation grow and flourish;• Digital Adoption – to ensure that all businesses in Swindon and Wiltshire are deriving competitive advantage from the use of digital technology; and• Digital Foundations – to create a workforce with the skills to create, embrace and derive value from advanced digital technology. <p>SWLEP should play a convening role to bring partners together, building private sector-led networks and linking to physical assets, for example, Corsham Mansion House.</p> <p>A Monitoring Framework to measure success of the strategy over time was being drafted as was the investment proposition.</p> <p>There were questions raised regarding the gaps in the digital infrastructure across Wiltshire and how that should be addressed. Although overall the county fared quite well with coverage and accessibility compared to the rest of the country, this would not be viewed sympathetically with rural communities which were badly served. A comment was received as to whether the SWLEP should be assisting these lesser served communities with more radical solutions. The ambition should be 100% coverage and access throughout the area. This is a sector which constantly moves and evolves and the area needs to stay ahead. One of the key actions in the report is to develop skills for the digital workforce. The emphasis is on children and young people, but a question was raised as to whether that was the right approach. With one of the LIS's Grand Challenges being the Ageing Society, should the focus be towards the older population? Aiming at the younger generation to get into digital employment via placements and apprenticeships was essential, as it was felt that University leavers would not necessarily be fit for the world of digital work as the technological environment moves so fast and there is a need to keep pace with developments.</p> <p>A link to the LIS Grand Challenges had commenced and this would be stressed.</p> <p>The outputs from the project were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strategy document• Evidence base• Brief investment proposition slide pack.	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>The Board: NOTED the Swindon and Wiltshire Digital Capabilities Strategy 2018 as presented, and requested it be brought back to a future board meeting incorporating the suggestions made.</p>	Sept 2018
4.4	<p>Cyber Resilience - Science Innovation Audit (SIA) The Cyber Resilience – Science Innovation Audit (SIA) paper was provided for information. The SIA involved Gfirst, The Marches, Worcestershire and SWLEP. Outside of London, the area represented the largest single block of cyber resilience with Special Forces in Herefordshire, UK security GCHQ in Cheltenham, radar technology in Malvern, defence and security at Porton and the MoD Joint Cyber Unit at Corsham. PB made additional comments that the SIA had been submitted to BEIS and that we awaited the outcome of the review as to its use.</p> <p>The Board: NOTED the content of this paper and endorsed the activity of the Alliance.</p>	
4.5	<p>Proposals for the Sub-national Transport Body (SNTB)</p> <p>ACre presented to the Board. The presentation can be found on the SWLEP website or by following the link below.</p> <p>https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/25-jul-2018/stbs-swlep-july-2018-v2.pdf?sfvrsn=5db5870d_4</p> <p>The South West had been the last to develop options for a Sub-national Transport Body and there were two options now emerging:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South West Peninsula and • Western Gateway <p>The options would be submitted to the Secretary of State for approval in September 2018. The SNTB would look at both road and rail transport after production of the evidence base. They would be pressing for improved North South connectivity, for example, the A36 Bristol to Southampton, and although Hampshire was not in the Western Gateway grouping, the evidence base would form the basis of the argument.</p> <p>The Chairman noted that solutions emerging elsewhere in the country were for SNTBs covering significantly greater geographical areas, in contrast to the two body solution being proposed for the South West.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked ACre for the presentation and although SWLEP had no formal feed into the final proposal, it could offer opinions.</p> <p>The Board</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	CONSIDERED the content of the report, and comments were made as above.	
4.6	<p>Governance Ministerial Review of LEPs</p> <p>Joe Manning spoke to the meeting. The Review was formally published on 24 July 2018. It had been discussed at the Regional Cabinet in Newcastle on Monday, 23 July 2018 and James Brokenshire MP, Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local government, raised the matter in the House.</p> <p>The year 2021 would see the Government coming out of its Local Growth Fund cycle. The LIS was a formal commitment, demonstrating the direction of travel towards the Shared Prosperity Fund and the Review set out policy expectations of the system.</p> <p>The Ministerial Review of LEPs set out the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• roles and responsibilities;• leadership and organisational capacity;• accountability and performance;• geography; and• relationships between LEPs and Mayoral Combined Authorities. <p>The Board welcomed the clarity on Government's continuing commitment to LEP with refined roles and responsibilities. They were still seen in a partnership role, bringing public and private sectors together for the benefit of the area. The Review demonstrated the framework within which LEPs were expected to operate, whilst allowing a degree of local discretion. There would be increased dialogue with government. The incorporation proposals would give legal status to LEPs and commonality for issues of accountability and scrutiny. The clear legal status would allow Government a formal contracting model. SWLEP was undertaking an analysis of its current structure and how it was performing against the outline of the Report. The results would be made available to the Board. SWLEP had been aiming for an April 2019 deadline for incorporation and this was also in line with the review. Overall, it was felt that SWLEP would deliver on all the recommendations.</p> <p>The next steps would be to consider how to eliminate the geographical overlaps of certain LEPs and produce a proposal to Government by the end of September with full responses expected by the end of October 2018. The Government recognised that this would mean additional work for LEPs, so additional funding would come in this, and next, financial year to assist with the implementation review and investment in organisational capacity. The question of the overall footprint of the SWLEP was raised, and the Board</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>being appropriately monitored. ID responded that DPT was keeping track of the projects and remained confident that deadlines could still be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that the RAG rating for the Maltings project –had moved from AG to RED and the narrative was described as “in flux”. ID advised that this simply reflected the ongoing conversations about the nature of the future development. <p>The Chairman asked the attendees to stress to their teams the timetable SWLEP needed to hit for project spend.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the Commissioning Group’s assessment that the highlight reports are an accurate representation of the current status of all LGF projects.</p>	
5.2	<p>Allocation of Funding</p> <p>PB spoke to the paper which would set the scene for further discussions in September. The situation was outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> £2.7m had been allocated to two projects, which were not yet live; there was pressure to re-allocate that money for another use, for example, to assist with Salisbury’s recovery from economic shock; there were potential sources of other funding; for instance the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (intended to replace European funding and LGF) and GPIF; a new Cultural Development Fund was to be launched; given the situation, the Board might feel that it needed to give higher priority to the needs of Salisbury and South Wiltshire; and proposals were coming forward to revise, and alter the sequencing of, The Maltings and Central Carpark project. There would be a need to discuss this further in September. <p>The Chairman vocalized the Board’s sympathy for the situation in Salisbury and Amesbury and recognised that the Board would want to commit resources to support recovery. SWLEP had already committed £21m to Salisbury projects for example, at the College and The Maltings, and there was likely to be a request for an additional £1.6m for the latter project. SWLEP should do everything it could to support South Wiltshire, but should take into consideration the total resources available to it and the importance of commitments it had already made.</p> <p>The meeting was advised that the Salisbury Recovery Plan had received Government sign off from the individual Government Departments and they were still heavily involved. ACr explained that Government had offered support for the Recovery Plan, but that there was no outline funding as yet. Recognising the extreme circumstances, the Government would be flexible</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>on outputs and outcomes for the Salisbury projects.</p> <p>To give the Board comfort and confidence it was suggested that the Salisbury Plan be reviewed in September which would detail the repurposing of the economic vision for the south of the county. Some Members of the Board were content to reduce other economic growth opportunities in the north of the county, in order to allocate more for the South, as there would be significant GVA loss in Salisbury.</p> <p>The Board: NOTED the issues raised in the discussion of the report: and IDENTIFIED further information required for the discussion and decision-making at the September Board meeting, which included sight of the Salisbury Recovery Plan.</p> <p>Col Dawes and AC left the meeting at 12.30pm.</p>	<p>Sept 2018</p>
5.3	<p>Finance Report – LGD Budget and profiling</p> <p>The paper was taken out of order and discussed ahead of Item 5.2. ID spoke to the paper and quoted a figure of £10.36m forecast underspend at the end of the financial year. There were however opportunities to accelerate spend identified by the Yarnbrook West Ashton project and the Wiltshire College, Lackham project, which would reduce this underspend.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the paper as an accurate summary of the current LGF financial position.</p>	
6.0 6.1	<p>SWLEP Core Activity</p> <p>Marketing and Communications</p> <p>Annual Report</p> <p>TB spoke to the paper and advised that he had received some comments from Board Members who had already viewed the draft Annual Report. Amendments to the draft would be made in time to upload to the SWLEP website and TB requested authority for the Steering Group to have final sign off.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the draft annual report; and AUTHORISED the Annual Report Steering Group to make any final amends which do not make major alterations to the current look and feel of the report.</p>	
7.0	AOB	
	None.	
	Date of next meeting / Closing remarks	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, 19 September 2018 at 9.30am in Room D001 / D001, Wiltshire College, Cocklebury Road, Chippenham, SN15 3QD.</p>	
	<p>Future Meetings</p> <p>Wednesday, 28 November 2018 Committee Room 6, Swindon Borough Council Civic Offices, Euclid Street, Swindon, SN2 2JH</p> <p>Meetings for 2019</p> <p>Wednesday, 23 January 2019 – PLEASE NOTE AFTERNOON MEETING Committee Rooms, Monkton Park, Chippenham, SN15 1ER</p> <p>Wednesday, 20 March 2019 Kennet Room, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, BA14 8JN</p> <p>Thursday, 23 May 2019 Alamein Suite, City Hall, Malthouse Lane, Salisbury, SP2 7TU</p> <p>Wednesday, 24 July 2019 Ceres Hall, The Corn Exchange, Market Place, Devizes, SN10 1BN</p> <p>Thursday, 26 September 2019 Auditorium, Aspire Business Centre, Ordnance Road, Tidworth, SP9 7QD</p> <p>Wednesday, 27 November 2019 Location to be advised</p>	
	<p>Part Two of the meeting (the public not present) remains commercial in confidence</p>	
8.0	<p>Growing Places Infrastructure Fund (GPIF)</p> <p>Conflicts of Interests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JM re-iterated his standing Conflict with a potential beneficiary of a GPIF loan; • ACr advised his Conflict with a potential beneficiary of a GPIF loan; PW's declaration that he knew potential beneficiary of a GPIF loan was noted. However, the Chairman felt this was not a sufficient reason for a formal conflict of interest to be recorded. <p>AR, as chair of the GPIF Working Group, spoke to the paper. He explained that owing to Vic O'Brien's resignation, an additional Board member was now required to join the GPIF Working Group.</p> <p>The applications were discussed with the Board.</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>The GPIF Working Group was working to develop the process for administering the smaller loans.</p> <p>An update on the existing GPIF loan was also presented.</p> <p>PB advised that he had received confirmation from AS on his voting for the recommendations.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the four applications presented to move to 'offer' stage; AGREED that further due diligence be undertaken for one applicant to assess if it should proceed to 'offer' stage, with a recommendation to be made to the Board by the GPIF Working Group; APPROVED up to £500,000 to be made available through loans from the GPIF fund to support the on-going recovery from the Salisbury and Amesbury incidents; APPROVED a loan to a company in Salisbury to assist the capital costs associated with the refurbishment and fitting-out of its premises; and APPROVED the ring-fencing of further loan monies to the same company, to be drawn down by the end of 2021, should this be required.</p>	19/09/2018
CLOSE of Part 2 at 12.55pm.		

Immei

19 September 2018



Attendance	
Board Members:	Amanda Burnside (AB) Col Andrew Dawes (AD) George Gill (GG) Shahina Johnson (SJ) – left at 10.55am John Mortimer (JM) - Chairman Alex Reed (AR) David Renard (DR) Adam Schallamach (AS) Baroness Scott of Bybrook OBE (JS) Peter Wragg (PW) – Deputy Chairman
Advisers to the Board	Alistair Cunningham
Observers to the Board	Cllr Pauline Church (PCh) Cllr Oliver Donachie (OD)
In attendance	Paddy Bradley (PB), SWLEP Director Tim Martienssen (TM), Wiltshire Council Leanne Sykes (LS), Wiltshire Council Philippa Venables (PV), Swindon Borough Council
Guest(s):	Sally Burnett (SB), Swindon Borough Council Ian Durston (ID), SWLEP Karen Leigh, BEIS Debby Skellern (DS), SWLEP General Nick Eeles (NE), Chairman, Royal Artillery Museum Project Richard Walters (RW), Wiltshire Council
Apologies	
Board Members:	Doug Gale (DG) Mark Smith (MS) Jonathan Webber (JW)
Advisors to the Board	Susie Kemp (SK)
Chair:	John Mortimer
Minutes:	Deborah House (DKH)
Location:	Rooms D001/002, Wiltshire College, Cocklebury Road, Chippenham, SN15

Item	Narrative	Deadline
1.0	Welcome / Apologies / Conflicts of Interest	
	The meeting opened at 9.45am. JM welcomed attendees to the meeting. In particular welcomes were extended to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Karen Leigh, Assistant Director at BEIS, to her first SWLEP Board meeting. Karen was the link to the Communities and Local Growth 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Unit (CLOG) and was the SWLEP BEIS Representative. In addition, Karen was responsible for the National Growth Hub programme and had assumed responsibility for the delivery of the Commonwealth Games;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Nick Eeles, who would be presenting the final proposal for the Royal Artillery Museum (RAM); • Robin McGowan (Salisbury BID) and Andy Rhind-Tutt (Salisbury Chamber of Commerce), attending as members of the public, for their interest in the South Wiltshire Recovery Plan and The Maltings Project; • Cllr Sandie Webb, Leader of Chippenham Town Council, Cllr Nick Murry, Wiltshire Councillor (Chippenham Monkton) and Jeff Harris, local Chippenham resident, all attending as members of the public, with interest in the Chippenham Station Hub Sadlers Mead project and the meeting would hear from them shortly. In addition, there were a number of residents from the Monkton Park area present. <p>Apologies were noted.</p> <p>JM reminded attendees of the Conflict of Interests policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • he re-iterated his Conflict regarding Junction 17 and with a potential beneficiary of a GPIF loan; • PW re-iterated his Conflict as a Trustee of the Royal Artillery Museum (RAM) regarding the potential allocation of Local Growth Deal funding to (RAM) and would not be taking part in the discussion (Item 4.1); • AR and SJ stated their Conflict regarding the IoT, as both Catalent and Create Studios were named partners (Item 5.3); • JS and PC stated their Conflict regarding the Chippenham Station Hub and they would not be taking part in the discussions (Item 4.1); and • AB stated her Conflict regarding LGF3 and the ongoing projects for Wiltshire College at the Salisbury and Lackham campuses. 	
2.0	Review of Minutes and Matters Arising	
2.0	<p>Board Membership - George Gill</p> <p>GG's three-year term had come to an end at this meeting and he had decided to step down as a Board Member. However, he would continue to support the Board in implementing the Digital Strategy as a specialist adviser to the Subgroup. George was thanked for his contribution to the Board and Members looked forward to continuing to work with him.</p>	
2.1	The minutes of the Board Meeting held on 25 July 2018 were reviewed and approved.	
2.2	Matters Arising not on the agenda	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Director's terms of employment had been agreed and would be published on the website. • The SWLEP response to the question of potential mergers raised by the Ministerial Review with neighbouring LEPs had been explored. There was no appetite from neighbouring LEPs or the SWLEP to merge and a full response would be submitted to Government by 28 September. Board Members would be sent a copy of the SWLEP submission. 	
3.0	<p>Submitted Questions</p> <p>The Chairman advised that no questions had been submitted within the specified time period. However, a number of emails had been received from members of the public, after the specified time period, relating the Chippenham Station Hub Project. The Chairman had acknowledged each of them and all specific questions would be answered in due course. As there was such strong interest from local residents of Sadlers Mead, it was felt that the meeting should hear those views and the Chairman invited three representatives, Cllr Sandie Webb, Cllr Nick Murry and Jeff Harries, to approach the table to give their viewpoints and concerns.</p> <p>Cllr Webb attended the meeting in her role as leader of the Town Council, and was not a Sadlers Mead resident. The questions Cllr Webb posed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the need-based evidence for a multi-storey car park of this size here as opposed to in the centre of town at the Bath Road site? • What were the results of the traffic analysis showing the impact that the increase in the car park capacity will have? • Where is the proposed footfall connectivity between the proposed car park and the town centre? <p>Cllr Webb acknowledged that the scheme would enable major employers to bring staff to Chippenham, but that the scheme did not make the connection to the town centre, turned its back on the growth of Chippenham and its future sustainability and did not demonstrate good value for money.</p> <p>Cllr Murry asked for clarification that the questions would be made available to Board Members. Some of Cllr Murry's issues were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the site was the wrong location for a multi-storey carpark; • that car parking should be located both sides of the railway tracks with commuter parking to the north; • that evidence had not been presented for the additional car parking requirements; • that the additional parking spaces under the proposed office building were not included in the increased traffic statistics; • the absence of investment for the Bath Road car park scheme; 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the company planning the Residential Home (old college) could withdraw its investment; • that investment would be diverted away from other projects; • that property values and community value of the park would decline with all the anti-social problems associated with multi-story car parks; • it would do nothing to enhance the public realm; and • he questioned when the proposed third station lift would be provided. <p>Mr Harris was attending the meeting as a resident of Monkton Park and advised he lived only 150 yards from the proposed car park. The issues he raised were on the grounds of safety and environment and some are repeated below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What actions would be taken because of the significant increase in traffic and the impact on young children, college students and train users? • How would emergency vehicles and carers reach the ageing population on Monkton Park? • In addition to the increased traffic, the heavy construction vehicles would have detrimental impact on the condition of the roads • Public health would suffer because of pollution, and sight of the ugly carpark would reduce the value of the houses in the area. <p>The Chairman thanked the speakers for their contribution and felt that the points made encapsulated the range of concerns that had been put forward.</p> <p>As a result of the strong interest, it was decided to bring the presentation of the Chippenham Station Hub Sadler's Mead Project forward in the agenda.</p>	
4.0	Local Growth Deal	
4.1	<p>Allocation of funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chippenham Station Hub <p>TM presented to the meeting. The presentation can be found on the SWLEP website of by following the link below.</p> <p>https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/19-sep-2018/sadlers-mead_19_9_18.pdf?sfvrsn=b2eccb64_4</p> <p>The presentation set out the phased plans for the area, including the construction of a new HQ building for Good Energy and a multi-storey car park in the context of the masterplan. TM read out a statement from Good Energy regarding its support for the scheme.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council was holding conversations with the owners of the land to the north of the station where additional car parking was being investigated. The ownership of the land was complex and not under Wiltshire Council's control.</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Details such as transport, safety and visual impact on landscape etc would go through the normal planning process, and was not the responsibility of the SWLEP Board to approve. The Retirement Home had already obtained planning permission and would therefore take primacy.</p> <p>The Chairman reminded the Board that it had already considered and approved the Outline Business Case (OBC) for this investment. At this meeting, the Board was being asked to approve the re-phasing of the scheme. Within the OBC, the carpark was part of the overall package and did not replace anything else outlined in the scheme. The Chairman re-iterated that the money available was time-limited. Decisions about the visual, traffic and amenity aspects of the proposed car park were beyond the scope and remit of the SWLEP; it would be up to Wiltshire Council's planning committee to make those decisions. The release of the money by the SWLEP Board would be dependent on the scheme promoter, Wiltshire Council, gaining planning permission.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the updated Outline Business Case for Chippenham Station Hub to enable the progression of phase 2 works; and NOTED the potential release of £3.8m from the Chippenham Station Hub project for re-allocation to other projects (further information available for the November Board meeting);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of funding re-allocation <p>ID spoke to the paper and gave an overview of the funding re-allocation summarised in the paper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swindon Museum & Art Gallery (SMAG) had been allocated £1.35m of funding. As the SMAG project had been unsuccessful in attracting additional Heritage Lottery Funding (HLF), the team was reviewing and developing a new proposal for the important collections. For this, SBC was requesting £250k and would release the remaining £1.1m back for re-allocation. • Chippenham Station Hub – There were ongoing discussions with Network Rail and GWR regarding Phases 3 and 4. Deferment of these phases may indicate a potential release of £3.8m for re-allocation. The team would come back to the November Board Meeting with further details. • Royal Artillery Museum (RAM) - £1.35m had already been allocated to this project and the revised proposals still required the full amount. • The Maltings and Central Car Park - £6.1m had previously been allocated for remediation of the car park site. After the incident in Salisbury and the retail down-turn nationally, the project was reviewed and refocused to make use of the £6.1m to regenerate land and buildings close to the Market Square and Fisherton Street. This would make a visible statement of improvement. This meant a change to the use of the allocation. 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Wilts Recovery Plan – there was funding to be allocated to the Recovery Plan and this would be discussed at future Board Meetings <p>ID advised the meeting that a request for funding had already been received from Fisherton Street traders for work in the public realm. Although this was only for £20k, it, and similar schemes, should be seen in the context of the South Wiltshire economic recovery as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swindon Museum & Art Gallery (SMAG) <p>PV spoke to the paper. SBC was in the process of developing a proposal for the November Board Meeting to reflect changes to the project. SBC was disappointed not to have received Heritage Lottery Funding, but it was keen to develop a strategy to make the best of the nationally important collections. SBC would be supportive of the allocation of the £1.1m to the Salisbury Recovery Programme</p> <p>SBC was thanked for its proposed release of allocated of funds.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED £0.25m for the development of a new scheme for the Swindon Museum and Art Gallery, freeing £1.1m for re-allocation to other existing SWLEP projects, or new proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Royal Artillery Museum (RAM) <p>NE presented to the meeting. The presentation could be found on the SWLEP website of by following the link below.</p> <p>https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/19-sep-2018/ram-presentation-to-swlep-19-sept-18-ne-final.pdf?sfvrsn=e4f1aba3_4</p> <p>The team was congratulated on its perseverance with the project despite the set-back of not being granted Heritage Lottery Funding. The Museum was one piece of the economic recovery jigsaw for South Wiltshire and added value to the overall package. It would be included in the overall marketing strategy of the area. After Stonehenge, Salisbury Plain could be a major visitor attraction. This project should not be seen as simply a military museum, but the arena would lend itself to art exhibitions and outside concerts etc thus making the venue multi-functional.</p> <p>Several Board Members undertook a recent site visit and advised that the collection was hugely impressive and deserved to be seen by a much wider audience. DR was impressed by the plans, thought and work that had gone into the project and, although it would offer only marginal economic benefit to Swindon, thought it was a great project and should receive support.</p> <p>Other discussions were:</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PB advised that the £1.35m allocated would be subject to conditions within the grant agreement, which would include a requirement to provide to the SWLEP the fund-raising strategy and plans to secure the long-term sustainability of the project; • a question was raised regarding the partnership agreements mentioned in the OBC and NE explained that the two other museums in Wiltshire, which held world-important collections at Salisbury and Devizes, would be linked to the museum and all would sign-post to each other. The story of 130 years of military activity on the Plain was not told anywhere else. He commented that access to Stonehenge was by timed slots, and whilst people had time on their hands, it would only be a short drive to Avon Camp to visit the museum. There would also be links into the Great West Way and partnerships with other military museums; • clarification was sought on timescales of the outputs; • PR for the project should not be just from a military perspective, but as tourist attraction and a stopping point on coach tours; • SWLEP support for the initial investment would attract other investors to the project; and • NE advised the meeting that the remaining initial funding was made up of two major donors of £1.6m each, RA and museum charity donations and that the gap of £2.25m would be found. <p>The Board: APPROVED £1.35m of funding for the Royal Artillery Museum project (subject to Independent Technical Advisor review of the business case and adherence to usual Assurance Framework requirements) with additional request for a plan for raising additional funding and evidence of the marketing plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Wiltshire Recovery Plan <p>TM presented to the meeting giving an overview of the plans to reposition the South Wiltshire economy. The presentation could be found on the SWLEP website of by following the link below.</p> <p>https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/19-sep-2018/swlep-board---south-wilts-presentation-19-september-2018.pdf?sfvrsn=b13a1206_6</p> <p>The aim was to diversify Salisbury's market place and address the global perceptions of the City and the wider South Wiltshire area. The retail and cultural offer were important assets, but the plans also looked at housing provision, Army Basing and transport investment.</p> <p>(SJ left at 10.55am)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Maltings and Central Carpark 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Richard Walters gave a presentation to the meeting on the need to re-phase The Malting and Central Car Park scheme. The presentation could be found on the SWLEP website of by following the link below.</p> <p>https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/19-sep-2018/lep-board---maltings-presentation---19-sep-18.pdf?sfvrsn=fddbe44c_4</p> <p>The re-phasing was proposed in the light of recent events in Salisbury and set in the context of a 5-10-year recovery plan. In addition, VisitWiltshire was leading work to develop a brand to promote the city nationally and internationally. The longer-term economic recovery plan would come back to the Board. Recovery had not stopped since the incident in March and support for businesses would continue to show the City was still open for business.</p> <p>In particular, JS thanked SBC for its proposed support to allocate £1.1m to Salisbury through the Recovery Plan as it was sorely needed. More events were required to keep the profile high and push the message that the City was safe, but these were expensive to hold. The community was keen to see something in hand. AC advised the meeting that tourism had dropped by 40% and footfall by 12%. The PR company, Heavenly, had been tasked with drafting an overall marketing plan.</p> <p>PB commented that larger, long-term strategic economic recovery was required and not smaller individual projects.</p> <p>Re-phasing the outcomes of the allocated £6.1m would mean that spend could be brought forward.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the revised scope for the use of the £6.1m allocated to the Maltings and Central Car Park project (subject to submission of a business case, review by an ITA and adherence to the usual Assurance Framework requirements); TASKED the SWLEP Programme Manager with identifying suitable alternative projects to use re-allocated funding within the LGF timescale constraints.</p>	
4.2	<p>Business Cases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ultrafast Broadband <p>ID spoke to the paper.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the Outline Business Case for Ultrafast Broadband, enabling the release of funding to support installation work.</p>	
4.3	<p>Commissioning Group Project Highlight reports</p> <p>The reports were taken as read and</p> <p>the Board:</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	AGREED that the highlight reports were an accurate representation of the current status of all LGF projects.	
4.4	<p>Ensuring project delivery and spend</p> <p>ID presented to the meeting. The presentation could be found on the SWLEP website of by following the link below.</p> <p>https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/19-sep-2018/ensuring-project-delivery-spend-4-4.pdf?sfvrsn=7fa17953_4</p> <p>LGF spend was running behind profile so the Board discussed how this could be managed, including the reallocation of funding, to bring other projects forward with the Board's agreement.</p> <p>In this context, underspend meant the programme was behind the spend profile. It did not mean there was unused funding to be re-allocated.</p> <p>ID provided the Board with the rationale for tightening the management of project spend. He mentioned the number of projects running behind schedule and the potential impact of projects not using their full allocation by March 2021. The proposal was to introduce a system to warn scheme promoters when projects were below spend profile, and then, if there were no significant improvement, remove the unused LGF allocation from the project. The mechanism of how this would be run, including the Board decision-making rules, would be brought to the November Board Meeting. The Board expressed its general agreement that new procedures were necessary, but it was keen to see the mechanics of how the proposal would be implemented.</p> <p>The Board: REQUESTED a detailed proposal paper for the Board Meeting in November 2018.</p>	Nov 2018
4.5	<p>Finance Report – Programme budgets</p> <p>There were no questions raised regarding the paper and it was taken as read.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the paper as an accurate summary of the current LGF financial position.</p>	
5.0	Strategic Developments	
5.1	<p>SWLEP Incorporation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquiring a legal personality; the SWLEP as an incorporated body 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>PB spoke to the paper. A slightly updated recommendation was included on the supplementary paper 5.1a circulated.</p> <p>Independent legal advice had been engaged by SWLEP to support the process; at present for Articles of Association only, but further elements would be investigated. The LEP Network and the Ministry of Housing, Community and Local Government (MHCLG) had established a joint steering group and subgroups to oversee the transition nationally.</p> <p>The Board discussion focussed on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the fact that funding support would be available from BEIS to assist the move to incorporation for which SWLEP could bid; • the role of elected officials and unitary officers as potential Directors of the new Company; • transition to the new Company and the position of existing Board Members; and • the relationship between the new Company and the Accountable Body, whichever LA took on that role. <p>The Board: APPROVED the proposal to establish the Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership as a company limited by guarantee; AUTHORISED the Director, working with the Chairman to implement the activities identified in paras 4.25 to 4.26 which will enable the SWLEP to attain a legal personality by becoming a company limited by guarantee on or before 1st April 2019; and AGREED to allocate a budget of up to £70,000, which will include some one-off costs in the 2018-19 financial year to establish the SWLEP as a company limited by guarantee.</p>	
<p>5.2</p>	<p>Economic Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Digital Strategy <p>GG spoke to the paper. He strongly believed it was a good piece of work, reflected the aims of the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and provided a good evidence base. It would act as a good springboard to take deliverables forward. GG would now refocus his attention to identify the specific investments that were needed for delivery.</p> <p>Thanks were extended to Debby Skellern for overall co-ordination of the project.</p> <p>The Board: AGREED to adopt the Swindon and Wiltshire Digital Capabilities Strategy 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update from Higher Education Task Group 	
<p>5.3</p>	<p>AB spoke to the paper with input from SB.</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>The prospectus for the multi-campus University was being drafted and would be presented at the November Board meeting for discussion and approval. The delivery of the University would start as a federated model in the first instance.</p> <p>The Department for Education had approved the proposal for Wiltshire College to be called a University Centre, although it would not have degree awarding powers at the start. Congratulations were offered to Wiltshire College on this status, which would lead to a change of branding in the future. The college would be looking to work in partnership with other businesses and organisations.</p> <p>With the SWLEP investment in Salisbury and Lackham campuses, Wiltshire College was now delivering six degrees, including a new life sciences degree coming on stream next year.</p> <p>In the short-term, the priority was the submission for Stage 2 of the Institute of Technology (IoT). This had been slightly delayed as the guidance documents for the bid process were still outstanding. It was considered to be an ambitious, but achievable plan.</p> <p>The Board: NOTED the progress to date.</p>	
6.0	SWLEP Core Activity	
6.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairman’s update <p>The list of meetings the Chairman had attended since the last meeting was in the published Board pack. No additional questions were raised.</p>	
6.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director’s Report <p>Activities were listed in the published Board pack and taken as read. No additional questions were raised.</p>	
7.0	AOB	
	None.	
	Date of next meeting / Closing remarks	
	<p>The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, 28 November 2018 at 9.30am in Committee Room 6, Swindon Borough Council Civic Offices, Euclid Street, Swindon, SN2 2JH.</p>	
	<p>Future Meetings</p> <p>Wednesday, 23 January 2019 – PLEASE NOTE AFTERNOON MEETING (1PM-4PM) Committee Rooms, Monkton Park, Chippenham, SN15 1ER</p> <p>PLEASE NOTE THAT WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF REVIEWING MEETING LOCATIONS.</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Wednesday, 20 March 2019 Kennet Room, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, BA14 8JN</p> <p>Thursday, 23 May 2019 Alamein Suite, City Hall, Malthouse Lane, Salisbury, SP2 7TU</p> <p>Wednesday, 24 July 2019 Ceres Hall, The Corn Exchange, Market Place, Devizes, SN10 1BN</p> <p>Thursday, 26 September 2019 Auditorium, Aspire Business Centre, Ordnance Road, Tidworth, SP9 7QD</p> <p>Wednesday, 27 November 2019 Location to be advised</p>	
	CLOSE of meeting 12.25pm.	

Sumner
28.11.2018



Submitted Questions

From CPRE Wiltshire, Charmian Spickernell, CPRE Wiltshire Vice Chair

Question One

We do have an overall query about how many jobs have been created in Wiltshire and Swindon in the last six years. This may be one that should be directed more at the Councils rather than SWELP although it is probably of interest to SWLEP?

Response

We use a national database called NOMIS. This the acronym that has replaced what was known as the National Online Manpower Information System. NOMIS is run by the Office of National Statistics (ONS). Unfortunately, ONS has changed the way it collects data so the two datasets are not continuous; there is 2012-2015 and then 2015-2016. You will see that the 2015 figures vary due to a change in the methodology so somewhere in the region of 35,000-38,000 more people were in employment in 2016 compared to 2012 which was the low point for the recession.

Employment also includes those which were self-employed over the VAT threshold, Managing Directors etc. Employees are those employed by a company excluding the former

Year	Employment BRES 2012-2015	Employment BRES 2015-2016	Employees BRES 2012-2015	Employees BRES 2015-2016
2012	294000		283,000	
2013	298000		288,000	
2014	313000		304,000	
2015	315000	318000	307,000	
2016		332000		323000
Change	Change 35,000-38,000		Change 37,000-40,000	

The table below shows economic, business and employment data across our Growth Zones.



Key Statistics	Swindon – M4 Zone	A350 Zone	Salisbury – A303 Zone	Chippenham and Corsham	Rest of Swindon and Wiltshire	SWLEP
GVA% SWLEP	55	24	13	7	15	-
Employees 2016	165,255	85,400	45,300	24,100	51,100	323,000
% employees in knowledge-based industries	23	19	25	16	14	21
No. businesses as % SWLEP	43.5	30.1	13.2	6.2	19.4	-
Total number of businesses	14,300	9,900	4,300	2,000	6,400	32,800
% micro (0-9 employees)	90.3	92.6	88.5	90.1	91.3	91.0
% small (10-49 employees)	7.8	6.0	9.7	7.9	6.8	7.3

Questions regarding Sadlers Mead

The SWLEP received email correspondence from 21 individuals prior to the Board Meeting regarding the Chippenham Station Hub, Sadlers Mead Project. These individuals were residents of the area, county and town councillors and a developer. The type of questions and concerns raised are listed below:

- the car park will be an eye-sore and will have a negative impact on the area;
- the car park will have a negative impact on house prices in the area;
- the car park will spoil the local environment, located next to an historic park in a Conservation Area;
- is the car park needed? It is not in the right place for people using the town centre;
- the car park will lead to an increase traffic on Station Hill and cause further congestion;
- the corner of the Sadlers Mead road passing the entrance to the car park is dangerous and a potential location for accidents;
- should we not be encouraging sustainable transport rather than catering for more cars on the roads; and
- the station area is already over-developed and does not require further development.

Individuals have received a response to their emails and a sample is attached.



15 November 2018

Via email

Dear

Sadlers Mead Car Park

Thank you very much for the email you sent prior to our September Board Meeting in relation to the planned car park on the Sadlers Mead site. The SWLEP received a number of emails on the subject, all covering similar themes, so I trust that the responses below cover the concerns raised in your correspondence.

The SWLEP also listened to the objections from three representatives of the local community at the Board Meeting. It was clarified that SWLEP funding for the project is dependent on a successful planning application and that the planning process would consider any objections to the scheme. When it comes to the planning application for a SWLEP-funded scheme, it is the responsibility of the scheme promoter (in this case Wiltshire Council) to submit a scheme as part of the planning process. While not responsible for design details, the SWLEP is keen to ensure that all stakeholder views are heard as part of the planning process, and for this scheme has specifically directed the scheme promoter to ensure that wide public consultation is carried out.

Yours sincerely

Patrick Bradley

Paddy Bradley
Director



1. The car park will be an eye-sore and will have a negative impact on the area.

Clearly the issue of whether the car park is an eye-sore is a subjective one, but the design team has been very conscious that multi-storey car park design has a poor reputation. The intention is therefore to clad the car park with natural materials sympathetic to the surrounding area. Also, that planting alongside the car park will be maximised to provide as much natural screening as possible.

The car park will be managed by Wiltshire Council, which will look to prevent any anti-social behaviour issues through their normal countermeasures.

2. The car park will have a negative impact on house prices in the area.

The car park is part of the wider Chippenham Station development scheme, which aims to improve facilities and the public realm in the station to cater for future forecast increases in passenger numbers. As the neighbourhood develops into a vibrant area of business and education, coupled with the electrification of the Great Western line, our view is that these improvements will increase house prices, rather than reduce them.

3. The car park will spoil the local environment, located next to an historic park in a Conservation Area.

The suitability of the location of the car park with regards to any designations in the area will be assessed as part of the planning application.

4. Is the car park needed? It is not in the right place for people using the town centre.

The Sadlers Mead scheme is part of a wider project to improve Chippenham Station and its surrounding area, in particular to address the forecast increased numbers of rail passengers using the station and the associated demand for extra car parking spaces. As such, we see the Sadlers Mead site as a suitable location for station car parking as well as for the Olympiad and other facilities in the immediate area. It is not specifically intended for use by visitors to the town centre, though they could do so if they wished.

5. The car park will lead to an increase traffic on Station Hill and cause further congestion.

A traffic survey has been carried out and will be scrutinised as part of the planning application process. The results of this survey will be a key element of determining how many spaces will be acceptable in the car park.



6. The corner of the Sadlers Mead road passing the entrance to the car park is dangerous and a potential location for accidents.

The suitability of the location of the car park with regards to safety will be assessed as part of the planning application. There are a number of measures that can be implemented, such as road furniture, signage etc, to ensure that the design of the area meets safety requirements.


7. Should we not be encouraging sustainable transport rather than catering for more cars on the roads.

The SWLEP is a keen promoter of sustainable transport and has invested in a number of cycling and bus schemes in the Swindon and Wiltshire area. We have also recently commissioned a Local Energy Strategy which, amongst other things, will look at how the development of hydrogen and electric-powered vehicles can be supported in the area.

The car park is a necessary part of encouraging more people to use the train, which we do see as a key part of a sustainable transport approach, especially with the current electrification programme. Also, one of the phases of the wider Chippenham Station project is improving the station forecourt to improve the access for buses serving the station and also the facilities for cyclists using the station.

8. The station area is already over-developed and does not require further development

The amount of development in the area will be considered as part of the planning application process. The aim of the overall Chippenham Station project funded by the SWLEP is to develop a vibrant area of business and education around the station which we think will improve the area and provide a gateway to the town that does it justice.

	<p style="margin: 0;">Board Meeting 28 November 2018 Paper Number 4.1</p>
---	--

Security Level:	Confidential <input type="checkbox"/>	Restricted <input type="checkbox"/>	Unclassified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Commercially Sensitive <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	---

Meeting & Date:	SWLEP Board Meeting – Wednesday, 28 November 2018		
Subject:	Highlight Reports		
Attachments:	None		
Author:	Ian Durston	Total no of sheets: (inc cover sheet)	14

Papers are provided for:	Approval <input type="checkbox"/>	Discussion <input type="checkbox"/>	Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

1. Purpose

Highlight reports on the status of each LGF project (and other LEP projects) are presented to the SWLEP Board in order to communicate the status of all projects and to demonstrate that projects are being managed in line with the LEP Assurance Framework. The highlight reports produced for each project that have been reviewed and approved by the SWLEP Commissioning Group. Copies of the individual highlight reports can be found on the SWLEP website by clicking on the 'SWLEP Project Summary Report' icon at the top of the page on the following link:

<https://swlep.co.uk/projects>

2. Summary

Six projects have been identified by the Steer Davies Gleave review as 'focus' projects that warrant specific attention in this summary. They are:

Chippenham Station Hub

Initial development work is commencing on the Phase 5 (Station Forecourt) and Phase 1b (Northern Access Lift).

For phase 2, a Heads of Terms has been agreed with Good Energy for their building on Sadlers Mead and a planning application has now been submitted for this and the car park on the same site. Objections to this phase of the project (particularly the car park) were raised by local residents at the September SWLEP Board meeting. There is a risk that the traffic survey carried out will require traffic mitigation

measures to be included as part of the project, with an associated cost. It has been decided not to include a basement level in the design.

Work is being carried out by WSP, in conjunction with GWR and Network Rail, to look at different options for the phase 3 and 4 car parks to the north and south of the railway line (e.g. using modular construction to allow for later additions) which may result in some work now being feasible on the phases within the overall £16m budget.

A350 Yarnbrook / West Ashton

Funding to cover the associated cost increase has been successfully granted by the Housing Infrastructure Fund. Completion of the clarification process with Homes England/Deloitte/Cushman & Wakefield is still ongoing (started in March 2018). Work on the Section 106 agreement is in progress. The procurement process for a construction contractor is underway – due for completing in December 2018.

Salisbury Central Car Park and Maltings

A proposal put to the September Board to use the £6.1m of LGF funding to work for plots closer to the Maltings Shopping Centre was agreed and work is now progressing on this basis. An Outline Business Case is being developed for approval at the January 2019 Board meeting and a planning submission is to be made in December 2018.

Swindon Bus Boulevard

A change control for the project was approved at the September Commissioning Group detailing the revised elements of the project that the LGF funding will be spent on (surveys, design, temporary bus station delivery), the associated milestones and the associated financial profiling. Some of this work (construction work to support the temporary bus facility) is now able to be carried out earlier than expected, which will be to the benefit of the overall LEP spend profile.

However, for the overall project, estimated costs have increased, specifically for the diversion of telecommunications cables running along Fleming Way. This has added a significant risk to the project.

New Eastern Villages

Southern Connector Rd – The Housing Infrastructure Fund application is progressing with a business case to be submitted in December. A change control is being submitted to this Commissioning Group for re-profiled milestone dates and acceleration of associated activities. However, a number of risks remain and are increasing in severity:

- HIF funding is not yet secured;

- land assembly is still in progress, with any objections leading to a CPO process;
- planning submission has not yet been made; and
- agreement on technical matters required from third parties (Environment Agency, Highways England).

A420/Gablecross - Land acquisition is still in progress. A change control is being submitted to the Commissioning Group for re-profiled milestone dates and acceleration of associated activities.

Wichelstowe Southern Access

The procurement process for the project is in progress with the tender documentation now issued and a contractor forecast to be appointed by February 2019. Construction is on track for completion by March 2021.

Highlight Reports are available for all other projects. The following statistics summarise the status across all of the projects:

- Six LGF projects have completed
- There are 19 live LGF projects covered by the highlight reports
- Five projects (26%) are rated GREEN
- Six projects (32%) are rated AMBER GREEN
- Two projects (10%) are rated AMBER RED
- Six projects (32%) are rated RED
- Four projects have improved their RAG rating since the last report, and two have deteriorated.

3. Recommendations

The Board is asked to approve that the highlight reports are an accurate representation of the current status of all LGF projects.

Local Growth Fund – Focus Projects

Project Ref	Project Name	Lead Delivery Partner	Previous	Current	Notes
LGF/1617/004/CSH	Chippenham Station Hub	WC	R	AR	Initial development work is commencing on the Phase 5 (Station Forecourt) and Phase 1b (Northern Access Lift). Phase 2 planning application has now been submitted. Work now being carried out to investigate possible approach to phases 3 and 4 (car parks to north and south of railway).
LGF/1617/009/YWA	A350 Yarnbrook/ West Ashton	WC	G	G	Work is progressing to procure building contractor. Clarification process for HIF fund is still ongoing (started March 2018).
LGF/1718/003/CCPM	Salisbury Central Car Park and Maltings	WC	R	G	An Outline Business Case is being developed for approval at the January 2019 Board meeting and a planning submission is to be made in December 2018.
LGF/1617/008/SBX	Swindon Bus Boulevard	SBC	R	AR	Project re-baselined following approval of new scope for LGF element. However, for the overall project, estimated costs have increased, adding a significant risk to the project.
LGF/1516/003/EV (iv)	New Eastern Villages Southern Connector Road	SBC	R	R	The Housing Infrastructure Fund application is progressing with a business case to be submitted in December. A change control is being submitted to this Commissioning Group for re-profiled milestone dates and acceleration of associated activities. However, a number of risks remain and are increasing in severity.
LGF/1516/003/EV (iii)	New Eastern Villages A420 Gablecross	SBC	R	R	Land acquisition is still in progress. A change control is being submitted to this Commissioning Group for re-profiled milestone dates and acceleration of associated activities.
LGF/1617/002/WI	Wichelstowe Southern Access	SBC	AR	AG	The procurement process for the project is in progress with the tender documentation now issued and a contractor forecast to be appointed by February 2019. Construction is on track for completion by March 2021.

Local Growth Fund (Growth Deals 1 and 2)					
Project Ref	Project Name	Lead Delivery Partner	Previous	Current	Notes
LGF/1516/001/A350	A350 Improvements	WC	Complete	Complete	
LGF/1516/002/A429	A429 Malmesbury	WC	Complete	Complete	
LGF/1516/004/PSP	Porton Science Park	WC	Complete	Complete	
LGF/1617/001/A350	A350 Dualling Bypass (Badger – Brook + Chequers)	WC	AG	AG	In final stages. Small slippage due to electrical connection works. Forecast completion in November 2018.
LGF/1617/007/MH	Mansion House (Corsham)	WC	G	G	In final stages of construction - completion forecast for November 2018. Focus now on model to operate the facility going forward - George Gill and Shahina Johnson involved in working group.
LGF/16/17/010/JNC17	M4 J17 Capacity Improvement	WC	Complete	Complete	
LGF/1617/009/UFB	Ultra Fast Broadband	WC	AG	AG	Build underway, though review underway of sites to be included following the wider deployment of Superfast in the area prior to this project.
LGF/1516/005/LSTF	LGF Sustainable Transport Package	SBC	AG	AG	Construction work on Queens Drive toucan crossing is now complete. Spring Gardens footway-cycleway to complete December 2018.
LGF/1617/003/SRT	Swindon Rapid	SBC	AR	R	Construction work on all elements of Wichelstowe phase in

	Transit				progress but behind original schedule. Development work in progress on Tadpole Farm and NEV schemes.
LGF/1617/006/JNC16	M4 Junction 16	SBC	Complete	Complete	
LGF/1617/010/SPHC	Royal Artillery Museum	WC	N/A	G	Detailed design beginning and tender documentation for build phase to be published in November 2018.
LGF/1617/011/SMAG	Swindon Museum and Art Gallery	SBC			Project under review – proposal for scope of use of £250,000 LGF money to be submitted to November Board meeting.

Local Growth Fund (Growth Deal 3)					
Project Ref	Project Name	Lead Delivery Partner	Previous	Current	Notes
LGF/1718/001/WCS	Wiltshire College - Salisbury	Wiltshire College	AG	AG	Refurbishment work (contract 1) contractor now on site. New build (contract 2) procurement in progress.
LGF/1718/002/WCL	Wiltshire College - Lackham	Wiltshire College	G	G	Stage 2 design work awarded to AWW and underway. Planning application in development.

Department for Transport – LGF (Growth Deal 1)

Project Ref	Project Name	Lead Delivery Partner	Previous	Current	Notes
LGF/1516/003/EV (i)	New Eastern Villages - Great Stall Bridge	SBC	AG	R	Change Control being submitted to this Commissioning Group to defer project and move funding to White Hart Junction and Gable Cross projects.
LGF/1516/003/EV (iia)	New Eastern Villages - Greenbridge Roundabout (Package 1)	SBC	Complete	Complete	
LGF/1516/003/EV (iib)	New Eastern Villages -West of A419 (Package 2)	SBC	AG	AG	Work progressing on business case.

Department for Transport - Retained					
Project Ref	Project Name	Lead Delivery Partner	Previous	Current	Notes
LGF/1516/003/EV (v)	New Eastern Villages White Hart Junction	SBC	R	R	Change Control being submitted to this Commissioning Group for revised milestones and accelerated associated activities. Significant risks becoming more severe: land assembly, work with Network Rail.
LGF/1516/003/EV (vi)	New Eastern Villages Business Case	SBC	R	R	OBC due to be submitted to January 2019 Board Meeting.

City Deal

Project Ref	Project Name	Lead Delivery Partner	Previous	Current	Notes
LGF/1516/006/CD	Higher Futures	WC & SBC	AG	AG	Target numbers of learners remain a challenge – increasing but behind profile. Achieved over 230 learners on higher and degree apprenticeships.

Careers and Enterprise Company (CEC)

Project Ref	Project Name	Lead Delivery Partner	Previous	Current	Notes
LEP/GEN/001/CEC	Enterprise Advisor Network	WC & SBC	G	G	59 schools/colleges & 50 Enterprise Advisers engaged. Focussed on getting schools/colleges to assess their careers provision against the Gatsby benchmarks. Shona Taylor appointed to run Careers Hub (for schools to share experience).

Department of Business Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS)

Project Ref	Project Name	Lead Delivery Partner	Previous	Current	Notes
LEP/GEN/002/GH	Growth Hub	LEP	G	G	Currently focussing on development of telephone triage service and face to face service, and piloting a physical presence in Salisbury.

Growing Places Infrastructure Fund (GPIF)					
Project Ref	Project Name	Lead Delivery Partner	Previous	Current	Notes
LEP/GPIF/001/CAS	GPIF – Castledown Business Park	WC	Complete	Complete	£2.54m loan now repaid.
LEP/GPIF/002/WD	GPIF – Woods Group	Woods Group	AG	AG	£1,279,235 loan agreement re-signed post issues with security. Repayment to SWLEP by end March 2021.




Key

Project Status

	Red	Amber Red	Amber Green	Green
	R	AR	AG	G

See below for RAG rating methodology

Direction of Travel

-  Project status expected to remain same going forward
-  Project status expected to improve going forward
-  Project status expected to get worse going forward

Milestones

BLUE – complete, **GREEN** - on track, **AMBER** - at risk, **RED** – will be late/is late.

RAG Rating

		Impact			
		1 (Low)	2	3	4 (High)
Probability	4 (Likely)				
	3				
	2				
	1 (Unlikely)				

The RAG reporting is based on the composite elements of probability and impact (see chart to the left) and splits in to the following categories:

- **GREEN:** Project considered being on track, to time, quality and cost.
- **AMBER-GREEN:** Project considered at risk of minor to medium impacts on time, scope and/or cost – requires small mitigating action.
- **AMBER-RED:** Project considered at risk of medium to major impacts on time, scope and/or cost – requires mitigating action.
- **RED:** Project considered at serious risk of significant impact on time, scope and/or cost. Immediate mitigating action required.

RAG Scoring

RAG rating	Cost	Scope	Time
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor cost variance on initial project cost may be present. • <1% change in total project cost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliverables and project scope remains unaltered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor project slippage may be present but total project delivery remains on track. • <30 days total slippage.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is experiencing or expected to experience minor cost increases. • >1% but <5% on total project cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is experiencing or is expected to experience small changes to scope and outputs delivered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is experiencing or is expected to experience slippage. • >30 days but <90days total project slippage
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is experiencing or is expected to experience major increases in total project costs • >5% but <10% on total project cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is experiencing or is expected to experience major changes to scope and outputs delivered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is experiencing major slippage and is due to deliver the project outputs and outcomes late. • >90 days slippage but <6 Months total project slippage.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is experiencing or is expected to experience significant and major cost increases. • >10% on total project cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is experiencing or is expected to experience significant change to scope and outputs delivered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is suffering significant and major delays to delivery. • >6 Months total project slippage.

Principles of Overall Project RAG Status

- The 'lowest' rating against any of the 3 areas of Cost, Scope or Time will be used for the overall project RAG rating.

