



swindonwiltshire

Local Enterprise Partnership

Wiltshire Council
Where everybody matters



SWINDON
BOROUGH COUNCIL

AGENDA

Meeting: Joint Strategic Economic Committee (SWLEP)
Place: Committee Room A - Wiltshire Council Offices, Monkton Park,
Chippenham SN15 1ER
Date: Thursday 21 February 2019
Time: 9.30 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 (Chair)	Leader of Wiltshire Council
Cllr Russell Holland	Swindon Cabinet Member for Finance
Cllr John Thomson	Wiltshire Council, Deputy Leader, and Cabinet Member for Communications, Communities, Leisure and Libraries
Cllr Oliver Donachie	Swindon Cabinet Member for Economy and Skills
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 Council 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 Council Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Waste
Cllr Toby Sturgis Wiltshire Council Cabinet Member for Spatial Planning, Development Management and Property

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 - 82)**

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, 19th September 2018, 28th November 2019 and the draft minutes from 23rd January 2019.

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 14 February 2019 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 18 February 2019. 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 Board Updates** *(Pages 83 - 96)*

To receive highlight reports on SWLEP projects.

7 **Date of the Next Meeting**

To confirm the date of the next meeting as 20th March 2019.

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 Martiensen (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>was asked whether it would consider discussing with neighbouring LEPs the possibilities and benefits of combining in any way. The Board's view was to implement the core recommendations of the Ministerial Review, particularly in respect of incorporation. The Director had been making contact with neighbouring LEPs to access their views and would continue to build on existing relationships.</p> <p>The Industrial Strategy placed great emphasis on productivity as in contrast to previous policy direction which tended to have been mainly focussed on increasing job numbers. There was then a discussion about profitability and better margins possibly being a better indicator of improvement than productivity.</p> <p>It was noted that in SWLEP democratic scrutiny was achieved through the engagement of the Joint Strategic Economic Committee (JSEC) and the Joint Scrutiny Task Group.</p> <p>When asked what the Government's expectations were of the Local Authorities in this regard, the response was that these partnerships are crucial for LEPs and provide political accountability and statutory regulation. An independent role with a separate secretariat function would increase transparency. The move towards incorporated status and maintaining the relationships would be challenging, but not impossible, with collaboration being key.</p> <p>The timeline to move to incorporation was tight, but the LEP Network had put together a Steering Group for the project with six Subgroups, which included geography and incorporation status. Advice from Legal teams would be sought, particularly with regard to the impact and liabilities for private Board Members.</p> <p>The Board: AGREED to confirm its view on the question of geography; AGREED to draft a full, written response on Ministerial Review setting out how we perform; and AGREED to draft a full, detailed proposal for incorporation, all for the September Board Meeting.</p> <p>Joe Manning left the meeting at 11.55am.</p>	<p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p>Sept 2018</p> <p>Sept 2018</p> <p>Sept 2018</p>
<p>5.0 5.1</p>	<p>Local Growth Deal Commissioning Group Project Highlight Report ID spoke to the paper and advised that a full summary of the Highlight Reports appears on the SWLEP website. Questions were raised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PW sought reassurance that the projects currently rated RED were 	<p></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>	
<p>8.0</p>	<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.	

Immer
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	
	<p>The meeting opened at 9.45am. JM welcomed attendees to the meeting. In particular welcomes were extended to:</p> <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		
	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>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.



Attending:	Board Members Amanda Burnside (AB) Doug Gale (DG) Shahina Johnson (SJ) John Mortimer (JM) - Chairman Alex Reed (AR) David Renard (DR) Peter Wragg (PW) – Deputy Chairman	In attendance Paddy Bradley (PB) Ian Durston (ID) Karen Leigh (KL), BEIS Tim Martienssen (TM) Philippa Venables (PV)
	Board Advisors Alistair Cunningham (AC) Susie Kemp (SK)	
	Board Observers Cllr Pauline Church (PCh) Cllr Oliver Donachie (OD)	
Apologies:	Baroness Scott of Bybrook OBE (JS) Adam Schallamach (AS) Col Andrew Dawes (AD) Mark Smith (MS) Leanne Sykes (LS), Wiltshire Council	
Guest(s):	Debby Skellern (DS), SWLEP Chris Ashton – representing Leanne Sykes Tim Dobrashian (TD), Wiltshire Council, Interim Director Economic Recovery Jeremy Holt - Clark Holt solicitors Phil Clement, SWLEP	
Chair:	John Mortimer	
Minutes:	Deborah House (DKH)	
Location:	Committee Room 6, Civic Offices, Swindon Borough Council, Euclid Street, Swindon, SN1 2JH	

Item	Narrative	Deadline
1.0	Welcome / Apologies / Conflicts of Interest	
	<p>The meeting opened at 9.45am. JM welcomed attendees to the meeting. In particular, welcomes were extended to Rick Kavanagh, who was representing Col Dawes, Chris Ashton, who was representing Leanne Sykes, Karen Leigh, the area representative from BEIS, Tom Dobrashian, the newly-appointed Interim Director of Economic Recovery from Wiltshire Council and Jeremy Holt from Clark Holt solicitors, who would be presenting in Part 2 of the meeting. Apologies were noted.</p> <p>JM reminded attendees of the Conflict of Interests policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> and re-iterated his Conflict regarding Junction 17 and with a potential beneficiary of a GPIF loan; 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PW stated his Conflict regarding the LGF General Account for the Royal Artillery Museum (RAM); • AR and SJ stated their Conflict regarding the IoT, as both Catalent and Create Studios were named partners; • AB stated her Conflict regarding LGF3 and the ongoing projects for Wiltshire College at the Salisbury and Lackham campuses. <p>The Chairman advised the Board that Jonathan Webber had tendered his resignation. His businesses were expanding with a lot of international travel and he was unable to commit time to SWLEP. He would continue to work with SWLEP on the management of unmanned aircraft and aerospace. The Chairman would be writing to thank him for his support.</p> <p>SJ announced that she would also be stepping down and that this was her last Board Meeting. This was purely because of the capacity pressure on the Create Studios' team and she would like to continue to support the SWLEP as a technical advisor around the culture, digital, and place-shaping areas.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked SJ for her contribution over the past three and a half years and looked forward to continuing to work with her.</p>	
2.0	Review of Minutes and Matters Arising	
2.1	The minutes of the Board Meeting held on 19 September 2018 were reviewed and approved with a minor amendment on Page 1.	
2.2	<p>Matters Arising not on the agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board Members had received a copy of the SWLEP response to the question of potential LEP mergers raised by the Ministerial Review; • the Outline Business Case for Chippenham Station Hub would be covered under LGF reports; • identifying alternative projects in the pipeline in Salisbury and other SWLEP areas, where re-allocated funding could be used, was a Work in Progress which could be presented to the Board at the next meeting; • the “ensuring project delivery and spend” paper was not ready to be brought to this meeting, but would be brought to a future meeting; and • an update on the Institute of Technology (IoT) was given in the Director’s Report. A Stage 2 bid had been submitted and the effort underpinning the bid had been fantastic. The area had a strong case, with a good collective approach. Interviews would be held in February 2019 and, if invited, this would be seen as a good sign. The decision was anticipated in March 2019. 	Jan 2019
3.0	<p>Submitted Question</p> <p>A question had been received from Charmian Spickernell, representing CPRE, regarding Energy, the response to which had already been circulated. Mrs</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Spickernell had been unable to attend the meeting in person. A further question from her had been received regarding the production of a strategic plan to cover the area around M4 Junction 17 which serves Chippenham and Hullavington. It had not been received however in time for a response to be tabled at the meeting. SWLEP would involve Wiltshire Council colleagues in drafting a response.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked Mrs Spickernell for her additional question and advised that a private briefing on area plans was expected for Board members at the January meeting.</p>	<p>Jan 2019</p>
4.0	Local Growth Deal	
4.1	<p>Commissioning Group Project Highlight Reports</p> <p>ID spoke to the paper.</p> <p>Chippenham Station Hub Phases 5 (public realm / forecourt) and 1b (lift) of the project were underway. Phase 2 of the project included the multi-storey car park and office building at Sadlers Mead and a Heads of Terms had now been signed with Good Energy for its office building. The traffic survey had been completed and had shown pressures on the junction at the bottom of Station Hill, which would be mitigated with traffic lights. A comment was added which stated that any growth would put pressure on traffic systems. ID would seek clarification from the project team regarding from where the funding for traffic mitigation would be provided. Phases 3 and 4 concerned car parking to the north of the station. Phase 3 would take a modular approach to a decked car park, but delivery timescales would be tight</p> <p>Yarnbrook The procurement process is underway for the contractor to be in place early next year. Still awaiting HIF clarification on funding.</p> <p>Action: Letters from SWLEP Chairman and BEIS representative to Homes England were offered to try to speed up the process.</p> <p>Salisbury and The Maltings Refocused funding was agreed at the last Board meeting. The Outline Business Case was being developed by Wiltshire Council in discussion with the Independent Technical Advisor (ITA), to present to the Board Meeting in January 2019. The planning submission was in progress, with the developer hoping to submit before Christmas.</p> <p>Swindon Bus Boulevard SWLEP funding for this project had been refocused on earlier up-front supporting work. A temporary bus facility to be in place and telecommunications infrastructure on Fleming Way to be moved. This had</p>	<p>Dec 2018</p> <p>Jan 2019</p>



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>led to a revised schedule with work accelerated. SBC was made aware that it needed to part-fund any overruns to the project. SBC was also in the final stage of negotiations with Zurich to be the Anchor tenant for Kimmerfields.</p> <p>Southern Connector Road The archaeological finds on site had delayed this project. The HIF business case was being submitted in December to Homes England and the decision was anticipated in March.</p> <p>Action: KL would pick up with Homes England.</p> <p>PV indicated an error in the paper, as the Change Control Notification was not due until January 2019 as SBC was now working towards a later timeline.</p> <p>A420 Gablecross A Change Control Notification for this project would be discussed later as part of Paper 4.3. The land acquisition was still in progress.</p> <p>Wichelstowe Southern Access Five submissions had been received for contractors to start operating in 2019. The project was progressing to schedule.</p> <p>Three projects were nearing completion, these being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corsham Mansion House, with a meeting to hand over the keys shortly. A question was raised on how this would be operated going forward; • A350 dualling due for completion shortly; and • LGF Sustainable Transport would complete in the next few weeks. <p>Outside LGF projects, ID also mentioned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Futures The Higher Futures programme had recent successes, with numbers picking up, particularly within Higher Level and Degree apprenticeships. • Growth Hub The Growth Hub was developing a bid for ERDF funding to support the face-to-face, start up and scale up service. <p>AR asked what the consistent themes were across the four projects which had improved. The response was that the project teams had worked hard to engage partners and focussed closely on delivery. There had been good engagement with GWR and Network Rail. The possible withdrawal of funding and the deadline of March 2021 mentioned at the previous meeting may have focussed their minds.</p>	<p>Dec 2018</p> <p>Jan 2019</p>
4.2	Finance Report – Programme budgets	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>ID spoke to the paper. The situation was as reported at the previous Board Meeting with an increase in actual spend in each of the project areas, but the forecast remained the same with an underspend £14m. Projects have been through the Change Control Notification processes.</p> <p>There were ongoing discussions on the use of the additional £90k funding from BEIS mentioned in the paper as to whether to put it to incorporation costs or into Growth Hub. This was still to be decided.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the paper as an accurate summary of the current LGF financial position.</p>	
4.3	<p>New Eastern Villages (NEV)</p> <p>SK spoke to paper. Swindon Borough Council (SBC) was seeking Board approval to refocus the funding within the New Eastern Villages projects to concentrate on the delivery of White Hart Junction and Gablecross by delaying the delivery of the Great Stall Bridge project beyond the timeline for SWLEP funding. As this was an unretained scheme, and was LGF-funded, so SWLEP could reallocate monies with the approval of the Board. There was discussion around the reallocation, with the overall feeling that the NEV project had originally been seen as a whole, so that the money was still within the same pot.</p> <p>The Chairman made clear that the SWLEP would be under no obligation to make funding available in the future for the Great Stall Bridge project, either in the current LGF programme or in future funding programmes. Future applications would be judged on their own merits and weighed against alternative applications for use of resources.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the change controls as submitted with the caveat that there would be no further funding for the Great Stall Bridge from current LGF rounds.</p>	
4.4	<p>Swindon Museum & Art Gallery (SMAG)</p> <p>SK / PV spoke to the paper. The Board had granted £250k at its previous Board Meeting for Swindon Borough Council to work up a proposal to house its world-class collection of modern art and thus support the growth of culture in the town centre.</p> <p>There was discussion on whether digitisation of the collection would enable it to be shared globally.</p> <p>The Board: NOTED the progress of the reallocation of £250,000 to support development of a new scheme which meets the objectives of</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	housing Swindon's art collection while developing a strong and compelling cultural offer in Swindon's town centre.	
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 <p>PB spoke to the paper and gave an update on progress. The LEP Geography paper had been submitted in September, and the Implementation Plan and request for extra funding had been submitted in October. The £200k request for the remainder of FY18/19 must be drawn down for spend by March 2019. We were expecting to hear about this further funding in December. A further tranche of this additional funding would also be made available for FY 19/20 and we were waiting to hear the deadline date for submission for this.</p> <p>SWLEP was on track for incorporation in January 2019. This would constitute a temporary measure, with a shadow company of two Directors and a single member, and at that point it would not be fully operational. SWLEP had sought the appropriate independent legal advice and the solicitors would give a presentation in the closed Part 2 session of the meeting for existing Board Members. It was anticipated that the operating costs for the new entity would be higher than currently, so an Operating Model would be brought back to the Board for discussion.</p> <p>The unique position of Col Andrew Dawes as a serving member of the Armed Forces to be a Board Director would be discussed in the Part 2 session.</p> <p>The Board: NOTED the progress made towards SWLEP becoming a company limited by guarantee; and NOTED the next steps and timeline.</p>	
5.2	<p>Economic Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy Strategy <p>MS had chaired the group, but his apologies were given today. Instead, PB spoke to the paper. A £40k grant had been obtained from BEIS to carry out the work. The main priorities were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • grid connections and grid capacity - alleviate and mitigate these issues; • SWLEP's Unique Selling Point (USP) was the established Hydrogen technology development work already taking place in the area. Hydrogen had potential to be a major fuel and energy source of the future; • new energy vehicles; • to be able to refuel all along the M4 corridor; 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more charging mechanisms throughout the area; and • a low-carbon approach. <p>The key areas to be targeted were still being worked on and would be brought back to the Board in January with proposed targets and any amendments to investment priorities. Thereafter SWLEP would look at funding possibilities.</p> <p>The South West Energy Hub was based in Bristol. SWLEP was fully engaged to make the case for resources to be directed to our area.</p> <p>The Energy Strategy contributed to our overall inward investment approach as it would be part of the draw of the area to ensure new development sites featured energy from renewable sources combined with security of supply.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the strategic priorities of the Swindon and Wiltshire Local Energy Strategy; REQUIRED a further report to be presented at the Board meeting in January 2019 for approval which includes a suite of appropriate targets and an updated set of actions.</p>	Jan 2019
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. PB directed the Board Members' attention particularly to the sections on the annual performance review and the emerging rail strategy. A progress report on the strategy's status would be given in January with the final report due in March 2019.</p> <p>No additional questions were raised.</p>	
7.0	AOB	
	None.	
	Date of next meeting / Closing remarks	
	The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, 23 January 2018 at 1pm in the Committee Rooms, Monkton Park, Chippenham, SN15 1ER.	
	<p>Future Meetings</p> <p>Wednesday, 20 March 2019 Kennet Room, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, BA14 8JN</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>PLEASE NOTE THAT WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF REVIEWING MEETING LOCATIONS.</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>Close of Public Meeting at 11.05am.</p>	
	<p>PART TWO – Board Workshop</p>	
<p>8.0</p>	<p>Acquiring a legal personality; the SWLEP as an incorporated body</p> <p>Jeremy Holt, from Clark Holt solicitors, spoke to the meeting. He had been engaged to assist SWLEP in the process of incorporation and was present at the meeting to explain the differences between the current SWLEP structure and the incorporated organisation and how this would impact on the roles and responsibilities of the current Board Members should they choose to move forward with the new structure.</p> <p>There was much helpful discussion and JH offered to speak to Members in confidence should there be any further questions at any stage of the process and beyond.</p> <p>The main objective was to ascertain whether existing Board Members wished to remain as Directors of the newly-incorporated body.</p> <p>Action: SWLEP Director to request confirmation of intentions from existing Board Members stood as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Dec 2018</p>
<p>9.0</p>	<p>Growing Places Infrastructure Fund (GPIF)</p> <p>The Chairman handed over the chairing of the meeting to the Deputy Chairman owing to his Conflicts of Interest already detailed under item 1.0.</p> <p>AR spoke to the paper and updated the Board on the status of the GPIF loan applications from the open call in May 2018. Of the five applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • three had been successful and were progressing to loan agreements and payment schedules; • one had been withdrawn; and • one was still under negotiation. This would be brought back to the Board in due course. 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Of the £100k Salisbury Regeneration Grant, all the funds had now been taken up. One Salisbury company was about to submit its final bid for GPIF loan shortly.</p> <p>SWLEP was looking to undertake more calls in the future which would be smaller, in the region of £250k - £1m.</p> <p>The Deputy Chairman then handed back proceedings to the Chairman to continue.</p> <p>The Board: NOTED the update regarding the loans from the Growing Places Infrastructure Fund (GPIF) since the May 2018 'call'; and NOTED the update on current capital grants to businesses in Salisbury and Amesbury as part of the recovery programme.</p>	
Close of Part Two of Meeting at 12.50pm		


23.01.17.

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

QUESTION ONE

The Energy storage installation already established in Swindon is well-sited on a brownfield site. Will SWLEP be considering the environmental needs as well as the economic needs when looking at the siting for energy storage installations?

RESPONSE

We will consider environmental needs as well as a range of other needs including social and economic impacts. The adoption of the Energy Strategy will involve a greater emphasis on environmental impacts in business case assessment.

QUESTION TWO (received too late to provide a response prior to the meeting)

Please can SWLEP encourage the production of a Plan to cover the area round M4 J17 which serves Chippenham and Hullavington? CPRE has concerns that this area is at present being left vulnerable, without a plan that would provide for the different uses that are needed for the area and would take into account the implications of development for transport, the environment and landscape.

Without a plan, the area is left vulnerable to cherry-picking from the highest bidder, regardless of the long term cumulative effects, some of which could be adverse for local communities.

We hope Wiltshire Council will be encouraged to bring forward a Plan in the forthcoming review and that a plan will be consulted on without delay.

RESPONSE (provided after the meeting)

The SWLEP has demonstrated its interest in the development possibilities around Junction 17. We would not want unfettered development and would encourage a strategic approach taking into account a range of factors affecting the area, including the impact on the environment.

Wiltshire Council is managing the process of its Local Plan Review and has provided the following comment:

The Local Plan Review will establish the amount of new employment land required in Wiltshire and will include a site selection process to decide which sites are to be allocated for employment. This will include considering the evidence set out in the Employment Land Review, but will also have regard to other issues including highways,



sustainable transport and landscape. The Local Plan process goes through several stages before a plan and the allocations within it are formally adopted.

It is too early to say whether land at M4 Junction 17 will be allocated as part of the Local Plan Review.

The Council is required to consult with relevant bodies on strategic matters to be addressed in the Local Plan, including the Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership.

Information on the review of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (known as the Local Plan Review) and the proposed Joint Spatial Framework can be found on the Council's website at <http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/planning-policy-local-plan-review>



In attendance:	Board Members: Amanda Burnside (AB) – left at 3.55pm Doug Gale (DG) John Mortimer (JM) – Chairman Alex Reed (AR) David Renard (DR) Adam Schallamach (AS) Mark Smith (MS) Peter Wragg (PW) – Deputy Chairman	Board Advisers and Observers: Paddy Bradley (PB) Cllr Pauline Church (PCh) - representing Baroness Scott of Bybrook OBE (JS) Alistair Cunningham (AC) – arrived at 1.25pm and left at 3pm Ian Durston (ID) Karen Leigh, BEIS Tim Martienssen (TM) Philippa Venables (PV)
Apologies:	Baroness Scott of Bybrook OBE (JS) Col Andrew Dawes (AD) Susie Kemp Cllr Oliver Donachie	
Guest(s):	Tim Dobrashian (TD), Wiltshire Council, Interim Director Economic Recovery Sam Howell, Swindon Borough Council, NEV Project Lead Debby Skellern (DS), SWLEP Rick Kavanagh – representing Col Andrew Dawes (left at 3pm) Leanne Kendrick - Wiltshire Council Paul Redford, Wiltshire Council, Growth & Investment Programme Manager Alan Richell, Wiltshire Council, Interim Growth & Investment Programme Director Leanne Sykes (LS), Wiltshire Council	
Chairman:	John Mortimer	
Minutes:	Deborah House (DKH)	
Location:	Committee Rooms, Wiltshire Council Offices, Monkton Park, Chippenham, SN15 1ER	

Item	Narrative	Deadline
1.0	Welcome / Apologies / Conflicts of Interest	
	<p>The meeting opened at 1.10pm. JM welcomed attendees to the meeting. In particular, welcomes were extended to Rick Kavanagh, who was representing Col Dawes, Karen Leigh, the area representative from BEIS, various officers from both Swindon Borough Council and Wiltshire Council who would be presenting items later in the agenda, and members of the public. Apologies were noted.</p> <p>JM reminded attendees of the Conflict of Interests policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> and re-iterated his Conflict regarding Junction 17, and his previous Conflict with a recipient of a GPIF loan was no longer valid, as the loan had now been issued; 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PW stated his Conflict regarding the LGF project for the Royal Artillery Museum (RAM); • AR stated his Conflict regarding the IoT, as Catalent was a named partner; • AB stated her Conflict regarding LGF3 and the ongoing projects for Wiltshire College at the Salisbury and Lackham campuses; and • Cllr Church stated her Conflict regarding potential allocation of £1.1m of funds for Salisbury, Item 4.3, as she operated a shop in the City. 	
2.0	Review of Minutes and Matters Arising	
2.1	The minutes of the Board Meeting held on 28 November 2018 were reviewed and approved with a minor amendment under Item 4.3.	
2.2	<p>Matters Arising not on the agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • letters to Homes England re Yarnbrook / West Ashton – letters sent by the Chairman and KL and awaiting further response. The meeting was advised that there had been a change of personnel in the role and KL was to hold a meeting with the new incumbent w/c 28 January 2019; • Southern Connector Road Homes Infrastructure Fund (HIF) – process agreed between SBC and Homes England – Homes England advised submission in March. This would be discussed later in the agenda under Part 2 of the meeting. • The Maltings Outline Business Case (OBC), delayed to a later meeting. This was deferred as work was still in progress. • Briefing on Area Plans – deferred to a later meeting. Part 2 today covers some of the points of interest. Confidential briefing would be given to Board Members on current interest. <p>The Board: NOTED that Zurich had now been confirmed as the Anchor tenant for the Kimmerfields development.</p>	
3.0	<p>Submitted Questions</p> <p>A question had been received from Charmian Spickernell of CPRE, but not in time to give a written response. Mrs Spickernell stated that the Rail Strategy was strongly welcomed and was an important aspect of planning, but she raised a question regarding consultations. The first phase had consulted rail people, but this had been focused on only one specific issue. Mrs Spickernell wanted to know what the next steps were for consultation, as the environment and social issues affected everyone.</p> <p>ID responded to the question and explained that two stages, written and a workshop, had been carried out which included businesses and business</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>representative organisations. A consultation session was held in January at STEAM, which included extensive representation from town councils, unitary authorities, rail user groups and transport provider companies. The strategy document for rail would come to the Board in March and there would be further consultation with representation from planners, town and unitary councils with responsibility for rail and road. The Rail Strategy would also be an important part of the Local Industrial Strategy.</p> <p>The strategy would be available to the general public via the SWLEP website as would all the strategies. Once all the information had been gathered, an independent panel of experts would test the evidence base and a rigorous case would be produced jointly with government. There would be opportunities along the way for input from interested parties. The public was advised to register on the Swindon & Wiltshire Growth Hub to obtain communications and maintain links. As this was Government-funded, consultation was an important aspect of the work to show openness and transparency.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked Mrs Spickernell for her continued interest in SWLEP activities.</p>	
4.0	Local Growth Deal	
4.1	<p>Commissioning Group Project Highlight Reports</p> <p>ID spoke to the paper and advised that the link to the individual highlight reports was on the SWLEP website, but he would be speaking in particular about the focus projects.</p> <p>Chippenham Station Hub</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 5, the station forecourt - consultation had been held in Chippenham last week for input from the public; • 1b, northern access lift – initial work has begun on this part of the project; • Phase 2, multi-storey carpark and Sadlers Mead - planning application had been submitted and would come before the strategic planning committee on 20 February. As seen from previous Board meetings, this part of the project was contentious with some local residents. An update would be available at the next Board Meeting; and • Phases 3 and 4, car parks to the north and south of the railway - Network Rail was investigating what was feasible within the timescales. An update would be available at the next Board Meeting. <p>Yarnbrook</p> <p>A Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) application had been submitted, with the announcement of the appointed contractor due shortly once final negotiations with Wiltshire Council and Persimmon Homes had been completed.</p> <p>The Maltings and Central Car Park, Salisbury</p>	<p>Mar '19</p> <p>Mar '19</p>



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>The £6.1m of LGF monies were now allocated to an amended version of the project as agreed by the Board. Planning had been submitted before Christmas for Phase I of the scheme, which included the new hotel and library. The Outline Business Case (OBC) was due to come to this Board Meeting, but there was still work being carried out by the scheme promoter and Independent Technical Advisor. The SWLEP Programme Manager would be meeting the team regarding this on 29 January and the OBC would be brought to the March Board Meeting.</p> <p>Swindon Bus Boulevard The upfront work was progressing as planned, although the risk of wider project costs were noted.</p> <p>Southern Connector Road (SCR) The SCR formed part of the New Eastern Villages scheme. The NEV project was a series of different projects interdependent on each other, which elevated the risks involved. The land assembly was still in progress and was complicated owing to the large number of land developers/owners. Any problems would mean a delay to timescales.</p> <p>HIF funding was needed to bridge the funding gap of £23m, with the application being submitted in March 2019 as proposed by Homes England. If the HIF application were unsuccessful, timelines could be affected and put the project at risk of closure. As the funding gap was so large, it would put a high degree of pressure on the scheme Promoter, Swindon Borough Council to cover the shortfall and no further LGF would be forthcoming. As this was a DfT retained scheme, the SWLEP Board was not the key decision-maker about the use of the funding. Swindon Borough Council's Leader and Chief Executive had met with the Chairman of Homes England recently to emphasise how important the scheme was to the area.</p> <p>A420 Gablecross The land acquisition work was still on-going. The Business Case was tied in with this and the SCR. Approval would be sought at the March Board or ex-committee.</p> <p>Wichelstowe Southern Access The procurement process was underway for a contractor to be appointed by April 2019.</p> <p>The Chairman commented that it would be preferable for the Business Cases to come to the Board Meeting if time allowed, rather than ex-committee, but appreciated that he would not want this to be the reason for holding up progress on these projects.</p> <p>ID also mentioned projects which were now completed, these being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Corsham Mansion House, completed since last board meeting. £2.5m monies from LGF had produced a nice facility with a mix of the old and the new with 50 desk spaces. SWLEP was talking with Wiltshire	<p>Mar '19</p> <p>Mar '19</p>



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Council on its day-to-day operation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A350 dualling now completed; and • LGF Sustainable Transport now completed with additional cycle routes around Swindon. <p>ID also noted progress on a non-focus LGF project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Wiltshire College Salisbury campus project where the cladding was going up ahead of schedule. <p>The Board: AGREED that the highlight reports are an accurate representation of current status of all LGF projects.</p>	
4.2	<p>Finance Report – Programme budgets</p> <p>ID spoke to the paper. The situation for the pure LGF projects had worsened slightly by £0.5m because of the ultrafast broadband project. It has been identified that the Superfast deployment in Wiltshire through 2017, by both Wiltshire Online and commercial providers, has exceeded original expectations. A State Aid due diligence exercise is therefore now required to ensure that the Ultra Fast deployment does not affect premises which already have a service. While this exercise is carried out, there is a pause in implementation, causing the delayed spend profile.</p> <p>Therefore, the spend would show in the next financial year 2019/20. All projects were forecasting spend by March 2021.</p> <p>For DFT projects, the spending was broadly in line with forecasts. Great Stall Bridge funding had been moved into the Gablecross and SCR projects as agreed at the last board meeting.</p> <p>The Chairman commented that the Programme Manager was working constantly with scheme promoters to ensure the monies were spent and this was stressed strongly in both the Commissioning Group and at the Board. All promoters were very clear that SWLEP could cancel the funding for projects with Board approval if the projects were such that they were reaching the point that SWLEP believed they could not be delivered by the timescale.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the paper as an accurate summary of the current LGF financial position.</p>	
4.3	<p>Proposals for project funding in the South Wiltshire Recovery Plan</p> <p>PB introduced the item and explained the background to the availability of £3.7m from the LGF fund. SBC officers working with Highways England had developed an alternative method of funding an enhanced improvement project for J15 on the M4, so releasing the £3.7m to re-allocated by the SWLEP Board. £1m had been allocated to ultrafast broadband and £1.35m each to Royal</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Artillery Museum (RAM), which was going ahead, and Swindon Museum & Art Gallery (SMAG), which was not. £200k had been allocated for SBC to come up with some alternative concepts for SMAG and the Council had stated that it supported the allocation of the remaining £1.1m to the South Wiltshire Recovery. As a result, Wiltshire Council was submitting two projects for consideration.</p> <p>TD spoke to the paper and explained that the footfall in Salisbury was down and that the cumulative impact on businesses was still stark. The SWLEP and Wiltshire Council were organising a major event for the business community on 20 February at The Guild Hall to communicate the extent of intervention to help grow the economy and to gain views about proposed future plans.</p> <p>Porton Science Park The first stage of Porton Science Park was almost fully let and we were now looking to future expansion plans involving a much larger development. Some preliminary activity was needed to give momentum to this development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assess the need for further provision of utilities (electricity, water, gas) and the timeframes involved; • analyse the market to understand what types of businesses from which sectors would be attracted to an enhanced science park; and • develop proposals for financial models to enable the concept of the new development to be brought to the market. <p>£200k was requested to pay for initial development work. The SWLEP would be an integral part of the project team to take forward this work.</p> <p>The Chairman requested a paper back to the board on the creation of team for Porton and business terms and development. Further development of the Porton site is fairly obvious thing for us to want to do and this activity would have to be done at some time in the future anyway. What is the best vehicle for engaging the private sector? AC advised the meeting that examples from past experience were available and maybe to have a positioning paper in time for Lord Henley's visit on 7-8 February 2019.</p> <p>The SWLEP Board: SUPPORTED a project for further development at Porton and requested a revised proposition for funding the development work at the March Board meeting.</p> <p>Illuminating Salisbury Adding a tourism attraction would add value to the night-time economy and increase overnight stays, with audiences on a regular basis, who would spend money in the City. This would feature in a potential bid to the Government's High Street Fund, alongside a Gateways project in Fisherton Street, which was to be submitted by 22 March. Illuminating Salisbury was an oven-ready project, which was part of an integrated strategy for Salisbury. Wiltshire Council was</p>	<p>Mar '19</p>



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>requesting a relatively small amount of money from the SWLEP Board, as it saw most of the funding coming from the High Street Fund. £150k would pay for the feasibility work and content ideas. It needs to be put against a project leading to capital spend, which this would be. The overall project cost was estimated at £1.5-£2m and could be ready in time for the Cathedral 800 years celebrations next year if we moved swiftly.</p> <p>The Board was informed of a number of examples of cities using creative illuminations to attract visitors and the significant benefit it brought to the local economy.</p> <p>The Board sought clarity on the cost of the two phases and was told that £100k would be for infrastructure, for example lasers etc and £50k for proof of concept. The infrastructure would remain constant, with the content changing at regular intervals.</p> <p>There was discussion about the risks involved in the project if the High Street funding was not forthcoming and the sort of private sector support available. AC commented that the Salisbury Business Improvement District (BID) had been very supportive.</p> <p>Cllr Church's opinion was sought because of her knowledge of the area, but owing to her already declared Conflict of Interest, AC responded on her behalf. The cultural body, Wiltshire Creative, would oversee the long-term cultural delivery of this project and there was strong grass roots support.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council would look to underwrite it and find the revenue, but the capital the Council would hope to get from the High Street fund.</p> <p>The Chairman requested that Board Members had sight of the overall South Wiltshire Recovery Plan at the next Board Meeting, in order for Board members to have a whole system view of the Recovery rather than making decisions on individual projects.</p> <p>The Board: AGREED to fund £100k for the second phase of the research into proving the concept on the condition that Wiltshire Council would repay the £100k from their revenue.</p> <p>The Board: AUTHORISED the Director to re-allocate £1.1m from the Local Growth Deal to support projects proposed by the South Wiltshire Operations Board which meet the economic outcomes sought by the Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership; REQUIRED a report from the Director to the Board meeting on 20 March 2019 on the definitive list of projects seeking Board support and the timescale for the use of the funding for those with developed proposals.</p>	<p>Mar '19</p> <p>Mar '19</p>



Item	Narrative	Deadline
5.0	Strategic Developments	
5.1	<p>SWLEP Incorporation progress report</p> <p>PB spoke to the paper giving an update on progress, advising the meeting that the SWLEP had become a not-for-profit company limited by guarantee on 14 January 2019 and that it was progressing with plans for SWLEP Limited to take over current operations by the end of March 2019.</p> <p>Action: AC and SK and respective legal teams to meet with PB to ensure clarity about governance arrangements in the transition from the “old” SWLEP to the “new” SWLEP Ltd.</p> <p>The Chairman stressed that the submission of our amended assurance framework was crucial by the end of March and that this would be brought to the March Board Meeting for approval.</p> <p>PB advised that all existing business Board Members had indicated that they were content to continue on the Board of SWLEP Limited. Both Local Authorities were finalising who would take their allocated places on the new Board.</p> <p>The Board: NOTED the progress made in the incorporation process</p>	Mar '19
5.2	<p>Spending plan for additional funding</p> <p>PB spoke to the paper. £280.300 had been allocated to help towards the costs of the development of the Local Industrial Strategy and incorporation and was made up as follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £200k confirmed funding from BEIS against a provisional spending plan; • £75k from DfE, in return for the submission by Friday 25 January of a Memorandum of Understanding which meets the governance and membership requirements of Skills Advisory Panels and the development of a fine-grained analysis of skills and employment data; and • £5,300 from ESRC to support Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) research and the evidence base. <p>The idea was to use more money from the BEIS pot by using researchers to test three big ideas. That internal resource could be flexed and adapted as the ideas emerge.</p> <p>DR commented that he would like to extend the work regarding hydrogen to include the opportunities presented by a A420 link from the M4 corridor into the Cambridge-Milton Keynes-Oxford arc. PB agreed to add this reference. AB stated that there was a need to review the remit of the Local Authorities'</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>separate employment and skills boards in the light of single LEP-wide group the DfE was looking for to fulfil the role of the Skills Advisory Panel (SAP). The SWLEP's Skills and Talent Subgroup could fulfil the role of the SAP with some minor changes to its terms of reference. This matter had also been raised at the Commissioning Group, including the need to maintain knowledge and expertise from Local Authority Skills and Employments Boards, which could involve invited some members to join the revised Skills and talent Subgroup.</p> <p>Action: PB and AB to draft a proposal to take to the Skills & Talent Subgroup for discussion.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the spending plan for the additional funding.</p>	<p>05/03/19</p>
<p>5.3</p>	<p>Economic Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy Strategy key performance indicators <p>PB spoke to the paper and explained the measures to be used.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the use of the key performance indicators for the Energy Strategy as indicated in section 3.7; and REQUESTED an annual report in the May of each year, commencing in May 2020 on the extent of achievement of the key performance indicators.</p>	
<p>5.4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rail Strategy Position Statement <p>As Chairman of the working group, PW introduced the paper. ID was leading on the work and stated that an extremely successful well-attended workshop had been held on 16 January led by Systra and SLC Rail. This strategy would feed into the LIS. It would show where the economic opportunities were from new services being provided by the Government and where, with new provision, the SWLEP could support economic growth. The intended outcomes of the Rail Strategy include a list of investment priorities in descending order according to potential contribution to the economy. The main emerging line options were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bristol – Swindon - Oxford – Cambridge • Southampton – Swindon – Oxford – Birmingham • Swindon – Gloucester – Birmingham – Manchester <p>with the following emerging station options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swindon East • Swindon West / Moredon Bridge • Devizes Parkway 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Porton Parkway • Corsham • Ashton Park • With Further investigation needed regarding a parkway station at Wilton. <p>DR commented that he would like Swindon strengthened, for example, the line through to Didcot, where work was needed for four-tracking.</p> <p>Questions were raised about how this strategy overlapped with that of GWR and Network Rail, as their project plans were complicated and long-term and discussions would have to be held now to ensure our priorities were built into their Phase plans. This needed to focus on integration of transport planning, including access to and from main hub stations through a range of public transport methods and the provision of adequate parking at these new stations</p> <p>JM commented that no change would happen in the area, unless we promoted it ourselves, as there would be no government money for such schemes. The quickest way was to get private sector to deliver it and SWLEP had just seen a presentation on third party delivery for station schemes.</p> <p>The Strategy would be brought to the SWLEP Board Meeting in March for approval.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the draft position statement, with suggested amendments, as an acceptable direction of travel for the SWLEP Rail Strategy.</p>	Mar '19
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>The activities were listed in the published Board pack. No additional questions were raised.</p> <p>The Board: NOTED the contents of the Chairman's and Director's reports.</p>	
7.0	AOB	
	None.	
	Date of next meeting / Closing remarks	
	The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, 20 March 2019 at 9.30am in the Kennet Room, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, BA14 8JN.	
	Close of Public Meeting at 3.15pm.	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	PART TWO	
8.1	<p>Chippenham developments</p> <p>Relevant Conflicts of Interest were noted.</p> <p>Alan Richell and Paul Redford presented to the meeting on a proposed scheme in Chippenham. This Housing Infrastructure Fund bid will be submitted by 1 March 2019. Letters of support had been received from most landowners and a Business Case was being developed for the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.</p> <p>The Board: SUPPORTED this scheme in principle subject to being provided with a confidential document mapped against the SWLEP strategy and draft of covering letter which would allow Members to consider any of the implications and make decisions ex-committee.</p> <p>Action: AR to provide Board Members with the necessary documentation.</p>	31/01/19
8.2	<p>New Eastern Villages (NEV)</p> <p>PV introduced the presentation and Sam Howells spoke to the meeting explaining the importance of the Southern Connector Road to the overall NEV scheme and the submission of a HIF bid in March.</p> <p>The Board: NOTED the contents of the presentation.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked the presenters for their contributions.</p> <p>Close of Part Two of Meeting at 4.15pm</p>	



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


QUESTION

The rail strategy is welcomed but it is not clear that the first round of consultation was widely advertised.

Is there a clear pathway for the next steps and will there be wider consultation, to include environmental and social issues, with the roll forward of the Local Plans before decisions are made?

RESPONSE

The response to the question was given verbally at the Board Meeting and is contained in the Board minutes under Item 3.0.

 <p>Swindon & Wiltshire LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP</p>	<p>Board Meeting 23 January 2019 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, 23 January 2019		
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Information <input 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

RAG rating remains at Amber/Red.

Initial development work is underway 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 its building on Sadlers Mead and a planning application has now been submitted for this and the car park on the same site. This will go to the Strategic Planning Committee in late February. Objections to this phase of the project (particularly the car park) were raised by local

residents at the September 2018 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.

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 (for example, 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

RAG rating remains at Green.

Funding to cover the associated cost increase has been successfully granted by the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF). Completion of the clarification process with Homes England/Deloitte/Cushman & Wakefield is still ongoing (started in March 2018). Letters have been sent to Homes England asking for resolution as soon as possible. The procurement process for a construction contractor is underway – completion imminent.

Salisbury Central Car Park and Maltings

RAG rating remains at Green.

A proposal put to the September 2018 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, though ongoing discussions with the Independent Technical Advisor mean that this will not be available for the January Board meeting as originally planned. A planning submission for plot 1 (hotel and library on British Heart Foundation site) has been made.

Swindon Bus Boulevard

RAG rating remains at Amber/Red.

Work is progressing to the latest plan. However, for the overall project (that is, not LGF element), estimated costs have increased. This has added a significant risk to the overall project.

Southern Connector Rd

RAG rating remains at red.

After consultation with Homes England and DfT, the final submission for the Housing Infrastructure Fund application will now be made in March 2019. Delays to the Outline

Business Case mean that this will now need to be signed off by the Board ex-committee. A number of risks remain and are increasing in severity:

- HIF funding is not yet secured (project cannot proceed if funding not obtained);
- land assembly is still in progress, with any objections leading to a CPO process (resulting in delays to project timescales);
- planning submission has not yet been made (resulting in delays to project timescales).

A420/Gablecross

RAG rating improved from Red to Amber/Green.

Land acquisition is still in progress. Delays to the Outline Business Case mean that this will now need to be signed off by the Board ex-committee.

Wichelstowe Southern Access

RAG rating remains at Amber/Green.

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

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

- seven LGF projects have completed;
- there are 17 live LGF projects covered by the highlight reports;
- four projects (24%) are rated GREEN;
- seven projects (41%) are rated AMBER GREEN;
- two projects (12%) are rated AMBER RED;
- four projects (32%) are rated RED; and
- one project has improved its RAG rating since the last report; and
- none has 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	AR	AR	Initial development work is underway on 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). Letter sent to Homes England.
LGF/1718/003/CCPM	The Maltings (Salisbury)	WC	G	G	An Outline Business Case is being developed for approval – discussions ongoing with ITA meaning approval now later than the January 2019 Board meeting. Planning submission for plot 1 has been made.
LGF/1617/008/SBX	Swindon Bus Boulevard	SBC	AR	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	Final Housing Infrastructure Fund application submission now to be made in March 2019. A number of risks remain and are increasing in severity. OBC sign off by Board now needs to be carried out ex-committee.
LGF/1516/003/EV (iii)	New Eastern Villages A420 Gablecross	SBC	R	AG	Land acquisition is still in progress. OBC sign off by Board now needs to be carried ex-committee.
LGF/1617/002/WI	Wichelstowe Southern Access	SBC	AG	AG	The procurement process for the project is in progress with the tender documentation now issued and a contractor forecast to be appointed by April 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	All significant engineering works now complete. Stage 3 Road Safety Audit of completed scheme on 19 th December.
LGF/1617/007/MH	Mansion House (Corsham)	WC	G	Complete	Construction work complete. Tenants due early 2019.
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	Final construction phase on Spring Gardens footway-cycleway scheduled to complete imminently.
LGF/1617/003/SRT	Swindon Rapid Transit	SBC	R	R	Construction work on all elements of Wichelstowe phase in progress or complete, but behind original schedule. Development

					work in progress on Tadpole Farm and NEV schemes. Change control agreed at Commissioning Group.
LGF/1617/006/JNC16	M4 Junction 16	SBC	Complete	Complete	
LGF/1617/010/SPHC	Royal Artillery Museum	WC	G	G	Detailed design in progress and tender documentation for build phase to be published in January 2019.
LGF/1617/011/SMAG	Swindon Museum and Art Gallery	SBC			Scoping work in progress. Highlight Report to be submitted in March.

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			Project no longer LGF funded.
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	Risk rating still red due to “interdependency with delivery of the Southern Connector Road: joint Business Case, Housing Infrastructure Fund bid and potential CPO for land acquisition.” Report to DPT is that this is a business case only risk, not a delivery risk. OBC sign off by Board now needs to be carried ex-committee.
LGF/1516/003/EV (vi)	New Eastern Villages Business Case	SBC	R	R	OBC sign off by Board now needs to be carried out ex-committee.

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 260 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 & 51 Enterprise Advisers engaged. Focused on getting schools/colleges to assess their careers provision against the Gatsby benchmarks. Recruitment for Careers Hubs working parties taking place.

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. A bid for ERDF funding has been submitted for further face to face support (inc. Start Up, delivered by Outset and Scale

					Up, delivered by Set Squared).
--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------

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.

