



<b>Attendance</b>	
<b>Board Members:</b>	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
<b>Advisers to the Board</b>	Alistair Cunningham
<b>Observers to the Board</b>	Cllr Pauline Church (PCh) Cllr Oliver Donachie (OD)
<b>In attendance</b>	Paddy Bradley (PB), SWLEP Director Tim Martienssen (TM), Wiltshire Council Leanne Sykes (LS), Wiltshire Council Philippa Venables (PV), Swindon Borough Council
<b>Guest(s):</b>	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
<b>Apologies</b>	
<b>Board Members:</b>	Doug Gale (DG) Mark Smith (MS) Jonathan Webber (JW)
<b>Advisors to the Board</b>	Susie Kemp (SK)
<b>Chair:</b>	John Mortimer
<b>Minutes:</b>	Deborah House (DKH)
<b>Location:</b>	Rooms D001/002, Wiltshire College, Cocklebury Road, Chippenham, SN15

<b>Item</b>	<b>Narrative</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome / Apologies / Conflicts of Interest</b>	
	<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"> <li>Karen Leigh, Assistant Director at BEIS, to her first SWLEP Board meeting. Karen was the link to the Communities and Local Growth</li> </ul>	



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"> <li>• General Nick Eeles, who would be presenting the final proposal for the Royal Artillery Museum (RAM);</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>Apologies were noted.</p> <p>JM reminded attendees of the Conflict of Interests policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• he re-iterated his Conflict regarding Junction 17 and with a potential beneficiary of a GPIF loan;</li> <li>• 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);</li> <li>• AR and SJ stated their Conflict regarding the IoT, as both Catalent and Create Studios were named partners (Item 5.3);</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• AB stated her Conflict regarding LGF3 and the ongoing projects for Wiltshire College at the Salisbury and Lackham campuses.</li> </ul>	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Review of Minutes and Matters Arising</b>	
<b>2.0</b>	<p><b>Board Membership - George Gill</b></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>	
<b>2.1</b>	The minutes of the Board Meeting held on 25 July 2018 were reviewed and approved.	
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Matters Arising not on the agenda</b>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The Director's terms of employment</b> had been agreed and would be published on the website.</li> <li>• <b>The SWLEP response to the question of potential mergers raised by the Ministerial Review</b> 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.</li> </ul>	
3.0	<p><b>Submitted Questions</b></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"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• What were the results of the traffic analysis showing the impact that the increase in the car park capacity will have?</li> <li>• Where is the proposed footfall connectivity between the proposed car park and the town centre?</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• that the site was the wrong location for a multi-storey carpark;</li> <li>• that car parking should be located both sides of the railway tracks with commuter parking to the north;</li> <li>• that evidence had not been presented for the additional car parking requirements;</li> <li>• that the additional parking spaces under the proposed office building were not included in the increased traffic statistics;</li> <li>• the absence of investment for the Bath Road car park scheme;</li> </ul>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the company planning the Residential Home (old college) could withdraw its investment;</li> <li>• that investment would be diverted away from other projects;</li> <li>• that property values and community value of the park would decline with all the anti-social problems associated with multi-story car parks;</li> <li>• it would do nothing to enhance the public realm; and</li> <li>• he questioned when the proposed third station lift would be provided.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• What actions would be taken because of the significant increase in traffic and the impact on young children, college students and train users?</li> <li>• How would emergency vehicles and carers reach the ageing population on Monkton Park?</li> <li>• In addition to the increased traffic, the heavy construction vehicles would have detrimental impact on the condition of the roads</li> <li>• Public health would suffer because of pollution, and sight of the ugly carpark would reduce the value of the houses in the area.</li> </ul> <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>	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Local Growth Deal</b>	
<b>4.1</b>	<p><b>Allocation of funding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chippenham Station Hub</li> </ul> <p>TM presented to the meeting. The presentation can be found on the SWLEP website of by following the link below.</p> <p><a href="https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/19-sep-2018/sadlers-mead_19_9_18.pdf?sfvrsn=b2eccb64_4">https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/19-sep-2018/sadlers-mead_19_9_18.pdf?sfvrsn=b2eccb64_4</a></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><b>The Board:</b>  <b>APPROVED</b> the updated Outline Business Case for Chippenham Station Hub to enable the progression of phase 2 works; and  <b>NOTED</b> 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"> <li>• <b>Overview of funding re-allocation</b></li> </ul> <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"> <li>• <b>Swindon Museum &amp; Art Gallery (SMAG)</b> 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.</li> <li>• <b>Chippenham Station Hub</b> – 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.</li> <li>• <b>Royal Artillery Museum (RAM)</b> - £1.35m had already been allocated to this project and the revised proposals still required the full amount.</li> <li>• <b>The Maltings and Central Car Park</b> - £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.</li> </ul>	





Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>South Wilts Recovery Plan</b> – there was funding to be allocated to the Recovery Plan and this would be discussed at future Board Meetings</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• <b>Swindon Museum &amp; Art Gallery (SMAG)</b></li> </ul> <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><b>The Board:</b> <b>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.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Royal Artillery Museum (RAM)</b></li> </ul> <p>NE presented to the meeting. The presentation could be found on the SWLEP website of by following the link below.</p> <p><a href="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">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</a></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• clarification was sought on timescales of the outputs;</li> <li>• PR for the project should not be just from a military perspective, but as tourist attraction and a stopping point on coach tours;</li> <li>• SWLEP support for the initial investment would attract other investors to the project; and</li> <li>• 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 <b>would</b> be found.</li> </ul> <p><b>The Board:</b> <b>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.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>South Wiltshire Recovery Plan</b></li> </ul> <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><a href="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">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</a></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"> <li>• <b>The Maltings and Central Carpark</b></li> </ul>	



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><a href="https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/19-sep-2018/lep-board---maltings-presentation---19-sep-18.pdf?sfvrsn=fddbe44c_4">https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/19-sep-2018/lep-board---maltings-presentation---19-sep-18.pdf?sfvrsn=fddbe44c_4</a></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><b>The Board:</b> <b>APPROVED</b> 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); <b>TASKED</b> the SWLEP Programme Manager with identifying suitable alternative projects to use re-allocated funding within the LGF timescale constraints.</p>	
4.2	<p><b>Business Cases</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ultrafast Broadband</li> </ul> <p>ID spoke to the paper.</p> <p><b>The Board:</b> <b>APPROVED</b> the Outline Business Case for Ultrafast Broadband, enabling the release of funding to support installation work.</p>	
4.3	<p><b>Commissioning Group Project Highlight reports</b></p> <p>The reports were taken as read and</p> <p><b>the Board:</b></p>	





Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p><b>AGREED that the highlight reports were an accurate representation of the current status of all LGF projects.</b></p>	
<p><b>4.4</b></p>	<p><b>Ensuring project delivery and spend</b></p> <p>ID presented to the meeting. The presentation could be found on the SWLEP website of by following the link below.</p> <p><a href="https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/19-sep-2018/ensuring-project-delivery-spend-4-4.pdf?sfvrsn=7fa17953_4">https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/19-sep-2018/ensuring-project-delivery-spend-4-4.pdf?sfvrsn=7fa17953_4</a></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><b>The Board: REQUESTED a detailed proposal paper for the Board Meeting in November 2018.</b></p>	<p><b>Nov 2018</b></p>
<p><b>4.5</b></p>	<p><b>Finance Report – Programme budgets</b></p> <p>There were no questions raised regarding the paper and it was taken as read.</p> <p><b>The Board: APPROVED the paper as an accurate summary of the current LGF financial position.</b></p>	
<p><b>5.0</b></p>	<p><b>Strategic Developments</b></p>	
<p><b>5.1</b></p>	<p><b>SWLEP Incorporation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Acquiring a legal personality; the SWLEP as an incorporated body</b></li> </ul>	

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"> <li>• the fact that funding support would be available from BEIS to assist the move to incorporation for which SWLEP could bid;</li> <li>• the role of elected officials and unitary officers as potential Directors of the new Company;</li> <li>• transition to the new Company and the position of existing Board Members; and</li> <li>• the relationship between the new Company and the Accountable Body, whichever LA took on that role.</li> </ul> <p><b>The Board:</b>  <b>APPROVED</b> the proposal to establish the Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership as a company limited by guarantee;  <b>AUTHORISED</b> 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  <b>AGREED</b> 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><b>Economic Planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Digital Strategy</b></li> </ul> <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><b>The Board:</b>  <b>AGREED</b> to adopt the Swindon and Wiltshire Digital Capabilities Strategy 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Update from Higher Education Task Group</b></li> </ul>	
<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><b>The Board: NOTED the progress to date.</b></p>	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>SWLEP Core Activity</b>	
<b>6.1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Chairman’s update</b></li> </ul> <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>	
<b>6.2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Director’s Report</b></li> </ul> <p>Activities were listed in the published Board pack and taken as read. No additional questions were raised.</p>	
<b>7.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
	None.	
	<b>Date of next meeting / Closing remarks</b>	
	<p>The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, 28 November 2018 at 9.30am in Committee Room 6, Swindon Borough Council Civic Offices, Euclid Street, Swindon, SN2 2JH.</p>	
	<p><b>Future Meetings</b></p> <p><b>Wednesday, 23 January 2019 – PLEASE NOTE AFTERNOON MEETING (1PM-4PM)</b> Committee Rooms, Monkton Park, Chippenham, SN15 1ER</p> <p><b>PLEASE NOTE THAT WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF REVIEWING MEETING LOCATIONS.</b></p>	



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

*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

<b>Year</b>	<b>Employment BRES 2012-2015</b>	<b>Employment BRES 2015-2016</b>	<b>Employees BRES 2012-2015</b>	<b>Employees BRES 2015-2016</b>
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.

