

<b>Attendees</b>	<p><b>Board:</b> Amanda Burnside (AB) / Col James Coote DSO OBE (JC), arrived 11.30am and departed 11.55am / George Gill (GG), arrived 9.45am / John Mortimer (JM) / Vic O'Brien (VO) / Baroness Scott of Bybrook OBE (JS)</p> <p><b>Advisors:</b> Dr Carlton Brand (CB) / John Gilbert (JG), arrived 10.15am</p> <p><b>Observers:</b> Chuck Berry (CBe) / Oliver Donachie (OD) / Garry Perkins (GP) – representing David Renard</p> <p><b>Secretariat:</b> Paddy Bradley (PB) / Sally Burnett (SB) / Alistair Cunningham (AC) / Andy Evans (AE)</p> <p><b>Others:</b> Trudie Clarkson (TC) / Ian Durston (ID) / Vanessa Joseph (VJ) / Debby Skellern (DS) / Leanne Sykes (LS)</p> <p><b>Guests :</b> Lt Col Guy Benson, Headquarters South West – representing Col James Coote DSO OBE for presentation / Jane Cilia, Swindon Borough Council (JCI) / Alex Crook, BEIS (ACr) / Allan Creedy (ACrd), Katie Cross (KC), Kingsley Hampton (KH) and Rob Murphy (RM) of Wiltshire Council / Stephen Hitchcock, Headquarters South West – representing Col James Coote at the meeting / Martin Reville (MR), ITA /</p>
<b>Apologies</b>	Andy Evans (AE) / Shahina Johnson (SJ) / Parvis Khansari (PK) / Simon Patten (SP) / David Renard (DR) / Adam Schallamach (AS) / Peter Wragg (PW)
<b>Chair</b>	John Mortimer (JM)
<b>Minutes</b>	Deborah House (DKH)
<b>Venue</b>	Tidworth Garrison Theatre, St Andrew's Road, Tidworth, SP9 7PD
<b>Start time</b>	9.30am
<b>Finish time</b>	12.35pm

<b>Item</b>	<b>Summary of Issues Discussed and Decisions – Part I</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome and Introductions, Conflicts of Interest</b>	
	<p>The Chairman welcomed all those present to the meeting. In particular, welcomes were extended to Cllr Oliver Donachie from Swindon Borough Council, and Cllr Chuck Berry from Wiltshire Council, who were new participants in the proceedings of the Board having taken over cabinet responsibilities for economic development in their respective councils. The Chairman extended his thanks to Fleur de Rhe-Philippe for her support and contribution over her time on the Board. JM advised that Col Coote had been called to a meeting in Andover and his presentation would be given by Lt Col Guy Benson and Stephen Hitchcock would represent Col Coote at the meeting until his arrival later. Col Coote had recently been promoted to Brigadier and would soon be taking up his new post at Army Headquarters in Andover.</p> <p>Apologies were noted.</p> <p><b>Conflicts of Interest</b> – None were declared.</p>	

2.0	<b>Board Minutes, Action Log, Chairman update</b>	
	<p>The minutes of the meeting held on 22 March 2017 were presented for consideration. It was,</p> <p><b>Resolved:</b> <b>To APPROVE and sign the minutes as a true and correct record.</b></p> <p><b>Matters Arising</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Board recruitment</b> – PB advised that the recruitment was now active with a closing date of 18 June 2017. Interviews were to take place in July with the aim of putting the successful candidates forward for ratification at the Board Meeting in July;</li> <li>• <b>University of Bath (ISTI)</b> – a letter of support had been sent to the University and a meeting with the Vice-Chancellor was scheduled for 6 June 2017;</li> <li>• <b>Growth Hub update</b> – two developers had joined the project team and selection for a creative agency was scheduled for 26 May. Two workshops had been held with stakeholders regarding data and content;</li> <li>• <b>Governance Framework</b> – PB advised that a meeting with the two Legal Leads from both UAs was scheduled and the Framework will be brought back to the Board Meeting in July 2017. ACr advised the meeting that the SWLEP Conflicts of Interest Policy is held up as a good example to other LEPs;</li> <li>• <b>Great West Way</b> – the SWLEP Board granted VisitWiltshire £20,000 to develop its Business Plan and JM advised that they should be informed if they were successful on 19 June; and</li> <li>• <b>Investment Manager</b> – PB advised that there were ongoing discussions within Secretariat and the item would be brought back to the Board in July. PB had been working closely with the UAs and assured the meeting that the post would differ from operations and have a more strategic focus</li> </ul> <p>The Board considered the Action Log of Board activities up to 16 May 2017 and the items were noted. In particular,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Heritage Lottery Fund's (HLF) decision regarding the Salisbury Plain Heritage Centre was on hold until after the election on 8 June 2017; and</li> <li>• The Outline Business Case for the Chippenham Station Hub had been postponed until the July Board Meeting to allow GWR to consult further with stakeholders.</li> </ul> <p>The Chairman updated the Board on his activities undertaken since the last meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 23 Mar – attended the Growth Hub event at Wellington Barn;</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 27 Mar – attended the LEP Annual Conference, including a meeting with Lord Prior of Brampton;</li> <li>• 28 Mar – attended a LEP Chairs’ meeting with the Prime Minister in Birmingham;</li> <li>• 30 Mar – attended the Great West Way Conference with the Minister for Tourism, Tracey Crouch;</li> <li>• 5 April – attended the ESIF Committee;</li> <li>• 11 April – chaired the SWLEP Growth Hub Governance Group;</li> <li>• 13 April – attended the Joint Strategic Economic Committee;</li> <li>• 24 April – attended the GWR Annual LEP Dinner in London;</li> <li>• 10 May – chaired the SWLEP Commissioning Group Meeting;</li> <li>• 22 May – chaired the pre-election Business Breakfast in Salisbury, and attended the South West LEPs’ meeting of Chairs and CEOs in Exeter;</li> <li>• 24 May – attended the Prince’s Countryside Fund event with HRH The Prince of Wales at Clarence House; and</li> <li>• various meetings with SWLEP Executive Team.</li> </ul>	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Submitted questions</b>	
	<p>Questions were received from Mrs Charmian Spickernell (CS), Campaign for the Protection of Rural England North Wilts and Swindon Group Committee Member. A copy of the questions and responses given is attached to these minutes. In response, Mrs Spickernell asked the meeting why the Joint Scrutiny Task Group appeared to be “secret” and not open to the public. It was explained that as the meeting is classed as a Task Group and not a Committee it is a closed meeting, but Mrs Spickernell was assured that the information was updated to the SWLEP website and fed through to Wiltshire Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee where the papers were discussed. So, therefore the information does feed through into the democratic process and the public domain. JM advised that making SWLEP procedures more transparent to the public was a continual process.</p> <p>With regard to the second question on Wichelstowe, Mrs Spickernell commented that the engineering review had been carried out only on what was possible from an engineering standpoint and not necessarily on what was best for Swindon. It did not taken into account the impact of having buses only at peak times on Red Post Drive or that a tunnel would be subject to flooding and expensive to rectify. GP responded to the points raised by CS stating that Swindon Borough Council had been working with the canal trust on methods to alleviate the flood risk and a final decision was due in two months’ time. CS stated that there was considerable public opposition to the tunnel and that CPRE’s position therefore had not changed.</p>	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Military update</b>	
	<p>Lt Col Guy Benson presented an update to the meeting on the Army status with particular reference to the situation within the County. (The</p>	

	<p>presentation can be found at <a href="http://www.swlep.co.uk/documents/2017.">http://www.swlep.co.uk/documents/2017.</a>) Funds were available for Covenant signings to show support for the Army and the families. JS advised that Wiltshire had been allocated £190k to lead this across the UK.</p>	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Strategic developments</b>	
<b>5.1</b>	<p><b>Higher Futures (HF)</b> AB and SB spoke to the paper. A brief background to the programme was given, which was previously called City Deal, where £1.4m had been allocated in 2014. Since the instigation of the programme the environment had changed significantly, with the military focusing more on retention. A series of workshops had been held with stakeholders and recommendations had been discussed on the best way forward to continue with the programme.</p> <p>One recommendation is to integrate Higher Futures into the Growth Hub, which would make it a truly employer-facing provision and reduce costs. It was felt to be crucial that the programme did not duplicate existing effort, but also formed part of the overall Higher Education Strategy to tackle the higher level skills challenge where the intention was to increase the uptake of Level 4+ in the area from 39.5% to 52% by 2026. The programme needed to be a collaborative approach across the area offering a truly impartial information, advice and support service to employers and acting as the interface for employers to access information with no need to compare and contrast provision across several providers. In effect, to be the one-stop shop. Higher Futures would work with employers and shape and tailor the provision. Rather than being seen as competition to the FE colleges it would act as a referral service if courses requested are already offered in the locale.</p> <p>The financial model continued to be developed. The programme still received commission from universities, but was looking at various charging structures for the range of services it provided to employers.</p> <p>Higher Futures' USP had been the unique involvement of the military in its programme. However, there were inherent difficulties in the relationship between the Careers Transition Partnership (CTP) and Higher Futures owing to the terms of the contract which prevented access to military personnel and Service Leavers. There had been high level military support for the programme and representation on both the SWLEP Higher Futures Group and the Skills &amp; Talent Subgroup. Liaising with Col Coote's replacement, Andrew Dawes, would be crucial to moving this forward.</p> <p><b>The Board resolved :</b> <b>to approve the recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>That Higher Futures provides employers with access to a</b></li> </ul>	

	<p>range of impartial skills advice, support and brokerage, the priority being higher level skills following the model set out at section 4 in the paper;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That Higher Futures is to become part of the Growth Hub so that it is integrated into the wider framework of support for business; and</li> <li>• That the Board seeks approval from Government for a new delivery model and revised outputs, namely 2,000 learners embarking on level 4+ programmes through Higher Futures by 2020, including doubling the number of learners embarking on higher or degree apprenticeships across the SWLEP area between 2015/16 and 2019/20 academic years.</li> </ul>	
<p>5.2</p>	<p><b>Direction of Travel for Higher Education Strategy</b></p> <p>AB and SB spoke to the paper. The paper had been through the Skills &amp; Talent Subgroup and demonstrated a joined up approach across the area. The uniqueness of the area was that it did not have a University campus within its boundary, which was also seen as a weakness. JM thanked the contributors for an excellent start on the Higher Education Strategy as this gave SWLEP more focus and clarity on what it was trying to achieve in this arena and encouraged the team to be ambitious for the SWLEP area. ACr indicated that the Higher Education Bill had recently been published which emphasised strong business links and that this was the way Government was thinking for future endeavours. Higher Education models of the future would need to involve employers and people's expectations would need to be managed. We had knowledge of the gaps in provision and the emerging sectors of cyber and agri-tech. Mapping across the SWLEP area would be crucial.</p> <p><b>The Board resolved to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note the content of the report outlining the context and current outcomes for employers and learners in terms of Higher Education; and</li> <li>• Approve the approach to the development of a SWLEP-wide HE Strategy outlined in section 8 of the report.</li> </ul>	<p>January 2018</p>
<p>5.3</p>	<p><b>Institute of Technology (IoT)</b></p> <p>SB spoke to the paper. The original Government announcement was for additional funding for delivery of STEM subjects to levels 3, 4 and 5 within Institutes of Technology (IoTs) limited to the FE sector. However, the recent publication of the Conservative Manifesto makes reference to degree provision, with "leading universities" acting as sponsors. Only one bid was expected for any LEP area. Involving Universities to ensure progression to a full degree (level 6) would provide further opportunities in the area. Given the high proportion of students studying level 3</p>	

<p>technical education in Swindon, the very low progression rates to Higher Education, and the increasing requirement for STEM, the provision of an IoT in SWLEP area would be a good step forward and was recommended in the Post-16 Review. The IoT would be sited in Swindon and currently the plan was for Swindon College to act as the lead. Three Universities were interested in working with SWLEP together with the colleges in the area, improving the technical pathways to University provision. Linking up with employers and providers would help to develop the model and bid as the work would need strong business input. ACr added that Government would be looking for bids that were employer-driven and added to social mobility. There was debate on the possibility of re-badging existing centres.</p> <p><b>The Board resolved:</b> <b>To accept the recommended approach to the development of an IoT being</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the IoT is developed through extending technical education currently delivered through colleges;</li> <li>• that collaborative bids between the FE sector, employers, LEPs and universities would be encouraged with an agreed lead partner;</li> <li>• that a key group of employers input to the development of the bid, building on work already in train with the key sectors;</li> <li>• that the priority would be to meet the needs of employers and learners in Swindon, while also benefitting Wiltshire residents in the northern travel to learn area;</li> <li>• that work started immediately to develop the business case, as the call for bids was anticipated after the election; and</li> <li>• that the SWLEP Skills and Talent Subgroup oversaw the development of the bid.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Timescales to be ascertained</b></p>
<p><b>5.4 Growing Places Infrastructure Fund (GPIF) Open call</b></p> <p>PB advised the meeting that SWLEP intended to reinvigorate the GPIF revolving loan fund. Having investigated how other LEPs manage their funds, it was ascertained that SWLEP did not recycle the loans speedily enough. Although the launch was on hold during the purdah period, the fund was set to launch an open call after the election. There was debate about the levels of interest charged on the loan, which would be dependent on the individual bidder's circumstances. Credit worthiness and EU compliance would also be part of the approval criteria. The Board wished for the process to be as simple as possible, whilst ensuring proper due diligence was followed.</p> <p><b>The Board resolved to:</b></p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Agree the application process and timeline;</b></li> <li>• <b>Agree the re-forming of the GPIF Working Group;</b></li> <li>• <b>Approve the draft GPIF Working Group Terms of Reference;</b></li> <li>• <b>Appoint up to five Board Members to sit as the GPIF Working Group;</b></li> <li>• <b>Agree to delegate the decision to issue a loan agreement at stage 2 of the application process to the GPIF Working Group; and</b></li> <li>• <b>Note that the State Aid implications of an open call were being investigated.</b></li> </ul>	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Local Growth Deal</b>	
<b>6.1</b>	<p><b>M4 Junction 17 Improvements Full Business Case</b></p> <p>KH presented to the meeting with additional comment from MR, the Independent Technical Advisor (ITA). (The presentation can be found at <a href="http://www.swlep.co.uk/documents/2017">http://www.swlep.co.uk/documents/2017</a> .) A geological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) was under the junction, but possible impact had been mitigated. JG asked whether the period of construction would contribute to increased problems at the junction and was assured that Wiltshire Council was working with Highways England to minimise the impact.</p> <p><b>The Board resolved:</b> <b>To approve the ‘M4 Junction 17 Capacity Improvement Scheme’ Full Business Case.</b></p>	
<b>6.2</b>	<p><b>A350 Chippenham Bypass Dualling Full Business Case</b></p> <p>RM presented to the meeting with additional comments from MR, the ITA. (The presentation can be found at <a href="http://www.swlep.co.uk/documents/2017">http://www.swlep.co.uk/documents/2017</a> .) MR stressed the need for stronger stakeholder engagement in the future about projects of this nature. Although the project had been disclosed in statutory plans, engagement needs to be more specific. “ A lesson learned for the future”</p> <p>A risk budget of £408k had been set aside for contingency purposes, and the meeting was assured that these funds would revert to SWLEP if not required.</p> <p><b>The Board resolved:</b> <b>To approve the ‘A350 Chippenham Bypass Improvements (Badger-Brook &amp; Chequers)’ Full Business Case.</b></p>	
<b>6.3</b>	<p><b>Finance Report – LGD Budget</b></p> <p>ID spoke to the paper. The total underspend from 15/16 and 16/17 was £4,19m, but it was envisaged that this underspend would catch up with</p>	

	<p>the profile. Forecast spend fell short of the grant profile in 17/18 as BEIS had allocated a higher grant figure for LGF3 projects than had actually been requested (LGF 3 projects were not included in previous reports). This could be managed and an exercise was currently underway with the projects to review and refine their forecast spend profile going forward, so an update on this would be provided for the July 2017 Board Meeting.</p> <p>A meeting was scheduled for 15 June 2017 with DfT to discuss the re-profiling of retained schemes, as this could be managed directly with the Department.</p> <p><b>The Board resolved: To note the contents of the paper.</b></p>	<p><b>1 July 2017</b></p>
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Other SWLEP Programmes</b>	
<b>7.1</b>	<p><b>Update on European Structural and Investment Fund 2016-2020</b></p> <p>JM thanked Julian Head (JH) for the provision of the paper and advised the Board that the European programmes were complex and under pressure of time as the UK approached the formal exit from the EU. There was a fear that not all the previously available funding would be authorised before the date of exit. JM would be meeting with JH to understand the issues.</p> <p><b>The Board resolved: To note the content of the paper.</b></p>	
<b>7.2</b>	<p><b>Finance Report – other SWLEP Programme Budgets and General Account</b></p> <p>ID spoke to the paper.</p> <p><b>To Board resolved: To note the content of the paper.</b></p> <p>An additional paper 5.12a was issued separately to the Board pack and PB advised that approval was sought from the Board to instigate the next Swindon and Wiltshire economic assessment.</p> <p><b>The Board resolved: To approve up to £40,000 to commission the Swindon and Wiltshire economic assessment through a mini framework procurement exercise.</b></p> <p><b>Action : DS to initiate procedures as above.</b></p>	<p><b>31 May 17</b></p>
<b>7.3</b>	<p><b>Commissioning Group – Project Highlight Reports</b></p> <p>The Board noted the receipt of the papers from the Commissioning Group and comments were made on particular projects where there were concerns as follows:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mansion House Corsham – the plans for the project went before Wiltshire Council’s Planning Committee on 24 May 2017 and were passed. As there had been objections from two statutory bodies, The Georgian Group and the Ancient Monuments Committee, the plans would now be put before the Secretary of State for a final decision. The project would be reviewed, with the assistance of ITAs, to ascertain whether this could be delivered to timescale and would be brought back to the November Board Meeting.</li> </ul>	<b>29 Nov 17</b>
<b>8.0</b>	<b>SWLEP Core Activity</b>	
<b>8.1</b>	<p><b>Annual Report</b></p> <p>PB advised that work on the production of the report was ongoing with the Working Group. The report would be brought to the July Board Meeting for approval. It is intended for the SWLEP website with hardcopies also available ready for an Autumn Conference.</p> <p><b>The Board resolved:</b></p> <p><b>To note for information the update on progress in producing the SWLEP’s Annual Report 2016-17.</b></p>	<b>July 2017</b>
<b>8.2</b>	<p><b>Marketing and Communications update</b></p> <p>Further to the submitted paper, VJ advised Board Members of two upcoming events in particular which SWLEP would be sponsoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>South Wilts Business Awards in Salisbury on 22 June 2017</li> <li>South West Business Expo at STEAM on 29 June 2017</li> </ul> <p>JS advised the meeting that Wiltshire Council was unable to participate in the Salisbury Big Business Event this year owing to purdah in the run up to the local elections. She also stated that she had received a complaint from an MP that the Meet the Candidates breakfast meetings were inappropriate use of public money and that there was low engagement with local MPs throughout the county. PB assured the meeting that no public money had been used for the breakfasts, which had been paid for through sponsorship agreements. Despite the cessation of campaigning after the Manchester bombing, three out of the seven scheduled were held. JM reassured the meeting that engagement with MPs would be sought once the outcome of the election was known.</p>	
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Any Other Business and date of next Board Meeting</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PB wanted to make Board Members aware of the Queen’s Award for Enterprise and asked that members promote amongst their networks; and</li> <li>GG requested that SWLEP ensured there was good data for the Growth Hub project.</li> </ul> <p>The next Board Meeting was scheduled for 19 July 2017 commencing at</p>	

	<p>9.30am at City Hall, Malthouse Lane, Salisbury, SP2 7TU</p> <p>Future Meetings :</p> <p><b>Wednesday, 20 September 2017</b> Committee Room 6, Civic Offices, Euclid Street, Swindon, SN1 2JH</p> <p><b>Wednesday, 29 November 2017</b> County Hall, Bythesea Road Trowbridge, BA14 8JN</p> <p><b>Wednesday, 24 January 2018</b> Committee Rooms, Monkton Park, Chippenham, SN15 1ER</p> <p><b>Wednesday, 21 March 2018</b> Location to be advised</p> <p><b>Meeting closed at 12.35pm</b></p>	
--	--	--

*Sumner 19 July 2017*

## Public Participation

**From Charmian Spickernell, Vice Chairman CPRE Wiltshire.**

### Question One

There has been reference to the SWLEP Overview and Scrutiny Committee.  
How often have they met and where can details of the meetings be found please?

### Response

The Joint Scrutiny Task Group has met on the following dates :

Year	Date
2014	28 October
2015	29 January 19 March 3 August 29 October 9 December
2016	12 April 6 July 20 October
2017	5 April

The papers for the meetings can be found on the SWLEP website using the following link :

<http://www.swlep.co.uk/board-profiles/details#> and viewing the appropriate tag on the right hand side.

The papers are also available on the Swindon Borough Council website using the link below:

<http://ww5.swindon.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=969&Year=0>

or the Wiltshire Council website using the link below

<http://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=1224&Year=0>

## **Question Two**

With reference to the Western Access for Wichelstowe, given that the employment area is not well placed for road distribution and there are flooding problems, would a link with the town centre, providing local jobs, be more important for the town than a road leading out of the town? Has public opposition to the M4 crossing over the years since 2002 been taken into account?

## **Response**

The options for the Western Access have been thoroughly reviewed as part of the planning process which resulted in outline consent for the Wichelstowe development being granted in 2005. This process included extensive public consultation. The options were further considered more recently as part of the “Western Access Review” undertaken by Peter Brett Associates in 2013. This information was used to support the SWLEP funding allocation towards the Western Access scheme in 2014.

The location of the Western Access ensures that the employment area within the Wichelstowe site has excellent connectivity to the motorway network.

In addition to the existing road network link to the town centre from Wichelstowe, there are two SWLEP-funded projects to improve means of travelling from Wichelstowe into the town centre.

- The Local Sustainable Travel Programme is building a series of safe cycle routes from strategic housing sites into the town centre. The route in the case of the Wichelstowe development is known as the Western Flyer; and
- The Rapid Transit Programme is developing enhanced routes for public transport using software and cameras to ensure priority passage for buses through traffic light junction. Again, the routes are from strategic housing sites, including Wichelstowe.