



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

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



Re-election of Board Members

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

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

The Board

APPROVED the re-election of both members.

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

Matters Arising

Mannington Roundabout (Quality Bus Corridor)

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

The Central Car Park and the Maltings

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

Remuneration Committee

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

Local Industrial Strategy Working Group

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

Chairman's update

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

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

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

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

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

Director's Report

No questions raised.



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



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

The Board

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

4.2 Draft Higher Education (HE) Strategy

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

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

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

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

Comments following the presentation were:

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



area to study, work and live;

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

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

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

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

The Board

AGREED to the vision, overall strategic aims and the emerging



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



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



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



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



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



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



Wednesday, 24 July 2019

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

Thursday, 26 September

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

25 July 2018



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

Question One

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

Response

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

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

Question Two

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

Response

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

Question Three

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

Response

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

Question Four

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

Response

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