



<b>In attendance:</b>	<b>Board Members:</b> Paddy Bradley (PB) Amanda Burnside (AB) Col Andrew Dawes (AD) Doug Gale (DG) Andrew Gudgeon (AG) Carole Kitching (CK) Paul Moorby (PM) John Mortimer (JM) – Chair Alison North (AN) Keeran Vetriko (KV) Philip Whitehead (PW <sub>h</sub> ) Peter Wragg (PW) – Deputy Chair	<b>Board Advisers:</b> Alistair Cunningham (AC) Susie Kemp (SK)  <b>Observers:</b> Cllr Gary Sumner (GS) Col Nev Holmes (NH)
<b>Apologies:</b>	Pauline Church (PCh) / Mandy Clarke (MC) / Becky Middleton (BM) / Alex Reed (AR) / David Renard (DR) / Mark Smith (MS)	
<b>Guest(s):</b>	Sam Fox and Leanne Sykes (LS), Wiltshire Council Phil Clement (PC) / Dragana Houston (DH) / Colette Mallon (CM) / Camille Marchand (CM) / Debby Skellern (DS), SWLEP Chris Crowther – Straburg Consulting Kevin Forthergill - Ecuity Karen Leigh (KL), BEIS Ian Durston (ID), SWLEP Philippa Venables (PV), Swindon Borough Council	
<b>Chair:</b>	John Mortimer	
<b>Minutes:</b>	Deborah House (DKH)	
<b>Location:</b>	Rooms D001/D002, Wiltshire College & University Centre, Cocklebury Road, Chippenham, SN15 3QD	

Item	Narrative	Deadline
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome / Apologies / Conflicts of Interest / Board Appointment</b>	
	<p>The meeting opened at 9.40am and the Chair welcomed attendees. Particular welcome was extended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Gary Sumner, who was representing David Renard and would be voting on behalf of Swindon Borough Council;</li> <li>• visitors Charmain Spickernell from CPRE and Katharine Mortimer;</li> <li>• Karen Leigh, who was the BEIS representative and SWLEP close advisor and link with Central Government;</li> <li>• Camille Marchand, who was a Swiss student currently on short-term placement with SWLEP; and</li> <li>• Chris Crowther and Kevin Fothergill who would be presenting later in the agenda.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair offered his congratulations on behalf of the Board to:</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Col Dawes who had been honoured with a CBE in the New Year's Honours list, and who was also stepping down from the Board at this meeting. Col Dawes was taking up his new post in Wales shortly. His replacement was Col Nev Holmes who was in the meeting as an observer; and</li> <li>Alistair Cunningham on becoming one of the two Executive Directors for Wiltshire Council.</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>PW stated his Conflict regarding the LGF General Account for the Royal Artillery Museum (RAM);</li> <li>AB stated her Conflict regarding the Local Growth Fund 3 allocation for Wiltshire College &amp; University Centre for both the Salisbury and Lackham campuses;</li> <li>PW stated his Conflict linked to the loan to Wiltshire College &amp; University Centre</li> <li>PW with regard to the Maltings Outline Business Case as there is a potential future land value uplift to Wiltshire Council as landowner. The Chairman agreed that PW could contribute to the discussion but not vote on the Agenda item.</li> </ul>	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Review of minutes and matters arising</b>	
<b>2.1</b>	<p>The minutes of the Board Meeting held on 27 November 2019 were reviewed and approved, with the following comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PW had been omitted from the attendee list; and</li> <li>In a written submission, BM stated that her comments relating to legal issues, particularly the proposed compulsory process to conclude land assembly for the Southern Connector Road project, which was discussed at item 6.4, had not been adequately represented in the draft minutes. BM had also expressed concern that revised approved road plans had not yet been presented to the Board. BM noted that there had been a discussion under item 6.2 regarding the reporting of the use, and possible return of unused, project contingency funds. She thought it important that the minutes noted assurances given that the basis for drawing down all capital, including contingency amounts, was strictly on evidence that expenditure is incurred and defrayed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: DKH to check and make necessary amendments for the Chair's signature.</b></p>	
<b>2.2</b>	<p><b>Matters Arising not on the agenda:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Governance Framework</b> – This would now come forward to the March Board meeting. We were awaiting the 2020-21 version of the</li> </ul>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>National Framework to ascertain if there were any amendment to make and then it would be brought back to the Board.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Chippenham Station Hub – ID to complete a breakdown of these costs and send out to Directors</b> – hard copy circulated at the table.</li> <li>• <b>Royal Artillery Museum (RAM) Business Case</b> – This would now come forward to March Board meeting. The business case was expected in the next few days to be reviewed by the Independent Technical Advisor (ITA) in time for the board meeting.</li> <li>• <b>Scrutiny arrangement for the SWLEP – PB to amend the ToR to reflect a change to quorate rules.</b> The Terms of Reference had been amended, but we were still awaiting the costs from Democratic Services for running the group. PWh commented that it was probably waiting to go through Wiltshire Council's own Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: PWh and AC to chase status.</b></p> <p>The Chair stressed that Business Cases needed to come through to the Board Meetings when designated, otherwise there was a danger of missing out on funding.</p>	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Submitted Questions</b>	
	The submitted questions received from the public and SWLEP responses had already been circulated to Directors. (Attached with these minutes.) As the member of the public was not attending the meeting, they were taken as read.	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Ex-committee decisions – outcome of votes</b>	
	<p><b>GPIF loan agreement</b></p> <p>The GPIF loan discussed at the last Board meeting in Part 2, being confidential at that time, had now been agreed ex-committee for the company Four Legs are better than Two. Voting results were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 votes in support;</li> <li>• and one abstention.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for PhD student</b></p> <p>SWLEP was working with Solent LEP and Enterprise M3 on Natural Capital and the PhD student would support this work. Voting results were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14 votes in favour;</li> <li>• one against; and</li> <li>• one abstention.</li> </ul>	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Local Growth Deal</b>	
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Commissioning Group Project Highlight Reports</b>	
	ID spoke to the paper which was a summary of the focus projects.	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p><b>Chippenham Station Hub</b> RAG rating had improved from AMBER RED to AMBER GREEN. The decision had been made at the Commissioning Group to release funding for other projects. Construction was now due to start on Phase 2, Sadlers Mead carpark, with the sustainable transport packages agreed in principal. (See paper 5.2.)</p> <p><b>Yarnbrook / West Ashton</b> RAG rating had improved to AMBER GREEN as the Housing Infrastructure Fund had now finally been earmarked for this project.</p> <p><b>The Maltings</b> RAG rating had improved to AMBER GREEN as the demolition work had now commenced. The Outline Business Case (OBC) was being submitted to this meeting in Part 2, owing to commercially confidential information contained in Paper 9.</p> <p><b>Swindon Bus Boulevard</b> The RAG rating to this project had improved to AMBER GREEN as Swindon Borough Council had been successful in its bid to the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) and the LGF had been agreed in principle. Work on the Outline Business Case (OBC) for SWLEP was progressing in tandem with that of the HIF. Although some information was missing at this stage, it would be covered later in the OBC to be submitted in May and the ITA had reviewed it.</p> <p><b>Southern Connector Road</b> The RAG rating was at AMBER RED owing to land assembly issues but has improved from a RED rating. The Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) would be triggered next week if landowners were not brought on board. Discussions with the Department for Transport (DfT) had reached an agreement that as long as the Full Business Case was signed off, a contractor appointed and all 3<sup>rd</sup> party funding in place, all DfT funding for the project can be released in the financial year 2020/21, with the spend subsequently managed by SBC/SWLEP. This spend could then go beyond March 2021.</p> <p><b>A420 Gable Cross</b> RAG rating was at AMBER GREEN and construction was due to start in May 2020.</p> <p><b>Wichelstowe</b> This project was another DfT retained scheme. Diggers were on site at the M4 and construction had commenced. The RAG rating remained at GREEN.</p> <p><b>The Swindon &amp; Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership Board:</b> <b>APPROVED</b> the highlight reports as an accurate representation of the current status of all LGF projects.</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>The Chair commented that this had been a good report to read and that it was gratifying to see that these key projects had improved their status. This reflected the immense hard work of the scheme promoters for these RAG ratings and demonstrated significant steps forward. He would personally like to thank the project teams as well as the hard work and tenacity of ID to bring this about.</p> <p>Highlight Reports were available for all other projects. The following figures summarised the status across all of the projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• nine LGF projects had completed;</li> <li>• there were 18 live LGF projects covered by the highlight reports;</li> <li>• seven projects were rated GREEN;</li> <li>• nine projects were rated AMBER GREEN;</li> <li>• two projects were rated AMBER RED;</li> <li>• 0 projects were rated RED; and</li> <li>• five projects had improved their rating since the previous report.</li> </ul> <p>The Board regretted that ID was leaving to take up a role with Engineering Consultancy Frazer Nash, but he had left behind one of the country's best performing Growth Hubs and its digital platform. An Interim Manager was in place to cover ID's role until a permanent replacement could be found and the Chair welcomed Claire Alexander who had returned to SWLEP after a five-year absence.</p>	
5.2	<p><b>Chippenham Station Hub Sustainable transport schemes business case</b></p> <p>There had been a change of direction for the spend and there was now an update to the business case for the wider scheme. There were eight sub-packages within the Business Case which included improvements to bus stops, cycle and pedestrian routes.</p> <p><b>The Swindon &amp; Wiltshire Local Enterprise Board: APPROVED this update to the Outline Business Case enabling the release of £1.98m funding to support design and construction work.</b></p>	
5.3	<p><b>Swindon Bus Boulevard Outline Business Case (OBC)</b></p> <p>The Outline Business Case had been provided for information only and was also available to view online via the link below.</p> <p><a href="https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/programmes/local-growth-fund-lgf/outline-business-cases/swindon-bus-boulevard/swindon-bus-boulevard-obc-jan2020.docx">https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/programmes/local-growth-fund-lgf/outline-business-cases/swindon-bus-boulevard/swindon-bus-boulevard-obc-jan2020.docx</a></p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>The OBC was in a mature state, but the ITA (Systra) had made comments back to the scheme promoters and these comments would be incorporated into the document when it was submitted to the Board in May. The project was to regrade Fleming Way and to close the road to traffic. Comments were received from absent Directors via email and were considered together with other detailed questioning from Directors around the table. AG stated that having the current information about the project was beneficial, as this made up part of Swindon regeneration overall. The Chair asked the Board to note the progress of the project.</p> <p><b>The Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Board:</b> <b>NOTED the content of the Outline Business Case for Swindon Bus Boulevard in advance of the submission of the Full Business Case for approval at the May 2020 Board Meeting.</b></p>	
5.4	<p><b>Update on progress of reallocation of funding</b></p> <p>The £3m from the Chippenham Station Hub scheme proposed for a link bridge would be unable to be spent before the March 2021 deadline and had therefore been released back to the Board for re-allocation.</p> <p>Projects which had previously been discussed owing to their uncertain delivery status had now improved. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Maltings, which as now on a stronger footing;</li> <li>• A420 Gablecross, which was now in a good state;</li> <li>• Royal Artillery Museum (RAM), the Business Case was now imminent, and ID had met with the project manager and had received reassurances about its delivery; and</li> <li>• the New Eastern Villages Southern Connector Road, which was now in a better state. (See Item 5.1 above.)</li> </ul> <p>The four projects which were to be discussed for receiving the reallocation of £3m were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growing Places Infrastructure Fund (GPIF) – the monies would be used to increase the fund available to offer more loans to businesses. These applications would continue to be submitted via the GPIF committee;</li> <li>• Wiltshire College &amp; University Centre Salisbury Campus – cladding to the rear of the building which would cost £1.4m to complete;</li> </ul> <p>A proposal for the work, provided by Wiltshire College, can be accessed via the link below:</p> <p><a href="https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/programmes/local-growth-fund-lgf/strategic-outline-business-cases/wiltshire-college-salisbury-campus-cladding-proposal.docx?sfvrsn=3d0356ea_2">https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/programmes/local-growth-fund-lgf/strategic-outline-business-cases/wiltshire-college-salisbury-campus-cladding-proposal.docx?sfvrsn=3d0356ea_2</a></p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Illuminating Salisbury – SWLEP had already funded development work for this project and now additional funding was required for the capital equipment. An SOBC for the work, provided by Wiltshire Council, can be accessed via the link below:   <a href="https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/programmes/local-growth-fund-lgf/strategic-outline-business-cases/sobc-illuminating-salisbury-2020-01-22.docx?sfvrsn=efeb8402_2">https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/programmes/local-growth-fund-lgf/strategic-outline-business-cases/sobc-illuminating-salisbury-2020-01-22.docx?sfvrsn=efeb8402_2</a> </li> </ul> <p>And an additional presentation of the proposed lighting scheme can be accessed via the link below.</p> <p><a href="https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2020/paper-5-4-illuminating-salisbury-slides.pdf?sfvrsn=23838e1a_2">https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2020/paper-5-4-illuminating-salisbury-slides.pdf?sfvrsn=23838e1a_2</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M4 Junction 15 - £3.7m had been originally allocated to this project from LGF Round 1. Highways England had then found extra sources of funding and these monies were released. Costs had now increased, but it supported the development of the New Eastern Villages (NEV) and the redevelopment of the Honda site.</li> </ul> <p>The table in the paper demonstrated the RAG rating of the four projects with regard to deliverability etc.</p> <p>PB advised that he had additional information about the Illuminating Salisbury project. There was a letter from the Cathedral raising objections and concerns. He had spoken with the Dean, The Very Reverend Nick Papadopoulos, the preceding evening. The Cathedral was not objecting to the overall project, as it could see the benefits of the scheme to Salisbury but wanted to be brought into the discussions.</p> <p>There was considerable debate by the Board about these four projects. The main issues were given below:</p> <p>KL asked the Board to consider which project would give the desired outputs. <b>Junction 15</b> was considered to be the crucial project to get in place because of its strategic importance, but there were concerns about its deliverability. The Strategic Outline Business Case submitted by Highways England was available via the link below.</p> <p><a href="https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/programmes/local-growth-fund-lgf/strategic-outline-business-cases/m4-j15-a419-sobc-(final).pdf?sfvrsn=a6b4124b_2">https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/programmes/local-growth-fund-lgf/strategic-outline-business-cases/m4-j15-a419-sobc-(final).pdf?sfvrsn=a6b4124b_2</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it would deliver the outcomes required and new housing would be stalled if the improved Junction did not proceed and would put SBC's</li> </ul>	





Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>delivery of housing in Swindon in peril with a potential five-year delay in building;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it was needed to attract new employers to the area. There would be a dedicated left turn at the Junction for London-bound traffic;</li> <li>• Junction 15's reach extended further than just the immediate area, was a link to the crucial artery of A419 and up to Birdlip and would benefit businesses by decreasing the congestion at that Junction;</li> <li>• the question was raised on where the balance of funding would come from and the meeting was told that Section 106 was possible, but the less additional funding SBC had to find then the more deliverable the scheme would be;</li> <li>• SBC had been successful in securing a HIF bid to help delivery of the Southern Connector Road, so why had the Council not considered the Junction 15 as part of this bid?</li> <li>• SBC advised that it was meeting with Highways England (HE) on 23 January about Junction 15 and speaking to Robert Buckland MP immediately to relay the decision of this meeting;</li> <li>• the question was raised as to the support of Highways England for the scheme if it was not prepared to fund it and when SBC had become aware of this situation;</li> </ul> <p>The discussion about J15 deliverability focussed on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spending – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ can the proposed SWLEP funding be defrayed by March 2021?</li> <li>○ The current estimated shortfall is £5.85m. If the SWLEP allocated £3m where would the remaining £2.85m come from?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Planning – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Can the programme successfully incorporate the process of closing Day House Lane and still meet the SWLEP spending timescale?</li> <li>○ The land at Junction 15 is in Highways England ownership and no further planning permissions were required to carry out the work.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Concerns were expressed about the timing of the submission from Highways England and the notice given to the Board of the shortfall in funding the project. Directors noted their concern about the pressure they felt under as a result of this late addition to the pipeline of funding requests. Directors supported the Chairman's view that the Board's dissatisfaction with the process should be made clear to Highways England, copying in local MPs.</p> <p><b>Illuminating Salisbury</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• if Illuminating Salisbury were chosen, the communications would need to be carefully handled as residents could object and ask why the money had been used this way when there was limited geographical benefit;</li> </ul>	





Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PWb commented that Salisbury had an increase in footfall at Christmas, which had bucked the national trend. It was all about vibrancy and creating an experience which should be crucial to all towns in the county;</li> </ul> <p>Cladding at Wiltshire College, Salisbury</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cladding had to be dropped from the initial plan to improve the campus due to project cost overrun</li> <li>The project is progressing well, and it was acknowledged it would be good to complete all the initially planned works</li> <li>However, the SWLEP had previously held to the principle that a project costs were agreed, and no further funding was given to create what was originally conceived.</li> </ul> <p>There was discussion amongst the Board Directors about whether they were in a position to make a decision about the allocation at the meeting or whether they needed more information and evidence. They were absolutely in agreement about deliverability being a crucial criterion. They were also aware of the need to resolve the re-allocation as soon as possible.</p> <p>After much debate, the Chair and SWLEP Director recommended a straight vote on Junction 15 support, subject to a two-week time limit to have the Directors' questions about the deliverability of the project answered, after which JM and PB would revert to the Board with a recommendation about whether to support the project. The majority vote on this project would then mean that the other projects would fall from the allocation. If there were no majority, Junction 15 project would fall from the list and then apportioning the rest of the £3m between Illuminating Salisbury and Wiltshire College &amp; University Centre would be decided.</p> <p>Board voting was eight for, two against and two abstentions owing to conflicts of interest. The allocation of £3m to the Junction 15 project was agreed in principle, subject to satisfactory responses to Board concerns. After this vote the Board then considered the process it required PB and JM to follow.</p> <p><b>The Swindon &amp; Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership Board: AGREED to allow PB and JM, if required to decide the percentage split across the Illuminating Salisbury and Cladding at Wiltshire College projects and the reasons in this instance; and AGREED for PB and JM to submit a report about the decisions to the other Board Directors.</b></p>	
5.5	<p><b>Finance and outputs reports for LGF projects</b></p> <p>ID spoke to the paper and stated that this was in a similar state to the last Board Meeting. Q3 spend had yet to be incorporated into these figures so the underspend would be reduced.</p> <p><b>The Swindon &amp; Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership Board:</b></p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p><b>APPROVED</b> this paper as an accurate summary of the current LGF financial and output position.</p> <p>A handout of the contingency amounts within projects was circulated at the meeting. (Now available on the SWLEP website.) This set out the SWLEP's position on the use of contingency funds in capital projects.</p>	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Local Industrial Strategy (LIS)</b>	
<b>6.1</b>	<p><b>Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) update</b> DG spoke to the paper. As the paper was provided for information it was taken as read, but DG highlighted Para 5 to the meeting which included some additional items from the recent LIS Working Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strategic priority added for rural areas;</li> <li>• to broaden the wording on Strategic Priority 7;</li> <li>• to be more explicit about what SWLEP meant by the Federated HE provision;</li> <li>• to be clearer on what was meant by a business-led cyber hub; and</li> <li>• to be explicit on what the Western Gateway would mean for SWLEP;</li> </ul> <p>Comments from absent Directors were considered.</p> <p><b>The Swindon &amp; Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership Board:</b> <b>APPROVED</b> the Vision statement; <b>APPROVED</b> the aim for each foundation; <b>NOTED</b> the feedback from the Central LIS Team; and <b>AGREED</b> the next steps and timeline.</p>	
<b>6.1a</b>	<p><b>First Draft Skills Plan update</b> AB spoke to the paper. The Skills &amp; Talent Subgroup was now operating as the new Skills Advisory Panel in line with the Government's requirements and charged with taking the Skills Plan forward. The Working Group was in the process of refreshing the overall Skills Plan and the draft outline was included in the pack. The Skills Plan was associated with the People side of the Local Industrial Strategy (LIS).</p> <p>The Skills Plan would be brought back to the Board in March.</p>	
<b>6.2</b>	<p><b>New Energy Vehicles Infrastructure Strategic Outline Business Case</b></p> <p>Kevin Fothergill (KF) from The Hydrogen Hub and Ecuity presented to the Board. The presentation can be accessed via the following link:</p> <p><a href="https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2020/ecuity-presentation-for-swlep-jan-22-2020-final.pdf?sfvrsn=cc61bf33_2">https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2020/ecuity-presentation-for-swlep-jan-22-2020-final.pdf?sfvrsn=cc61bf33_2</a></p> <p>KF updated the Board on the changing environment with a significant growth in hydrogen vehicles, particularly for larger vehicles, where electric options were</p>	

**Mar  
2020**



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>not viable. There was a need to demonstrate the viability and challenges of hydrogen fuel. It was commercially viable and already being used in fork-lift trucks. We should be putting infrastructure in ahead of the country to produce the hydrogen and had the capability and knowledge already to do this. PWh offered his support because hydrogen answered a lot of questions with regard to electric vehicles.</p> <p><b>The Swindon &amp; Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership Board:</b>  <b>APPROVED</b> that the work continues to progress to SOBC stage;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>AGREED</b> that Community and Rural charging options (options 2 and 3) were progressed together as a single SOBC; and</li> <li>b) <b>AGREED</b> that the hydrogen demonstrator (option 4) was progressed as a SOBC.</li> </ul>	
6.3	<p><b>Business-led cyber centre update</b></p> <p>AG introduced the item to the Board. This was a project on which the Board had received regular updates. If we wished to attract businesses into the area, we needed to assure them that they would be safe.</p> <p>Chris Crowther (CC) from Straburg Consulting presented to the Board. The presentation could be accessed via the following link:</p> <p><a href="https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2020/swlep-cyber-hub-assessment-for-submission-ds.pdf?sfvrsn=3b229c24_2">https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2020/swlep-cyber-hub-assessment-for-submission-ds.pdf?sfvrsn=3b229c24_2</a></p> <p>They were asked at a previous meeting to investigate sites and stakeholders for such a centre. They looked at the physical proximity to academia, government institutions, defence and areas of entrepreneurship and the centre would bring all these elements together. The main reason for the choice of site were given in the presentation. The balance between areas inside and outside a security wire were also considered.</p> <p>The Chair thanked CC for another good presentation. Areas for further consideration to the Board were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more specifics about what the “demonstrator” was. (CC stated that there were people waiting to move on this if we could move);</li> <li>• how Swindon’s Institute of Technology would be linked. (AG stated that he would link in with this); and</li> <li>• to make visible at Cyber clusters. There was an event scheduled for Swindon shortly.</li> </ul> <p>PWh commented that he thought this would sit brilliantly with Digital Corsham and bring people into the area.</p> <p>The project would be for a “Business Cyber Centre”.</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p><b>The Swindon &amp; Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership Board:</b>  <b>APPROVED</b> Corsham as the preferred site for the SWLEP Cyber Hub;  <b>APPROVED</b> that the initial demonstrator be established at the Corsham Science Park; and  <b>APPROVED</b> the continuing development of detailed business case.</p>	
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Chairman's statement</b>	
	<p>The Chairman thanked the Board for its faith in him and for electing him to another three-year term as Chair in November but advised the meeting that he was proffering his resignation owing to ill health. He had enjoyed the years he had spent on the Board but felt that the Board deserved 100% from the Chair, something which he currently was unable to do. This would be an opportunity to recruit another Chair as soon as possible. He would stay in post until such time as another Chair had been selected and it was still his intention to attend the Board Meeting in March.</p>	
<b>7.1</b>	<p><b>Chair's update</b>  The meeting:  <b>NOTED</b> the contents of the report.</p>	
<b>7.2</b>	<p><b>Director's Report</b>  PB offered his thanks to AN and PM for their help in the recent interviews for the replacement Growth Hub Manager.</p> <p>The meeting:  <b>NOTED</b> the contents of the report.</p>	
<b>8.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
	<p>AB advised of an invitation to Michele Donelan MP to commence the construction of the new building at Lackham Campus on Friday, 14 February at 12 noon and all Board Directors would be welcome to attend.</p> <p>AG would like to offer thanks from the Board to John, Ian and Andrew for all the hard work they had put into the SWLEP over the past years. Fellow Directors agreed with this view.</p>	
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Part TWO of meeting</b>	
	<p><b>Local Growth Deal</b>  <b>The Maltings Outline Business Case</b>  ID spoke to the Paper. The Outline Business Case contained commercially sensitive information which was why it was being discussed in Part Two of the meeting.</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>The Independent Technical Advisor (ITA) to this project was the Steer Group. This plan was part of bigger investment into The Maltings, which would make a significant difference to the city. The question was raised about plans for the displaced car parking. (Para 2.9 of the Paper refers.) Sam Fox of Wiltshire Council advised that there would be some carparking on site, but the aim was to make maximum use of the Park &amp; Ride facilities for the City. Although it was discussed that Park &amp; Ride was not such a good solution for business, this was countered by the argument that the City would only be losing 300 spaces overall and that the car park was not full anyway most of the time.</p> <p><b>The Swindon &amp; Wiltshire Local Enterprise Board:</b> <b>APPROVED the Outline Business Case for the Central Car Park and Maltings project in order that construction can be started, PWh abstaining from the vote.</b></p> <p>The Chair congratulated the team on a good paper.</p>	
	<b>Date of next meeting</b>	
	<p><b>Wednesday, 25 March 2020</b> The Alamein Suite, City Hall, Malthouse Lane, Salisbury, SP2 7TU</p> <p>The Board Directors to meet at 9am for a 9.30am start to the public meeting.</p>	
	<p><b>Future Meetings</b></p> <p>The Board Directors to meet at 9am for a 9.30am start to the public meeting.</p> <p><b>Thursday, 21 May 2020</b> Offices WRc, Frankland Road, Swindon, SN5 8YF</p> <p><b>Wednesday, 22 July 2020</b> The Auditorium, Aspire Business Centre, Ordnance Road, Tidworth, SP9 7QD</p> <p><b>Wednesday, 23 September 2020</b> Location to be advised.</p> <p><b>Wednesday, 25 November 2020</b> Location to be advised</p>	
	<b>Close of the meeting at 12.55pm</b>	

**25 / 3 / 2020**



**From Peter Downing**

**RE: A350 West Ashton By-Pass**

**QUESTION ONE**

What is the current status of the project ie on time, delays etc?

**RESPONSE**

Whilst the project has experienced some delays historically, it is currently on track against its latest agreed schedule and is due to complete the expenditure of its LGF grant money by March 2021 which is a key milestone for the SWLEP Board (note that completion of construction for the overall project will be after March 2021).

**QUESTION TWO**

What is the estimated time of commencement of this project?

**RESPONSE**

Design work for the project has been progressing for a number of months now. Construction work on site is on track to commence in July of this year.

**QUESTION THREE**

Is there a possibility that Central Government funding for this project could be withdrawn if current deadlines are not met?

**RESPONSE**

The LGF funding allocated to this project by the SWLEP Board could be withdrawn if the March 2021 deadline mentioned above was not expected to be met, or if other significant issues with the project arose. A key issue on the project has been the need for Wiltshire Council to sign an agreement with Homes England for additional funding to supplement the LGF funding allocated by SWLEP. This agreement has recently been signed. Given this, and that the project is progressing to plan, the SWLEP Board currently see no reason for LGF funding to be withdrawn from the project.