

In attendance:	Board Members: Paddy Bradley (PB) Amanda Burnside (AB) Mandy Clarke (MC) Doug Gale (DG) Andrew Gudgeon (AG) Carole Kitching (CK) Becky Middleton (BM) Paul Moorby (PM) John Mortimer (JM) – Chair Alison North (AN) Alex Reed (AR) David Renard (DR) Mark Smith (MS) Keeran Vetriko (KV) Philip Whitehead (PW _h) Peter Wragg (PW) – Deputy Chair	Board Advisers: Alistair Cunningham (AC) Observers: Cllr Gary Sumner (GS) Col Nev Holmes (NH) – joined at 10.25am and left at 11.30am
Apologies:	Pauline Church (PCh) / Susie Kemp (SK)	
Guest(s):	Alison Bunce, representing Col Nev Holmes Sam Fox, Wiltshire Council Dragana Houston (DH) / Colette Mallon (CM) / Debby Skellern (DS) / Claire Alexander (CA) SWLEP Martin Harvey (MH), RAM Project – joined the meeting at 10.20am and left at 11.05am Karen Leigh (KL), BEIS Philippa Venables (PV), Swindon Borough Council (SBC)	
Chair:	John Mortimer	
Minutes:	Deborah House (DKH)	
Location:	Via conference call	

Item	Narrative	Deadline
1.0	Welcome / Apologies / Conflicts of Interest / Board Appointment	
	<p>The meeting opened at 10.10am and the Chair welcomed attendees. No member of the public was present. Particular welcome was extended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Karen Leigh, who was the BEIS representative and SWLEP close advisor and link with Central Government; and Alison Bunce, who was supporting Col Nev Holmes as he was currently on telephone calls concerning Covid-19 and would join the meeting when he was able. <p>Apologies were noted.</p> <p>JM reminded attendees of the Conflict of Interests policy:</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PW stated his Conflict regarding the LGF General Account for the Royal Artillery Museum (RAM); AB stated her Conflict regarding the Local Growth Fund 3 allocation for Wiltshire College & University Centre for both the Salisbury and Lackham campuses; AR declared his standing Conflict as Catalent was an Anchor Employer for the Institute of Technology (IoT); and CK declared her standing Conflict as New College was involved as a provider in the Institute of Technology (IoT). 	
2.0	Review of minutes and matters arisings	
2.1	The minutes of the Board Meeting held on 22 January 2020 were reviewed and approved.	
2.2	<p>Matters Arising not on the agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scrutiny arrangements for the SWLEP PB updated the meeting on the current situation. A paper had gone before Wiltshire Council's Overview & Scrutiny Committee. The activity would be managed through the SWLEP, which would commission Wiltshire's Democratic Services to run the arrangements. The group would include non-executive council members from both Local Authorities and separate business representatives. The proposed quorate for the meetings had gone through committee. SWLEP was still awaiting costs from Democratic Services but had made an estimate in the budget. Update on Business Cases Business Cases scheduled to come to this meeting but were not yet available and had been delayed to May 2020 would be discussed under Item 4.2. Update on Skills Plan A proposal for the SWLEP Skills Plan had gone to the Skills & Talent Subgroup on 9 March. A recent document from the Department for Education (DfE) indicated the broad structure for all Skills Plans in England to be consistent across the country. We needed to review our current thinking and relate it back to that. The annual skills report was due in March 2021, which would be based on an analysis of the impact of Skills & Talent Subgroup on implementing the plan. One of the pieces of work SWLEP was now doing was reviewing the plan in light of Covid-19. The aspirations and focus may need to change. So not yet able to bring the Skills Plan to the Board but anticipated to be in a better position by the May meeting. <p>Action: to send out the latest Government guidance on the Skills Plan expectation to Board Directors who had requested it.</p>	March 2020
3.0	Submitted Questions	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>SWLEP had not received any submitted questions, but Charmian Spickernell of CPRE but would like to re-iterate her comments stated in previous meetings about Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) bid for Chippenham and the lack of public consultation.</p> <p>Action: DKH to circulate email to Board.</p> <p>PWh added that a paper was taken through Cabinet yesterday and advised that no consultation and no required public participation would take place during the Covid-19 period. However, there would be no relaxation in timescales as the Council had to proceed with the work to conclude the contract with Homes England otherwise it would lose the allocated £75m.</p> <p>There was both opposition and local support to the project, with Chippenham Town Council in favour. PWh added that Mrs Spickernell had been in touch directly with Wiltshire Council with the same question and at the meeting on 25 March, which was filmed and broadcast, Mrs Spickernell had received a response.</p> <p>Action: However, for the benefit of openness and transparency, PWh to provide SWLEP with the written response in order for forwarding to Mrs Spickernell to show collaborative working.</p>	<p>March 2020</p> <p>March 2020</p>
4.0	Local Growth Deal	
4.1	<p>Reallocation of £3m – decision re Junction 15</p> <p>PB stated for the record that Directors had agreed to take a second vote via email, subject to the circulation of the budget figures from SBC so that Directors could see the state of the budget and contingency.</p>	
4.2	<p>Commissioning Group Project Highlight Reports</p> <p>CA spoke to the paper which was a summary of the focus projects.</p> <p>Chippenham Station Hub</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project was on track • Work on Sadlers Mead car park had commenced • Approval for £1.5m for the third lift was being sought at this meeting • The overall OBC had already been approved, but the status update was to be discussed later in the meeting <p>Yarnbrook / West Ashton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAG rating was AMBER GREEN • The Full Business Case would be submitted to May Board for approval • CIL and s106 funded work for Ashton Park was progressing • Wiltshire Council was currently finalising the legal agreement on the Housing Infrastructure Fund with Homes England • Detailed design work continued 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>The Maltings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RAG rating was AMBER GREEN The OBC had been submitted to the January Board Meeting and funding was approved The MOU for the river corridor improvements was progressing Technical amendments in response to ITA were made in January / February 2020 <p>Swindon Bus Boulevard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RAG rating was at AMBER GREEN The Outline Business Case was currently with the ITA and was due to come to the May Board Meeting for approval The Future High Streets Fund bid (£25m) EOI was successful and the main bid was being developed <p>Southern Connector Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RAG rating was at AMBER RED The inspector had approved the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) ahead of the deadline, but this was subject to a six-weeks' challenge period The Full Business Case would be submitted to the Department of Transport in November 2020 <p>A420 Gable Cross</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RAG rating was AMBER RED SBC had commissioned an independent review of the tender process which had resulted in retendering The Full Business Case was due to come for Board approval at the meeting in May <p>Wichelstowe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RAG rating was at GREEN with work progressing on site The project was due to be completed by March 2021 <p>The Chair advised the Board that both he and PB had visited the site of Wichelstowe Southern Access on 10 March. He deemed it a fascinating project which had been hampered by the recent bad weather making it six weeks behind schedule at present. The Chair was thrilled to have been invited back at any time in the future to view progress.</p> <p>All dates quoted in the report were the pre-Covid-19 crisis, so SWLEP was anticipating impact on these dates going forward.</p> <p>The Swindon & Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership Board: APPROVED the highlight reports as an accurate representation of the current status of all LGF projects.</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
4.3	<p>Highlight Reports were available for all other projects. The following figures summarised the status across all the projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ten LGF projects had completed; • 16 projects were rated GREEN; • nine projects were rated AMBER GREEN; • one project was rated AMBER; • two projects were rated AMBER RED; and • 0 projects were rated RED; <p>Comments on other projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Royal Artillery Museum (RAM) project had moved its status from AMBER RED to AMBER GREEN; • the White Hart Junction project had moved its status from AMBER GREEN to AMBER RED, owing to the complicated land swap; • the Wiltshire College & University Centre, Lackham Campus project OBC would come to the May Board for approval. It was currently still going through the ITA process; and • SWLEP funds on the Swindon Bus Boulevard were being used for enabling works on Fleming Way, preparing the site for BT cabling diversions. This was on track, if not slightly ahead of profile. <p>The question was raised as to why there had been an independent review for the Gablecross project within the New Eastern Villages scheme. The response was that SBC was constantly looking for Value for Money across contracts. The LA had followed guidance from Highways England (HE) and DfT to follow the HE procurement route.</p> <p>The SWLEP was kept abreast of the situation as it developed. When tender prices came back far higher than could be managed within the spending envelope, the decision was made to move outside the Highways England procurement framework and SBC now had successful engagement through another procurement framework operated by Hampshire Council. PB explained that it was SBC's role as a scheme promotor to keep SWLEP informed and that the issue for SWLEP was the impact on the programme and the defrayment. Contractors were advised very clearly of the upper limit, but still came in too high.</p> <p>AR requested that the notes reclarify the position.</p> <p>Action: CA and PV to amend accordingly.</p> <p>Chippenham Ib Outline Business Case (OBC)</p>	<p>March 2020</p>



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>CA spoke to the paper and explained that this phase of the project was for step-free access (lift) to the Chippenham station from the North. The OBC for the overall project had already been approved; this paper was requesting a drawdown of £1.5m for Phase 1b. Progress outlined as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • implementation plan to be signed off by March 2020; • start on site date of October 2020; and • substantial completion by the end of March 2021. <p>A copy of the Outline Business Case for the overall project can be found by following the link below:</p> <p>https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/programmes/local-growth-fund-lgf/outline-business-cases/chippenham-station-hub/overall-obc-jan-18/chippenham-station-hub-obc-20180109.pdf?sfvrsn=36be589_8</p> <p>Procurement would be through Network Rail and GWR would procure for the safe walking route. This was a complicated and drawn out process with partners Network Rail.</p> <p>SF added that Network Rail was leading on the detailed design and the £1.5m envelope was still within the £16m overall project cost. Wiltshire Council was at the pre-procurement stage and so there was still uncertainty around the final costs. The implementation agreement with NR was subject to funds being released. One option for delivery which was the more expensive option included the risk premium. PWWh added that his experience would suggest that Wiltshire Council pay the premium in order to defray the risk.</p> <p>The Chair commented on Phase 7 of the scheme and stated that he had repeatedly raised the personal opinion about the building of residential units so close to the railway. Explanations had always been that this pays for elements of the project, but he felt that the proximity to the college could lead to high-tech business units, which would be more beneficial to the area.</p> <p>BM agreed with the Chair's comments and would like to discuss further outside the meeting. Chair would appreciate something from the Council and other partners in the project that this is the right use for that space.</p> <p>The Swindon & Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership Board: APPROVED the update to the Outline Business Case, enabling the continued release of funding within the agreed Local Growth Deal allocation to complete design and construction work, subject to securing the necessary consents.</p>	
4.4	Royal Artillery Museum (RAM) Business Case	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>CA spoke to the paper. SWLEP would be granting £1.35m out of total project costs of £8.1m. The Outline Business Case can be found on the SWLEP website by following the link below.</p> <p>https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/programmes/local-growth-fund-igf/outline-business-cases/royal-artillery-museum-(ram)/ram-updated-obc-10-feb-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=ad477240_8</p> <p>Annexes to the OBC can also be found by visiting the SWLEP website.</p> <p>It was noted that the forecast economic impacts were based on RAM's target visitor numbers: 91,000 paying visitors in Year 1, growing to 153,000 paying visitors in Year 7.</p> <p>CA advised that the additional information provided within the Updated OBC, together with subsequent discussions between RAM's team and the ITA, had satisfied the ITA that their questions and concerns had now been addressed by RAM and that the project offered value for money .</p> <p>CA drew the Board's attention to Section 6.7 in the paper and highlighted three red risk ratings associated with planning. Martin Harvey (MH), Programme Director for the project, added that more actions had taken place since the report had been prepared and updated the meeting accordingly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the planning team was still working hard to finalise planning application documentation and maintaining good dialogue with the Planning Department; MH felt that they had mitigated planning risks through the thoroughness of approach which included an archaeological evaluation, an ecological survey and an extensive transport assessment; community engagement events had taken place earlier in the year and a Community Liaison Group had been established; <p>The question was raised on how long it would take for a project of this type to obtain planning consent in normal circumstances and then how long when adding the impact of Covid-19.</p> <p>SF advised the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> that the planning team was resilient and could work remotely; for a high-profile application like RAM he suggested that a comprehensive pre-application be completed to iron out any issues; he was due to speak to Maj Gen Nick Eeles within a few days; there had been 1,000 signatures each for and against the project; the Liaison Committee had met prior to the outbreak of Covid-19 but would need to meet again; he suggested that RAM should look to extend its timetable for submission of the planning application; and 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> he would urge not to make a decision until the public had been allowed to comment, otherwise there would be critics of the process which may lead to a judicial review. <p>The Chair asked whether the SWLEP spend on this project would have been completed before Covid-19. A planning application would take 12-16 weeks to be determined and although it was a tight deadline SF felt it was achievable. MH also was optimistic about the timetable and would be looking to get on site within a couple of months after the planning permission had been granted, Covid-19 aside. He would anticipate spending the SWLEP grant monies rapidly in the stage of construction and more than likely to be spent before the end of the year.</p> <p>The Chair requested check points and time marks in the process as progress points on the planning in order to stay on schedule.</p> <p>Action: CA and team to draft progress points / timescales.</p> <p>The signing of the lease was classed as a risk and discussions with DIO and Army HQ had been positive. The Army had confirmed publicly that the signing of the lease was intended when planning permission had been granted.</p> <p>PM added that he and several other Directors had an informative visit to the site on 16 March 2020 but wanted to make the point that the junction of A345 / A342 would be a difficult turn for coaches. The discussion would be taken off-line.</p> <p>The Swindon & Wiltshire Local Enterprise Board: APPROVED the updated Outline Business Case for the Royal Artillery Museum enabling the release of £1.35m in funding from the Local Growth Fund to support construction work.</p>	
4.5	<p>Finance and outputs reports for LGF projects</p> <p>CA spoke to the paper and reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> part of the Quarter 3 (Q3) reporting to BEIS, £5.7m of LGF funding moved to a Department for Transport (DfT) Retained Scheme - NEV White Hart Junction; this had reduced the overall LGF spend and associated grant reporting to £101,469,630; the submitted Q3 report indicated £8.5m spend against a profile spend of £18.6m, 46%; a revision of the Q3 spend showed an increase to £8.8m, 47%; and a further £9.8m spend is forecast for Q4 19/20 (January to March 2020). <p>All projects were reporting that they would be completed by March 2021, even though there were concerns about the spend profile.</p> <p>The Swindon & Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership Board:</p>	April 2020



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	APPROVED this paper as an accurate summary of the current LGF financial and output position.	
5.0	Local Industrial Strategy (LIS)	
5.1	<p>Draft Strategy and route to publication</p> <p>DG spoke to the paper and detailed the key points being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to take the Local Industrial Strategy document to publication; • to progress the Implementation Plan; and • that there were two key projects proceeding in parallel. <p>At the recent Working Group, it was agreed to publish the document as an emerging LIS to get it out in the public domain and allow key stakeholders to view but continue to progress and work behind the scenes with Government. However, this latter point was now proving difficult with the Covid-19 situation.</p> <p>The Chair thanked DS and DH in getting the document to this stage and thanked DG for his chairing of the Working Group. The question was raised on whether SWLEP needed to inform Government if it were to publish the LIS and KL responded that it was perfectly acceptable to go ahead at present and that BEIS would pick it back up when possible.</p> <p>There had been over 1,000 business engaged during this process. It would be a good opportunity to issue to stakeholders in bite-sized chunks and invite comments.</p> <p>There was a question raised about the process for the funding and grant allocations for spin offs, particularly for the behaviour of large corporate organisations. PB advised that this was aimed mainly at University-led R&D. KL confirmed that the Government had a general ambition for this. It was agreed to take this discussion off-line. The Chair advised therefore that the reference should be retained in the document.</p> <p>The question was raised whether the reference to the Institute of Technology (IoT) could be made stronger and the team agreed to enhance.</p> <p>Action: DS to amend accordingly.</p> <p>The meeting agreed that this was a terrific document but queried how long it would remain as “emerging” as any projects coming forward should reflect back to this document. It was agreed that the feedback period would be limited when issued to key sectors in order for them to comment.</p> <p>The Swindon & Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership Board: APPROVED the Vision statement; APPROVED the aim for each foundation; NOTED the feedback from the Central LIS Team; and</p>	March 2020



Item	Narrative	Deadline
5.2	<p>AGREED the next steps and timeline.</p> <p>Business-led cyber centre update AG updated the meeting and the Chair thanked him for his work in this area. The Centre had been a tangible project until hit by Covid-19 issues. It had been looking at the existing cyber strategy and the national benefits and aligning with them. The landscape was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BEIS was keen for the Cyber Valley to operate, which was from Worcester down to the border with Dorset; • the newly established Western Gateway with a growing digital gaming and animation environment; and • these two areas were connected by Swindon & Wiltshire at the pivot point. <p>Phil Clement, SWLEP's Head of Export & Inward Investment, and Chris Crowther, Straboug Consulting, had recently been overseas where the concept had received great interest from several international companies. It would be viewed as a launch pad and incubation space with engagement with Defence, Law Enforcement, members of National Security Centre and academia. The Centre would be based in Corsham Science Park for up to three years with the option of a new build on site nearby if it were to become available. Corsham was chosen because of its location and connectivity with the ability to expand if necessary later. SWLEP would work with partners in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R&D opportunities for business to work closely with academia and other innovators; • incubator space to start to engage with the Government accelerator programme; • R&D, training and apprenticeships within academia; • employment opportunities and retraining from existing to new careers; • diversity into the space – people with talent, but struggling into careers; and • security and resilience centre available to SMEs across the country with access to data to make them secure. <p>SWLEP had been looking for more engagement with the full range of stakeholders, including a new involvement with the Police. However, this had been stalled because of Covid-19. The team would now be trying to meet key stakeholders digitally for the time being in order to move the project forward.</p>	
5.3	<p>New Energy Vehicles Infrastructure DS updated the meeting. SWLEP had been working with Ecuity for business engagement. The Board gave approval at the January meeting for the elements of community charging and hydrogen. Four Strategic Outline Business Cases (SOBCs) had been received.</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Hydrogen SOBC looked at</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. intercity buses and energy generation; 2. logistics demonstrator would hopefully have forklift trucks operating within the next year; and 3. a hydrogen demonstrator which would generate power on a specific site. <p>Defra had established a Rural Community Energy Fund with £40k available in grants and SWLEP was working up a business case and was also working with the National Collection Centre at Wroughton for the art of the possible and exploring these concepts to the next level.</p> <p>Although the exploration of hydrogen power was good, PWh was concerned about the emphasis on forklift truck and larger vehicles as some car manufacturers, such as Hyundai, were now producing small cars. The response was that forklift trucks were in fact a starting point and it would expand to other modes.</p> <p>The Chair commented that it was good that SWLEP had work already progressing on two elements of emerging industrial strategy.</p>	
6.0	Business Planning for 2020/21	
	<p>PB updated the meeting on the key items from the paper. Owing to the Covid-19 work the situation had become uncertain, but SWLEP had identified key areas as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DS and DH were working on the Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) and its implementation; • DS was working on the Business Transfer Agreement; • DS and Sandy Evans on financial planning through 2020/2; and • redirecting staff to the Growth Hub to deal with Covid-19 and were expecting 5/6 additional members to join Hub team <p>PB added that SWLEP needed to be prepared to pick up projects when the situation settled, and he expected there to be a stimulus to the economy from Government when the time was right. He also suggested that we maintain a watching brief on the effect that Covid-19 would have on future work patterns as this may impact on the mix of residential vs incubator hub space in certain locations. Everything that we had planned to happen in 2020 may now be shunted into 2021.</p> <p>Given the on-going situation he advised the meeting of a proposed postponement of the annual conference from October 2020 to April 2021. The meeting was in agreement.</p> <p>Additional comments from Board Directors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PWh requested some figures in terms of targets under Section 4.2 of the paper. <p>Action: PB to update</p>	March 2020



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the implementation plan for the LIS is taken forward there should be more emphasis within the document. <p>Action: PB to make clearer in the annual plan</p> <p>The Chair commented that although the LIS focussed on key areas and specific sectors, we should not forget the large numbers of businesses within the area which would still need support.</p>	March 2020
7.0	Governance Framework	
	<p>DS spoke to the paper. The SWLEP Governance Framework was compliant with the National Assurance Framework but needed to reflect the working to delivery of the LIS and SWLEP incorporation. More national guidance was expected during 2021.</p> <p>A request was made for a Task & Finish Group to be established to take this to the next phase. As the incoming Chair, PM was to sit on the Group and KL and MC volunteered to assist.</p> <p>The Chair thanked DS for her work on the Governance Framework.</p>	
8.1	<p>Director's Report</p> <p>Attention drawn to the business engagement figures</p> <p>Section 4.5 of the report focussed on the business engagement figures with a tally across the team on contact with businesses. This amounted to 3,200 contacts across the course of the year and showed that the SWLEP's message was becoming more widespread and providing a pipeline of potential business for the GPIF.</p> <p>The online presence for Growth Hub had substantially increased over the past year. Currently, the Growth Hub was the main channel of communications regarding Covid-19 and had a dedicated page which had been up for two weeks. Growth Hub was receiving constant feedback with 70+ calls last week alone. In future the Hub would be progressing from purely information pages to advice. The direct approach by issuing information under Paddy's name had yielded some great responses.</p> <p>The meeting: NOTED the contents of the report.</p>	
8.2	<p>Chair's update</p> <p>The meeting: NOTED the contents of the report.</p>	
9.0	Update on the outcome of the SWLEP Chair recruitment	
	<p>The Board confirmed in a unanimous vote that Paul Moorby (PM) would take over as Chair of the SWLEP from 1 April 2020. PM thanked everyone for their</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	support and praised the outgoing Chair, John Mortimer for the fantastic job he had done over the last four years.	
	Date of next meeting	
	Thursday, 21 May 2020 The meeting was scheduled to be at the Offices WRc, Frankland Road, Swindon, SN5 8YF. However, there was a strong chance that it would be held virtually again.	
	Future Meetings The Board Directors to meet at 9am for a 9.30am start to the public meeting. Wednesday, 22 July 2020 The Auditorium, Aspire Business Centre, Ordnance Road, Tidworth, SP9 7QD Wednesday, 23 September 2020 Location to be advised. Wednesday, 25 November 2020 Location to be advised	
	Close of the meeting at 12.15pm	

21 May 2020