



Membership	<p>Business Improvement Districts (BIDs): Chippenham – (Kathryn Crosweller) Swindon – (Diane Powell) BusinessWest – (Ian Larrard) Salisbury – (Andy Rhind-Tutt) Thames Valley – (Alex Broad CLA – (John Mortimer) Federation of Small Business – (Mary Webb OR Nicola Bailey) Icaew – (Martin Warren) Institute of Directors – (Guy Tullberg) NFU – Andrea Witcombe (maternity leave) / Edward Humber in interim SWLEP – (Paddy Bradley / Tom Bown / Jo Minnaar) VisitWiltshire – (David Andrews/Peter Wragg)</p>
Attendees	<p>John Mortimer - CLA Paddy Bradley – SWLEP Tom Bown – SWLEP Robin McGowan– Salisbury BID Jo Minnaar - SWLEP Colette Mallon - SWLEP Phil Clement - SWLEP Amanda Peach representing Mandy Timbrell - Higher Futures SWLEP Mary Webb – Federation of Small Business Rob Perks Inspire by Wessex Chamber Leigh Robertson representing Alex Broad - Thames Valley Rob Butler representing Guy Tullberg - Institute of Directors Andrew Wells - Business West</p>
Apologies	<p>Andy Rhind-Tutt – Salisbury Chamber / Guy Tullberg – Institute of Directors / Nicola Bailey - FSB / Ian Larrard - Business West / Mandy Paterson - Inspire by Wessex Chamber / Kathryn Crosweller - Chippenham BID / Diane Powell - Swindon BID / Edward Humber – NFU / Martin Warren - Icaew / Deborah Fraser - CBI / Ian Durston – SWLEP / David Andrews – VisitWiltshire / Alison Edgar</p>
Chair	John Mortimer (JM)
Minutes	Trudie Clarkson (TC)
Venue	Meeting Room, City Hall, Salisbury
Start time	12:00pm
Finish Time	14:00pm

1.0	Welcome and Introductions	
2.0	Minutes of meeting held on 10 May 2018	
	The Minutes of the meeting held on 10 May 2018 were approved.	
3.0	Round Table Discussion	ALL
	<p>RM stated that the situation in Salisbury was still challenging following recent events. However, the cordon had now been removed from most areas, and the intense media coverage had finished. At this stage it was difficult to know the long-term effects in the town centre, as most town centres were having challenging times. They were looking at the changing needs of the town and at the long-term prospects so that in ten years it would still be a vibrant city. MW stated that though there were tourists, they were not staying overnight in the city. They believed footfall was down 10-15%. JM explained that SWLEP had provided £50,000 of immediate capital fund grants, which was subsequently increased by another £50,000. All of this had now been allocated except £8,000. This was on top of the £6m SWLEP had provided towards the future Maltings redevelopment, and £15m towards Salisbury College. MW stated that it would be good for Salisbury to have a deep clean when all the cordons have been removed.</p> <p>RP stated that Bexit was giving mixed messages, so some of the businesses were feeling frustrated, but most had given up worrying. At this stage, it appeared only the businesses that relied heavily on import/export were unduly concerned. However, most businesses were optimistic, and felt that growth was strong. Businesses still stated that there was a skills and talent shortage particularly amongst the 16-18-year olds with poor literacy skills. AW stated skills, recruitment and retention were still the key issues in Swindon, and two major employers had grave concerns over Brexit and were making redundancies over the next three months. This means about 700 people would be looking for new employment. However, small businesses stated that they feel no major change, and it was very much business as usual. LR stated that there was frustration, and irritation that nothing appeared to be moving fast enough and there was a lack of clarity. There was a discussion on the migrant workforce and that the issues may not just be down to Brexit.</p> <p>PB stated that there could be a windfall from the European Structural Fund, possibly in the region of £2-3m owing to the exchange rate and the funding being paid in Pounds Sterling, not Euros. MW stated that nationally it appeared that small companies were finding it very difficult to access finance. RM stated that it was difficult to obtain specific economic data that was not just anecdotal. RP stated that it was possibly retail that banks had issues with, and after a brief discussion this was agreed by all.</p>	

	<p>JM then spoke about the SWLEP changing its legal identity next year, and becoming incorporated. This was following a vote of confidence from the Government. He also stated that new Board Members would be required by November, and that in line with employment law, by 2020 30% of the Board should be women, and there should be an ethnic representation. RP stated that women had other obligations outside of work at home, so may not be able to commit. NOTE: Please see additional note at the end of these minutes</p>	
4.0	Growth Hub update	JoM
	<p>JoM gave an update on growth hub, stating that we were now moving into phase 3 of implementation. Soon there would be seminars and workshops to support the people who use it. Growth Hub was currently proving to be very successful, and each week the data was expanding. JoM encouraged any of the business representatives at the meeting to encourage their members to use it.</p>	
5.0	Salisbury update	PB/PC
	<p>Regarding the Salisbury update, PB stated SWLEP had doubled its support, including personnel visiting businesses in Salisbury and Amesbury to gather information and data. SWLEP was also looking at the Local Industrial Strategy plan regarding the recent incidents, and how to aid the recovery and expansion over many years. To-date 27 companies had benefited from SWLEP funding, to a maximum of £5,000 per company. Regarding the new funding and interest rate loan for companies it is in the region of 2-7%</p>	
6.0	Institute of Technology update	PB
	<p>Regarding the Institute of Technology (IoT), PB stated that the current bid was going well. The Government was looking at 11-15 IoT bids from around the country, and the application was definitely on the right track. By November we should have more information.</p>	
7.0	Higher Futures update	AP
	<p>AP representing MT gave an update on Higher Futures. She stated that the Digisheds (Carriageworks) sessions had gone well, but it would be great for more people to attend, and to help advertise the experience and the benefits of meeting spaces and technology. Any of the groups represented at the meeting could pass on details to TB. It was noted that although there had been a military leavers' fayre, there appeared to be no similar facility for military wives. AP stated that she would consider this and hopefully be able to organise a spouse recruitment drive to rectify it.</p>	
8.0	Growing Places Infrastructure Fund (GPIF) update	PC
	<p>Regarding the Growing Places Infrastructure Fund, we had now awarded £5m over four companies – creating new jobs and prospective growth and health to the companies. The first loan is due to be sent out in September. By November all should have received their funding.</p>	
9.0	Developing our local Industrial Strategy	PB



	<p>PB gave an account on Developing our Local Industrial Strategy. This included explaining the objectives to boost productivity, be global leaders in our area, and to recognise what would be developing over the next 10-15 years. Areas that would be covered in the report would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• mobility,• our ageing society,• clean growth,• digital technology, and• automation. <p>The report would be looked at in 2020 and would show how our area distinguishes from other areas. It will also be looking at both local councils' spatial planning documents which will be available Autumn/Winter 2018.</p>	
10.0	AOB	ALL
	<p>Dates of future Meetings 7 November 2018, 12 noon - 2pm, Wavin, Chippenham, SN15 5PN 13 February 2019, – 12 noon - 2pm. Location TBC (Salisbury) 8 May 2019, – 12 noon - 2pm. Location TBC (Chippenham/Swindon) 7 August 2019, – 12 noon - 2pm. Location TBC (Salisbury) 6 November 2019, – 12 noon - 2pm. Location TBC (Chippenham/Swindon)</p>	
	Meeting closed at 2.00pm	

Ammin
7 November 2018



ADDITIONAL NOTE TO ITEM 3.0 ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION:

“RP stated that women had other obligations outside of work at home, so may not be able to commit.”

The above statement received adverse comment when the Minutes were discussed pending approval. RP was asked to clarify his meaning. He was not in attendance at the meeting, but made the following comment in a subsequent communication

Whilst I can't remember the detail, I'm sure there was a request to ask if any members were able to help with finding women business leaders who could join the LEP Board and I commented that one of the reasons it was sometimes difficult to find females in senior business roles is because many have family commitments, by choice very often, and meetings are often held at times they find inconvenient. This could of course apply to males too but it is a matter of fact that more females have childcare considerations than males. This was not pejorative but just an observation that it could be a relevant consideration. The fact that 66% of Inspire's Executive Board is female more than meeting the 30% target for females on Boards recommended for good Corporate Governance, should demonstrate my attitude to females in senior roles! We do have a flexible approach to organising our Board meetings to fit around childcare issues allowing those individuals to fully participate at Board level.