

Meeting Minutes

Meeting title	Growth Deal programme – Reallocation of Funds
Date/time/venue	By email – from Lynn Stacey (tabled by Mally Findlater MF) 2nd August 2017 @ 15:50
Attendees	<i>Members:</i> Diane Savory (DS) (<i>Chair</i>), Roman Cooper (RC), Mark Hawthorne (MH), Stephen Jordan (SJ), Stephen Marston (SM) Mike Warner (MW), Adam Starkey & (AS) Rob Loveday (RL) Neill Ricketts (NR) David Owen (DO), Claire Mould (CM) & Matthew Burgess (MB)

No.	Item	Action	By
3b	<p>Written Procedure: Agenda Item 4 – Growth Deal Programme reallocation of funds</p> <p>At the Board meeting on 25.04.17 the process for reallocation of Growth Deal funds that become available when projects are either withdrawn or underspent was discussed and noted. As the Board meeting on 8/8/17 was cancelled, Agenda Item 4 – Growth Deal Programme reallocation of funds was reviewed and processed by written procedure.</p> <p>The Board were emailed a covering paper with information on progress to date, a revised timetable and a status report.</p> <p>Information from all projects with indicative funding, not yet confirmed, has been gathered to inform the ‘status’ report.</p> <p>During the process of gathering up to date information on the current projects with indicative funding, it has not been possible to collect all the information needed to fully inform recommendations for 4 of them. As a result, the timetable has been revised, and a 3rd option for the August Board decision was added: 3) allowed extra time, for final decision at October Board. A revised timetable has been provided to all relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>The Board was asked by written procedure to review the information and recommendations provided, and then to confirm by email their individual responses for each point that required a decision. Responses were required by 5pm on 08.08.17 The individual points are listed below, and the decision made.</p> <p>As the responses to the written procedure process did not deliver a quorate decision from the full Board due to holiday absentees, the LEP Chair (DS) made the final decisions on behalf of the Board, taking account of those responses that were received. Diane had reviewed Agenda item 4 in advance and noted the recommendations from the LEP executive and Board sub groups. She accepted all the recommendations in the covering paper (details below for each decision)</p>		

Status of Projects:

Retail Entrepreneurship Project:

The £400K indicative funding for the Retail Lab is profiled to be spent in 17/18. As the original plans for delivery by the LEP failed to progress, expressions of interest were invited for substitute projects that would deliver the same objectives and outcomes, but that would also provide a sustainable and exciting contribution to the Programme. Two projects were shortlisted, and reviewed by a sub group. As a result, Marketing Gloucester's 'Supporting Retail Entrepreneurship' project had been selected for consideration by the LEP Board.

Action for written procedure:

The Board to decide if the Marketing Gloucester 'Supporting Retail Entrepreneurship' project will be confirmed as the substitute project for the Retail Lab £400K investment or not.

Decision:

DS confirmed on behalf of the full Board that this substitution has been approved.

Project Status Report (RAG rated) :Projects with indicative funding that have not yet got funding confirmed (funding agreements)

Of the 11 projects under review , the following have been rated as **GREEN**. They are progressing as we would expect at this point in the programme, and it was recommended that their indicative funding is confirmed:

- Cheltenham Cyber Park**
 - A40 Longford Traffic Scheme**
 - A419 Corridor Improvements**
 - Gloucester South West By Pass**
 - Cheltenham Spa Railway Station**
 - Lydney Transport Strategy**
- The substitute **Retail Entrepreneur** project

Action for written procedure:

The Board to decide for each of the Projects rated **GREEN**:

- 1) indicative funding confirmed, 2) indicative funding withdrawn (either voluntarily or enforced) or 3) allowed extra time, for final decision at October Board

Decision:

DS confirmed on behalf of the full Board that for all of the GREEN rated projects listed above their indicative funding will be confirmed.

The following Projects have been rated as **AMBER**. They still have the potential to be viable and credible investments, but, to varying degrees, are judged to justify careful consideration in this process. There is either an element of challenge or the required information is not yet available to make a final decision. It was recommended that a decision for each of these projects should be: 3) allowed extra time, for final decision at October Board

Advanced Renewable Energy Resource Centre (ARERC):

- B4063 Staverton Bridge Junction**
- A38 B4066 access to Berkley**
- St Barnabas Roundabout**

Action for written procedure:

The Board was asked to decide for each of the Projects rated **AMBER**:

- 1) Indicative funding confirmed, 2) indicative funding withdrawn (either

<p>3c</p>	<p>voluntarily or enforced) or 3) allowed extra time, for final decision at October Board</p> <p>Decision: DS confirmed on behalf of the full Board that for all of the AMBER rated projects listed above they should be allowed extra time, for a final decision at the October Board.</p> <p>The ‘Opportunity’</p> <p>The amount and timing of the ‘opportunity’ remains unknown. As a final decision on those projects that will have their indicative funding withdrawn (if any) will not now be known until the October Board, it was not possible to provide an update now.</p> <p>Action by written procedure: Board noted information in point 3c</p> <p>Potential projects for consideration:</p>		
<p>3d</p>	<p>All the GD3 projects that were not successful have indicated that they will either be resubmitting their existing projects without change, or will be working on revised business cases that would be able to deliver reduced project outputs for a reduced investment.</p> <p>To date, no new projects have been put forward officially by either the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Committee or the LEP Board as ‘exceptional’, and therefore eligible for consideration.</p> <p>The new timetable affects the deadline for these submissions, which should be noted by Board members and communicated to any project promoters who they are in discussion with.</p> <p>Action by written procedure: Board noted information in point 3d</p>		