



**Minutes of the Cheshire and Warrington Local Enterprise Partnership
Performance and Investment Committee Meeting
held on 19th June 2017 at Wyvern House**

In attendance: Ged Barlow (Chairman), Howard Hopwood, Jan Willis, Steve Park, John Downes, Chris Hindley, Alison Knight, Rachel Brosnahan, Francis Lee, Mark Livesey, Philip Cox (part)

Apologies: Martin Ashcroft, Susan Woodward Moor, Paul Goodwin

Presentations by: Helen Nellist and Jasbir Dhesi (South Cheshire College)
Alison Armstrong and Alison Knight (Cheshire West and Chester Council)

| Item No. | Item | To be Actioned by | By When |
|----------|--|-------------------|---------|
| 1. | Welcome, Introductions and Apologies GB opened the meeting and asked everyone to introduce themselves and welcomed the two new committee members. MA and PG sent their apologies. SWM is currently on secondment to Cheshire East Council. | | |
| 2 | Conflicts of Interest GB asked for any conflicts to be declared. AK declared an interest in the Ellesmere Port One Estate project. | | |
| 3 | Minutes and actions from the last meeting: The Lancashire Rep is stepping back from the strategic oversight board. It is proposed that Andy Farrell take the seat. FL is the deputy on the Northern Powerhouse Investment Fund Regional Advisory Board. Northgate: AK to encourage team to share information but stated much will still be confidential. The minutes were agreed | | |
| 4 | Terms of Reference (TORs) GB clarified what the role of the P&I was: it was required to assess grant and loan applications and to manage and monitor projects moving forward. The P&I looks at the detail of the project whereas the Strategy committee looks at the principles of investing funding. ML clarified that the P&I committee had a scrutiny role and that there was clear separation of duties from the Scrutiny Committee. CH asked if projects could be passed back for further information to be obtained before a decision was made. GB confirmed absolutely. JW queried funding criteria and how projects are assessed. RB confirmed | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|----|---------|
| | <p>that we use the 5 case model, but following revised government guidance we would now have to use Land Uplift Value as a measure rather than Benefits Cost Ratio.</p> <p>The TORs were approved.</p> | | |
| 5 | <p>South Cheshire College Presentation: Ellesmere Port and Chester Campus Remodelling</p> <p>Helen Nellist and Jasbir Dhesi presented the proposal to remodel the Ellesmere Port and Chester campuses.</p> <p>11000 pupils, 1,300 apprenticeships, 1,500 employers, 800 staff, although due to be reduced to the restructure.</p> <p>£27m secured from HMT. The funding was conditional upon the College securing a grant from the LEP for the remodelling work. South Cheshire College is one of three colleges applying to access funds from the Restructure Fund and is the first to get an offer.</p> <p>HMT will not pay for capital work, hence the need for a grant.</p> <p>£21m has been used to off debts. £6m has been given either interest free or at 1.5%.</p> <p>The college have now been able to put forward £250k of match funding to the project (7%) and will meet any cost overspends. They also expect to be able to pay for £1m of capital investment for the next three years.</p> <p>They expect to be able to achieve £3.3m of savings per year by 2017.</p> <p>Ofsted grade has already improved.</p> <p>GB asked why the campuses were designed the way they were given they were relatively new. Dhesi said that education changes with political whims.</p> <p>JW asked about outputs as those shown were very low. Helen explained they'd been asked by HMT not to forecast growth and that maintaining current numbers was essentially growth due to the demographics of 16-19 year olds.</p> <p>SP stated he was concerned about centralising services and the extent to which students were prepared to travel.</p> <p>JD concerned that costs may have gone up by next year and the cost per sqm shown was high.</p> <p>AK said they had followed through on the ABR review recommendations.</p> <p>HH concerned about the rationale for the project.</p> <p>The Committee agreed to approve the project with the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actual increase in student numbers expected to be provided • Schedule of works and cost plan to be provided • Confirmation that the College will meet any cost over spend. <p>GB requested that RB obtain slides before meetings in future to check the presentation can be completed within the time allowed.</p> | | |
| | | RB | Ongoing |

| | | | |
|---|---|----|----------------------------------|
| 6 | <p>Ellesmere Port One Estate Presentation</p> <p>AK introduced herself and explained that central government were keen on the one estate principle. There was another CEO meeting planned for the 10th July where it was hoped to get agreement to sign the MOUs and agree the preferred design option.</p> <p>Perfect Circle had completed their initial design work and had come up with four designs each of which retained the library which is proposed to be used for back office staff.</p> <p>The preferred option (but yet to be agreed with partners) is a brand new hub costing £34m with a 175 week build (option 2). AA thought they could have the hub up and running in as little as 85 weeks from the start of work.</p> <p>Option 2 would have a proposed start date of November 18 and a finish of February 2022. RB commented that the LGF monies need to be spent by the end of March 21 so the proposed timing of the project is a concern but something we could try and work with.</p> <p>AA explained the difficulties with getting all the partners to confirm capital contributions that it appeared not all partners were 100% committed to the scheme. RB felt that commitment to the scheme needed to be made asap as there was a danger that conversations about the project would go on with no decisions being made, putting the funding at risk.</p> <p>CWAC have so far got approval to commit £7m to the scheme.</p> <p>The Committee agreed that all partners should sign an MOU by the end of July and that by the end of September the funding package for the agreed option should be confirmed,</p> | AK | End of July and End of September |
| 7 | <p>Cheshire Green Update</p> <p>PC gave a short summary of where the loan application was up to and the changes proposed.</p> <p>Everyone agreed they were happy to proceed on the basis set out in the paper.</p> | | |
| 8 | <p>Programme Manager update</p> <p>RB ran through the report. She explained that PC had asked that the top 5 corporate and programme risks were reported monthly to the P&I committee. Everyone noted the risks.</p> <p>HH asked that on Thornton letters from the companies donating the equipment, confirming the values were obtained.</p> <p>RB discussed the outputs profiled on projects against the target which showed that the LEP should exceed targets.</p> <p>GB requested that any projects underperforming on outputs should be brought forward to the committee for discussion asap.</p> | | |

| | | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 9 | <p>ESIF Update</p> <p>FL ran through his report. Joderell Bank application had been rejected but they're keen to do something with them.</p> <p>On the broadband project they were going to move some money to SME support activity instead.</p> <p>ESF – Government no longer co-financing.</p> | | |
| 9 | <p>Office Move</p> <p>RB confirmed that the LEP should be moving offices into Wyvern House on the 31st July.</p> | | |
| 10 | <p>AOB</p> <p>From September meetings to be moved to a Wednesday at 1.30.</p> | | |

DRAFT