



## Hampshire Prosperity Partnership Board

1 June 2026

### Agenda Item 7 – Call for projects in Hampshire seeking capital funding from the LEP legacy reserves

The Hampshire Prosperity Partnership Board (HPPB) is asked to:

**NOTE** the approach to managing conflicts of interest set out in Part 2, and **DECLARE** verbally any conflicts not identified in Part 2, at the beginning of this agenda item

**NOTE** the recap of the process undertaken so far to invite, assess and shortlist applications, and of the discussion at the HPPB meeting on 9 March, as set out in Part 3

**CONSIDER** the further information provided regarding the 16 shortlisted applications, as set out in Part 4 and the tables at Annex 1:

- a) in response to the questions raised by HPPB on 9 March
- b) in response to issues identified by the Hampshire County Council (HCC) officer panel

**CONSIDER** the results of further cost-benefit analysis undertaken by HCC for the 16 shortlisted projects, as set out in Part 5

**CONSIDER** the results of the due diligence carried out by HCC's Finance team, as set out in Part 6

Subject to the above consideration, **RECOMMEND** that all of the projects shaded in green in the table below, except for No. 42, South of Romsey Town Centre, should be approved for funding

No.	Project name	Applicant	Total score	Funding requested	Running total (all projects)	Running total (green only)
44	Microbial Innovation Centre	University of Southampton	29.75	£2,570,000	£2,570,000	£2,570,000

No.	Project name	Applicant	Total score	Funding requested	Running total (all projects)	Running total (green only)
6	Aerospace, Defence and Security Curricula Development	ADS	29	£450,000	£3,020,000	£3,020,000
26	Bacteriophage and Biologics Manufacturing and R&D Facility	University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation	26.75	£3,000,000	£6,020,000	£6,020,000
38	Faraday Connect	Fareham Borough Council	26.5	£1,167,941	£7,187,941	£7,187,941
42	South of Romsey Town Centre	Test Valley Borough Council	26	£2,000,000	£9,187,941	£9,187,941
45	Securing the Future of the New Forest Tour	New Forest National Park Authority	25.75	£2,270,000	£11,457,941	£11,457,941
23	Leigh Park Skills Centre	Havant Borough Council	25.25	£6,681,080	£18,139,021	£18,139,021
12	Test Valley Community Construction Academy	Sparsholt College	25	£1,056,000	£19,195,021	£19,195,021
48	Tech+Tour Hampshire Rollout	South Hampshire College Group	24.5	£400,000	£19,595,021	£19,595,021
39	Seascape Restoration and Innovation Centre	University of Portsmouth	24.5	£3,908,727	£23,503,748	
28	BRIDGE - Workforce and Innovation Centre	University of Winchester	24	£3,519,000	£27,022,748	
47	Alton Adult Learning Hub	HSDC	23.75	£180,000	£27,202,748	£19,775,021
13	IncuHive Farnborough	Rushmoor Borough Council	23.5	£1,445,000	£28,647,748	£21,220,021
2	Hampshire Fare Digital Futures Programme	Hampshire Fare	22.25	£57,300	£28,705,048	£21,277,321
37	Havant Maths and English Hub	HSDC	21.75	£400,000	£29,105,048	£21,677,321
31	Hampshire Creative Business Escalator	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	21.25	£325,000	£29,430,048	£22,002,321

**RECOMMEND** that the following three approvals should be subject to the following conditions:

- **No. 26, Bacteriophage and Biologics Manufacturing and R&D Facility – conditional on a satisfactory, legally-binding agreement being in place between the project partners (see paragraph 4.6)**
- **No. 27, Havant Maths and English Hub and No. 47, Alton Adult Learning Hub – conditional on confirmation that HSDC’s “enhanced supervision” status has been removed (see paragraph 5.6)**

**AGREE that HCC should undertake further work to assess the business case for No. 42, South of Romsey Town Centre, and report back to a future HPPB meeting**

**NOTE that all shortlisted proposals remain subject to (a) the subsidy control determination process and (b) formal approval by Hampshire County Council, and NOTE the remaining stages of the process as set out in Part 8**

## 1. Overview

1.1. The main body of this paper consists of the following parts:

- **Part 2** sets out a proposed approach to declaring and managing conflicts of interest at the HPPB meeting on 1 June, using the same process that was followed on 9 March.
- **Part 3** provides a concise recap of the process undertaken so far to invite, assess and shortlist applications, and of the discussion at the HPPB meeting on 9 March.
- **Part 4** considers further information provided by the shortlisted applicants since the HPPB meeting on 9 March:
  - a) in response to the questions raised by HPPB on 9 March
  - b) in response to issues identified by the Hampshire County Council (HCC) officer panel

That further information is summarised for each of the shortlisted applications in the tables at **Annex 1**.

- **Part 5** describes the due diligence undertaken by HCC's Finance team on the shortlisted applications, summarises the results of this work, and sets out any issues arising from this.
- **Part 6** provides an overview of the work undertaken by HCC to estimate benefit-cost ratios for the shortlisted projects, and sets out any issues arising from this.
- **Part 7** sets out recommendations, with proposed conditions in the case of some projects.
- **Part 8** sets out the remaining stages of the process, including completion of the subsidy determination process, and formal approval of funding for projects by HCC Cabinet.

## 2. Conflicts of interest

- 2.1. Each application to the call of projects was submitted by a single organisation i.e. the applicant. This is the organisation that, if the application were successful, would enter into a funding agreement with Hampshire County Council and receive the funds. In the case of a collaboration, the applicant would effectively be the lead partner.
- 2.2. Applicants were also asked to provide the “names of other organisations involved in your project”.
- 2.3. In the case of several applications, the applicant was an organisation led by an HPPB member. Organisations led by HPPB members were also referred to within several applications as “other organisations involved” in the project. These are shown in bold in the table below, for the 16 shortlisted applications. If required, the full version of this table, covering all applications, is at paragraph 2.4 here:

<https://documents.hants.gov.uk/hampshire-prosperity-partnership/HPPB-260309-Callforprojects.pdf>

### 2.4. We recommend that:

- **At the beginning of this agenda item, HPPB members declare verbally any other actual, potential and/or perceived conflicts of interest relating to the shortlisted applications, not shown in the table below. These will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.**
- **If during this agenda item any HPPB member wishes to discuss one of the projects for which the applicant was an organisation led by an HPPB member, the latter (as shown in the right-hand column of the table) should withdraw from the meeting room for the duration of that discussion.**

No.	Project name	Applicant	Other organisations involved	HPPB member from applicant
12	Test Valley Community Construction Academy	<b>Sparsholt College</b>	<b>Test Valley Borough Council</b>	Julie Milburn
13	IncuHive Farnborough	<b>Rushmoor Borough Council</b>		Gareth Williams
26	Bacteriophage and Biologics Manufacturing and R&D Facility	University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust	<b>University of Southampton</b>	
28	BRIDGE - Workforce and Innovation Centre	<b>University of Winchester</b>		Sarah Greer
31	Hampshire Creative Business Escalator	<b>Hampshire Chamber of Commerce</b>		Ross McNally

No.	Project name	Applicant	Other organisations involved	HPPB member from applicant
42	South of Romsey Town Centre	<b>Test Valley Borough Council</b>	<b>Hampshire County Council</b>	Phil North
44	Microbial Innovation Centre	<b>National Biofilm Innovation Centre, University of Southampton</b>		Mark Smith
45	Securing the Future of the New Forest Tour	New Forest National Park Authority	<b>Hampshire County Council</b>	
48	Tech+Tour Hampshire Rollout	South Hampshire College Group	<b>Sparsholt College Hampshire Chamber of Commerce</b>	

### 3. The process so far

#### Overview of the process so far

- 3.1. The call for projects was open from 27 November 2025 until 16 January 2026. 55 applications were received, of which two were withdrawn. The total amount of LLR funding requested across the remaining 53 applications was £120.85 million i.e. over five times the available total of £22.3 million.
- 3.2. In late January, a panel of HCC officers carried out an initial assessment of the applications, and shortlisted 16 of these. The shortlisted applicants were invited to present face-to-face to the panel in February, and were asked questions to elicit further information about their projects in advance of, during and after the presentation sessions.
- 3.3. The following paper (with annexes) was provided for the HPPB meeting on 9 March. This set out in detail the process that had been followed, considered the composition of the shortlist, provided concise information about the applications that were not shortlisted, and more detailed information about the shortlisted applications:

<https://documents.hants.gov.uk/hampshire-prosperity-partnership/HPPB-260309-Callforprojects.pdf>

<https://documents.hants.gov.uk/hampshire-prosperity-partnership/HPPB-260309-Callforprojects-Annex4.pdf>

#### HPPB meeting on 9 March

- 3.4. HPPB discussed the call for projects at its meeting on 9 March 2026. During the meeting, HPPB followed the approach to declaring and managing conflicts of interest referred to in Part 2 above.
- 3.5. HPPB asked detailed questions about the assessment and shortlisting process that had been followed by the officer panel and concluded that the process had been robust.

- 3.6. HPPB then discussed each of the 16 shortlisted projects in turn. For each discussion, any Board member(s) with a conflict of interest relating to the project that was being discussed stepped out of the room. For some of the projects, HPPB raised questions where further clarification was required.
- 3.7. HPPB agreed that all 16 shortlisted projects should proceed to the next stage of the process – the due diligence stage. However, this was on the basis that officers would report back to the next HPPB meeting with further information in response to the questions that HPPB had raised about some projects, and the results of the due diligence. HPPB would then make its recommendations about which projects should receive funding at its next meeting.
- 3.8. The draft minutes from the HPPB meeting on 9 March are attached separately, for approval by HPPB on 1 June.

#### **4. Further information about the shortlisted projects**

- 4.1. Since the previous HPPB meeting on 1 June, HCC has sought further information from the shortlisted applicants:
- a) in response to the questions raised by HPPB on 9 March
  - b) in response to some other issues identified by the Hampshire County Council (HCC) officer panel
- 4.2. This further information is summarised for each of the shortlisted projects in the tables at Annex 1. The rest of this Part 4 considers specific issues arising from the further information.

##### Responses to questions raised by HPPB on 9 March

- 4.3. We have received further information from applicants in response to all of the questions raised by HPPB on 9 March. Some of these responses were lengthy and detailed; the information in the tables at Annex 1 therefore consists of a summary and/or key excerpts in some cases. We will talk through the responses to HPPB's questions at the meeting on 1 June.

##### No. 26, Bacteriophage and Biologics Manufacturing and R&D Facility

- 4.4. The paper for the HPPB meeting on 9 March noted that further discussions were needed with the applicant for this project – University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust (UHS) – in particular to understand the proposed partnership and commercial structure.
- 4.5. Key features of that proposed structure are as follows:

- HCC would provide grant funding from the LLR to UHS. This would fund the conversion of the upper floor of the Lister Building at Adanac Park (currently a shell) into a space that would meet the bespoke requirements of the manufacturing facility. The premises is owned by UHS, which would lease the converted premises to Jafral at a commercial rate.
- The manufacturing facility would be owned and operated by a wholly owned UK subsidiary of Jafral.
- The other key partners – UHS, the University of Southampton, and the UK Health Security Agency – would not be investors in the facility. The respective roles of the partners would be set out in a Memorandum of Understanding, followed by a legally binding Project Agreement. These roles would include all of the partners being part of a Design Committee, that would ensure that the design, construction and accreditation of the facility are fit for clinical, research and regulatory purposes, and also of an Expert Reference Group.
- HCC would not join the partnership but could potentially be a member of the Expert Reference Group, to provide a link with HCC's economic development and skills activities.
- UHS have indicated that they are open in principle to considering an arrangement whereby HCC would receive a stream of payments, from the uplift in rental value resulting from the fit-out. We are still at an early stage of exploring this.

4.6. We believe that the proposed approach summarised above should provide a viable basis for taking forward this application. However, the project partners would need to make further progress before HCC could enter into a funding agreement with UHS, including putting in place the Project Agreement. **We therefore recommend that the funding for this project should be dependent on that legally binding commitment between partners being in place.** It seems likely that this would result in the funding agreement being concluded for this project later than for others.

## 5. Due diligence

5.1. For each of the shortlisted projects, a series of financial due diligence checks has been undertaken, including:

- Checks on the legal and financial status of applicants (using a third-party provider (CreditSafe) to provide a risk score)
- In-house assessments

- Searches on the Companies House and HMRC VAT Number registers as appropriate
- Detailed reviews of the financial business cases and benefit-cost ratios (BCRs) by in-house HCC professionals

5.2. Additional information and assurances have been sought from applicants as appropriate.

5.3. All of the shortlisted applicants have passed the financial due diligence tests. For estimated BCRs, see Part 6 below.

#### No. 27, Havant Maths and English Hub and No. 47, Alton Adult Learning Hub

5.4. The paper for the HPPB meeting on 9 March noted that in January, the Department for Education had issued HSDC (the applicant for both of these projects) with a revised “Financial Notice to Improve”, placing HSDC under “enhanced supervision”. It also stated that during the due diligence stage, we would test further whether this status raised any substantial concerns about the delivery of the projects.

5.5. HSDC met with HCC officers to discuss this in April, and subsequently provided written responses to our questions, together with management accounts. This has provided a good level of assurance that progress has been made, and HSDC has passed our due diligence checks.

5.6. We have also received an email from the Department for Education, stating that it is expected that the additional restrictions that were placed on the college since January will be lifted in mid-June. **We therefore recommend that funding for these projects should be conditional on this happening.** HSDC have indicated they will accept this condition.

## 6. Cost-benefit analysis

6.1. As explained in the paper for the HPPB meeting on 9 March, quantified cost benefit analysis was not used as part of the shortlisting process for any project, because of concerns that the data provided by applicants did not provide a robust basis for comparison.

6.2. Since 9 March, however, HCC has carried out further work on the benefit data provided for the 16 shortlisted projects, to test whether they would all represent value-for-money. Where necessary, HCC has sought further information from the shortlisted applicants regarding their benefit assumptions and the underlying evidence.

6.3. As a result, HCC has generated estimated benefit-cost ratios (BCRs) for the 16 shortlisted projects. With one exception (see next paragraph), all of the

projects have a BCR of at least 1.7, which represents acceptable value-for-money. The median estimated BCR across all 16 shortlisted projects is 3.3.

#### No. 42, South of Romsey Town Centre

6.4. The estimated BCR for this project is low, at 0.17. However, this is driven by the very high total project cost of £23 million. Also, the project is expected to give rise to standard transport-related benefits and land value uplift associated with housing delivery, but these impacts are not captured within the benefit framework that we have used for our cost-benefit analysis.

**6.5. We therefore recommend that HCC should undertake further work with the applicant, Test Valley Borough Council, to review the business case for this project.** This could involve focusing on the business case specifically for the bus interchange enhancements which the LLR funding would be used for, rather than the project as a whole, which has several other elements.

#### No. 38, Faraday Connect

6.6. The paper for the HPPB meeting on 9 March stated that HCC would carry out a specialist transport review of the business case for the link road at Daedalus, which accounts for over 90% of the cost of this project.

6.7. An independent review was commissioned from an external consultancy, Stantec. The review recommended that the project costings should include a higher level of optimism bias, and applied sensitivity testing to other assumptions. The review concluded that despite these more conservative assumptions, the scheme continues to deliver an economic value of £2 per £1 invested, which would still be categorised as a high value return by the Department for Transport.

## 7. Recommendations

7.1. The following table shows the 16 shortlisted projects, ranked on the basis of their scores from the initial assessment and shortlisting process, from highest to lowest. Assuming that all of the projects above them are approved, then the two projects shaded in orange are not affordable within the overall budget constraint of £22.3 million, as indicated by the “Running total (all projects)” column. All of the projects shaded green, however, are affordable within the budget.

No.	Project name	Applicant	Total score	Funding requested	Running total (all projects)	Running total (green only)
44	Microbial Innovation Centre	University of Southampton	29.75	£2,570,000	£2,570,000	£2,570,000

No.	Project name	Applicant	Total score	Funding requested	Running total (all projects)	Running total (green only)
6	Aerospace, Defence and Security Curricula Development	ADS	29	£450,000	£3,020,000	£3,020,000
26	Bacteriophage and Biologics Manufacturing and R&D Facility	University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation	26.75	£3,000,000	£6,020,000	£6,020,000
38	Faraday Connect	Fareham Borough Council	26.5	£1,167,941	£7,187,941	£7,187,941
42	South of Romsey Town Centre	Test Valley Borough Council	26	£2,000,000	£9,187,941	£9,187,941
45	Securing the Future of the New Forest Tour	New Forest National Park Authority	25.75	£2,270,000	£11,457,941	£11,457,941
23	Leigh Park Skills Centre	Havant Borough Council	25.25	£6,681,080	£18,139,021	£18,139,021
12	Test Valley Community Construction Academy	Sparsholt College	25	£1,056,000	£19,195,021	£19,195,021
48	Tech+Tour Hampshire Rollout	South Hampshire College Group	24.5	£400,000	£19,595,021	£19,595,021
39	Seascape Restoration and Innovation Centre	University of Portsmouth	24.5	£3,908,727	£23,503,748	
28	BRIDGE - Workforce and Innovation Centre	University of Winchester	24	£3,519,000	£27,022,748	
47	Alton Adult Learning Hub	HSDC	23.75	£180,000	£27,202,748	£19,775,021
13	IncuHive Farnborough	Rushmoor Borough Council	23.5	£1,445,000	£28,647,748	£21,220,021
2	Hampshire Fare Digital Futures Programme	Hampshire Fare	22.25	£57,300	£28,705,048	£21,277,321
37	Havant Maths and English Hub	HSDC	21.75	£400,000	£29,105,048	£21,677,321
31	Hampshire Creative Business Escalator	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	21.25	£325,000	£29,430,048	£22,002,321

**7.2. Subject to its consideration of the information provided in this paper, HPPB is therefore asked to:**

- **RECOMMEND** that all of the projects shaded in green in the table above, except for No. 42, South of Romsey Town Centre, should be approved for funding
- **RECOMMEND** that the following three approvals should be subject to the following conditions:

- **No. 26, Bacteriophage and Biologics Manufacturing and R&D Facility – conditional on a satisfactory, legally-binding agreement being in place between the project partners (see paragraph 4.6)**
- **No. 37, Havant Maths and English Hub and No. 47, Alton Adult Learning Hub – conditional on confirmation that HSDC’s “enhanced supervision” status has been removed (see paragraph 5.6)**
- **AGREE that HCC should undertake further work to assess the business case for No. 42, South of Romsey Town Centre, and report back to a future HPPB meeting**
- **NOTE that all shortlisted proposals remain subject to (a) the subsidy control determination process and (b) formal approval by Hampshire County Council (see 8.2 and 8.3 below)**

7.3. As discussed in the paper for the HPPB meeting on 9 March, the total available funding of £22.3 million is made up of £13 million from the former Solent LEP (58%) and £9.3 million (42%) from the former Enterprise M3 LEP. To align with the purpose of the original allocation of the funding from Government, the final list of approved projects will need to deliver benefits to the former LEP area for which the funding was granted. However, this does not require the direct investment to be within the actual former LEP area.

7.4. The following table shows that this condition would be met, if all 14 of the projects shaded in green in the previous table were to be approved. 79% of the funding would deliver benefits to the former Solent LEP area (31% allocated to projects with a Hampshire-wide impact, plus 48% allocated to projects with a local impact in the ex-Solent area). 52% of the funding would deliver benefits to the former EM3 LEP area (31% allocated to projects with a Hampshire-wide impact, plus 21% allocated to projects with a local impact in the ex-EM3 area).

No.	Project name	Hants-wide impact	Local impact ex-EM3	Local impact ex-Solent
44	Microbial Innovation Centre	£2,570,000		
6	Aerospace, Defence and Security Curricula Development	£450,000		
26	Bacteriophage and Biologics Manufacturing and R&D Facility	£3,000,000		
38	Faraday Connect			£1,167,941
42	South of Romsey Town Centre		£2,000,000	

No.	Project name	Hants-wide impact	Local impact ex-EM3	Local impact ex-Solent
45	Securing the Future of the New Forest Tour			£2,270,000
23	Leigh Park Skills Centre			£6,681,080
12	Test Valley Community Construction Academy		£1,056,000	
48	Tech+Tour Hampshire Rollout	£400,000		
47	Alton Adult Learning Hub		£180,000	
13	IncuHive Farnborough		£1,445,000	
2	Hampshire Fare Digital Futures Programme	£57,300		
37	Havant Maths and English Hub			£400,000
31	Hampshire Creative Business Escalator	£325,000		
<b>Total</b>		<b>£6,802,300</b>	<b>£4,681,000</b>	<b>£10,519,021</b>
<b>Split</b>		<b>31%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>48%</b>

## 8. Remaining stages of the process

### Communication to shortlisted applicants following this HPPB meeting

8.1. Following this meeting, the shortlisted applicants will be emailed to advise them about the outcome of the meeting and next steps, and to share any feedback from HPPB members.

### Subsidy control

8.2. During the due diligence stage, HCC has begun work to carry out subsidy control determinations, to confirm whether funding of shortlisted projects would be consistent with subsidy control legislation. This work will be completed before HCC enters into funding agreements with successful applicants (see 8.4).

### HCC decision-making

8.3. Following the HPPB meeting on 1 June, we will refer HPPB's recommendations to HCC Cabinet, for approval. The earliest opportunity for this is the HCC Cabinet meeting on 7 July.

### Funding agreements

- 8.4. Following approval of funding by HCC Cabinet, Hampshire County Council's Legal team will draw up funding agreements with approved projects. These will be based on the template funding agreement that was published as part of the call for projects, which will speed up the process. Experience suggests that finalising and signing funding agreements is likely to take five to six weeks, although this is dependent on the timeliness with which applicants turn around requests from HCC.
- 8.5. Projects will typically submit claims for a number of payments over the course of the project, paid in arrears against a schedule of milestones set out in the funding agreement. Funding agreements will also set out ongoing obligations on applicants to report on progress and achievement of outcomes. Ongoing monitoring of projects by HCC will be the responsibility of the Economy and Skills team.

Stephen Martin  
Head of Economy and Skills

## **Annex 1 – Further information regarding the 16 shortlisted projects**

The following tables set out further information provided by the shortlisted applicants since the HPPB meeting on 9 March:

- a) in response to the questions raised by HPPB on 9 March
- b) in response to issues identified by the Hampshire County Council (HCC) officer panel

The tables also set out any project-specific issues that would need to be addressed, prior to HCC entering into the funding agreement with the applicant.

For reference:

- The information provided about the shortlisted applications for the meeting on 9 March is here – see in particular Annex 2 and Annex 3 (page 33 onwards):

<https://documents.hants.gov.uk/hampshire-prosperity-partnership/HPPB-260309-Callforprojects.pdf>

- The overview slides provided by the shortlisted applicants, also provided for the HPPB meeting on 9 March, are here:

<https://documents.hants.gov.uk/hampshire-prosperity-partnership/HPPB-260309-Callforprojects-Annex4.pdf>

<b>Project No. 2</b>	<b>Hampshire Fare Digital Futures Programme</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	Hampshire Fare (HF)
<b>Overview</b>	Delivering digital platforms to improve productivity, connectivity and market access, for over 350 food, drink, farming and hospitality businesses.
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	<b>The Board emphasized the need to confirm that the LLR funding would be used for capital expenditure</b>
	HF has confirmed that none of the funding will be used for revenue expenditure and that the creation of long-term digital and physical assets is considered capital expenditure.
<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	<b>Has the project underestimated the investment required to develop viable products?</b>
	<p>It is recognised that digital platform and app development projects can vary significantly in cost, and that there may be concern around underestimation. However, we are confident that the proposed level of investment is both realistic and sufficient to deliver viable, high-quality products.</p> <p>This confidence is underpinned by several factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive research and supplier validation</li> <li>• Detailed scoping and costed proposals</li> <li>• Pre-existing technical groundwork</li> </ul> <p>Taken together, the combination of benchmarking, proven technology approaches (including white labelling), detailed scoping, and contingency provision gives us strong confidence that the project has not underestimated the required investment and can be delivered within the funding envelope.</p>
<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	Funding agreement to include wording making it clear that responsibility for applying the grant correctly as capital expenditure sits with the recipient.

<b>Project No. 6</b>	<b>Aerospace, Defence and Security Curricula Development</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	ADS
<b>Overview</b>	Developing industry-validated apprenticeship and training curricula in aerospace, defence and security, and licensing this to Hampshire FE and HE institutions.
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	<p><b>The Board emphasised the need to confirm that development of curriculum could be classified as capital expenditure</b></p> <p>ADS provided detailed documentation as part of their application regarding the capitalisation of the expenditure of the project. Subsequently HCC Finance reviewed this and were satisfied with the justification. ADS also provided confirmation that staff costs for the mentoring component of the project (as opposed to curriculum development) would be covered by ADS match funding.</p>
<b>Other issues addressed</b>	N/A
<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	Funding agreement to include wording making it clear that responsibility for applying the grant correctly as capital expenditure sits with the recipient.

<b>Project No. 12</b>	<b>Test Valley Community Construction Academy</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	Sparsholt College
<b>Overview</b>	A mezzanine extension to the existing Future Skills Construction Centre at the Andover College campus, with multi-trade, electrical, and retrofit and green skills bays.
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	<p><b>Please provide more detailed evidence of:</b></p> <p><b>(a) how the project would meet the needs of construction businesses and,</b></p> <p><b>(b) how the project would ensure that participants moved into jobs in the construction industry</b></p>
	<p><b>(a) Meeting the needs of construction businesses</b></p> <p>The project is directly aligned to employer demand in Test Valley and Hampshire, evidenced by persistent skills shortages, strong learner demand exceeding current capacity, and growth in housebuilding and retrofit activity.</p> <p>The planned extension will expand provision in key shortage areas: electrical installation, multi-trade skills, welding/fabrication, and retrofit/green technologies (e.g. Solar PV, EV charging, heat pumps).</p> <p>Employers are embedded in design and delivery through an established network (including Taylor Wimpey and local SMEs), shaping facilities to increase training capacity, particularly in electrical and retrofit skills in response to decarbonisation and regulatory change.</p> <p>The project will improve training quality and relevance by focusing on ‘work-ready’ skills, modern construction practices, and digital approaches. This supports employers—especially SMEs—by strengthening the local skills pipeline and reducing recruitment risk.</p> <p>It also widens the labour pool through targeted programmes for adults, career changers, and underrepresented groups, improving workforce diversity and addressing gaps in employability and trade readiness.</p> <p><b>(b) Ensuring participants move into construction jobs</b></p> <p>Employment outcomes are built into the Academy’s design. Training aligns to recognised routes, from foundation skills to Level 1–3 qualifications and apprenticeships, with expanded capacity increasing progression into jobs.</p> <p>Strong employer partnerships support structured work experience, placements, and direct recruitment opportunities, ensuring learners understand workplace expectations and employers can assess candidates early.</p> <p>Job readiness is prioritised through health and safety training, employability skills, and practical competencies, with additional support for those facing barriers to completion.</p> <p>For adults, an “employment-first” model aligns training to live vacancies, with clear routes into interviews, apprenticeships or jobs, supported by guaranteed employer engagement where needed.</p> <p>Progression will be tracked through enrolments, completions, apprenticeships and sustained employment, ensuring provision remains demand-led and aligned to local development and labour market needs.</p>

<b>Other issues addressed</b>	<b>Is there an opportunity for the project to apply for the recently announced construction skills capacity funding?</b>
	Sparsholt College has submitted a bid to the construction skills capacity fund, for a much larger, separate project covering both of the college's campuses, but remains cautious about the likelihood of success given the assessment criteria for the fund.
<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	N/A

<b>Project No. 13</b>	<b>IncuHive Farnborough</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	Rushmoor Borough Council
<b>Overview</b>	Refurbishment of The Meads Business Centre to create 19,000 sq ft of affordable, flexible workspace for start-ups and SMEs.
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	<b>How have Rushmoor selected IncuHive as their operator for this facility, and did this involve a tender process?</b>
	IncuHive has not been procured as a formal operator. Instead, the arrangement is a commercial landlord–tenant lease, with IncuHive operating independently and taking on financial risk. The proposal originated from IncuHive and was assessed on its merits, including alignment with regeneration objectives and viability, after other market options proved undeliverable.
	<b>Have options for private investment been considered?</b>
	Private investment was explored but is not viable due to the high cost of refurbishing vacant space relative to expected income. The scheme’s focus on affordable workspace for start-ups limits rental returns, making borrowing or commercial finance unfeasible. Grant funding is therefore required to enable delivery.
	<b>Please provide more detailed evidence that there is a need within Rushmoor/Farnborough for this facility.</b>
	There is strong demand for flexible workspace driven by a large base of microbusinesses and professional/digital sectors. Market trends show increasing preference for flexible, high-quality space, with limited suitable town-centre supply. The scheme aligns well with this demand, offering appropriately sized, accessible workspace for small and growing businesses.
<b>Other issues addressed</b>	N/A
<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	N/A

<b>Project No. 23</b>	<b>Leigh Park Skills Centre</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	Havant Borough Council
<b>Overview</b>	Building a construction training centre in Leigh Park, providing skills development opportunities for individuals at risk of becoming NEET, and acting as a community hub.
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	<b>How would the project address any potential overspend?</b>
	Overspend will be controlled through strong governance, including regular cost monitoring, risk management, and formal change control. Developer funding (including a £300k contribution from Southern Water) provides contingency to manage unforeseen costs without requiring additional public funding.
	<b>Who will own the freehold of the building once it is complete?</b>
	The freehold will remain with Havant Borough Council (or successor authority), ensuring long-term public benefit, alignment with regeneration objectives, and flexibility for future community use while retaining public oversight.
	<b>Please provide more detailed evidence of:</b> <b>(a) how the project would meet the needs of construction businesses and</b> <b>(b) how the project would ensure that participants moved into jobs in the construction industry</b>
South Hampshire faces significant and sustained construction skills shortages, driven by housing growth, infrastructure demand, and an ageing workforce. The Leigh Park Skills Centre responds by expanding employer-aligned training, building on strong existing outcomes from City of Portsmouth College, where most learners already progress into employment or apprenticeships.	
<b>a) Meeting the needs of construction businesses</b>	
The project targets critical skills gaps identified through LSIP and employer engagement, particularly at Levels 2–3 across core trades. It will deliver job-ready learners through industry-aligned facilities, employer-informed curriculum design, and training that reflects real site conditions.	
It builds on proven delivery, with over 1,000 learners completing construction programmes locally and the majority progressing into jobs or apprenticeships. This ensures a consistent pipeline of skilled workers to support business productivity and sector growth.	
<b>b) Ensuring participants move into construction jobs</b>	
Employment is embedded in delivery through strong employer links, work placements, site exposure, and direct recruitment pathways. Historic data shows high progression into employment and apprenticeships, which the new Centre will scale up.	
An integrated model—linking 14–16 provision, FE, and a Youth Hub—creates a clear, supported pathway into work, reducing drop-off and improving outcomes. Programme design, employability support, and employer-led recruitment ensure learners move directly into sustained jobs.	

<b>Other issues addressed</b>	<b>Is there an opportunity for the project to apply for the recently announced construction skills capacity funding?</b>
	Havant Borough Council have advised that this project is not eligible for the construction skills capacity fund on multiple grounds, including its timing, its status as a new build rather than refurbishment, and other eligibility criteria.
<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	N/A

<b>Project No. 26</b>	<b>Bacteriophage and Biologics Manufacturing and R&amp;D Facility</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	UHS NHS Trust
<b>Overview</b>	Building the UK's first GMP-certified bacteriophage and biologics manufacturing facility, to supply the NHS and global private industry, and boost leading-edge research.
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	<b>The Board noted that further discussions would be required regarding the partnership, commercial and management structure for the project, and the nature of any funding agreement.</b>
	<b>See the discussion at paragraphs 4.4 to 4.6 above. Information provided by the applicant in response to further questions from HCC is set out below.</b>
<b>Other issues addressed</b>	<b>Please provide as much detail as you can about the capital works that the LLR funding would pay for, including the extent to which these would be bespoke to the requirements of the bacteriophage facility.</b>
	LLR funding will support the conversion and fit-out of the upper floor of the Lister Building (Adanac Park) into a specialist GMP bacteriophage facility. Works include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cleanroom laboratory spaces</li> <li>• Enhanced utilities (air handling, power, drainage)</li> <li>• Supporting infrastructure (logistics, security, compliance)</li> </ul> The facility will be highly bespoke, reflecting regulatory and technical requirements for sterile biologics manufacturing. Estimated cost is c.£3.1m including design and contingency.
	<b>Please provide further information about:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>The proposed lease agreement between UHS and the Jafra UK subsidiary</b></li> <li>b) <b>The effect of the LLR-funded capital works on the rental value</b></li> <li>c) <b>How UHS would mitigate the risk of carrying out the capital works and then the project not going ahead i.e. what gives UHS assurance about the commitment of Jafra and the other partners?</b></li> </ol>

	<p>a) UHS considers that funding these works will create a long-term, publicly owned manufacturing facility delivering sustained value to Hampshire. While initially supporting phage production, the facility will have wider use for other biologics.</p> <p>The project is underpinned by a partnership between Jafral, UoS and UHS, with a 10-year lease agreed at market rates to ensure no subsidy and secure a stable, long-term relationship. Rental values will be independently assessed using specialist advisors, with lease agreements clearly setting out landlord and tenant responsibilities for maintaining the facility.</p> <p>b) We will take advice from specialist advisors, as referenced, to determine the impact on rental values. It is expected that the fit-out will increase rental value per square metre and introduce business rates, which are not currently applicable to the space.</p> <p>While detailed calculations are not yet available, comparable assessments of shell versus fitted space indicate clear uplifts in rental yield and associated rates. UHS will also seek to optimise the VAT position, reflecting the potential use of the facility for managed healthcare services.</p> <p>c) The partnership predates the HCC/LEP programme, with all parties already working to establish GMP phage manufacturing in Hampshire.</p> <p>While there remains some risk around final location decisions, this is being managed through formal legal agreements. An MoU will set out roles, followed by binding Project Agreements and an Agreement for Lease to secure commitment before any works commence.</p> <p>These arrangements will provide clarity on scope, responsibilities and funding, and mitigate risk particularly given the new company structure through appropriate assurances from the Jafral parent company.</p>
	<p><b>Assuming a model in which UHS and the University of Southampton do not take direct financial stakes in the project, as presented to HCC on 16 April:</b></p> <p>a) <b>Please provide further detail about the roles that UHS, UoS and UKHSA would play in the partnership (e.g. through the Joint Design Committee and the Expert Reference Group), what kinds of partnership agreements would be put in place, and how these partners would benefit from the project.</b></p> <p>b) <b>How (if at all) might HCC support the project through involvement in these partnership arrangements</b></p>

	<p>a) The Design Committee will be a time-limited advisory group ensuring the facility design, construction and accreditation meet clinical, research and regulatory requirements. It will include partners (UHS, UoS, UKHSA and Jafra) and support alignment with relevant regulators. The Expert Reference Group will provide longer-term strategic advice once operational, supporting innovation, research collaboration and future product development. It will be advisory only, with no role in delivery or procurement. Non-executive roles for UHS/UoS on the company board are under consideration to strengthen partnership working. Contractual arrangements will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. A legally binding partnership framework (replacing the MoU) covering roles, governance, IP and collaboration principles</li> <li>II. Terms of reference for both groups</li> <li>III. Project-specific research agreements</li> <li>IV. Data sharing agreements where required</li> </ul> <p>b) It is not considered necessary or appropriate for HCC to take a formal board role, as this could blur governance responsibilities. Instead, HCC is better positioned in a strategic, enabling role focused on place-based economic development. Participation in the Expert Reference Group would allow HCC to provide insight on growth, skills and partnerships, while maintaining alignment with public sector priorities without constraining the company's governance or commercial flexibility.</p>
<p><b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b></p>	<p><b>See paragraph 4.6 above.</b></p>

<b>Project No. 28</b>	<b>BRIDGE - Workforce and Innovation Centre</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	University of Winchester
<b>Overview</b>	A collaborative, industry-partnered centre, training health and social care professionals in home-care and digital delivery, and enabling the development of new technology.
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	<b>Please set out your plans for outreach to businesses that are innovating in this sector, and how they would apply to use the facilities</b>
	BRIDGE will use a structured, multi-channel outreach model to engage health and digital SMEs, targeting key sectors aligned to Hampshire's strengths (e.g. MedTech, digital health). Early engagement through networks, partners, and a virtual presence will build a strong pipeline ahead of launch.  SMEs will apply through a simple, accessible process aligned to three annual programme cycles, with selection based on relevance, feasibility, and adoption potential. Ongoing pipeline development will be supported through partnerships, events, and referrals, with continued engagement beyond the programme through alumni networks and market access support.
	<b>How would the project monitor improvements in care outcomes arising from these innovations?</b>
	BRIDGE will track impact through a three-tier framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Direct:</b> product validation and workforce skills within the facility</li> <li>• <b>Workforce-linked:</b> adoption and service outcomes via trained practitioners</li> <li>• <b>System-level:</b> contribution to strategic health and economic indicators</li> </ul> This approach links innovation from testing through to real-world use, using data on practitioner competence, technology adoption, and system-wide outcomes to evidence impact and refine delivery over time
<b>Other issues addressed</b>	N/A
<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	N/A

<b>Project No. 31</b>	<b>Hampshire Creative Business Escalator</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce
<b>Overview</b>	Creating an online platform that will connect creative businesses with the people, advice and resources required to fuel their growth.
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	<b>Please provide further evidence to support the project's projected benefits</b>
	The projected benefits are grounded in strong national evidence showing that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creative businesses face structural barriers (especially access to finance and networks).</li> <li>• Targeted support programmes increase growth, employment and investment.</li> <li>• Digital and ecosystem-based models can effectively deliver these outcomes at scale.</li> </ul> Comparable programmes (e.g. Creative UK and cluster initiatives) demonstrate that business support leads directly to job creation, increased turnover, and significant investment, with strong returns on public funding. The Escalator applies these proven approaches in a blended digital model, with <b>deliberately conservative assumptions</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Employment:</b> 325 FTE jobs over six years, based on a small proportion of engaged businesses growing.</li> <li>• <b>Economic impact:</b> GVA uplift estimated using standard benchmarks, delivering measurable value.</li> <li>• <b>Investment:</b> Modest projections for finance raised, reflecting known market constraints.</li> </ul> <b>Summary</b> The programme's benefits are evidence-based, aligned with proven interventions, and conservatively modelled, providing a credible and realistic pathway from support to economic impact.
	<b>Can the applicant confirm that the Escalator will be open to businesses wider than the membership of Hampshire Chamber of Commerce?</b>
	Yes, we can confirm that the Escalator will be open to businesses wider than the Hampshire Chamber of Commerce. The platform will be available to all creative businesses in the region.
	<b>Please confirm what plans are in place for transferring ownership of the Escalator, once the status of the cluster is formalised</b>
	The transfer of ownership to the Southern Creative Catalyst has been discussed, agreed and will be formalised once the Catalyst has been granted CIC status (application pending).
<b>Other issues addressed</b>	N/A

<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	Funding agreement to include wording making it clear that responsibility for applying the grant correctly as capital expenditure sits with the recipient.
---	---

<b>Project No. 37</b>	<b>Havant Maths and English Hub</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	Havant & South Downs College (HSDC)
<b>Overview</b>	Creating a hub from which to deliver roll on / roll off, modular Maths and English provision, to re-engage post 16 NEETs.
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	<b>The Board noted that, as part of the due diligence process, HCC would need to test further whether HSDC's current status raises any substantial concerns about the delivery of these projects</b>
	<b>See the discussion at paragraphs 5.4 to 5.6 above.</b>
<b>Other issues addressed</b>	N/A
<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	<b>See paragraph 5.6 above.</b>

<b>Project No. 38</b>	<b>Faraday Connect</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	Fareham Borough Council
<b>Overview</b>	Enabling additional business space at Daedalus (Solent Enterprise Zone) through a new link road with junction improvements, and an accelerated power upgrade.
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	<p><b>Could and/or would this project go ahead without LLR funding?</b></p> <p>Faraday Connect is important given the economic/employment benefits it can bring. However, it sits alongside the delivery of Swordfish Business Park and other corporate priorities, notably the town centre regeneration, which require significant capital investment. Without 50% LLR funding, the project would need to be reviewed in the context of competing capital requirements. Importantly, the delivery of Swordfish Business Park is time dependent. Contractual obligations with Homes England require development works to have commenced by late 2027. Planning and survey work is underway but failure to meet this deadline would enable Homes England to exercise its option to recover the land. Fareham Town Centre regeneration is again underway with a masterplan being developed.</p> <p>Delivery of this project is critical to the health of the Town Centre and, therefore, to Fareham as a whole. Funding needs to be identified for many of the regeneration proposals. FBC is seeking to progress these schemes in the context of struggling to deliver a balanced budget. As a result, if LLR funding cannot be secured, delivery of Faraday Connect would most likely be delayed, along with the opportunity to generate enhanced retained business rates in the short term.</p> <p>FBC has explored other funding options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private developers do not generally fund infrastructure projects, as there is no direct return on investment.</li> <li>• Borrowing is also not feasible, because in contrast to previous schemes at Faraday Business Park and Solent Airport as detailed in an earlier presentation, this project does not generate a direct income stream to repay the borrowing costs. As noted elsewhere FBC does not have a revenue surplus either from the Daedalus site or the wider corporate budget to be able to fund loans for this project.</li> <li>• Future capital receipts from the sale of land, creates a circular problem. FBC only receive receipts after infrastructure is built, planning is granted and contracts are signed. Additionally, if the land sales are in individual plots as opposed to the whole, there is the question of borrowing again to meet any interim shortfall. This Option would at best significantly complicate, frustrate and delay, as opposed to enable early delivery of Faraday Connect.</li> </ul> <p>FBC believe that 50% LLR grant funding remains the best route to deliver this Project with the remaining 50% coming from existing Retained Business Rates despite the competing priorities. FBC does not feel it has sufficient available resource to proceed to delivery of Faraday Connect in isolation.</p> <p><b>Given that the project aims to unlock development potential, could the resulting increase in BRIG be used to repay a loan?</b></p>

	<p>Fareham Borough Council has delivered Hangars and other buildings that have been sold or let shortly afterwards to fund or pay back borrowings, so it is a route we are familiar with. The difference in this case is that the Link Road is a catalyst for future development and not an investment that will yield a direct revenue return.</p> <p>First, whilst future growth can be projected when BRIG begins to flow, to cover the repayment of a loan, it cannot be guaranteed. In the meantime, overall, Daedalus is at best a revenue neutral site and there is a sizeable deficit from operating Solent Airport. This means there is no surplus revenue to fund a loan. In a wider context, FBC is challenged to deliver a balanced budget, meaning there is no surplus revenue from elsewhere to repay a loan. This is set against competing priorities including town centre regeneration.</p> <p>Second, as noted the Council has legally binding delivery obligations with Homes England, at the western side of Daedalus on land, which is to become Swordfish Business Park. The design and planning stages are well underway and are currently competing for funding with Retained Business Rates from Faraday being invested to bring this forward. Failure to meet contracting and commencement of works ahead of late 2027 gives rise to Homes England having the Option to recover the land. FBC will need to borrow significant sums against future Retained Business Rates to fund this project to meet these obligations.</p> <p>FBC does truly recognise the benefits of the link road scheme which is why match funding has been offered despite competing priorities for Retained Business Rates.</p> <p>FBC see matched grant funding for this project very much as the best funding route and the optimal use of public funds. It is the catalyst for accelerated and balanced delivery of short &amp; long-term Economic Growth and Employment Generation.</p> <p>To conclude, the funding will enable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over 24,000 sqm of Employment space with the associated benefits outlined in our presentation</li> <li>• Accelerated accumulation of Retained Business Rates, to help fund future economic development for the local economy with the delivery of Swordfish Business Park to the west</li> </ul> <p><b>The Board noted HCC's intention to undertake a specialist transport review of this project, as part of the due diligence stage.</b></p> <p><b>See paragraphs 6.6 and 6.7 above.</b></p>
<b>Other issues addressed</b>	N/A
<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	Given the recommendation of the independent review regarding optimism bias, and the risk of sector-wide increases in construction costs, the funding agreement will need to clearly define the risk of cost increases as the applicant's responsibility to manage.

<b>Project No. 39</b>	<b>Seascape Restoration and Innovation Centre</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	University of Portsmouth
<b>Overview</b>	Creating a collaborative facility for marine ecosystem restoration, regenerative aquaculture and technological innovation to scale nature-based solutions.
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	<p><b>Can the applicant confirm that there is no duplication with the role and work of the National Oceanography Centre?</b></p> <p>There is no duplication between SRIC and the National Oceanography Centre (NOC); their roles are distinct and complementary.</p> <p>NOC operates as a national research organisation focused on offshore and deep-sea science, delivering large-scale programmes, vessels and observation systems. Its work is primarily global and research-led.</p> <p>In contrast, SRIC is a place-based, applied centre focused on coastal restoration, innovation and skills in the Solent. It will provide specialist infrastructure, pilot environments and workforce development that are not currently available in the region.</p> <p>SRIC's role is to translate research into real-world application—supporting businesses, testing technologies, and scaling nature-based solutions. This includes SME support, skills training, and acting as a regional delivery hub linking partners.</p> <p>The two organisations are therefore complementary: NOC provides upstream research and data, while SRIC provides downstream application, testing and regional impact. This relationship is recognised in NOC's support for the project.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> SRIC adds new capability rather than duplicating existing provision, creating clear additionality through applied delivery, skills and economic impact in Hampshire and the wider Solent.</p>
<b>Other issues addressed</b>	N/A
<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	N/A

<b>Project No. 42</b>	<b>South of Romsey Town Centre (SoRTC)</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	Test Valley Borough Council
<b>Overview</b>	<b>Regeneration of the Romsey bus station and Crosfield Hall sites, delivering a new bus station, community facility, public car parking and public realm.</b>
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	<b>Please provide further evidence for the economic benefits of this project, and in particular how it would contribute to economic growth</b>
	<p>The proposal contributes to economic growth in two ways. Firstly, by facilitating the ability for people to access and use the town centre and support businesses. Secondly, by facilitating movement to enable people to access employment and education opportunities.</p> <p>Key points from TVBC's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity to increase footfall and recover to pre-Covid levels</li> <li>• Supports town centre resilience and long-term economic growth</li> <li>• Attracts residents, visitors, and private investment into vacant units</li> <li>• Boosts retail, hospitality, and leisure sectors</li> <li>• Relocating community facilities increases linked trips and town centre activity</li> <li>• Improved public transport and access increases visitation and dwell time</li> <li>• Enhances inclusion by improving access for non-car users</li> <li>• Strengthens bus services, supporting sustainable transport and local economy</li> <li>• Expands labour market access and connectivity to key employment areas</li> <li>• Improves access to further education, supporting skills and workforce growth</li> </ul>
	<b>Could further CIL or another funding source be used to support this project, instead of LLR?</b>
	TVBC noted that the Council has already committed funding across multiple regeneration projects, with limited flexibility to reallocate resources to SoRTC. Existing funding sources, such as capital receipts, CIL, and reserves are constrained or uncertain, and borrowing is not considered viable due to financial risks and lack of revenue generation. As a result, LLR funding is the most appropriate option to enable delivery.
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	<b>How would the project improve access to the town centre, and would it result in a better service for bus passengers?</b>
	The vision sets out a framework to drive a shift towards sustainable travel and improve the town centre gateway. The SoRTC scheme will replace the bus station, with potential to expand capacity and improve facilities to boost patronage, supported by operator backing. Enhanced waiting areas and better infrastructure aim to make public transport more attractive. The project will also explore wider highway improvements to reduce congestion, improve bus access, and create a more pedestrian-friendly environment.

<b>Other issues addressed</b>	N/A
<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	<b>See paragraphs 6.4 and 6.5 above.</b>

<b>Project No. 44</b>	<b>Microbial Innovation Centre</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Overview</b>	<b>Creating a Microbial Innovation Centre that will provide specialised testbeds and services, to support the validation and commercialisation of advanced microbial technologies.</b>
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	N/A
<b>Other issues addressed</b>	N/A
<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	N/A

<b>Project No. 45</b>	<b>Securing the Future of the New Forest Tour</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	New Forest National Park Authority
<b>Overview</b>	<b>Securing the long-term future of the New Forest Tour by investing in a new generation of modern, accessible, low-emission open-top buses.</b>
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	<b>What potential alternative funding sources are there for this project, including transport-specific funding, and have they all been fully considered?</b>
	NFPA demonstrated that they had considered a range of alternative funding sources and set out reasons why they are not viable or are less well aligned to this project than the LEP legacy reserves. Sources considered were: National Lottery funding, central Government funds, developer contributions / CIL, Bus Service Improvement Plan funding, and operator funding. They stated that there is no alternative funding source capable of delivering the required capital investment at the necessary scale and within the required timeframe. LEP legacy reserves funding is therefore the most appropriate mechanism as a targeted, one-off capital intervention to secure a proven economic asset and unlock long-term, self-sustaining operation.
	<b>In the absence of the New Forest Tour, would existing local bus services not simply pick up the same customers?</b>
	In their response NFPA noted that the New Forest Tour has a different purpose, network coverage and accessibility. It is designed to link visitor attractions and also provide views of the scenery to encourage engagement with the National Park and enhance the visitor experience accordingly. Without it, those other bus services would not provide the same usefulness or fulfil its purpose.
	<b>Would the project have wider benefits for travel in and around the New Forest?</b>
	<p>The New Forest National Park Transport Summit 2025 identified that only around 7% of visitors currently use sustainable transport, road travel accounts for approximately 60% of local emissions, highlighting the need for high-quality alternatives to private cars.</p> <p>The New Forest Tour is already seen as an effective option, providing access to key destinations and supporting car-free travel. Investment in a new fleet would build on this success. The project also supports a more integrated and user-friendly transport network by linking rail stations, towns, villages and attractions, and enabling multi-modal journeys, particularly during peak summer months. It responds to the need for more accessible and flexible services, including for those without car access.</p> <p>Off-season use of the vehicles on the Bluestar 6 route further strengthens year-round connectivity between Southampton and the New Forest, improving access to jobs, education and services.</p> <p>Overall, the project supports modal shift, reduces congestion, and helps protect the National Park environment, contributing to wider economic, environmental and social objectives.</p>
<b>Other issues addressed</b>	N/A

<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	N/A
---	-----

<b>Project No. 47</b>	<b>Alton Adult Learning Hub</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	Havant and South Downs College
<b>Overview</b>	Creating a hub focused on tackling worklessness among the over 50s, by connecting them with high local demand in manufacturing, logistics and healthcare.
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	<b>The Board noted that, as part of the due diligence process, HCC would need to test further whether HSDC's current status raises any substantial concerns about the delivery of these projects.</b>
	<b>See <a href="#">the discussion</a> at paragraphs 5.4 to 5.6 above.</b>
<b>Other issues addressed</b>	N/A
<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	<b>See paragraph 5.6 above.</b>

<b>Project No. 48</b>	<b>Tech + Tour Hampshire Rollout</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	South Hampshire College Group
<b>Overview</b>	<b>Acquiring a second mobile unit, to enable the proven, Solent-based Tech+Tour outreach project to extend its delivery across the whole of Hampshire.</b>
<b>Questions raised by HPPB on 9 March</b>	N/A
<b>Other issues addressed</b>	N/A
<b>Issues to be addressed prior to the signing of the agreement</b>	N/A