

## Hampshire Prosperity Partnership Board

**Date:** Monday 9 March 2026

**Time:** 14:00 – 17:00

**Location:** Hampshire County Council, Mitchell Room

**Present:**

Cllr Nick Adams-King – HCC	Simon Watson – M Group
Cllr Gareth Williams – Rushmoor BC	Joanna Butler – Butler Farms
Cllr Phil North – Test Valley BC	Nicola Kildunne – FSB
Cllr Martin Tod – Winchester CC	Sarah Greer – University of Winchester
Mark Smith – University of Southampton	Natalie Wigman – HCC
Ross McNally – Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Stephen Martin – HCC
Laura Read – Marwell Wildlife	Teresa Hogsbjerg – HCC
	Fran Downton – Tourism SE (agenda items 1 to 5 only)
	Cllr Steve Pitt – Portsmouth City Council (via Teams, agenda items 1 to 5 only)

**Apologies:** Cllr Zoe Huggins – HCC  
 Paul West – Marketing Consultant  
 Fiona Stilwell – PETA  
 Julie Milburn – Sparsholt College Group  
 Alastair Welch – ABP

		Action
<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome</b>	
<b>1.1</b>	NAK welcomed and introduced to the Board two guests, Steve Pitt and Fran Dowton.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Minutes of last meeting</b>	
<b>2.1</b>	Spelling of name updated.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Action points from last meeting</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	Tourism South East invited to next meeting – Complete. Support for Hampshire Business Awards re-negotiated and approved.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Conflicts of interest (excluding item 8)</b>	
<b>4.1</b>	See item 8 below.	

5.	<b>Local Visitor Economy Partnership</b>	
5.1	<p>FD provided an update regarding the current status of the Local Visitor Economy Partnership (LVEP) for Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton, including funding arrangements and activities that may continue beyond year one. The group is nearing the end of the first year since the LVEP was accredited by Visit England.</p> <p>The Board discussed the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted that for marketing and promotion to have a substantial impact, a significant investment would be required.</li> <li>• Concern was raised about whether the current approach under-represented mid, north and rural Hampshire, and the importance of geographical balance was emphasised.</li> <li>• The importance of diversity, inclusion and accessibility was emphasised, including diversity on the Advisory Board.</li> <li>• The Board noted the need to align with other relevant strategies and plans, and reduce duplication and fragmentation as far as possible.</li> </ul> <p>The Board agreed to recommend to HCC that the funding commitment from Portsmouth and Southampton to the LVEP for 2026/27 should be matched by HCC. It was also agreed that Laura Read would represent the Board within the LVEP, and that nominations for one other HPPB representative would be sought by email. <b>Action</b> – TAH to email the Board regarding a second representative.</p>	TAH
6	<b>Devolution and LGR Update</b>	
6.1	<p>NAK provided an update to the Board and covered the following key points in respect of devolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MHCLG had confirmed that there would be no Mayor for the first two years.</li> <li>• Investment funding would be 40% of the original allocation during the first two years (increased from 30%), and Hampshire and the Solent would have access to the Homes England Strategic Place Partnership initiative.</li> <li>• The Statutory Instrument was due to be laid before the Easter recess.</li> <li>• Ruth Adams had been appointed CEO of the Combined Authority.</li> </ul> <p>In respect of LGR, Hampshire and the Solent was now waiting for the Government announcement of the geography.</p>	
7	<b>Updates to and confirmation of terms of reference</b>	

7.1	<p>NW introduced the item and explained why the terms of reference (TOR) of the HPPB, the Hampshire Skills Partnership and the Super Cluster needed to come back to the Board for approval.</p> <p><b>Action</b> – The Board discussed the HPPB TOR and agreed that the following changes should be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a term of office for the Board members</li> <li>• Explicitly mention collaboration with the Solent Growth Partnership and the Hampshire and the Solent CCA</li> <li>• Make it clear that membership of the Board is appointment of a person and not their organisation, so when a member steps down, a replacement needs to be agreed</li> </ul> <p>With these changes, the HPPB TOR were agreed.</p> <p>The Board also agreed the TOR of the Hampshire Skills Partnership and the Super Cluster.</p>	NW
8	<b>LEP Legacy Reserves</b>	
8.1	<p>The Board noted the conflicts of interest set out in the Board paper for this agenda item, and were asked to declare verbally any other conflicts of interest. Additional verbal declarations were as follows:</p> <p>Mark Smith – project 26          Joanna Butler – declared her membership of Hampshire Fare          Laura Read – declared her membership of Hampshire Fare, and an interest in biofilms, the subject of project 44          Nick Adams King – projects in Test Valley          Phil North – projects in Test Valley          Martin Tod – projects in Winchester          Gareth Williams – projects in Rushmoor</p> <p>James Hassett removed himself from the meeting for the entirety of this agenda item, due to potential conflicts of interest across multiple projects relating to Freeport activities.</p> <p>As proposed in the Board paper, during specific discussions of the applications, Board members with conflicts of interest left the room while the relevant project was being discussed.</p> <p>The Board discussed the process that had been followed to assess and shortlist the projects, including: the composition of the panel; the scoring process; the considerations taken into account during shortlisting; and communication with applicants. The Board confirmed that they were content with the shortlisting process.</p> <p>The Board then discussed each of the shortlisted projects in turn, and for some projects, noted further questions that needed to be addressed. These further questions are set out in Table 1 below.</p> <p><b>Actions</b> – The Board agreed that:</p>	SM

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All 16 shortlisted projects should proceed to the due diligence stage</li> <li>• As part of the due diligence stage, HCC officers should seek further information in response to the questions raised by the Board about specific projects</li> <li>• HCC officers should report back to HPPB at its next meeting on the responses to the further questions and the outcome of the due diligence stage, and HPPB would confirm its recommendations regarding the shortlisted projects at that meeting</li> </ul>	
<b>9</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
<b>9.1</b>	None	

**Table1 – Project-specific Notes**

No.	Project name	Applicant	Notes
2	Hampshire Fare Digital Futures Programme	Hampshire Fare	Further Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Board emphasized the need to confirm that the LLR funding would be used for capital expenditure</li> </ul>
6	Aerospace, Defence and Security Curricula Development	ADS	Further Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Board emphasized the need to confirm that development of curriculum could be classified as capital expenditure</li> </ul>
12	Test Valley Community Construction Academy	Sparsholt College	Further Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please provide more detailed evidence of (a) how the project would meet the needs of construction businesses and (b) how the project would ensure that participants moved into jobs in the construction industry</li> </ul>
13	IncuHive Farnborough	Rushmoor Borough Council	Further Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How have Rushmoor selected IncuHive as their operator for this facility, and did this involve a tender process?</li> <li>Have options for private investment been considered?</li> <li>Please provide more detailed evidence that there is a need within Rushmoor/ Farnborough for this facility</li> </ul>
23	Leigh Park Skills Centre	Havant Borough Council	Further Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How would the project address any potential overspend?</li> <li>Who will own the freehold of the building once it is complete?</li> <li>Please provide more detailed evidence of (a) how the project would meet the needs of construction businesses and (b) how the project would ensure that participants moved into jobs in the construction industry</li> </ul>
26	Bacteriophage and Biologics Manufacturing and R&D Facility	University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust	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.
28	BRIDGE - Workforce and Innovation Centre	University of Winchester	Further Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please set out your plans for outreach to businesses that are innovating in this sector, and how they would apply to use the facilities</li> <li>How would the project monitor improvements in care outcomes arising from these innovations?</li> </ul>

No.	Project name	Applicant	Notes
31	Hampshire Creative Business Escalator	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	<p>Further Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please provide further evidence to support the project's projected benefits</li> <li>• Can the applicant confirm that the Escalator will be open to businesses wider than the membership of Hampshire Chamber of Commerce?</li> <li>• Please confirm what plans are in place for transferring ownership of the Escalator, once the status of the cluster is formalised</li> </ul>
37	Havant Maths and English Hub	HSDC	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.
38	Faraday Connect	Fareham Borough Council	<p>Further questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could and/or would this project go ahead without LLR funding?</li> <li>• Given that the project aims to unlock development potential, could the resulting increase in BRIG be used to repay a loan?</li> </ul> <p>The Board noted HCC's intention to undertake a specialist transport review of this project, as part of the due diligence stage.</p>
39	Seascape Restoration and Innovation Centre	University of Portsmouth	<p>Further Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can the applicant confirm that there is no duplication with the role and work of the National Oceanography Centre?</li> </ul>
42	South of Romsey Town Centre	Test Valley Borough Council	<p>Further Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please provide further evidence for the economic benefits of this project, and in particular how it would contribute to economic growth</li> <li>• Could further CIL or another funding source be used to support this project, instead of LLR?</li> <li>• How would the project improve access to the town centre, and would it result in a better service for bus passengers?</li> </ul>
44	Microbial Innovation Centre	University of Southampton	No further clarifications requested by the Board.
45	Securing the Future of the New Forest Tour	New Forest National Park Authority	<p>Further Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What potential alternative funding sources are there for this project, including transport-specific funding, and have they all been fully considered?</li> <li>• In the absence of the New Forest Tour, would existing local bus services not simply pick up the same customers?</li> <li>• Would the project have wider benefits for travel in and around the New Forest?</li> </ul>
47	Alton Adult Learning Hub	HSDC	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>No.</b>	<b>Project name</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Notes</b>
48	Tech+Tour Hampshire Rollout	South Hampshire College Group	No further clarifications requested by the Board.