



Driving prosperity in the M3 corridor

Enterprise M3 Board Meeting

31 January 2017 - 2.00-5.00pm

University of Creative Arts, Falkner Road, Farnham, GU9 7DS

MINUTES

Board in Attendance

Geoff French - Chair
Dave Axa
David Barnes
Andy Barr
Tim Colman
James Cretney
Nick Elphick
Jason Gaskell
Tim Jackson
Andrew Lambert
Keith Mans
Malcolm Parry
Louise Punter
Clive Sanders
Mike Short
Chris Tinker

Guests in Attendance

Emma Shailer
Ian Thompson
Andrew Smith
Mark Pearson
Toni Wootton

Apologies

Ferris Cowper
Moir Gibson
Peter Martin
Paul Spooner

EM3 Team

Kathy Slack
Rachel Barker
Sarah Carter
Chris Quintana
Kevin Travers
Justine Davie

1. Welcome from University of Creative Arts

- 1.1 Emma Shailer, Assistant Director for Marketing, Recruitment and Student Admissions at the University of Creative Arts (UCA) welcomed the Board. The Board was advised that the UCA was the second largest provider of creative arts in Europe and was made up of four campuses across the South East located in Farnham, Epsom, Rochester and Canterbury. The UCA Farnham provided the most diverse range of courses, had over 2,000 students and provided on-campus accommodation for 400 students. The employment rate for UCA graduates was 94% as students at UCA were supported to gain the necessary skills to be ready for employment. The creative industry was growing and worth £133bn to the UK economy however the Government was pulling away from investing in creative arts.

2. Welcome and Introductions

- 2.1 Geoff French welcomed everyone to the meeting.

3. Minutes of the previous meetings & matters arising

- 3.1 The minutes of the previous meetings were agreed and the actions were noted.

4. Declarations of Interest

- 4.1 In addition to all interests previously declared, the following interests were noted:
- Malcolm Parry and Mike Short declared an interest in the 5G Project Phase 2 item and left the room during the decision making.

5. Enterprise M3 Enterprise Zone Interim Consultants Report

- 5.1 Nick Elphick provided an update on the activity being undertaken to progress the implementation plan for the multi-site Enterprise Zone which had to be submitted to Government by 31 March 2017. The draft implementation plan had been submitted in October 2016 which anticipated that the Enterprise Zone had the potential to deliver over 200 new businesses, approximately 10,000 new jobs, around 21,000sqm of new commercial space and over 28,000sqm of refurbished commercial space. This would result in an estimated business rate retention of £69m net present value.
- 5.2 Andrew Smith and Ian Thompson from Cushman and Wakefield reported on the work that had been carried out to date and the content of the intervention measures required over the next five years. Cushman and Wakefield had been retained to assist in the development of the final implementation plan and had been working alongside the interim Programme Steering Group to develop: an economic vision for the three sites linking back to the Strategic Economic Plan; an investment plan which identified and costed the key interventions needed and estimated the business rate uplift; and, an updated EM3 Enterprise Zone property market report providing evidence of anticipated demand at each site to support the projections for business rate growth. The investment plan had required extensive consultation with landowners and local authority partners to identify and progress the interventions required to unlock and address the barriers to development at each site. A draft package of intervention measures had been identified which totalled £37.8m. It was key that the interventions were put in place to enable the development of the sites. The business rates income was dependent on achieving momentum for new developments, once the development pipeline had been established a sustainable business rates income stream could be used to finance further interventions to maintain momentum. Over the long term the aim was for the Enterprise Zone to fund interventions and deliver a surplus for wider economic development programmes.
- 5.3 The Governance arrangements had been considered and it was agreed that the interim Programme Steering Group (PSG) would be formalised which would require a review of membership to ensure a clear separation of the development and promotion of specific interventions for each site. Applications for proposed interventions for the development of the sites would first be considered by the local leadership for the particular site before being submitted to the PSG, it would then be considered by the PMG and on to the Board for final approval. The Board was requested to delegate authority to a sub-group to review the final implementation plan for the Enterprise Zone and propose any major changes in advance of it being submitted to the Board on 28 March.
- 5.4 The Enterprise Zone partners had contributed funding for the consultancy contract awarded to Cushman and Wakefield and for the costs of the Programme Director post. It was proposed that the funding was also used to fund the development of a marketing plan and writing a bid for the second round of Enterprise Zone capacity funding.
- 5.5 The Board discussed the Enterprise Zone work and in particular the marketing plan. It was highlighted that each of the sites had their own marketing plan and that there should be a co-ordinated approach. It was confirmed that the overarching marketing for the multi-site Enterprise Zone would add value to any marketing in place for the individual sites. The Board agreed the governance structure proposed and agreed that Geoff French, Dave Aham, Paul Spooner, Nick Elphick and Kathy Slack be appointed to a sub-group with delegated authority to agree any changes to the implementation plan, sign off the EZ plans and agree to the submission of the plans to DCLG.

Action to be taken	By Whom	When
Co-ordinate marketing activity for the multi-site Enterprise Zone with the individual site marketing	Mark Pearson/ Toju Ogbe	31 March 2017
Set up a meeting of the sub-group to discuss the implementation plan and agree any changes	Mark Pearson	March 2017

6. Implications of the Industrial Strategy

- 6.1 Kathy Slack advised the Board on the implications of the industrial strategy following the recent Government announcement. A green paper had been published which was an offer to businesses to strike new sector deals to address sector-specific challenges and opportunities. As part of the deal Government would offer a range of support, including addressing regulatory barriers to innovation and growth, looking at how trade and investment deals could be used to increase exports and supporting the creation of new institutions to provide leadership, support innovation or boost skills. Enterprise M3 was in a strong position as work was already taking place on a number of the areas listed in the ten strategic pillars however it was key that the work on the Strategic Economic Plan and Science and Innovation Audit dovetailed with the industrial strategy. The consultation on the green paper closes on 17 April.
- 6.2 The Board discussed the green paper and requested some clarity on what was meant by 'creating the right institutions to bring together sectors and places'. Toni Wootton advised that further details would be provided but the requirement was to look at combining groups that currently represented the same sector and bring them into one sector board. Guidance was requested from Government on the type of sectors that Government would like to see included.

Action to be taken	By Whom	When
Provide further information on bringing together sectors and places and the types of sectors to be included	Toni Wootton	February 2017

7. Nominations Committee

- 7.1 Mike Short updated the Board on the progress of the work of the Nominations Committee. The Committee had been working on the process for appointing new board members and succession planning for the new Enterprise M3 Chair. The Committee had discussed the action groups and proposed that deputy chairs were appointed to each of the groups. The importance of a database of potential board members was highlighted to ensure a future pipeline was created for when there were vacancies on the Board. The Board was asked to pass any names of potential board members to Rachel Barker.

Action to be taken	By Whom	When
Provide names of potential board members to Rachel Barker	All Board Members	Ongoing

8. Local Growth Fund 3

- 8.1 The Board received an update on the Local Growth Fund 3 progress and details on the proposed approach following the final allocation announcement. The Local Growth Fund 3 allocation had been provisionally confirmed as £71.12m which was considerably higher than the initial indicative figure of £35-40m. The amount had been increased after the weighting for the criteria of devolution deals had been reduced and was also helped by the support from local authorities, other key partners and local MPs. Once final confirmation had been received thank you letters would be sent out to partners to thank them for their support in helping secure the additional funding.
- 8.2 A revised list of indicative projects had been submitted to Government on 5 December based on the agreed priority list compiled following discussion at the November PMG and Board meetings. The Board received the revised projects list and details on the potential effect the reduction in LGF from £164m to £71m could have on outputs. In total 13 of the original 26 projects had been included in the revised list with a further three projects part funded from existing funding. There were five projects not included in the list at this stage and it was not clear which skills projects would be included in the transforming colleges programme. Initial discussions had been held with project applicants on their ability to proceed with a reduced allocation but no details on the final allocation had been provided.

- 8.3 There were some projects that had not been included on the revised list that could still be delivered at a later date or by using other funding sources. Of the projects not proceeding two were linked to the Enterprise Zone and it was hoped they could proceed using the borrowing ability against future business rates. The Bridge for Business and North Downs Line projects requested significant levels of funding and deliverability needed to be explored, however discussions would be held with the project applicants to see how the LEP could help the projects proceed. The Enterprise M3 Transport Action Group would liaise with Thames Valley Berkshire and Coast to Capital LEPs to seek opportunities to work together to support the North Downs Line project.
- 8.4 Once the allocation had been confirmed the LGF3 projects would be combined with those already in the pipeline from LGF1 and 2 to provide an overall picture. The Board would need to look at the projects and agree the final pipeline and discuss whether any projects could be brought forward or delayed.

Action to be taken	By Whom	When
Send letters to partners to thank them for support in securing the LGF3 allocation	Kathy Slack	February 2017
Update spreadsheet with LGF3 projects once final allocation confirmed	Rachel Barker/ Justine Davie	February 2017

9. Enterprise M3 Strategic Economic Plan Refresh

- 9.1 The Board received an update on the progress with the refresh of the Strategic Economic Plan and discussed the establishment of a Steering Group. A tender specification had been issued seeking consultancy support to work alongside the team. The successful organisation would work closely with the action groups, executive team and wider partners to produce an updated SEP. The aim was to produce a creative and highly integrated SEP which captured synergies across the thematic areas. It was proposed that a Steering Group was established to provide advice to the consultant team and monitor the overall progress of the work. The final report would be presented to the 28 September Board meeting.

Action to be taken	By Whom	When
Jude Robinson to be advised of members wishing to be involved in the Strategic Economic Plan Refresh Steering Group	All Board Members	February 2017

10. Enterprise M3 Governance, Accountability and Transparency

- 10.1 Rachel Barker presented the revised Assurance Framework to the Board and highlighted the major changes. In October 2016, Government issued guidance to all LEPs which detailed the required amendments. The revised Assurance Framework had to be signed off by the Accountable Body before 28 February in order to draw down the Local Growth Fund allocation for 2017/18. The majority of the required revisions had been made however further clarification was being sought on a small number of points which may require some additional changes. The Board was asked to grant delegated authority to the Chair to agree any final amendments which was agreed.
- 10.2 As the role of Enterprise M3 continued to increase the agenda for Board meetings had become increasingly full and it was therefore recommended that an Enterprise M3 Resources, Finance and Audit committee was established. This would allow for greater scrutiny of Enterprise M3's operational budget and more detailed input from Board members. It was proposed that membership was drawn from the Enterprise M3 Board.
- 10.3 The Board was advised that following discussions with the HE institutions to appoint a successor to Dr Malcolm Parry, it was proposed that Professor Paul Hogg, Vice Chancellor of Royal Holloway joined the Board from March 2017. John Jervoise had indicated his wish to

step down as Chair of the Rural Action Group and Mark Lebus, co-owner and Managing Director of LC Energy, had offered to take on the role for a period of 3 years. The Rural Action Group had confirmed that they supported the appointment.

- 10.4 The Board agreed that Professor Paul Hogg be appointed as the HE Board representative from March 2017. The Board agreed that Mark Lebus be appointed as the Chair of the Rural Action Group.
- 10.5 The Board discussed the Assurance Framework and a question was asked relating to scrutiny and who took on the scrutiny role. The Board was advised that a system was being established between LEPs to carry out peer reviews, the Accountable Body undertook a scrutiny role as part of their auditing requirements and there was an annual review carried out by Government. It was proposed that details on the scrutiny functions should be included in the assurance framework.
- 10.6 The Board also requested that a governance structure, with details of each group's membership, be circulated for information.

Action to be taken	By Whom	When
Rachel Barker to be advised of Board Members that wish to be involved in the Governance, Accountability and Transparency committee	All Board Members	February 2017
Include details on scrutiny of EM3 LEP in the assurance framework	Rachel Barker	February 2017
Governance structure to be circulated to Board Members	Rachel Barker	Before 28 March 2017

11. Local Growth Fund Programme Update

- 11.1 Rachel Barker provided an update on the current Local Growth Fund programme. Contracts for all the early start projects had been signed and were expected to deliver in 2016/17 as planned. The contract for Farnborough International had also been signed and it was hoped that a Ministerial visit could be arranged to celebrate the contract signing. Toju Ogbe, the new Enterprise M3 Communications and Engagement Manager, was looking to improve communications associated with the Local Growth Fund projects and would be drawing up a calendar of activity.
- 11.2 The actual LGF spend to date for 2015/16 and 2016/17 was £37.7m. The total forecast for 2015-2017 was £67.4m which was £8.7m below the allocation for the two years. The actual funding distributed to date in 2016/17 was low at £9.2m however, a detailed review of all 2016/17 projects had taken place and the team remained confident that the forecast could be met. The Board would be advised through the weekly news of any major variations to the Q4 spend before the next Board meeting.
- 11.3 The forecast for 2017/18 showed £49m against available funding of £38m, which included the underspend from 2015/16 and 2016/17. Taking into account the delays experienced in previous years and the pending announcement of LGF3 allocation of funding, the team was comfortable with this level of over-programming in 2017/18. The total allocation over the growth deal period was currently only 3% over the funding envelope. Work was underway to ensure that in future the Board was updated on programme outputs/outcomes as well as spend, and an output/outcomes dashboard was in development.
- 11.4 A request had been received for an additional £350k for the Aldershot Railway Station and Surrounds LGF project which had previously been approved by the Board in July 2016. The cost estimates previously provided by South West Trains had been underestimated and there was now an additional £350k required for the provision of the new car park. Rushmoor Borough Council had been requested to investigate whether local contributions could be

increased through S106 contributions, South West Trains or the developer of the bus station site. There was also an option to increase the LGF allocation by taking some funds allocated to the wider Aldershot Town Centre Regeneration phase of the scheme.

- 11.5 The Programme Management Group had discussed the project and agreed that it should proceed but that no more than £175k additional LGF grant should be allocated and the remainder sought from other sources. The Group delegated authority to the Chair and Director to agree the final allocation. The Board agreed with the recommendation that the projects should proceed with a maximum additional LGF allocation of £175k to be taken from the wider Aldershot Town Centre Regeneration LGF project.

Action to be taken	By Whom	When
Board members to be updated on any major variations to Q4 spend before the next Board meeting	Rachel Barker	February/ March 2016
Aldershot Railway Station project to continue with an additional LGF allocation of no more than £175k	Kevin Travers	February 2016

12. Local Growth Fund Projects for Approval

a) Sustainable Transport Programme

- 12.1 Kevin Travers reported to the Board on the proposed allocation of LGF for sustainable transport schemes. To date the LEP had allocated £5.925m of funding for sustainable transport with £18.475 remaining unallocated. The Board was asked to consider the options available for distribution of the remaining sustainable transport funds over the growth deal period.

- 12.2 It was proposed that the unallocated sustainable transport funding should be allocated to sustainable transport schemes but with some flexibility to reallocate some of the funding elsewhere if required. There was an extensive pipeline of sustainable transport schemes including those submitted under LGF3. The Board was asked to recommend the provisional allocation of £15.77m to five schemes:

- Blackwater Valley Gold Grid
- Brooklands Business Park
- Staines Sustainable Transport Package Phase 1
- Whitehill & Bordon Sustainable Transport Programme
- Woking Sustainable Transport Package Phase 1

- 12.3 It was highlighted that once the business cases had been received, each of these projects would be reported to the Board for final approval. Work would be carried out with scheme promoters to ensure that the business case met the LEPs wider objectives. Details on the funding profile of the £15.77m would be requested from the scheme promoters and fed into the overall funding profile, there would be £2.705m that would remain unallocated. The Board supported the proposed approach.

b) Wider Staines upon Thames Sustainable Transport Package (Phase 1)

- 12.4 Kevin Travers reported to the Board on the Wider Staines upon Thames Sustainable Transport Programme submitted by Surrey County Council. The total cost of the scheme was £4.95m, with a LGF request of £3.713m (75%), £1.29m in 2017/18, £2.27m in 2018/19 and £152.5k in 2019/20. The remainder would be met from contributions from Heathrow Airport Ltd, Surrey County Council, Spelthorne Borough Council and a contribution from local bus operators.

- 12.5 The aim of the proposed package was to improve sustainable transport options and usage between Staines Town Centre and the south side of Heathrow Airport. The package consisted of six schemes:

- Scheme 1: A308 London Road/High Street (£1.09m) – a new shared cyclist and pedestrian route to address road safety
- Scheme 2: Rosefield Road, Greenlands Road (£0.025m) – develop a direct access link between Staines station and key employment destinations
- Scheme 3: Stanwell Moor Road (0.78m) – improve the shared off road route and install a toucan crossing on the most direct, continuous route into Heathrow Terminal 5 from Staines.
- Scheme 4: Park Road (0.52m) – a pedestrian and cycle route connecting Stanwell Moor to Stanwell and beyond to Heathrow Terminal 4 and cargo terminal
- Scheme 5: Town Lane (£1.035m) – A30 to Heathrow link provision of a shared use path connecting residential catchment areas with a number of major trip attractors
- Scheme 6: Stanwell sustainable transport links and bus corridor improvements (£0.855m) – create a network of cycling and walking routes, utilising quiet roads where possible

12.6 The proposed package had been assessed by AECOM and the overall conclusion was that a good strategic case had been developed which was enhanced by the recent approval for the expansion of Heathrow. AECOM had suggested a number of actions designed to maximise the possibility of protecting and securing the LEPs investment.

12.7 The Programme Management Group discussed the project and noted that although the match funding only represented 25% of the total cost of the scheme that was the standard level of contribution for transport schemes and should be taken into account when schemes were being ranked. There was also some concern about Surrey County Council's (SCC) ability to deliver the scheme. Following recent discussions with SCC the Enterprise M3 team felt that SCC were being more realistic about delivery and therefore should be able to meet the timetable. It was highlighted however that SCC would be advised that any delays in the delivery of this project would impact on funding for future schemes.

12.8 The Board expressed some concern that the match funding was all backloaded to 2019/20 and there was also an issue with the map identifying the routes into Heathrow Terminals 4 and 5. Discussions would be held with the scheme promotor to establish a more even spread of the match funding. The routes into the terminals would also be investigated, it was expected that there were complimentary works being carried out on the London side of Heathrow. The Board agreed that £3.713m of grant expenditure from LGF be approved for the Wider Staines upon Thames Sustainable Transport Package Phase 1.

c) **Lower Thames Flood Defences**

12.9 Rachel Barker reported to the Board on the Lower Thames Flood Defence project which was a £2m LGF request to support the design phase of the scheme split across 2017/18 and 2018/19. The project was promoted by a wide partnership including the Environment Agency, Surrey County Council, six local authorities, Thames Region Flood and Coastal Committee and Thames Water. The scheme would contribute to the flood risk reduction for 100,000sqm of commercial space, 50km of road and rail network and parts of the M3, M4 and M25. The scheme also aimed to unlock in excess of 800 ha of land from the flood plain and initial estimates confirmed that 13ha could be suitable for housing.

12.10 Independent due diligence had been carried out by AECOM which concluded that the project directly aligned with the Enterprise M3 Strategic Economic Plan. AECOM had made the recommendation that the project had the potential to proceed but further work was required before entering into a funding agreement.

12.11 The Programme Management Group discussed the project and there was some concern expressed that the funding was for the design and development work with no certainty that the project would be delivered. It was however acknowledged that the project was of national

significance and there were a number of parties that would be required to make contributions to ensure that the scheme was implemented.

12.12 The Board discussed the project and noted that a proportion of the funding was for planning fees to local authorities. As this project relied on a number of contributions from partners it was suggested that the planning fees should be waived by the local authorities. The Board agreed that £2m of grant expenditure from LGF be approved for the Lower Thames Flood Defence work and acknowledged the risk of granting funding for design and development work which was a departure from the usual practice. They also agreed that a letter should be submitted to the Environment Agency setting out the concerns with the deliverability of the project, proposing that planning fees were waived by local authorities and advising that the LEP would not be able to contribute any additional funding to the project.

d) 5G Project Phase 2 – Step-out Digital Games Cluster

12.13 Chris Quintana reported on the 5G Project Phase 2 – Step-out Digital Games Cluster. The University of Surrey had been provisionally allocated £5m for the overall 5G project and in March 2015 the Board approved £1.75m LGF for Phase 1. The second phase required a further £1.75m of LGF funding which would form part of a wider £8.25m capital project matched by the 5G Innovation Centre (5GIC) founder industry members' contributions and the University of Surrey EPSRC programme.

12.14 The aim of the project was to create a large scale 5G step-out facility linked to the main 5G test bed to serve the Guildford and Aldershot gaming communities. The funding would support: the development of the core 5GIC test bed to demonstrate 5G automotive, video/VR on the move and tactile internet (robotic) applications; the deployment of a large scale 5G step-out facility located at the Surrey Research Park; and, provision of 5G connectivity at the Aldershot Games Hub to serve the world class digital gaming business cluster of Guildford and Aldershot. Over a five year period the project was expected to delivery 50 new business starts, 200 new jobs, support 300 businesses and leverage more than £5m private sector investment.

12.15 Due diligence had been carried out and AECOM had highlighted a number of issues including the risk of business creation levels not being achieved, the costs of equipment exceeding the figures, and not being able to identify staff with relevant skills. In response, the University of Surrey provided assurance that they would cover any overspend and they were now working with a specialist recruitment company to address any staffing issues. There was also a risk that the match funding would not be realised. The Board received a verbal update on some of the issues raised by AECOM.

12.16 The Board commented on the benefits of seeing the outputs achieved for Phase 1 before considering funding for Phase 2 and agreed that £2m of grant funding expenditure from LGF be approved for 5G Project Phase 2 – Step-out Digital Games Cluster.

e) Juniversity

12.17 Sarah Carter reported on the Juniversity project which had previously been considered by the Programme Management Group in January 2016 but had not been recommended for approval due to the low match and the limited impact and reach of the project. The University of Winchester had now redesigned the project, revised the business case and provided a greater percentage of match towards the project. The revised request for was for £432,050 of LGF with a total project cost of £864,100.

12.18 The aim of the project was to address the future skills requirements of businesses in north Hampshire by raising aspiration among young people. Research showed a diminishing interest in STEM subjects from the age of ten onwards. The project would provide a Juniversity hub on the site of the new Barton Farm Academy in Kings Barton in Winchester. The hub would provide a flexible and experimental learning environment in which teachers, academics, students and researchers could pioneer new and creative teaching and learning techniques using the involvement of business and creative entrepreneurs. Juniversity would focus on

Basingstoke and Andover, working with the younger generation in communities with high deprivation and low educational and employment aspirations. Juniversity would also provide a base for the development of teachers throughout their career and help address the teaching skills shortage experiences by schools across the Enterprise M3 LEP region.

12.19 AECOM had assessed the project and raised three key areas of concern: the cost and professional fees above benchmark data; a risk to delivery should there be a delay in handover of the site from the housing developer; and, whether a 10 year lease was long enough to provide a suitable strategic investment.

12.20 The Programme Management Group considered the revised business case and was supportive that the project had been extended to Winchester, Andover and Basingstoke and acknowledged that engagement with this age group was important along with education for teachers on new technologies. The PMG also acknowledged that Juniversity was a pilot project and was not about meeting the curriculum but was in addition to raise interest in STEM subjects. The PMG had also requested evaluation at 5-years, as it was felt that 10-years was too long.

12.21 The Board agreed that £432.5k of grant funding expenditure from LGF be approved for the Juniversity project.

Action to be taken	By Whom	When
Work with scheme promoters to progress the business cases for the five sustainable transport projects	Kevin Travers	February 2016
Progress the Wider Staines upon Thames Sustainable Transport Package (Phase 1) to contracting	Kevin Travers	February 2016
Send a letter to the Environment Agency to set out the concerns relating to the Lower Thames Defence project	Alex Piper	February 2016
Progress the Lower Thames Flood Defence project to contracting	Alex Piper	February 2016
Progress the 5G project Phase 2 to contracting	Chris Quintana	February 2016
Progress the Juniversity project to contracting	Sarah Carter	February 2016

13. Growing Enterprise Fund

13.1 The Board noted the recent progress of the Growing Enterprise Fund.

14. Finance Report

14.1 The Board noted the current financial position for 2016/17, the actual expenditure and income as at 31 December 2016 and the 3-year budget forecast.

15. EU Programme Update

15.1 The Board noted the progress on the EU Programme.

16. Directors Report

16.1 The Board received and noted the Directors Report.

17. **Forward Programme**

17.1 The Board received and noted the Forward Programme.

18. **Any Other Business**

18.1 The Chair thanked Malcolm Parry for his valuable contribution to the Board and wished him well for the future, which would include continued involvement with the LEP.

18.2 The future Enterprise M3 Board meetings would be held on

- Tuesday 28 March, 2017 – BMW Head Office, Farnborough
- Thursday 25 May, 2107 – Brooklands College, Ashford
- Thursday 27 July, 2017 – venue TBC
- Thursday 28 September, 2017 – venue TBC
- Thursday 30 November, 2017 – venue TBC
- Thursday 25 January, 2018 – venue TBC
- Thursday 29 March, 2018 – University Centre Farnborough