

## Economic Development Strategy 2009-2014 Consultation Responses – February 2009

Consultee	Consultee Response	SKDC Officer Response
Lincolnshire Heritage	Please add under the Economic Development Action Plan – last bullet point could include ‘a high quality of life and an outstanding protected natural and historic environment that will set South Kesteven apart from other districts within the Region’	This statement can be put into the strategy if members wish.
Service Manager SKDC	The goals for 2020 stated on page 2 ‘exemplar of best practise’ I felt a really strong statement, and whilst I am a fan of stretch goals, I am not sure how we would prove / measure that. The second point is a general comment about retail, in Grantham in particular – I imagine that this gets covered in great detail in the growth point strategy, but it felt we might say more in this document.	This statement has been removed  The local retail study provides more detail on this type of information and is helping to form the LDF
Stamford Chamber of Trade	A small matter of fact: on page 10 you note that “there is an increase in 2007 of nearly 100 businesses turning over more than £65,000 per annum”. This is a false assumption, because any business can apply for registration, no matter how low its turnover. It is only obligatory if turnover exceeds £65,000. Many of those applying for registration could be turning over less than £65k	This response is accurate; however there is currently no measurement of businesses starting up with turnover under £65,000 so therefore cannot be stated. It is recommended this information remains within the Strategy and a further sentence stating the above is put in.
Stamford Chamber of Trade	We are concerned that this document does not reflect the current parlous state of the local and national economy, being mainly a forward and continuous projection of previous policies and objectives. We cannot stress strongly enough that the world has changed in the last year – nothing is now as it was and new thinking and focus is required. At national level, the Government is continuously launching initiatives and taking steps that would have been unthinkable only a few months ago, yet at regional and sub-regional level, having read this document, you would assume that the current recession, possibly depression, doesn’t exist	The document is aiming at over 5 years not at the current 6 months or year. Therefore it is important to state the objectives that South Kesteven District Council wishes to aim for. Further detail on the current state of the economy can be added in, however in doing so the document becomes ‘time-banked’ in 2009 and may not accurately portray the economy in 2010+. The EDM suggests that the information is removed and shortened bullet points reinstated that can be amended annually with the Action Plan
Stamford Chamber of Trade	In particular, the almost blinkered focus on the creation of new businesses, no matter what their chances of survival, is both wasteful and unrealistic. What is needed is a far more focused approach on existing businesses supported by programmes and resources that will help them to survive.	The Economic Development Team recognises this model, however to create a vibrant and prosperous economy new technologies and businesses must be grown and encouraged at the same time that support for existing businesses are given. A dual approach should be given, meaning that this response should not be further considered.
Stamford Chamber of Trade	Finally, we note that the Lincolnshire E D Strategy has a section entitled “Supporting the growth of Lincolnshire’s most important employment sectors”, listing tourism as one of these and stating that capacity-building programmes will be established. In SKDC’s strategy there is no mention of this, indeed any mention of tourism is conspicuous by its absence. We stress once again that it is more sensible in these times to concentrate on industries that have known potential rather than wasting resources on	The ED strategy does not focus on any one particular sector. The Lincolnshire ED Strategy is somewhat subjective in the wording of “important” and does not define this. The RES states that Tourism only accounts for 3% of GVA where as Manufacturing is around 23% GVA as a SIC. Therefore to make a more profitable local economy the focus should be on increasing added value

	risky and inappropriate new business ventures, if indeed there are now many people who are prepared to launch themselves into such an unpromising economic environment.	sectors. This does not discount Tourism as an industry, especially in some towns (Stamford) where its importance is high. The Strategy does not focus on any one particular SIC, and to do so may discount us from growing sectors.
Stamford Town Council	The 'Vision' is a very general mission statement. It identifies SKDC as a rural district which is essentially true but it fails to take into account the variable nature of the urban/rural areas in terms of population or economics.	No further proposal or suggestion was given for an alternative Vision. If a further vision is proposed or amendment – members may wish to consider it.
Stamford Town Council	<b>Bullet point 3:</b> We would suggest that the words 'Welland Quarter', in its current state, be removed. This relates to an outdated plan which never went out to full public consultation and which more recent studies have shown to be no longer valid for Stamford given that plans have already been approved for additional supermarkets/retail parks to the east of the town. We must also take into account the unexpected depth of recession which is being experienced locally, nationally and globally. Stamford Town Council will be submitting their own local plan but also responses to the Welland Quarter Development. We would strongly suggest that the words 'Welland Quarter Development' will be both confusing and have negative connotations if it continues to be used. We suggest that the finished proposal be called the Stamford Development Plan.	EDM suggests that the Welland Quarter project is removed, and that the project be renamed 'Stamford Priory Development' and is considered within the Economic Development Action Plan in due course.  Members may wish to consider supporting the Stamford Development Plan formally within the ED Strategy or future action plan.  Consideration is been given as part of the revision to the Local Development Scheme, to reintroduce the preparation of a Stamford Area Action Plan as part of the LDF. If so, the AAP could pick up on proposals for the Welland Quarter, hotel/conference development, issues coming out of the Stamford Town Plan.
Stamford Town Council	<b>Bullet points 3 and 10:</b> These point to the culture and heritage of the District yet neither indicate that Stamford is the main attraction for both heritage and tourism. It should be included by name and in particular there should be a positive attempt to promote Stamford within the District for it's tourism potential	EDM suggests that the point stated be included subject to evidence being provided confirming that Stamford is the <b>main</b> attraction for both heritage and tourism.
Stamford Town Council	<b>Bullet point 4:</b> We would like to encourage the sale of locally sourced goods and it would seem appropriate to include it under this point.	This can be included as a generic statement, however the District Council would still have to adhere to its contract procedure policy and rules when buying.
Stamford Town Council	<b>Page 2 – State of the Economy</b> <b>Global:</b> We would suggest that these paragraphs need to be reworked given the rapidly changing global economic conditions and the knock-on effect these are having at both national, regional and local levels. <b>European</b> Comments as above apply.	Agreed – as stated members may wish to consider in doing so if the document will then be 'time – banked' and the EDM suggests that this section be significantly reduced to state a more general overview given the quick changing situation. This can then be updated annually with the action plan.
Stamford Town Council	<b>Page 4 – Local Economy</b> We strongly support the contention made in paragraph 2 that Lincolnshire will lag behind without significant intervention. The current District priorities are confined to the Grantham and Bourne growth bids.	Members may wish to consider this suggestion in setting the priorities and priority plans each year. The Stamford College suggestion is a very good one and could be included.

	<p>Intervention and attention needs to be addressed across the district. Stamford is traditionally seen as a business, commercial and tourism centre with a high level of skilled population and this needs to be capitalised upon.</p> <p>The future of Stamford New College, and the proposed change in status from College to University in 2010 will further add to this skill's pool and this needs to be capitalised upon. This should be included in the Local Economy element.</p>	
Stamford Town Council	<p><b>Page 11 - East Midlands Development Agency</b> The Regional Economic Strategy targets for SKDC included in bullet points RES1-RES5 we would agree with if these were to be worked for and achieved equally across the District.</p> <p><b>Page 13 – Welland SSP</b> We would like to see the 'partnership' between SKDC and the Welland SSP devolved down to Town/Parish level as we believe these are more able to target specific local projects. The local expertise and knowledge is both available and relevant</p>	<p>This suggestion is recognised, South Kesteven District Council has created priority plans one of which is titled 'good for business' this priority will focus on key specific towns, namely Grantham and Bourne</p> <p>The Welland SSP information should be removed in its entirety due to the dissolving of the partnership in April 2009.</p>
Stamford Town Council	<p><b>Page 13 – Local Strategic Partnership – Sustainable Community Strategy</b> We are concerned about the sentence which reads: <i>'Extensive consultation has been collected through the member organisations of the Local Strategic Partnership to establish relevant priorities which address the needs of our partners and the communities we serve.'</i></p> <p>We believe that the Local Strategic Partnership is formed of the Lincs Assembly and the District LSP. Neither of these have consulted with the Stamford Town Council about what they believe to be priorities. If they refer to the Local Area Forums then we do not believe that these can be classed as 'extensive consultation' models. The pattern prior to the last meeting of the Stamford Local Area Forum was one whereby the meeting was made up entirely of presentations by SKDC officers but they could not be described as consultation exercises. If they refer to the local TCMPs, then again we do not believe that these represent models of consultation.</p> <p>We do not believe that the priorities identified by the Council do necessarily reflect true public opinion and we would welcome a more transparent, model of public consultation. We note that the 'extensive consultation' have identified Grantham and Bourne as the priority areas. We would like to see active consultation being undertaken more closely through elected councils / open public forums / newspaper adverts.</p>	<p>Members may wish to note this response – but the EDM suggests no further amendments to the Strategy as no further suggestions are made.</p>
Stamford Town Council	<p><b>Page 14 – Local Development Framework</b> We accept the need for this document to identify sufficient employment land within SKDC as a major priority. It appears from the recent survey</p>	<p>The Submission Core Strategy recognises that housing and economic growth should go hand in hand and has</p>

	<p>of economic land availability within SKDC. Identified through the Brownfield Land Action Plan 2008, that the drive for more housing has been undertaken without giving due thought to providing economic generation/employment land within the district. This could have, and indeed should, be achieved by declassifying available lands from residential to commercial status. This is essential at this time of recession.</p>	<p>identified the provision of approximately 24 hectares of new employment land at Stamford. These sites will be identified in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD, which is currently under preparation. All of the housing allocations from the SK Local Plan have now either been built out or have planning permission and it is not, therefore, possible to reassess their suitability for other uses.</p>
Stamford Town Council	<p><b>Page 14 – ED Objective 1: - The Inward Investment Challenge “Attracting Inward Investment”</b></p> <p>We concur with this entirely. Not enough have been done to attract inward investment to South Kesteven. There is also the problem of ‘leeching’ of highly skilled workers out of the four towns. We believe that this could certainly be done around Stamford which has one of the highest level of skilled/professional workers within the District, and with more due to come online via Stamford New College/University. However, we believe that SKDC need to look at major schemes, rather than public realm improvements in order to improve this situation. This would include such schemes as a national conference centre for Stamford which would be ideally placed given the wealth of culture/heritage/tourism interests which would act as a magnet not only for delegates but for their families to come to the town and would greatly increase the opportunities for providing added employment and inward investment. We believe that SKDC needs to be much more pro-active throughout the District. Coupled with this, there needs to be serious attention given to communications within the District if we are to ensure inward investment and a serious analysis of inter-county communication via adequate highways/bypasses etc.</p>	<p>Members may wish to note this response – but the EDM suggests no further amendments to the Strategy.</p>
Stamford Town Council	<p><b>Page 15 – ED Objective 2: - The Skills Challenge “Diversifying our skills”</b></p> <p>We do not believe that bullet point 3 <i>‘Delivered in partnership with Stamford Town Partnership and Lincolnshire County Council the Stamford Gateway project’</i> is in any way relevant to this objective and cannot understand its’ inclusion here along with the other schemes which are all relevant to the skills question. The statement ‘We have learnt to consult and communicate more with local stakeholders.....’ needs to be demonstrated in future developments.</p> <p>We can only stop our younger, more skilled workforce finding employment wider afield if we are able to achieve adequate inward investment and job opportunities.</p>	<p>Within the Skills Challenge text there is no reference to the Gateway project. However a page down in the document the strategy does refer to the Gateway Project under ‘where we are now/what we did well’.</p> <p>Therefore no amendment is suggested.</p>
Stamford Town Council	<p><b>Page 16 – ED Objective 3: - The productivity challenge “Improving our local output”</b></p> <p>We agree that Grantham and Stamford have major infrastructure advantages over Lincolnshire because of their geographical location in the</p>	<p>No suggestions to the ‘more needs to be done’ therefore no amendments or additions should be added to the Strategy.</p>

	<p>centre of the country and their transport links. However, much more needs to be done here to build upon these advantages which is not being done.</p> <p><b>Page 16 – ED Objective 4:- The Entrepreneurship Challenge “Growing our local businesses”</b> We fully agree with this.</p> <p><b>Page 16 – ED Objective 5:- The Knowledge and Technology Challenge “Increasing our knowledge economy”</b> Fully agree and support this. Without this approach we will continue to decline. Can we see how this will be achieved?</p>	<p>Members may wish to note this response – but the EDM suggests no further amendments to the Strategy as no further suggestions are made</p>
Stamford Town Council	<p><b>Page 17 – Measuring the Impact</b> We have strong reservations about the Stamford Welland Quarter and would refer you to our comments under ‘Vision’ bullet point 3. In its current state it is unacceptable and needs to be brought up to date with another name, new plans which reflect changes since this document was produced and under the ownership of Stamford Town Council.</p> <p><b>Page 18 – Outcomes</b> <b>a. Where are we now in 2008</b> We see the lack of skills at level 3 NVQ or above at 26% to be one of the most worrying statistics and believe emphasis should be placed on increasing this to above the 28% you see as feasible in ‘Where we want to be in 2014’. This is an area which requires close monitoring and co-operation between councils and the providers of education within SKDC.</p>	<p>This should be removed, and Stamford Priory Development put in as suggested.</p> <p>EDM agrees, but requires this to be in partnership with LCC rather than being a lead, but rather a support partner.</p>
Stamford Town Council	<p><b>Conclusions:</b> In response to the points you raise at the beginning:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the Vision realistic? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. We believe that it should be achievable but with more difficulty given the current economic climate.</li> <li>b. We also believe that it should be more robust and less vague.</li> <li>c. It is limited in the schemes which it illustrates to achieve the vision ie Grantham and Bourne. It takes no account of Stamford or the Deepings which are central to District.</li> <li>d. Neither does it give emphasis to the rural areas in terms of transport, infrastructure etc.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Could the Profile for South Kesteven include further statistics or data? <p>Yes. We would like to see:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. More demographic data; eg population working or retired</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>No further vision has been proposed. Some further demographic data can be put into the strategy including as suggested (a, c &amp; e)</p>

	<p>etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. A breakdown of educational attainment per major town. Also the percentage of young people who return to Stamford after graduating.</li> <li>c. A breakdown of deprivation indices by town/rural area so that we can prioritise assistance/projects.</li> <li>d. We would like to see the percentages of workers who work outside the District and where they travel to (this will help us to assess both employment and transportation needs).</li> <li>e. Changing patterns of employment.</li> <li>f. Breakdown of tourism income / numbers.</li> </ul> <p>3. Have we included all the necessary partners for the economic development of the District within the "How we fit in" No. No emphasis is laid on the local town/parish councils. We do hope that the LDF is going to take account of individual town plans.</p> <p>4. Chapter 7: Are the "Priorities" identified the most appropriate for the District? See our notes.</p> <p>5. Can we measure our "impacts and outcomes" in another or different way? Do not feel able to answer this at the current time.</p>	<p>The preparation of LDF documents will take account of town and parish plans.</p>
District Councillor & Town Councillor	<p>SKDC should consider the implications of the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stamford New College applying for University status in 2010</li> <li>• The potential for a National Conference Centre in Stamford</li> <li>• Tourism is an important industry to Stamford and we should capitalize on that.</li> </ul>	<p>Members may wish to consider the following when developing the Annual Action Plan over the next five years.</p>