

Buckinghamshire Thames Valley Local Enterprise Partnership

Consultation summary report

Introduction

This summary of the overall responses received from the month-long consultation on the draft Buckinghamshire LEP Local Industrial Strategy sets out:

- A list of contributors to the consultation
- A summary of the feedback and emerging themes
- A suggested way to address the feedback received to produce the final draft

Consultation responses

Responses received from:

- Angela Spang, Founder and Owner, SPANG GROUP
- Greta Paa-Kerner, Head of Business Engagement, Buckinghamshire New University
- Alistair Lomax, Director of Development, University of Buckingham
- Ken Christy, Rural Support
- Neil Jackson, Conservation and Landscape Officer, Chilterns Conservation Board
- Jacqueline Ford, Economic Development Officer on behalf of Wycombe District Council
- Emma Luddington, Living Well at Home Ltd
- Klaus Allion, Managing Director, Ant Telecom
- David Manby, Development, Growth & Manufacturing Limited
- Donna Wilkinson, Principal Economic Development Officer on behalf of Chiltern & South Buckinghamshire District Council
- Roz Bird, MEPC

Summary of feedback

Question in consultation	Overall response	Resulting impact on final draft of LIS
Question 1 Do you agree or disagree that we have identified the right focus for the Buckinghamshire Local Industrial Strategy?	On the whole the consultation responses were positive about the focus for the draft strategy. There were however some criticisms that the rural economy had not made as strong a feature as should have been the case. References to the links include the rural economy's ability to support growth in SME's; sustainable places to live and reducing car use.	The links to the rural economy are implicit in the drivers but could be brought to the fore while linking them to the opportunities that will come from the Living Lab and Digital agenda in areas such as Robotics in Agriculture.

Question in consultation	Overall response	Resulting impact on final draft of LIS
<p>Question 2 What is the most important thing the Buckinghamshire Local Industrial Strategy should focus on?</p>	<p>There was agreement that a focus on taking innovation to market in an effective and efficient manner was key.</p> <p>Gaps in the overall narrative included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Affordable housing for young people - Detail on transport connectivity - New models of living and working combined - Better links between councils and SMEs to design out problems 	<p>While Heathrow's growth features clearly in the draft LIS, reference to Old Oak Common has also been suggested for an explicit reference given investment and links to and from London.</p>
<p>Question 3 Do you agree or disagree that the Westcott Space Cluster, Pinewood and the National Film and TV School, the Silverstone Technology Cluster and Stoke Mandeville Hospital are the internationally significant economic assets around which we should build our industrial strategy?</p>	<p>Mainly agreement that the document has highlighted the right assets.</p> <p>Some identification that those assets were supported by smaller and lesser known but equally important supply chains.</p> <p>Sports engineering was highlighted as part of the broader Silverstone offer.</p> <p>A lack of reference to the 'intellectual infrastructure' of the county was criticised in relation the presence and roles of universities</p>	<p>Greater reference to the 'intellectual infrastructure' in Buckinghamshire could be made in the final version with an identification of the specialisms of the two host universities.</p> <p>An initial place setting introduction will also be incorporated to highlight the significance of major High Wycombe and Aylesbury as the major urban centres, key links to the M40 corridor and Chiltern Rail network and key business park hubs.</p>
<p>Question 4 Which of Buckinghamshire's place-based assets do you believe are most important to its economic growth and what infrastructure improvements do you think are most necessary to support the delivery of this strategy?</p>	<p>Westcott and Stoke Mandeville were most often referenced but there was no suggestion that any should be removed.</p> <p>The sparsity of reference to other place-based assets was highlighted alongside the need to link to specific policies that relating to 'protect, preserve and prosper' these current assets.</p>	<p>The lack of policy links through the document is in direct response to feedback from MHCLG and the need to understand the whole picture before identifying activity with government departments.</p> <p>A section setting out the wider spatial assets will be added including more context on the</p>

Question in consultation	Overall response	Resulting impact on final draft of LIS
	A number of business parks and physical assets were highlighted as important.	connections to and from London.
<p>Question 5 How can the Buckinghamshire LIS further drive growth across the Oxford-Cambridge Arc?</p>	<p>Mainly comments related to Buckinghamshire fuelling the businesses to take innovation and commercialise it.</p> <p>On a more practical note, sharing and learning from other LEPs was mentioned.</p>	Some nuancing of language to make sure innovation to commercialisation is fully understood through the document.
<p>Question 6 Do you agree or disagree that the key actions required to mobilise those economic assets are: promoting a skills and inspiration revolution; ensuring that Buckinghamshire has the latest digital infrastructure; developing living labs; mobilising our capacity to commercialise innovation; and supporting business growth?</p>	<p>This question solicited a list of generic actions that could be delivered through the LIS including more business space, more quality homes and more accessible transport.</p> <p>Reference to natural capital resources was also highlighted as a missing area of focus.</p>	These more generic actions did not feature in the evidence base as being a unique challenge to Buckinghamshire. The LIS intends to identify specific routes to increasing productivity and addressing the Grand Challenges.
<p>Question 7 Are there any other sources of national competitiveness which should feature in the Buckinghamshire Local Industrial Strategy?</p>	<p>There was broad agreement that the sources identified were the right ones.</p> <p>Emerging strengths in ‘robot farming’.</p> <p>Agriculture was highlighted as a competitive feature of Buckinghamshire by rural representative(s).</p>	A more central feature for the rural economy will feature in the final draft.
<p>Question 8 How could you or your organisation contribute to delivering an ambitious local industrial strategy for Buckinghamshire and what would enable you to do so?</p>	Most organisations or individuals offered their organisation’s support (in the area in which they specialised).	No change proposed to the final document.

Question in consultation	Overall response	Resulting impact on final draft of LIS
<p>Question 9 Is there anything else you would like to say about the development of the Buckinghamshire Local Industrial Strategy?</p>	<p>Positive statements highlighted the inclusive nature of how the strategy was built and the comprehensive nature of the document.</p>	<p>No change proposed to the final document.</p>

'The LIS is hugely welcome – this will help to give a collective focus on how Buckinghamshire can grow in its international reputation and skills base. It is already a great place to do business but to succeed we need more talented people with a broadest range of skills.' Living Well at Home Ltd.