

## **Minutes**

**Meeting:** Chippenham Town Centre Partnership Board

**Date:** 28<sup>th</sup> Jan 2022

**Location:** Chippenham Town Hall

**Time:** 12.00pm

### **Attendees:**

Michelle Donelan MP (chair) – (MD)  
Cllr Richard Clewer, Leader, Wiltshire Council – (RC)  
Laura Hall Wilson – Parliamentary assistant to MP (LHW)  
Simon Hendeby – Director of Commercial and Assets, Wiltshire Council (SH)  
Mark Smith – CEO – Chippenham Town Council (MS)  
Cllr Desna Allen – Leader, Chippenham Town Council (DA)  
Ian Hatt – Principal, Wiltshire College (IH)  
Don Steele – Chair of Trustees – Chippenham Borough Lands Charity (DS)  
Phil Tansley – CEO - Chippenham Borough Lands Charity (PT)  
Owen Inskip – Pinnacle Group (OI)  
Huw Thomas – Chippenham Chamber of Commerce (HT)

### Support Officers

Louise Cary – Wiltshire Council (LC)  
Victoria Moloney, Wiltshire Council (VM)  
David Milton – Wiltshire Council (DM)  
Richard Walters – Wiltshire Council (RW)

### Apologies

Tom Hedges – Eagle One

#### **1. Introductions**

#### **2. Minutes of last meeting**

Approved as an accurate record.

#### **3. Declarations of Interest**

Owen Inskip confirmed that he has property interests within town centre including the Wilkos (31/33 High Street) store and property near the railway station. Also noted that his wife owns 3 shops in the town centre (market place). Outside the town centre he confirmed that he owns a 55% of land held by Chippenham 2020.

#### **4. Revised Terms of Reference**

The amended ToRs circulated with the Agenda were ratified by the Board. It was agreed that the approved ToRs can be provided on request to third parties.

#### **5. Town Centre Masterplan – baseline analysis and proposed way forward (Dave Milton)**

David Milton (DM) - Team Leader, Major Projects at Wiltshire Council - made a presentation on the findings of the initial baseline work (paper included) and a proposed approach to masterplanning Chippenham Town Centre

**Action:** (WC) - Presentation slides to be issued to the TC Partnership Board.

In discussion – the following points / issues raised;

In response to question from PT – DM confirmed that the Future Chippenham consultation work undertaken by consultants Cratus that he referred to in his presentation will be published.

DA – raised concerns over how to deal with the ‘anti-change’ lobby and general cynicism that she felt was attached to consultations led by Wiltshire Council.

DM – noted the need to line up allies and build consensus early, focussing on the positive issues. This consultation should be led by the TCP Board not the ‘Council’.

RC – shared his experience on Salisbury Market Place consultation – which he took over as Chair of the Salisbury Area Board following a hostile public response to a controversial scheme promoted by local Vision Partnership – broke down consultation into bite size elements – focus on what might be acceptable – this is what you said – this is what we will do..... resulted in unblocking a stalled scheme and delivering a major public realm improvement. Lessons learned can be applied here – a consultation led by the Partnership focussed on what works for the Community for Chippenham.

PT – wanted to see greater engagement with the Council as well as wider stakeholders.

RC – this is why this Board has been established and is chaired by MP.

MD – agreed – the creation of the TCP Board marks a new point – consultations need to be carefully devised.

DS – agreed the ‘one plan’ approach outlined by DM - based on an agreed vision has to be the way to go – expressed concern over multiplicity of plans

SH asked whether the TCP Board happy with the process proposed in DM’s presentation and the Board agreed the model DM set out.

OI – expressed the view that it may be preferable for the consultation process to be led independently – not Council branded survey – SH /DM agreed – would be led by the Board.

DA – requested that the ToR’s be shared with third parties - MD confirmed that the approved TORs could be published externally.

OI – noted his view that he was the only ‘proper’ stakeholder in attendance with something to commercially gain or lose from the Masterplan – he suggested greater landowner representation. SH noted that Eagle One were invited (they gave apologies during the course of the meeting).

The Board discussed the need for a consultation that asked the right questions – to be fronted by as a questionnaire from the TCP Board not branded as a Council consultation.

MD – happy for a survey to be conducted.

RC – agreed noting the need to determine what the important questions are – need to figure this out – before consultation is commenced.

OI – would be best to have the questions circulated in advance for approval –

Action - DM agreed to work up some proposed questions for use in a consultation and to put these back to the Board for approval along with a proposed methodology for the consultation process.

## **6. Lessons learned from Salisbury Place Board – considerations for Partnership Structure (Victoria Moloney)**

VM gave a presentation on lessons learned from the Salisbury Place Board and possible considerations for the Chippenham TCP Board. Slides to be circulated

Key points: 25 factors – Institute of Place Management (IPM) of 254 in total – priorities – and action groups to lead.

In Salisbury 5 groups created each leading ‘pillars’ - with defined outcomes and established working groups / action groups – led by the agency most appropriate (Parish Council, BID etc) Each pillar has action plan – that is fed into the Place Board – not a reporting function – key issues brought to the Place Board.

The Board has been active for 3 years (in various stages of evolution) broadly the same key stakeholders - 3 stages - Transition, Revitalisation and Transformation.

RC – the Board needs to be tightly focussed on what its role is.

OI – focus needs to be on vitality of the high street – not building retail on Bath Road – footfall is not bad but its low spend – so is footfall the primary focus?

PT – agreed – Board needs a vision for what it wants to achieve

MS – what officer support to support this Board – RC – yes needs impetus from Council – but move quickly to local support – is about establishing the right mechanism – once established it needs to be self-sustaining.

## **7. AOB**

Membership – MD – proposed inviting the Town Team – DA – noted they have no connection to the TC and was unclear who they answer to.

MS – why should they be exclusively be chosen over others? MD – others should be considered – they should add value to the discussion.

SH – noted that the earlier discussion was that the Town Team may be an appropriate organisation to lead one of the work ‘pillars’ and by doing so attend Board meetings in that capacity.

OI – supportive – given the Town Team represent traders with a business interest in the town’s success. The Chair (MD) asked for Board members to vote on whether the Town Team should be invited and it was carried that they should.

The Board discussed whether the Civic Society should be represented – which the Board agreed.

SH – raised a point relating to Purple Flag – brought to his attention by the Council’s Community Engagement Manager. Noted by the Board.

## **8. Date of next meeting**

March – 25<sup>th</sup> – provisional TBC – to be held at Town Hall