



**The Economic Impact of Watts Gallery - Artists' Village,
Compton, Guildford, Surrey**

Final Report

04 March 2016

School of Hospitality and Tourism Management

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

University of Surrey

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
1 Introduction	2
2 Methodology.....	5
2.1 Data Collection.....	6
2.2 Analysis	8
3 Profiles of Watts Gallery Estate Visitors	9
3.1 Demographic Profile	9
3.2 Behavioural Profile.....	13
4 Economic Impact.....	18
4.1 Local Economic Impact	18
4.2 Impact on the Wider Economy	22
5 Conclusion.....	24
Appendix	25
Methodological Notes.....	25
Adjustment to Management Data	26
Post-Visit Survey Questionnaire	27
Key References.....	36
Endnotes	37

Figure 1.1 – Annual admissions, 2000-2015 (unit: person)	2
Figure 1.2 – Monthly admissions in 2015 (unit: person)	3
Figure 2.1 – GU postcode area.....	5
Figure 3.1 – Visitors split by gender.....	10
Figure 3.2 – Visitors split by country of residence.....	10
Figure 3.3 – Visitors split by age group.....	11
Figure 3.4 – Visitors split by educational attainment	11
Figure 3.5 – Visitors split by employment status.....	12
Figure 3.6 – Visitors split by household income	12
Figure 3.7 – Visitors split by times of visits.....	13
Figure 3.8 – Visitors split by main purpose of visit	14
Figure 3.9 – Visitors split by travel companion.....	15
Figure 3.10 – Visitors split by mode of transport	15
Figure 3.11 – Visitors split by length of trip.....	16
Figure 3.12 – Visitors split by alternative activity	17
Table 4.1 – Per person spending in Compton.....	18
Table 4.2 – Per person spending in nearby towns outside Compton.....	19
Table 4.3 – Towns outside Compton where the visitors spent money	19
Table 4.4 – Direct economic impact of Watts Gallery Estate on the local area in 2015.....	20
Table 4.5 – Total economic impact of Watts Gallery Estate in 2015	21
Table 4.6 – Direct economic impact of Watts Gallery Estate on wider economy in 2015	23
Table 4.7 – Total economic impact of Watts Gallery Estate on wider economy in 2015.....	23
Table A.1 – Definitions	25
Table A.2 – Additionality matrix	26

Executive Summary

Watts Gallery Estate is a purpose-built art gallery based in the village of Compton, Guildford. It was founded in 1904 to display the works by the great Victorian artist G. F. Watts. After a major restoration project in recent years, the Gallery has revived, welcoming up to 35,000 visitors a year. As a result, businesses in the local area benefit from the increase of tourists in terms of income and job creation.

The research was commissioned by Watts Gallery, with a view to providing quantitative evidence of economic impact brought by the Gallery, and to articulating the importance of tourism in the local area.

The research drew on a post-visit survey of visitors to the Gallery, which received 307 responses, and desk research on the Gallery's management data and UK's economic data. They were analysed with a robust method that complies with similar economic impact studies.

The research finds that in 2015 the Gallery directly contributed £2.62 million worth of additional gross turnover to other local businesses in Compton and nearby towns, due to the Gallery's operation and its visitors' spending. Translated into gross value added (GVA), the economic impact amounted to £1.29 million, supporting 49 full-time equivalent jobs in the local economy. Taking the knock-on effect into consideration, this local economic impact could be further amplified to a scale of £6.08 million in terms of gross turnover, £2.98 million GVA and 99 full-time equivalent jobs. Overall, every £1 local expense by the Gallery ultimately yielded £2.65 additional gross turnover, or £1.30 additional GVA, for the economy.

The research also recognises that the Gallery may bring about economic benefits to non-local suppliers, and hence create a far reaching impact on the wider economy. It is estimated that the total economic impact of Watts Gallery Estate on the wider economy was £7.76 million in terms of additional gross turnover, £3.80 million additional GVA and 124 full-time equivalent jobs in 2015.

1 Introduction

This research was commissioned by Watts Gallery, Compton, Guildford, in November 2014. Watts Gallery has undergone major renovation in recent years, after raising £11 million to save the Gallery, which also included restoring the Tea Shop, opening a Shop in the Old Pottery, installing improved toilet facilities, providing appropriate car parking space, and securing brown signs on the A3.

Once a thriving 19th Century campus, Watts Gallery has revived after the recent restoration and seen visitor numbers soar from 12,000 a year to 35,000 a year. Figure 1.1 shows the annual admission numbers from 2000 to 2015. There has been a leap in admissions since 2011.




Figure 1.1 – Annual admissions, 2000-2015 (unit: person)

Source: Watts Gallery management data

Figure 1.2 shows the monthly admission numbers in 2015, during which a post-visit survey was conducted for the purposes of the current research. The figure also captures the seasonality in visitor admissions.




Figure 1.2 – Monthly admissions in 2015 (unit: person)

Source: Watts Gallery management data

With the large inflows of visitors to Watts Gallery, local businesses in Compton and nearby towns are expected to benefit from the visitors’ activities and associated spending. The Tea Shop at Watts Gallery constantly supports local producers including Loseley Park, the Christmas Bakery at Worpleston, and R. J. Ford the Butchers at Fleet. About two-thirds of the food and drinks in the Tea Shop are sourced from local producers. The Shop at Watts Gallery stocks many products from the local area, including West Meon Pottery, Smithies Honey, Grayshott Pottery, Veeton Fleece.

This current research aims to scientifically assess the economic impact of Watts Gallery an Artists' Village in order to provide a case study for Guildford Borough Council and other Local Authorities to increase their investment in tourism.

The intended outcomes are quantitative evidence of the value of increased businesses in the local area, the financial impact on suppliers and the number of jobs supported.

For clarification purposes, the research uses **Watts Gallery Estate** to refer to the following collection of buildings, which make up Watts Gallery an Artists' Village:

- *Watts Gallery, The Old Pottery Gallery, Shop and Visitor Centre, Watts Chapel, Limnerslease the Artists' Home and Studio and the Tea Shop.*

For simplicity, Watts Gallery Estate is also referred to as **the Gallery**.

2 Methodology

The primary concern of the study is the Gallery's local economic impact. To distinguish between local and non-local, the research team defines the local area of Watts Gallery Estate as the GU postcode area (Figure 2.1), which covers west *Surrey*, north-east *Hampshire*, parts of *West Sussex* and a small part of *Berkshire*. Towns in the area include Alton, Camberley, Cranleigh, Farnham, Fleet, Godalming, Guildford, Petersfield, Petworth, Sandhurst, Virginia Water, and Woking, to name a few.



Figure 2.1 – GU postcode area

Source: Ordnance Survey and Royal Mail data

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:GU_postcode_area_map.svg)

This definition is a pragmatic choice and it is supported by the empirical evidence. From the Gallery, most parts of the GU postcode area are accessible by car within 30 minutes. The area is also where activities by visitors took place before or after their visits to the Gallery, as the post-visit survey responses disclose. Besides, it is easy to identify whether a business is local or not by referring to its postcode.

2.1 Data Collection

The data for economic impact assessment came from a post-visit survey, the Gallery's management data, and desk research for UK economic data.

The **post-visit survey** was conducted over a 10-month period from March 2015 to December 2015 through Qualtrics.com. The purpose of the survey was to establish the demographic and behavioural profiles of visitors to the Gallery, especially their spending in the local area during the trip to the Gallery. The questionnaire was distributed via email to the visitors after their visits to the Gallery. Meanwhile, on-site volunteers were recruited to encourage visitors to take part in the survey, and to collect responses in hardcopies should the visitors prefer. Overall, 307 responses were collected between 10 March 2015 and 30 December 2015.

From the post-visit survey, the following impact streams were calculated:

1. **Visitors' off-site spending in Compton.** Visitors were asked about their spending in the village of Compton. This included shopping, food and drink, other cultural/leisure attractions, and accommodation.
2. **Visitors' off-site spending in nearby towns outside Compton.** It is of interest to capture the visitors' spending a bit further away. According to the town names provided by the respondents, the off-site spending mainly took place in the local area (GU postcode area). Hence, all off-site spending is relevant to the local economic impact assessment.
3. **Visitors' spending on transport.** This might be the spending on train tickets, bus tickets, car rental, petrol, parking, and so on.

Management data of the Gallery were collected with regard to the Gallery's resources expended. The Gallery's annual consolidated reports for 2012/13 and 2014/15 were referred to. In addition, a brief survey on detailed financial figures was conducted with the Gallery. This helped to identify the percentages of expenditure with local suppliers and to estimate the financial performance of the Gallery in the calendar year of 2015, to be compatible with the collected survey data.

The management data were used to establish the following impact streams:

4. **The Gallery's operating expenditure** (net of staff costs). This is the Gallery's expenditure with local/non-local suppliers on goods and services, in order to maintain the Gallery's collection, generate income, and manage the Gallery. Since it will ultimately be 'translated' (or attributed) to the Gallery's operating expenditure, the visitors' in-gallery spending is not counted as an impact stream. This avoids double counting.
5. **The Gallery's staff costs.** All the wages and salaries paid to the employees are considered as a part of the local economic impact.

The sum of the above five impact streams is the gross turnover of local businesses.

To take the research a step further, **desk research** was conducted to establish the Gallery's knock-on effect onto the wider economy.

6. **Multipliers that capture the secondary impact.** These were calculated based on UK's Input-Output tables 2010 version published on Eurostatⁱ. The multipliers are the averages at the UK levelⁱⁱ.

The knock-on effect is formally termed as the *secondary economic impact*, which is a combination of *indirect impact* and *induced impact*. The *indirect impact* refers to the changes in turnover, income or jobs in sectors within the region that supply goods and services to the galleries. It is the 'supplier' effect. The *induced impact* refers to the increased turnover within the region resulting from household re-spending of the income earned in the galleries and supporting sectors. It is the 'consumption' effect.

2.2 Analysis

The direct economic impact of Watts Gallery Estate was established by summing up the impact streams 1–5, as defined in the previous section. The knock-on effect was then estimated by applying the multipliers onto the direct economic impact.

In calculating the economic impact associated with the Gallery, a main consideration is measuring the genuinely ‘additional’ impact that can be credited to the Gallery. This requires some careful treatment when estimating impact streams 1–3, in order to distinguish the effects between additionality, deadweight and displacement.

If a visitor would have gone on a trip to a non-local area as his/her alternative activity, then his/her actual off-site spending should be attributed to the Gallery. Otherwise, if a visitor would still have come to Compton and the local area without visiting the Gallery, then his/her actual off-site spending should not be counted, because the spending would have been earned by local businesses anyway.

In the post-visit survey, respondents were asked about their *main purpose* when coming to Compton and their *alternative activity* if they had not visited Watts Gallery Estate. Based on the responses, only the following two cases would be counted towards the impact streams 1–3:

- I. 100% of off-site spending (in Compton, other towns, and transport) will be counted, if the *main purpose* was Watts Gallery Estate and the *alternative activity* was a trip to a non-local area;
- II. 25% of off-site spending (in Compton, other towns, and transport) will be counted, if the *main purpose* was *not* Watts Gallery Estate and the *alternative activity* was a trip to a non-local area.

Overall, the data collection and analytical method described above largely follows existing similar studies, for example, ConsultEcon (2010), Glyndebourne and East Sussex County Council (2013), Groves (2005), and Stynes, Vander Stoep, and Sun (2004).

3 Profiles of Watts Gallery Estate Visitors

The visitors' demographics and their behaviour were established based on the responses to the post-visit survey. Given the time constraint and the slow responses, the number of responses has not been particularly high, which may raise concerns about the data's representativeness. To ensure the results were robust, as preliminary analysis the research team followed a resampling procedure, which took out a number of smaller samples from all the responses and estimated the profile figures. The preliminary results were compared and found to be reasonably stable. The final results were also comparable to the figures from the Gallery's annual exit survey. Hence, the sample of this current research is seen as an adequate reflection of the visitors.

In processing the survey data, a consideration is the seasonality in admissions. To take this on board, the admission numbers, as reported in Figure 1.2, were used to weight the sample. The idea is, if the responses received during a given season were incommensurately low, then they were assigned a larger weight in the sample; if they were incommensurately high, then they were given a smaller weight. In doing so the sample has improved representativeness of the actual visitor population.

3.1 Demographic Profile

By and large, the Gallery received a diverse group of visitors, ranging across different age groups, educational attainments, occupations and income levels.

It is seen in Figure 3.1 that the Gallery attracted more women than men to visit.

In terms of the visitors' residence, the vast majority lived in the UK (Figure 3.2). According to their postcodes, the visitors mainly came from the Greater London area and Surrey. The most common postcodes are GU (49.6%), KT (11.1%) and London postcodes (11.1%). Outside the UK, visitors came from Australia, Poland, Portugal, Spain, and the USA.




Figure 3.1 – Visitors split by gender

Source: Post-visit survey




Figure 3.2 – Visitors split by country of residence

Source: Post-visit survey




Figure 3.3 – Visitors split by age group

Source: Post-visit survey

From Figure 3.3, most of the visitors were above 45 years old, with the biggest group being 55–64 (34.7%), then 65–74 (28.1%) and 45–54 (15.8%).

With regard to education (Figure 3.4), it is common that a visitor held a higher degree, such as Bachelor’s (27.9%) and Master’s (28.5%).




Figure 3.4 – Visitors split by educational attainment

Source: Post-visit survey

Almost half of the visitors (46.5%) were already retired. The rest of the visitors tended to be employed on a full-time (22.1%), part-time (10.7%), or self-employed (8.1%) basis.





Figure 3.5 – Visitors split by employment status

Source: Post-visit survey



More than a quarter of the visitors had a household income above £70,000 per year. The next income group is £35,000–£49,999, nearly a fifth of the visitors.

Figure 3.6 – Visitors split by household income

Source: Post-visit survey

3.2 Behavioural Profile

The behaviour profile aims to reveal why and how the visitors arranged their visit to the Gallery. In particular, understanding a visitor's main purpose of coming to Compton and the visitor's alternative arrangement is relevant to determining whether his/her spending could be credited to the Gallery.




Figure 3.7 – Visitors split by times of visits

Source: Post-visit survey

Almost a quarter of the visitors came to the Gallery on a regular basis. They tended to make a visit about 2–6 times every year.

The rest of the visitors had been to the Gallery occasionally, mostly once or twice.




Figure 3.8 – Visitors split by main purpose of visit

Source: Post-visit survey

According to Figure 3.8, Watts Gallery was the major reason why the visitors were coming. The next attraction was the Tea Shop. All in all, 92.5% of the visits were primarily related to Watts Gallery Estate. Only 7.5% of the visits were driven by other activities (leisure, seeing friends and relatives, business, shopping, and so on) in the local area.

In terms of travel companion, as shown in Figure 3.9, many visitors tended to travel with a spouse or partner (31.0%), a group of friends or acquaintances (25.0%), or family members (19.3%). But there were also some visitors (17.9%) coming to the Gallery on their own.

Figure 3.10 shows that car was the predominant mode of transport for the visitors (84.7%), much more popular than any other modes.




Figure 3.9 – Visitors split by travel companion

Source: Post-visit survey




Figure 3.10 – Visitors split by mode of transport

Note: The percentages do not add up to 100% because some visitors used more than one mode of transport. Source: Post-visit survey.





Figure 3.11 – Visitors split by length of trip

Source: Post-visit survey

For most of the visitors, coming to the Gallery was a day trip. For those who stayed overnight, they chose accommodation in nearby towns, such as Guildford, Bookham, Crawley, Farnborough, Godalming, Petersfield, Woking and London.



- Gone to other places in Compton and villages nearby (for example, Artington, Godalming, Guildford town, Shackleford, Worplesdon, Wanborough)
- Gone on a trip elsewhere in Surrey (for example, Epsom, Farnham, Kingston, Reigate, Woking)
- Gone on a trip to London
- Gone on a trip elsewhere in the UK
- Would have stayed at home or gone to work

Figure 3.12 – Visitors split by alternative activity

Source: Post-visit survey

If they did not visit the Gallery, many of the visitors (37.9%) said they would have stayed at home or gone to work. Alternatively, they might have gone on a trip to London (12.2%), or elsewhere in the UK (9.4%). The spending by these visitors should be attributed to the Gallery and counted towards its economic impact.

But 40.4% of the visitors would still come to Compton or elsewhere in Surrey, even if they were not visiting the Gallery.

4 Economic Impact

Economic impact is generally measured in terms of *gross value added (GVA)* and the number of full-time equivalent jobs supported. GVA is the value added part of gross turnover. It is defined as the value of output minus the value of intermediate consumption. It measures the economic contribution to the economy of each individual producer, industry or sector in the UKⁱⁱⁱ. The full-time jobs supported denote the economic impact on the employment market. They indicate the labour inputs that are required to generate a particular level of economic impact, but do not necessarily refer to the actual ‘identifiable’ number of posts.

4.1 Local Economic Impact

The economic impact of a gallery broadly consists of two categories: the impact of gallery operation and that of its visitors’ off-site spending. As explained in the methodology section, the data on the Gallery’s operation came from management data, whilst the visitors’ off-site spending came from the post-visit survey.

Table 4.1 – Per person spending in Compton

	Spending (£)	Share
Shopping	0.40	10.3%
Food and Drink	2.15	54.8%
Accommodation	1.36	34.7%
Cultural/Leisure/Entertainment	-	-
Other Spending	0.01	0.3%
Total	3.93	100.0%

Source: Post-visit survey

Table 4.2 – Per person spending in nearby towns outside Compton

	Spending (£)	Share
Shopping	3.28	26.1%
Food and Drink	4.69	37.2%
Accommodation	3.27	26.0%
Cultural/Leisure/Entertainment	0.79	6.3%
Other Spending	0.57	4.5%
Total	12.60	100.0%

Source: Post-visit survey

Table 4.3 – Towns outside Compton where the visitors spent money

County/Area	City/Town			
Berkshire	Bracknell (1)			
Hampshire	Chawton (2)	Farnborough (1)	Langrish (1)	Marfield (1)
	Selborne (1)			
Surrey	Cranleigh (1)	Dorking (1)	Elstead (1)	Farncombe (1)
	Farnham (2)	Frimley (1)	Godalming (8)	Gomshall (1)
	Guildford (20)	Long Ditton (1)	Loseley (2)	Milford (3)
	Shalford (1)	Shere (1)	Wisley (3)	
West Sussex	Crawley (1)	Petworth (1)		
Greater London	Kingston upon Thames (1)	London (3)		

Note: The number in the brackets () denotes the number of entries in the sample. For example, Guildford (20) means that 20 respondents visited Guildford. Source: Post-visit survey.

Table 4.1 and Table 4.2 report the average spending per visitor in the village of Compton and in nearby towns. According to the survey responses, outside Compton the visitors' spending took place in such towns as Bracknell, Cranleigh, Crawley, Godalming, Guildford and Petworth (see Table 4.3), which largely coincide with the local area defined by the research team. Overall, shopping, food and drink, and accommodation were the main categories of spending.

It should be reiterated that not all of the off-site spending is counted towards the local economic impact. Only the spending by the visitors whose alternative activity was in a non-local area constitutes 'additional' contributions to the local economy. Besides, whether the spending could be credited to the Gallery depends on the visitor's main purpose of coming to Compton.

Table 4.4 – Direct economic impact of Watts Gallery Estate on the local area in 2015

Economic impact		Gross turnover (£)	Gross value added (GVA) (£)	Jobs supported
Impact of gallery operation	Operating expenditure	1,337,560	620,307	
	Wages and salaries	955,553	504,824	
	Sub-total	2,293,114	1,125,131	33
Impact of visitor spending (off-site)	In Compton	78,510	38,168	5
	In nearby area outside Compton	251,896	127,950	11
	Sub-total	330,406	166,118	16
Total		2,623,520	1,291,249	49

Source: Watts Gallery Estate management data, post-visit survey and the research team's calculation

Table 4.4 reports the direct economic impact on the local area. The gross turnover is the amount that the Gallery and its visitors paid into the local economy, in other words, the additional gross economic contribution that Watts Gallery generates through its operation. Overall, Watts Gallery Estate directly brought about more than £1.29 million worth of GVA to the local area, and supported 49 full-time equivalent jobs through its operation in 2015.

Translated into *per capita* terms, the economic impact is equivalent to £26,352 worth of GVA per job. This is comparable to the GVA per person figures for South East England^{iv} (£25,843 in 2013) published by the Office for National Statistics. It is also within the similar range suggested by other studies of museums in the UK or the USA (ConsultEcon, 2010; ERS Research & Consultancy, 2014; Stynes, Vander Stoep, & Sun, 2004).

Table 4.5 – Total economic impact of Watts Gallery Estate in 2015

Economic impact		Gross turnover (£)	Gross value added (GVA) (£)	Jobs supported
Impact of gallery operation	Operating expenditure	3,131,826	1,494,310	
	Wages and salaries	2,162,468	1,105,473	
	Sub-total	5,294,294	2,599,784	77
Impact of visitor spending (off-site)	In Compton	187,375	89,760	7
	In nearby area outside Compton	599,553	294,959	15
	Sub-total	786,928	384,720	22
Total		6,081,222	2,984,503	99

Source: Watts Gallery Estate management data, post-visit survey and the research team's calculation

Considering the knock-on effect, the direct economic impact will be multiplied because the recipients of spending by the Gallery and its visitors can re-spend their income. Table 4.5 shows the total economic impact resulting from the Gallery's local expenditure and the visitors' off-site spending in the local area. The numbers are the sums of direct economic impact and knock-on effect. Since the re-spending of income could take place outside the local area, potentially the above total economic impact should benefit a slightly wider area.

The multiplier between the total impact and the direct impact is calculated to be 2.31 for GVA and 2.02 for jobs, very close to the estimates cited by City of London Corporation (2014)^v.

Overall, the total economic impact of Watts Gallery Estate amounted to £2.98 million worth of GVA, supporting 99 full-time equivalent jobs in 2015.

Comparing the total economic impact to the direct expenditure by the Gallery, it is estimated that every £1 local expense by the Gallery ultimately generated £2.65 gross turnover (equivalent to £1.30 GVA) into the economy, which is within the similar range implied by other studies of UK's museum sector (see ERS Research & Consultancy, 2014; Travers, 2006).

4.2 Impact on the Wider Economy

To take the economic impact assessment a step forward, the research team estimated the Gallery's impact on the wider economy. It followed the same method as that of the local economic impact. The only difference was that the operating expenditure with non-local suppliers was added back to the impact of gallery operation, and the transport costs were added alongside other visitor spending.

The idea behind the wider economic impact is that the Gallery's expenditure and the visitors' spending also benefit businesses outside the local area. This could be due to direct transactions with non-local businesses, or the knock-on effect.

Taking the non-local elements into consideration, Table 4.6 reports the direct economic impact associated with all of the Gallery's operational spending and the visitors' off-site spending. Accordingly, Table 4.7 reports the total economic impact that includes both direct impact and knock-on effect.

Overall, the economic impact of Watts Gallery Estate on the wider economy is much larger. £1.63 million worth of GVA was directly generated, and 58 full-time equivalent jobs were supported. Considering the knock-on effect, the total economic impact amounted to £3.80 million worth of GVA and 124 full-time equivalent jobs. The impact was expected to benefit households and businesses much beyond the local area.

Table 4.6 – Direct economic impact of Watts Gallery Estate on wider economy in 2015

Economic impact		Gross turnover (£)	Gross value added (GVA) (£)	Jobs supported
Impact of gallery operation	Operating expenditure	1,866,450	879,130	
	Wages and salaries	955,553	504,824	
	Sub-total	2,822,004	1,383,954	38
Impact of visitor spending (off-site)	In Compton	78,510	38,168	5
	In nearby area outside Compton	251,896	127,950	11
	Transport	178,972	82,662	4
	Sub-total	509,377	248,780	20
Total		3,331,381	1,632,734	58

Source: Watts Gallery Estate management data, post-visit survey and the research team's calculation

Table 4.7 – Total economic impact of Watts Gallery Estate on wider economy in 2015

Economic impact		Gross turnover (£)	Gross value added (GVA) (£)	Jobs supported
Impact of gallery operation	Operating expenditure	4,347,415	2,089,927	
	Wages and salaries	2,162,468	1,105,473	
	Sub-total	6,509,883	3,195,401	93
Impact of visitor spending (off-site)	In Compton	187,375	89,760	7
	In nearby area outside Compton	599,553	294,959	15
	Transport	462,327	222,328	9
	Sub-total	1,249,255	607,048	31
Total		7,759,138	3,802,449	124

Source: Watts Gallery Estate management data, post-visit survey and the research team's calculation

5 Conclusion

Watts Gallery an Artists' Village is a major attraction to visitors coming to Compton, Guildford. After the recent restoration, the Gallery has brought in more than 35,000 visitors to the local area, generating substantial economic impact onto the local economy and beyond.

The research finds that Watts Gallery, its Chapel, Limnerslease, Old Pottery Gallery and Tea Shop accounted for more than 90% of the visits. Over half of the visitors would have gone on to other places outside the local area, if they did not visit the Gallery. All these visits eventually translated into the Gallery's expenditure and the visitors' spending outside the Gallery.

Overall, the Gallery directly contributed £2.62 million worth of additional gross turnover to other local businesses in Compton and nearby towns in 2015. In terms of gross value added (GVA), the economic impact amounted to £1.29 million, supporting 49 full-time equivalent jobs. Taking the knock-on effect into account, this local economic impact could be further multiplied to a scale of £6.08 million gross turnover, £2.98 million GVA and 99 full-time equivalent jobs. It is implied that every £1 local expense by the Gallery ultimately yielded £2.65 gross turnover (or £1.30 GVA) for the economy. Beyond the local area, the Gallery achieved an even further impact on the wider economy if the financial benefits to non-local suppliers were considered. It is estimated that the total economic impact of Watts Gallery Estate on the wider economy was £7.76 million in terms of gross turnover, £3.80 million GVA and 124 full-time equivalent jobs.

Given the considerable economic impact in terms of income and jobs for the local area, it is of particular importance to keep investing in Watts Gallery an Artists' Village, which will also boost tourism in the local area. More importantly, beyond the economic benefits, it is the prominent social, cultural and educational impacts of the Gallery that make it an exceptional asset to the people living in the local area.

Appendix

Methodological Notes

In estimating the economic impact of a gallery, only the ‘additional’ benefits brought by the gallery should be counted. This is because the economic impact would have been lost if the gallery did not exist.

As outlined in the impact assessment guides compiled by English Partnerships (2008) and by Scottish Enterprise (2008), four other effects should not be counted towards the economic impact of an intervention, i.e., deadweight, displacement, leakage and substitution.

Table A.1 – Definitions

Deadweight	output that would have occurred without the intervention; no reduced outputs elsewhere in the target area
Displacement	the proportion of intervention outputs accounted for by reduced outputs elsewhere in the target area
Leakage	the proportion of outputs that benefit those outside of the intervention’s target area
Substitution	where a firm substitutes one activity for a similar activity to take advantage of public sector assistance

Source: English Partnerships (2008) and by Scottish Enterprise (2008)

From the post-visit survey, based on a respondent’s answer about his/her main purpose of visit and his/her alternative activity, the following additionality matrix is derived and referred to when calculating the economic impact:

Table A.2 – Additionality matrix

What would you most likely have done, if you had not visited Watts Gallery or its buildings?	Thinking about coming to Compton, Guildford, Surrey, what was the main purpose of your visit?	
	Watts Gallery Estate	Other activities
Visit the local area	not additional	not additional
Visit a non-local area	additional, count 100%	partly additional, count 25%
At home/work	additional, count 100%	partly additional, count 25%

Source: The research team

The additionality matrix was designed in line with the methods adopted by similar studies, especially Glyndebourne and East Sussex County Council (2013) and Stynes, Vander Stoep, and Sun (2004).

Adjustment to Management Data

The management data are largely available from the Gallery’s annual consolidated reports. The items concerned are the costs of generating voluntary income, maintaining Watts Gallery and its collection, governance costs, plus two projects of charitable activities.

Adjustment has been made to update the figures to match the activities in the calendar year of 2015. This was done by either applying an average annual growth rate onto the 2015 financial year figure, or taking the average between 2012 and 2015 if there were no obvious trends. The annual growth rates were derived based on the figures between 2012 and 2015, or between 2014 and 2015 if there were substantial leaps over the years.

Post-Visit Survey Questionnaire

Thank you for participating in the survey!

We are conducting a survey of visitors to Watts Gallery Estate in Compton, Guildford. The results will be used to help understand the importance of visitor economy to the gallery and its surrounding area. The survey should take less than 15 minutes.

For the purposes of this survey, **Watts Gallery Estate** refers to the following collection of buildings, which make up Watts Gallery an Artists' Village:

Watts Gallery, The Old Pottery Gallery, Shop and Visitor Centre, Watts Chapel, Limnerslease the Artists' Home and Studio and the Tea Shop.

First of all, please recall your past visits to Watts Gallery Estate...

Q1. Are you a regular visitor to any aspect of Watts Gallery Estate? *(please fill in the blanks)*

(1) Yes, I visit here on a regular basis.

On average, _____ times every _____ (week/month/year).

(2) No, I have been here only _____ times.

Q2. Can you remember when your most recent visit was?

It was in _____ *(MM/YYYY, for example, 08/2015)*

We would like to establish tourists' spending behaviour on their trips to Watts Gallery Estate. Thinking about your MOST RECENT visit to the gallery and its buildings, please answer the following questions:

Q3. Thinking about coming to Compton, Guildford, Surrey, what was the main purpose of your visit? *(please select only one answer)*

(1) Watts Gallery

(2) Watts Chapel

(3) Limnerslease

(4) The Old Pottery Gallery, Visitor Centre and Shop

(5) The Tea Shop at Watts Gallery

(6) Other leisure activities in local area (cycling, walking, picnic, talk/event, etc.)

(7) Seeing friends and relatives

(8) Other (business, shopping, etc.)

Q4. Did you travel with others? *(please select only one answer)*

(1) Alone

(2) With a spouse or partner

(3) With members of my family

(4) With an organised group or club

(5) With a group of friends or acquaintances

(6) Other

Q5. What mode(s) of transport did you use? *(please select ALL that apply)*

[1] Car

[2] Bus

[3] Private coach

[4] Train

[5] Motorbike

[6] Bicycle

[7] Walk

[8] Taxi

[9] Other

Q6. Did you stay overnight on your trip (either in commercial accommodation, or with friends and relatives)? *(please fill in the blanks)*

(1) No, it was a day trip.

(2) Yes, I stayed overnight in _____ (town names) for _____ nights

We would like to establish tourists' spending behaviour on their trips to Watts Gallery Estate. Thinking about your MOST RECENT visit to the gallery and its buildings, please answer the following questions:

Q7. Thinking about your most recent visit, approximately how much in total have you and your group spent or intend to spend on the following categories? Please give your best estimate.

The total transport cost of the whole trip
(buses, trains, petrol, parking, etc.)

£ _____

How many people does the above amount cover? _____ people

In Watts Gallery Estate (on-site)

Including: Watts Gallery, The Old Pottery Gallery, Shop and Visitor Centre, Watts Chapel, Limnerslease the Artists' Home and Studio and the Tea Shop.

Admission/Entry Fees £ _____

Tours/ Events/ Activities £ _____

Donations £ _____

Venue Hiring £ _____

Shopping £ _____

Food and Drink £ _____

Other Spending £ _____

How many people do the above amounts cover? _____ people

Outside Watts Gallery Estate (in Compton)

Shopping £ _____

Food and Drink £ _____

Accommodation £ _____

Number of Nights _____ nights

Cultural/Leisure/Entertainment £ _____

Other Spending £ _____

How many people do the above amounts cover? _____ people

Outside Compton (in other towns)

Please provide the names of all the towns you
visited/intend to visit _____

Shopping £ _____

Food and Drink £ _____

Accommodation £ _____

Number of Nights _____ nights

Cultural/Leisure/Entertainment £ _____

Other Spending £ _____

How many people do the above amounts cover? _____ people

**Q8. What would you most likely have done, if you had not visited Watts Gallery or its
buildings? (please select only one answer)**

(1) Gone to other places in Compton and villages nearby (*for example, Artington, Godalming, Guildford town, Shackleford, Worplesdon, Wanborough*)

(2) Gone on a trip elsewhere in Surrey (*for example, Epsom, Farnham, Kingston, Reigate, Woking*)

(3) Gone on a trip to London

(4) Gone on a trip elsewhere in the UK

(5) Would have stayed at home or gone to work

Finally, we would like to know a bit about you. This information will only be used for statistical purposes, and be treated confidentially.

Q9. Are you ...

(1) Female

(2) Male

Q10. Do you live in the UK? (*please fill in the blanks*)

(1) Yes, and my postcode is _____ (*example: GU3 1DQ*)

(2) No, I live in another country. The country name is _____ .

Q11. Which of these age groups do you fall into?

- (1) Under 16
- (2) 16–24
- (3) 25–34
- (4) 35–44
- (5) 45–54
- (6) 55–64
- (7) 65–74
- (8) 75 or above

Q12. What is the highest level of qualification you attained?

- (1) GCSE
- (2) A Level, or equivalent
- (3) Higher National Certificates (HNC), Certificates of Higher Education (CertHE)
- (4) Foundation degree or equivalent (DipHE, HND, etc.)
- (5) Bachelor's degree or equivalent (Graduate diplomas, Graduate certificates, etc.)
- (6) Master's degree or equivalent (Postgraduate diplomas, Postgraduate certificates, etc.)
- (7) Doctoral degree or equivalent
- (8) Other qualification
- (9) No formal qualification

Q13. Which of the following best describes your employment status?

- (1) Full-time employment
- (2) Part-time employment
- (3) Self-employed
- (4) Housekeeper
- (5) Student
- (6) Retired
- (7) Unemployed
- (8) Other

Q14. Which of these is closest to your household's net annual income (including any benefits or pensions)?

- (1) Less than £15,000 per annum
- (2) £15,000–£25,999 per annum
- (3) £26,000–£34,999 per annum
- (4) £35,000–£49,999 per annum
- (5) £50,000–£69,999 per annum
- (6) £70,000 per annum or above

Key References

- City of London Corporation (2014). *The City Arts and Culture Cluster: Economic Impacts and Developments*. London: City of London Corporation. Available from WWW: <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/business/economic-research-and-information/research-publications/Documents/Research-2014/Arts-and-Culture-Economic-Impact.pdf>
- ConsultEcon (2010). *New Miami Science Museum – Economic Impacts Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: ConsultEcon, Inc. Available from WWW: <http://www.frostscience.org/blog/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/1749-MiaSci-Full-Impacts-Rpt-2apr10r.pdf>
- English Partnerships (2008). *Additionality guide: A standard approach to assessing the additionality of interventions*. London: English Partnerships.
- ERS Research & Consultancy (2014). *An economic impact study of the North East museums sector*. Newcastle upon Tyne: ERS Research & Consultancy. Available from WWW: <http://www.museumdevelopmentne.org.uk/geisha/assets/images/Economic-Impact-FINAL-REPORT-April-2014.docx.pdf>
- Glyndebourne and East Sussex County Council (2013). *The economic impact of Glyndebourne*. Available from WWW: <http://www.glyndebourne.com/about-us/glyndebourne-economic-impact-report-2014/>
- Groves, I. (2005). *Assessing the economic impact of science centres on their local communities*. Kingston, Australia: The National Science and Technology Centre.
- Scottish Enterprise (2008). *Additionality and economic impact assessment guidance note*. Edinburgh: Scottish Enterprise.
- Stynes, D. J., Vander Stoep, G. A., & Sun, Y. Y. (2004). *Economic impacts of Michigan museums*. East Lansing, MI: Department of Park, Recreation and Tourism Resources, Michigan State University.
- Travers, T. (2006). *Museums and galleries in Britain. Economic, Social and Creative Impacts NMDC/MLA, London, UK*.

Endnotes

ⁱ ESA supply, use and input-output tables, <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/esa-supply-use-input-tables/data/workbooks>

ⁱⁱ Ideally, the South East-specific multipliers should be used. This requires Input-Output (I-O) tables only for South East, which are not available. Without the South East I-O tables, the specific multipliers cannot be robustly derived. Hence, the research team opted to use UK average multipliers.

ⁱⁱⁱ The relationship between gross value added (GVA) and gross domestic product (GDP), <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/method-quality/specific/economy/national-accounts/gva/relationship-gva-and-gdp/gross-value-added-and-gross-domestic-product.html>

^{iv} Regional GVA NUTS1, <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/taxonomy/search/index.html?nscl=Regional+GVA&nscl-orig=Regional+GVA&content-type=Dataset&content-type=Reference+table&sortDirection=DESCENDING&sortBy=pubdate>

^v At the UK level, 2.43 for GVA and 2.37 for employment; at the South East level, 2.14 for GVA and 2.10 for employment. See Figure 1 in City of London Corporation (2014). However, to be in line with the current research's methodological framework, robust estimates of multipliers at the South East level should be based on South East-specific Input-Output tables, which are not available. This is also noted in Endnote ii.