SOUTH JOINT COMMITTEE

25 SEPTEMBER 2008

Subject: Cotswold Conservation Board Grant Settlement

Lead Officer: Colin Staves

Contact on 01789 260333

Lead Member/

Portfolio Holder: Councillor S Beese

Summary

To consider a request from Cotswold Conservation Board for the Council to write to DEFRA and Natural England seeking a fairer grant settlement in the future for the special landscape area when compared to other protected landscapes.

RECOMMENDED:

That the Committee

- endorses the Cotswold Conservation Board Report entitled 'Comparison of purpose and resources between Conservation Boards, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Partnerships and National Park Authorities'; and
- 2. expresses its views to Natural England, DEFRA, the relevant Secretary of State, John Maples MP that the criteria for applying funding to the Cotswold Conservation Board in exercising its responsibilities for the stewardship of the AONB be made clear and transparent and that funding provision for the Cotswold Conservation Board should be made fair in comparison to other AONBs, whether constituted as Partnerships or Boards.

1 Background/Information

- 1.1 The Cotswold Conservation Board has been analysing the grant offers from Natural England in recent years in order to determine how the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Board settlement compared to other AONBs and National Park Authorities.
- 1.2 The Board agreed the attached paper earlier this year, at its meeting in March.
- 1.3 The Cotswolds is the largest AONB and its grant settlement is a significant sum. However, when analysed on an area or per head of population basis the AONB is receiving far less investment when compared with other protected landscapes, i.e. within the Cotswolds the Sustainable Development Fund (SDF) amounts to £39 per sq km, whereas the national average is £300 per sq km.
- 1.4 The Board has been given the additional duty of increasing the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB,

- modelled on those of the National Park Authorities, which makes the poor grant settlement comparison all the more concerning.
- 1.5 Natural England recognise the sum awarded to the Cotswolds, but fail to recognise how thinly the investment has to be spread compared to other AONBs or National Parks.
- 1.6 North Wiltshire District Council's Executive have considered the Board paper, endorsed its findings and have written to DEFRA, Natural England and their local MP asking why the grant settlements should place the Cotswolds at such a disadvantage.
- 1.7 The Cotswold Conservation Board have now asked the Council to consider writing to DEFRA and Natural England based upon the evidence provided in the attached Board paper, so that we might secure a fairer settlement for our special landscape in the future.

2 Options available to the Cabinet

2.1 The Committee can either support the request from the Cotswold Conservation Board, or not.

3 Members' Comments

3.1 None received.

4 Implications of the proposal

4.1 Legal/Human Rights Implications

None.

4.2 Financial

No direct financial implications, but poor grant settlements could mean that the Board seeks additional financial contributions from the local authorities within the AONB.

4.3 Environmental

Inadequate resourcing will restrict the ability of the Board to achieve its objectives of preserving and enhancing the AONB as well as promoting the enjoyment and understanding of this special landscape.

4.4 Corporate Strategy

The work of the Board is supportive of the Corporate Strategy vision of 'maintaining and enhancing the heritage and green environment' of the District.

4.5 **Equality Impact Assessment**

None.

5 Risk Assessment

5.1 There is a potential reputational risk to the Council in not supporting the request from the Conservation Board is if all the other partners to the Board endorse the findings and make representations as requested.

Pat Reid

HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES

COMPARISON OF THE PURPOSES OF THE COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD AND ITS ASSOCIATED RESOURCE BASE WITH OTHER ENGLISH AONB PARTNERSHIPS AND NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITIES

Summary: This report compares the resources available to the Cotswolds Conservation Board in the delivery of its purposes with those available to other English AONB Partnerships and National Park Authorities.

Author: Martin Lane, Director

Recommendations:

- (a) That the report be noted;
- (b) That the information be utilised when discussing the Board's resource base with counterparts in Natural England, Defra, Local Authorities and other partner organisations;
- (c) That Local Authority partner organisations be requested to endorse this report, and to correspond with Defra and Natural England highlighting the degree to which the Cotswolds AONB and Board are under-resourced compared to other protected landscapes in England.

Background

1. The proper resourcing of the Conservation Board's work has been discussed at a variety of meetings in 2007/08. The poor grant settlement for 2007/08 from Natural England led to a series of correspondence with local MPs, Natural England and the Secretary of State.

Comparison of Purposes and Resources

- 2. Comparative figures are not always available, particularly for the family of AONBs, and more detailed data collection and analysis could be undertaken. For example further analysis could be undertaken of resource inputs compared to achievements, although comparable data across the protected landscape family as a whole is not currently available. However, this initial exercise is extremely useful in serving to illustrate some key findings.
- 3. Whilst the Conservation Board and National Park Authorities have extremely similar purposes there is a considerable difference in the resources available with which to deliver these purposes;
- 4. Whilst the Cotswolds AONB is an extensive area and the Conservation Board has a large grant settlement from Natural England compared with other AONBs, when the resources are analysed the AONB and Board has access to far less resources per square kilometre or per head of population compared to other AONBs;

A designated landscape

5. In terms of protected landscapes the Cotswolds AONB is;

- the second largest protected landscape in England, second to the Lake District National Park.
- the largest AONB, with the most constituent local authority partners
- has the largest resident population of any protected landscape
- has in excess of 20 million day visitors a year, more than any other AONB and comparable to visitor numbers in the Lake District and Peak District National Parks, (Annexes 1 and 2).

The Board's purposes, duty and obligations

- 6. The Board's purposes are modelled on those of the National Park Authorities, (Annex 3). Consequently the Board has two purposes; to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB and increase the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB. In addition, and again like National Park Authorities, when pursuing its purposes the Board has a duty to seek to foster the social and economic well being of the AONBs local communities.
- 7. As an independent corporate body established through Parliament the Board is required by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and its Establishment Order to provide for a series of measures eg audit requirements, as for local authorities, national park authorities and other similar organisations, (**Annex 4**). These obligations are far more comprehensive than those which applied to the former AONB Partnership.
- 8. Other AONB partnerships, joint committees or joint advisory committees do not have the second purpose or duty and are not obliged to comply with the same legislation as a stand alone Conservation Board.

Resources

- 9. Staff resources: In 2007/08 the Board had 12 full time equivalent staff, including the Caring for the Cotswolds team supported by the Heritage Lottery Fund. Initially this staffing level looks broadly comparable with other AONBs, but when analysed against the geographic areas of the various AONBs the Cotswolds has far less staff resources per square kilometre than other AONBs (**Annex 5**).
- 10. Staff resources have to cover at least twice as much territory as for many other AONBs and 17 times as much territory when compared to National Parks.
- 11. Core grant: A similar picture emerges when Natural England's core grant is analysed per square kilometre of AONB or per head of resident population. The Cotswolds AONB has to make its grant settlement spread much further than other AONBs and considerably further than the settlement awarded to National Park Authorities.
- 12. The core grant for the Cotswolds has to spread two to three times as far as for many other AONBs and ten times as far as that for the Lake District National Park.
- 13. Sustainable Development Fund (SDF) Grant: The SDF grant is awarded as a standard sum per AONB or National Park. In 2006/07 this sum was £ 80,000 per AONB and £ 200,000 per National Park.

14. Given the extent of the Cotswolds this standard sum approach means that the money has to go a lot further per square kilometre than other AONBs and National Parks. The average amount of SDF per square kilometre of AONB or National Park is in the region of £ 300, whereas in the Cotswolds this amounts to only £ 39.

Supporting Papers:

- **Annex 1 English AONB Resources 2007/08**
- Annex 2 English National Park Authority Resources 2007/08
- Annex 3 Comparison of Conservation Board Purposes with those of National Park Authorities.
- Annex 4 Additional Requirements of an Independent Conservation Board
- Annex 5- Comparison of the Staff Resources available to AONB Partnerships, National Park Authorities and the Cotswolds Conservation Board.

This page has been left intentionally blank

ENGLISH AONB RESOURCES 2007/08

			;	3	
4			თ	326	Wye Valley AONB
7	679280	27000	12	195	Tamar Valley AONB
12		133341	12	983	Sussex Downs AONB
6	15000000	96000	6	419	Surrey Hills AONB
8	210000	15161	7	403	Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB
4		34000	ნ	337	South Devon AONB
ω		8736	4	115	Solway Coast AONB
5		18000	9	804	Shropshire Hills AONB
4	250000	2853	8	99	Quantock Hills AONB
3	2336880	10000	ယ	135	Northumberland Coast AONB
11		93700	7	1730	North Wessex Downs AONB
9		12000	19	1983	North Pennines AONB
3	2029300	12000	ζī	171	North Devon AONB
4		18242	4	451	Norfolk Coast AONB
	334000	15000	6	603	Nidderdale AONB
		6000	6	198	Mendip Hills AONB
	1250000	12200	4	105	Malvern Hills AONB
			2	161	Lleyn Peninsula AONB
	1000000	12915	6	558	Lincolnshire Wolds AONB
12	22360000	66000	9	878	Kent Downs AONB
	115000	2000	2	16	Isles of Scilly AONB
		132731	4	189	Isle of Wight AONB
	2000000	20000	7	221	Isle of Anglesey AONB
5		5800	3	204	Howardian Hills AONB
		121000	15	1460	High Weald AONB
	1595500	10000	2	188	Gower AONB
	1191000	16000	7	802	Forest of Bowland AONB
		32500	5	383	East Hampshire AONB
•	2517400	22000	5	268	East Devon AONB
		92000	10	1129	Dorset AONB
		15161	6	90	Dedham Vale AONB
11	8895600	30000	8	983	Cranborne Chase AONB
:	2778100	84957	رن د	958	Cornwall AONB
			8	157	Clwydian Range AONB
15		70000	11	833	Chilterns Conservation Board
:		8351	6	74	Chichester Harbour AONB
:	1600000	8788	3	68	Cannock Chase AONB
	2200000	13500	4	370	Blackdown Hills AONB
	250000	10000	4	75	Arnside and Silverdale AONB
Constituent LA's	Visitors (million)	Resident Population	@ 07/08	(sq km)	
N _o	Day		(FTE)	Area	

ENGLISH NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY RESOURCES 2007/08

	2040,000	f	201	140000	12	2030 12	Board
47	\$6.46 000*	•	3		3		Cotswolds
5	£4,951,000	22	9	19654	124	1774 124	Yorkshire Dales
12	£7,723,294	22	22	38000	251	1437	Peak District
							Moors
5	£4,979,300	22	9.5	25000	134	1435	North York
4	£2,955,700	22	1.5	2200	81	1049	Northumberland
			Available				
5	£3,514,000	22	Not	34400	63	570	New Forest
5	£6,407,000	22	22	42200	184	292	Lake District
4	£3,593,600	22	1.4	10600	91	691	Exmoor
4	£4,321,078	22	4	29100	110	953	Dartmoor
8	£4,126,763	21	5.4	5721	135	303	The Broads
	SDF						
LAs	07/08 inc.	Members	(million)	1	2007/08	κ m	
Constituent	Grant	Authority	Visitors	Population	(FTE)	(sq	
No.	Defra	No.	Day	Resident	Staff	Area	

^{*}Natural England grant

Defra grants excludes planning fees raised and invested in the operation of planning functions and services

Comparison of Conservation Board Purposes with those of National Park Authorities

National Park Purposes:

- To conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the
- To promote opportunities for understanding and enjoyment of its special qualities.

Conservation Board Purposes:

- To conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural
- of the area of outstanding natural beauty. To increase the understanding and enjoyment by the public of the special qualities

Finance and Corporate Governance: Additional Requirements of an independent Conservation Board

- governance reports To be subject to a full External Audit, including value for money opinion and
- To be subject to a full Internal Audit
- accounting policies, notes and explanatory foreword. Statement of Accounts includes proscribed information requirements including To produce an annual Statement of Accounts and Statement on Internal Control (to be replaced by Statement on Corporate Governance from 2007/08 accounts
- To have a separate Finance Officer in accordance with S151 of LGA 1972
- To operate in accordance with Accounts and Audit Regulations
- To comply with CIPFA Statement of Recommended Practice in financial matters
- To implement Risk Management, including maintaining a Risk Register
- To manage a Corporate Governance Action Plan
- To have a Code of Corporate Governance
- scheme of delegation, procedure rules, codes and protocols) To operate a Constitution for the Board (inc. defined structure and committees
- To operate a Members' Allowance Scheme (reviewed annually)
- and Hospitality. To maintain a Register of Members' and Officers Interests and Register of Gifts
- To record and report Related Party Transactions
- Operate separate financial systems, including separate bank accounts
- Operate separate payroll system
- Maintain pension fund and policies and comply with regulation and legislation.

Operation of the Board:

- To operate a Board of 40 Board members
- (and working groups) meetings, 8 Executive Committee Meeting and 20 sub committee meetings a year To operate a more independent and extensive committee structure: 4 Board
- To support the appointments process for Secretary of State appointees
- nominations process and any associated elections To administer the appointment of 8 Parish Council Board Members, the
- To have an Independent Standards Committee (inc recruitment of 3 independent
- members of public. To hold all Board and committee meetings in public, with access by press and
- partners of Board meetings To advise all parish councils, DEFRA, Natural England and all Local Authority
- Executive and sub committee meetings To maintain a website with up to date papers and information about Board
- property (if holding assets) and contents cover. employers liability, libel and slander, trustee guarantee, fidelity guarantee, motor, Maintain insurance cover for an independent organisation inc public liability,
- Maintain a stand alone GIS system
- Maintain separate OS licences
- legal, democratic services, accountancy and payroll services Maintain external service level agreements or contracts to provide: IT, personnel,
- Maintain IT Policy and security arrangements. Manage connections and IT kit
- Maintain physical security arrangements on property

Comparison of the Staff Resources available to AONB Partnerships, National Park Authorities and the Cotswolds Conservation Board

Staff per Square kilometre of Protected Landscape (2007/08)

	Sq km	FTE*	
Cotswolds	2038	12	= 170 sq km per head
Conservation Board			- Annual Control of the Control of t
Chilterns Conservation	833	1	= 76 sq km per head
Board			A STATE OF THE STA
Tamar Valley AONB	195	12	= 16 sq km per head
High Weald AONB	1460	15	= 97 sq km per head

		Sq km	FTE	
The Broads	8	303	135	= 3 sq km per head
Dartmoor N	Dartmoor National Park	953	110	= 8 sq km per head
Exmoor Na	Exmoor National Park	691	91	= 8 sq km per head
Lake District National	ct National	2292	184	= 11 sq km per head
Park				
Yorkshire I	Yorkshire Dales National 1774		124	= 13 sq km per head
Park				

Staff per Authority Member (2007/08)

	No.	FTE	
	Members		
Cotswolds	40	12	= 3.3 members per head
Conservation Board			
Chilterns Conservation	29	1	= 2.6 members per head
Board		i i	

	No.	FIE	
	Members		
The Broads	21	135	= 0.2 members per head
Dartmoor National Park	22	110	= 0.2 members per head
Exmoor National Park	22	91	= 0.2 members per head
Lake District National	22	184	= 0.1 members per head
Park			
Yorkshire Dales National	22	124	= 0.2 members per head
Park		!	

Staff per Constituent Local Authority (2007/08)

	No. LAs	FTE	
Cotswolds	17	12	= 1.4 per head
Conservation Board			
Chilterns Conservation	15	1	= 1.4 per head
Board			

	No. LAs	FTE	
The Broads	8	135	= 0.06 per head
Dartmoor National Park	4	110	= 0.04 per head
Exmoor National Park	4	91	= 0.04 per head
Lake District National	5	184	= 0.03 per head
Park			
Yorkshire Dales National 5	5	124	= 0.04 per head
Park			17. 18.

Core Grant per Square kilometre of Protected Landscape (2006/07)

£788.00 per sq km	£775,000	983	Sussex Downs AONB
			AONB
£2175.00 per sq km	£161,000	74	Chichester Harbour
£772.00 per sq km	£153,000	198	Mendip Hills AONB
£835.00 per sq km	£163,000	195	Tamar Valley AONB
			Board
£629.00 per sq km	£524,000	833	Chilterns Conservation
			Conservation Board
£277.00 per sq km	£566,000	2038	Cotswolds
	excl. SDF		
	Grant		
	£ Core	Sq km	

	Sq km	£ Core Grant	
		excl. SDF	
The Broads	303	£3,926,763	£3,926,763 £12,959.00 per sq km
Dartmoor National Park	953	£4,121,078	£4,121,078
Exmoor National Park	691	£3,393,600	£4,911.00 per sq km
Lake District National	2292	£6,207,000	£6,207,000 £2,708.00 per sq km
Park			
Yorkshire Dales National 1774	1774	£4,751,000	£4,751,000 £2,678.00 per sq km
Park			

Core Grant per head of Resident Population (2006/07)

	Population	£ Core	
		Grant	
		excl. SDF	
Cotswolds	140000	£566,000	£4.00 per head
Conservation Board			
Chilterns Conservation	70000	£524,000	£7.00 per head
Board			
Tamar Valley AONB	27000	£163,000	£6.00 per head
Mendip Hills AONB	6000	£153,000	£26.00 per head
Chichester Harbour	8351	£161,000	£19.00 per head
AONB			i de la companya de l
Sussex Downs AONB	133341	£775,000	£6.00 per head

		_	
The Broads	5721	£3,926,763	£3,926,763 £686.00 per head
Dartmoor National Park	29100	£4,121,078	£4,121,078 £142.00 per head
Exmoor National Park	10600	£3,393,600	£3,393,600 £320.00 per head
Lake District National	42200	£6,207,000	£6,207,000 £147.00 per head
Park	į		
Yorkshire Dales National	19654	£4,751,000	£4,751,000 £242.00 per head
Park			

Comparison of SDF allocations (2006/07)

	Sq km	SDF Allocation	
Malvern Hills AONB	105	£80,000	£761 per sq km
Mendip Hills AONB	198	£80,000	£404 per sq km
South Devon AONB	337	£80,000	£237 per sq km
Cornwall AONB	958	£80,000	£83 per sq km
East Devon AONB	268	£80,000	£298 per sq km
Quantock Hills AONB	99	£80,000	£889 per sq km
Cannock Chase	68	£80,000	£1176 per sq km
AONB			
Isle of Scilly AONB	16	£80,000	£5000 per sq km
Total Sq km of all	2049	£640,000	£312 per sq km
Cotswolds	2038	£80,000	£39 per sq km
Conservation Board			
Chilterns	833	£80,000	£96 per sq km
Conservation Board			

km			National Parks above
£308 per sq	£600,000	1947	Total Sq km of all
km			
£660 per sq	£200,000	303	The Broads
km			
£289 per sq	£200,000	691	Exmoor National Park
km			
£209 per sq	£200,000	953	Dartmoor National Park
	SDF Allocation	Sq km	

FTE = Full time equivalent

*CCB staff as at start of 07/08 i.e. includes project staff linked to Caring for the Cotswold