



**Meeting of the Lake District National Park Partnership
Tuesday 26th April 2022 at 13.30 (HYBRID) LDNPA Office, Kendal and **TEAMS****

MINUTES

Partner Name	Organisation	Apologies received
Stephen Henwood	Independent Chair	
Lorraine Smyth Fran Richardson	ACT	
Danni Armstrong	Allerdale Borough Council	Graham Kennedy
Kevin Sayers	United Utilities	
	Copeland Borough Council	Eric Barker
Sonia Hutchinson	Cumbria Association of Local Councils	
Libby Bateman	Country Land & Business Association	Lucinda Douglas
Carole Barr	Cumbria & Lakes Local Access Forum	
Nigel Wilkinson	Cumbria LEP	
Jane Wilson	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	
Keith Ashcroft	Environment Agency	
Fergus McMorrow	Eden DC	Les Clark
Keith Jones Kevin May	Forestry Commission / Forestry England	
Marie Smallwood	Historic England	Trevor Mitchell
Sarah Swindley	Lake District Foundation	
Richard Leafe Hanna Latty Kerry Powell Steve Ratcliffe Tim Duckmanton Andrew Herbert	LDNPA	
Adrian Anderson	LDNPP	
David Hall	National Farmers Union	
Chris Kaighin	Natural England	
Jez Westgarth	National Trust	
Blanaid Denman	RSPB	David Morris
Mike Turner	Business Task Force	Maria Whitehead
Chloe Tringham	Cumbria County Council	
Dan Hudson	SLDC	Jonathan Brook Andrew Jarvis
Lois Mansfield	University of Cumbria	
Gill Haigh	Cumbria Tourism	
Douglas Chalmers Laura Partington	Friends of the Lake District	

Observers/Speakers	Organisation	Apologies received
	WCRT	Jodie Mills

Observers/Speakers	Organisation	Apologies received
Simon Johnson	Fresh Water Biological Association	
Michael Carter	LDNPA Member	
Tiffany Hunt	LDNPA Member	
Veronica Fiorato	LDNPP Partnership Manager (6 th June)	
Chris France Paul Fellows Claire Shields	North York Moors National Park Authority	

1. Welcome/meeting management/purpose (Chair)

The Chair welcomed Partners to the meeting, noting the hybrid format. A number of new faces were welcomed to the meeting, including observers from the North York Moors National Park.

The Chair introduced Veronica Fiorato, who has been appointed the LDNPP Partnership Manager on a secondment from Historic England. Veronica will officially start in June, and attends in an observer capacity at this meeting.

The Chair outlined the agenda, including a reminder that the Partnership will now be holding an externally facilitated 'Ways of Working' session at the next Partnership meeting in July (13th) – this had intended to be in April but to allow greater preparation time has been moved.

The Chair thanked Partners for contributing to the Defra consultation on the government's response to Landscapes review. Partner views were taken into account in a Partnership response (now submitted), which was circulated with these papers.

Matters Arising:

Fran Richardson (ACT) gave an update (via the Teams link) on their **Esmee Fairburn funding bid**. This will hopefully result in a 2 year programme for the Partnership, involving a 'collaboration Partnership hub'. The idea is to revisit community plans and conversations – and to seek community ideas from Partners. For example a form of citizens' enquiry/panel could be convened to understand how communities want to see sustainable transport in their areas. More information will be shared with Partners at future meetings/

ACTION: briefing paper from Fran to be shared with Partners.

Lois Mansfield (UoC): shared news that The **University of Cumbria** and **Imperial College London** are working together to launch a new graduate entry medical school in Carlisle. The new school, which aims to enrol its first students in autumn 2025, will train new doctors for Cumbria and North West England to transform healthcare in local communities

DECISION: Approval of notes from December 6th Partnership meeting.

2. LDNPP Management Plan (Various)

General (Michael Carter) – gave an overview of progress in setting up the five Key Outcome Groups (KOGs), the Plan Coordination Group (PCG) (which has met twice so far in 2022) Plan governance and the involvement of Lois Mansfield (UoC) related to data, monitoring and research. Michael noted that whilst the KOGs have been set up on different timescales, with some more developed and defined than others, progress

has been made validating actions, identifying those involved and accompanying resources.

KOG Chairs (drawn from Partners) had provided verbal updates (at PCG) so far and work is underway to develop a consistent RAG report format and summary dashboard. Progress summaries are produced following PCG meetings and shared with all Partners and LDNPA members, which allows Partners who do not attend KOGs or PCG to stay informed. PCG has also considered a change control process in case any changes are needed to the Plan, although there is a necessarily high bar for changes and Partners would be kept informed. The 13th July Ways of working session will shed further insight into how best the Partnership deals with Plan delivery, and also engagement with stakeholders (including communities).

Vibrant Communities and Prosperous Economy (Hanna Latty, for Jonathan Brook) – Hanna gave a synopsis of group progress, including the focus on lobbying of MPs (and parish questionnaires) related to housing/second homes and the ministerial visit of Lord Benyon. The progress on the significant Windermere Gateway scheme was highlighted, including the use of brownfield land and the housing infrastructure fund. The economic case for the Lakes line passing loop is a focus of the group, as are the seven area action plans in the Tactical Visitor Management Action Plan (TVMAP).

ACTION: Partnership Team to compile a list of which Partner representatives are on each Key Outcome Group, which will be available to Partners on request (**complete**)

Climate Action (Richard Leafe/Tim Duckmanton) – the first meeting of this group is on 17th May. Partners were reminded that this key outcome cuts across the KOGs. There are also links with ESIF, the Borderlands initiative and Zero Carbon Cumbria. The group also hopes to help coordinate reductions in business carbon through funding related to the Low Carbon Lake District grants. There is work underway to understand what the Lake District's carbon budget is, via collaboration with the Zero Carbon Cumbria Partnership (ZCCP). Partners will also shortly be asked to provide details of the carbon reduction targets in their own business/management Plans.

ACTION: On receipt of a letter from the Chair Partners are asked to assist the team with providing details of their own carbon reduction plans related to the Lake District.

Richard gave a brief update on proposals in conjunction with ZCCP for nature net zero funding (Estée Lauder), and water quality. This is an interesting early example of what could be a model for private sector funding in this space.

Sustainable Travel and Transport (Lorraine Smyth) – this group is well established and delivering well, involving a range of active Partners. Recent meetings have focused on both the transformative, and non-transformative, actions in the Plan – all have been allocated Partner owners and timescales. The group has engaged in lobbying activity related to bus funding and train capacity and electrification, and has engaged with the CCC CTIP consultation. The group recognises the strong cross-over with other KOGs, most notably Climate/Carbon and VCPE (shuttle buses and work related travel challenges). The STT also aims to engage with local community groups and is considering a joint event/open meeting with ZCCP in the Autumn to engage the wider public and network of stakeholders.

ACTION: STT group to provide Partnership with update on its research activity, either at the next meeting or by correspondence.

A Lake District for Everyone (Sarah Swindley) – a half-day session was held with a range of stakeholders in January (including Place Innovation who were involved in the research which assisted the development of the LDfE sections of the Plan). Following that meeting a range of stakeholders volunteered for the specific LDfE KOG to look at delivery of the actions – this group will meet soon (May). The group is a coalition of the willing, and includes a greater number of non-Partners than other KOGs. Its remit will also consider inclusion in broad terms, as well as the Partnership’s culture and processes – what works and what it can do better. The group will also aspire to outreach work in terms of communities of interest, as well as communities of geography. This is an area where the Partnership could attract funding, although is currently under resourced. There is also an opportunity to see what can be learned from Natural Parks England, and other National Parks/Protected landscapes that have done work in this area.

ACTION: Partners to contact Sarah directly with any examples of existing work on this topic that they can share.

Future of Farming and Forestry, Nature Recovery and Climate Change (Jez Westgarth) – Jez highlighted the multiple linkages across the KOGs which were being factored into the plans of the FFNC group. The group is assigning leads and sub-leads on actions, although some work is required in the transition from this being the post-CAP group to an active KOG. There remain challenges with resource and capacity across Partners. The national picture in terms of government funding/agri-transition has an impact on the delivery of this group.

Communication – the group discussed how to communicate beyond the Partnership to interested stakeholders, especially about the Plan. Partnership Press will be used to highlight particular KOGs each edition (from July) and Partners will be encouraged to share across their networks. However, more needs to be done to ensure Partner comms reps are involved in messaging related to Plan progress – a number of Partners felt the work of the KOGs could more widely shared. However, it was noted that the right things at the right time should be communicated. This theme will be examined as part of the Ways of Working session at the next Partnership meeting (13th July).

Data, Monitoring and Research (Lois Mansfield) – each KOG now has a monitoring lead. It is known that a lot of monitoring is undertaken, but coordinating that and ensuring efficiency is key. Lois briefly advised Partners of the pre-work undertaken to ensure the State of the Park reporting aligns with Partnership/LDNPA monitoring. An overall dashboard for monitoring is under consideration as a next steps – Partners will be kept informed.

On research, each KOG has its own list of questions but progress is slow, largely due to funding/resource challenges. The STT group has commissioned a piece of transport research, as mentioned above.

ACTION: Partners to contact Lois with details of research they are undertaking to avoid duplication

ACTION: Share again the research project register document with Partners (complete)

Paul Fellows (NYMNP) – said there was a National Parks Monitoring Officers Group, which was possibly a research sharing opportunity. Rob Allison is on this group for the LDNPA.

Plan Risk, Issue and Opportunity Register – Nigel Wilkinson said that the deteriorating macro-economic situation, most visible as a ‘cost of living crisis’ would present challenges to action delivery, particularly for the LDfE and VCPE groups (though also STT related to transport costs). This could be added to the Plan RIO register.

The Chair thanked Partners for their involvement in the KOGS, welcomed the updates and reports of progress. It is important to celebrate the successes and keep the momentum as these groups form and begin delivery. He thanked Michael Carter for chairing the PCG.

3. Partner involvement in the Plan/process & look ahead to ‘Ways of Working’ Partnership session at 13th July meeting (Chair)

The Chair reminded Partners of the upcoming session at the next Partnership meeting (Rheged, 13th July) – a facilitator has been appointed, and the session will be followed by a Partnership lunch. This follows from Katie Harpers’ Ways of Working paper in December which proposed reviewing how the Partnership operates in delivery mode, following Plan development mode. The Partnership MOU also makes reference to the requirement to have periodic reviews of this nature.

The Partnership will have an opportunity take stock, validate any organisational or governance changes and review how Partners are working together. It is also important to learn from the Plan development period – to improve the delivery phase and to help the development of the next plan. It was acknowledged that there were ‘bumpy periods’ for Partners and relationships when drafting the Plan and so it will also be worth spending time on some of the ‘softer’ issues of behaviours and values.

It is worth noting that the changes in Cumbria local authority structure will have an impact on Partner membership. It is important to consider the Partnership’s role – does it help shape change, or react to it? It is not a public body, so what is its role? There is an opportunity in this work to be clearer on the role of advisory groups and who they report to. It is also worth considering whether the Partnership has the right resources to achieve its aims.

Further details, including some Partner homework and pre-reading, will be distributed in June (complete). The Chair also noted that the Partnership will also be asking Partners for a (voluntary) contribution to help cover the costs of the event.

Comments from Partners (various):

- Important to remember the national policy framework that many Partners work within, and how that impacts locally in the Lake District
- Focus on issues where the Partnership can make the most difference
- Resource is critical, and very challenging across many Partners – the issue is how we make a difference together
- Important to have a shared understanding on limitations

- Avoid duplication of effort – some initiatives are already underway on a pan-Cumbria basis (not always on National Park boundary)
- Determine how the Partnership is sure it makes a difference – what are the metrics?
- Important to see the Plan as a framework for the next one, not to have to re-do it all again
- Need to horizon scan for future priorities and challenges
- There is a difference between sphere of influence and sphere of control
- Relationships may change with different structures and Partner organisations
- Worth investing the time to understand what other Partners are doing
- Importance of mechanism to report what projects are currently in train
- The Chair noted that the recent letter to Defra from Partners (which he drafted following their contributions) showed the challenge of collective agreement across such a wide range of Defra priorities. That breadth can be a challenge to the Partnership's focus.

Break

4. WHS Briefing (Steve Ratcliffe)

Steve Ratcliffe, as Chairman of the WHS Steering group, advised the Partnership of recent discussions with Historic England concerning the management of the World Heritage Site.

Steve answered a number of questions from Partners.

5. Natural England – Wild Ennerdale National Nature Reserve Proposal (Chris Kaighin) – see slides

Chris gave an update on the proposal for Ennerdale to become a National Nature Reserve (NNR). He said this would not change the existing management plan for the site, and that neighbours, farming tenants and parish councils nearby had already been widely consulted. Designating Ennerdale as a NNR would provide 20% of the National Park's target of 10% of land being reserve status. The legal process for the designation is due later this year.

Comments from Partners:

Libby Bateman (CLA) – was not sure all landowners had been consulted. There are issues around visitor management (greater visitors if NNR?) and access for farm machinery. Libby felt there needed to be more importance given to engaging with private landowners.

Kevin May (FE) – part of the role of bringing this issue to Partners is to help determine who best to speak to for further consultation. He acknowledged there were concerns over more people/visitors and commercialisation, but also wondered if there had been some mis-information. Kevin noted there had been a local meeting with over 130 people. There are interesting discussions to be had about valley transport, parking charges, visitor facilities/centre and beaver introduction. Kevin felt that whilst management of Wild Ennerdale is secure and an exemplar of 're-wilding', that being a NNR would be a welcome bonus.

Kevin Sayers (UU) felt the order of engagement, with a comms plan identifying key stakeholders would be valuable. More communication to help address concerns would be coming soon.

Laura Partington (FLD) thought it would be useful to understand what impacts there had been on other areas that became designated – what could be learned?

Jeremy Westgarth (NT) added that there was a communication gap and that some of these issues raised existed before the proposed designation. The National Trust has actively engaged with commoners and tenants in the area, with more discussion to come. It is important to sell the immediate benefits, but also to recognise those that might be realised in 20years + time.

Lois Mansfield (UoC) – felt there might be boundary issues and sheep drifting into areas designated as an NNR. Chris replied that these issues were already factored into the existing management plan, and that no further fencing was deemed necessary.

ACTION: CK to share existing management plan for Ennerdale with LM.

Partners had a discussion about the NNR proposals and whether they strengthened the attributes of WHS, noting the next Ennerdale Management Plan (due 2028) would also include a heritage impact assessment. There is still productive woodland and agriculture at the site. Some wondered if there was an ‘opportunity cost’ related to Ennerdale, with their being a potential risk of funding and attention being drawn away from other projects and areas.

Blanaid Denman (RSPB) – the project at Ennerdale is about sustainability and longevity, with lots of commitment to Partners. A NNR designation would cement that, and ensure long term protection. The proposal for a NNR is testament to the work that has gone on, including RSPB involvement.

The Chair thanked Partners for the timely discussion and useful challenges. The discussion had identified the need for continued engagement and dialogue with stakeholders. He congratulated those involved in the valley to date – a good example of change in a complicated area.

ACTION: Partners with further questions to email Chris directly.

6. Farming in Protected Landscapes (FiPL) case studies (Andrew Herbert) – see slides

Andrew Herbert (LDNPA) gave an update on FiPL, which is very well aligned with the aims of the LDNPP Management Plan. There is a huge amount of Partnership support and a local assessment panel, which also involves Partners. FiPL is designed to fund those things that cannot already be funded through, for example, Higher Level Stewardship or Countryside Stewardship. The aims of the programme are ‘innovation, collaboration, diversification and transformation’

ACTION: Slides used for this topic, including year 1 case studies, to be shared with Partners

Comments from Partners (various):

- Where does FiPL lead, and is there an end date? Andrew replied that conversations are happening within Defra around longevity, and how FiPL will influence future programmes to come.

- Relatively small amounts of money makes it seem like a trial – is this a means to an end?
- Important to consider the impact on Environment Land Management Scheme (ELMS)
- The significance of FiPL is about reaching areas other funding does not.

The Chair thanked Andrew for an informative and timely update.

7. Close & AOB (Chair)

The Chair thanks Partners for an engaging session which had covered a lot of ground. Partners should look forward to the meeting at Rheged (13th July) and the facilitated Ways of Working session on Plan delivery and Partnership governance.

Farewells

1. **Kerry Powell (LDNPA).** The Chair noted that this would be Kerry's final Partnership meeting before her departure in June. He thanked Kerry for her regular attendance of Partnership meeting and the support she had shown the Partnership throughout her time at the Authority. The Chair wished Kerry well on behalf of the Partnership.
2. **Douglas Chalmers (FLD)** – the Chair noted Douglas was leaving his role of Chief Executive at FLD, and thanked him for his work with the Partnership, both with the CLA initially and more recently with FLD. Douglas thanked the Chair and noted that from inception the Partnership has worked for the greater good in a complicated area. He admitted there have been times when he has been in the 'naughty corner'. It had been, he said, a pleasure and privilege to be involved with the Partnership and he had learned a lot from his involvement.

The Chair presented Douglas with a bottle of sparkling wine and card.

REMINDER: Next Partnership Meeting: **13th July 9.00am, to include post meeting lunch**

General list of acronyms used at Partnership meetings:

AES	Agri-Environment Schemes
BA	Breakthrough Actions
BDUK	Broadband Delivery UK
BTF	Business Task Force
CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
CLS	Carbon Landscapes Scheme
CHF	Community Housing Fund
CLT	Community Land Trusts
CLH	Community-led Housing
CW	Cumbria Woodlands
CWT	Cumbria Wildlife Trust
FC	Forestry Commission
FLD	Friends of the Lake District
FTA	Free Trade Agreement
FTTP	Fibre to the premises
FTE	Full time equivalent
GS	Gain Share
HLS	Higher Level Stewardship
ICAP	ICAP is a leading markets operator and provider of post trade risk mitigation and information services
LCA	Landscape Character Assessment
LDNPA	Lake District National Park Authority
LEP	Local Enterprise Partnership
Mbps	Megabits per second
NCA	National Character Area
NE	Natural England
NERC	Natural Environment Research Council
NFM	Natural Flood Management
NFU	National Farmers Union
NT	National Trust
PES	Payment for Ecosystems
RESG	Rural Economic Sub Group (LEP)
SCaMP	Sustainable Catchment Management Programme
SEP	Superfast Extension Programme
SLMT	Sustainable Land Management Tool
SOTP	State Of The Park Report
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
TAG	Technical Advisory Group
TOR	Terms of reference
TVGM	Tactical Visitor Management Group
UU	United Utilities
VESG	Visitor Economy Sub Group (LEP)