

COMMITTEE:	Services Committee
DATE:	30 June 2006
CONSULTEES:	Chris Manby/Jane Chapman/John Lomas/Jim Dixon/Democratic Services
DIRECTORATE:	Conservation & Development

PART B

Stanage/North Lees Estate – Future Management (PM6193/MC)

This report is exempt under Paragraph 9, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as it contains information relating to terms proposed or to be proposed by the Authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the disposal of property and disclosure to the public would prejudice the Authority.

Proposal

Asset Management Plan review, setting out detailed pros and cons, including financial information in reaching recommendations on the Estate's future management. This report should be cross-referenced to the Part A report of the same title, which provides further background information and views of consultees.

The proposals are that the partnership approach, as embodied in the Stanage Forum, should continue to be built upon for the longer-term future management of the Estate. Due to the urgency presented by the current farm tenants leaving on 29 September 2006, it is recommended that, in the short-term, we should seek someone else to manage the day-to-day running of the farm (as a farm business tenant or partner) and use the opportunity to seek alternative management of some of the buildings on site, thereby releasing capital and saving revenue expenditure. It is considered that these new proposals will not preclude investigating greater partnership working, including as part of corporate investigation into possible trust status, as an over-arching objective.

The following package of recommendations is considered to offer the best combination of actions in order to withdraw from some management responsibilities and raise capital under the asset management review criteria whilst still achieving National Park objectives.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

THE LAND

- 1. Keep the moorland and in-bye land together as one farming unit. Tenders should be sought for a new 5-year Farm Business Tenancy (or other partnership arrangement whereby the partner manages the farming operation for 5 years). *Post script: This was approved by committee.***

THE BUILDINGS

- 2. Seek a partnership with suitable organisation(s)/individual(s) for the Hall, Farmhouse and Cruck Barn, whereby the partner purchases them at best value but with suitable conditions to restore and protect the Listed buildings, enable achievement of the farm objectives and prevent sale on to an unsuitable purchaser or at an unfair profit. Detailed terms and conditions to be approved by the Director of Conservation and Development, in consultation with the Head of Law, Head of Financial Services and Chief Finance Officer. *Post script: This was deferred by committee. A further report will follow in Spring/Summer 2007.***

PARTNERSHIPS FOR THE WHOLE ESTATE

- 3. Refresh existing partnership arrangements in the short-term. Review how the Authority works with any new tenants/partners once they have been selected, including how they should fit into the Stanage Forum. *Post script: This was approved by committee.***
- 4. Investigate further the pros and cons of setting up a Trust/partnership for Stanage or a wider area, as part of an Authority wide consideration. *Post script: This was approved by committee.***

Policy/Legal Background

See Part A report.

Key Issues

The main issues considered are:

- The land – could the management of the in-by fields be split from the moorland, with the recommendation that they should not.
- Buildings – it is considered that the Authority could sell some of the buildings by seeking partners to continue to conserve and enhance their historic value, without undue effect on the rest of the Estate.
- Partnership working – it is considered that the Authority should continue to build on the well established partnership way of working with farm and historic building tenants and through the Stanage Forum for the longer term future.

The recommendations follow a staged approach. The suggested timescale for implementation would be as follows:

- Seek tenders for a Farm Business Tenant/partner for the land, as soon as possible, for 3 alternative arrangements simultaneously, with a view to getting a new tenant in place by the time Derby College, the current tenants leave, on 29 September 2006:
 - (a) For the land, new barn, farm house and cruck barn
 - (b) For the land, new barn and cruck barn
 - (c) For the land and new barn alone
- Seek tenders for partnership(s) for the buildings (after agreeing what conditions to attach).
- Consider tenders for the land and the buildings simultaneously to ensure they are compatible and decide whether to operate a lease-back option at this time, for use of the farmhouse and/or cruck barn by the new farm tenant.
- Refresh partnership arrangements with new tenants/partners – as soon as in place, after 29 September 2006.
- Investigate trust/partnership potential for the Estate or a wider area – likely to

take up to 2 years, so by September 2008. This should include consideration of whether such a trust/partnership should seek to manage the farm in-house, once the farm tenancy ends (in 5 years time).

Background

Provided below are further details about the recommendations and a summary of main justifications for them. Then, in Appendix 2, follows a more detailed list of all options considered and a summary of issues/pros and cons. These were discussed at meetings with internal and external consultees, whose views are detailed in the appendix to the Part A report.

THE LAND

Moorland, including Stanage Edge

There are very clear reasons for the Authority owning and managing the moorland and the Edge (with its conservation designations and high visitor numbers). It might only be possible to dispose of our interest here to a very like-minded organisation but this has not been explored.

In-bye fields (pastures and hay meadows)

The reasons for retaining this are less clear. The pros and cons are listed below, with the recommendation that it should be retained.

Woodlands

The main woodlands on the Estate are managed by the Authority's Forestry & Tree Team. It is suggested that their management should be reviewed after the decisions have been made about the main Estate.

Detail of the Recommendation:

Keep the moorland and in-bye together:

It is recommended that a Farm Business Tenancy/partnership agreement should be sought for 5 years. This is kept as short as possible so as not to prejudice longer-term management options, such as a trust or partnership to manage the whole Estate (see below) but long enough to interest a farming tenant and meet the minimum time requirement for DEFRA's Higher Level (agri-environment) Scheme.

Justification (summary):

- The farming system for this Estate relies on moorland and enclosed fields ("in-bye"). The sheep flock is hefted to the moor (has grazed it for generations and does not stray) but needs in-bye land for lambing and winter grazing.
- The conservation values of the land (including 6 flower-rich hay meadows and 4 wet pastures) and important conservation links between the moorland and in-bye would have greatest certainty of protection.
- Separation would make it very difficult to achieve a number of the agreed farm objectives (see below for further detail).
- Optimum opportunity to demonstrate best practice in terms of integrated management across a broad range of habitats.
- Although there are no covenants preventing separation, the previous owner sold to the Authority so that the Estate would remain intact, so any decision to separate would have to be fully justified and explained carefully.

THE BUILDINGS

The Estate has the following buildings:

- (a) North Lees Hall – a 16th Century Grade II* Listed Building - leased to the Vivat Trust for 50 years until 2038, who manage it as holiday apartments and are responsible for all repairs and maintenance.
- (b) North Lees Farmhouse – until now inhabited by the farm tenant's shepherd/farm manager (although has been vacant for the past 4 years due to structural changes at Derby College, the current tenants)
- (c) Cruck Barn – Grade II Listed traditional barn. Contains teaching room, toilets and

- limited agricultural use for hay and machinery storage and lambing.
- (d) New Barn – a modern steel framed agricultural building of some use for farming purposes but requiring major drainage work.
 - (e) Cattiside Cottage – The Estate Warden’s residence
 - (f) Campsite building & car parks

It is advised that buildings d-f are not critical to the current management decisions facing the Authority. Building d (the new barn) has no other potential use other than with the farm land. It is advised that the reviews of e and f should follow on afterwards, as a consequence.

Detail of the Recommendations:

To seek a partnership with a suitable individual or organisation for the Hall, Farmhouse and Cruck Barn who will:

- Fully restore and maintain the buildings in keeping with their historic value as Grade II Listed. The Hall requires significant ongoing maintenance. Vivat Trust spent £..... last year replacing the roof and carrying out other external maintenance. The cost of internal refurbishment currently required has been estimated by the Vivat Trust at around £..... The exterior of the farmhouse needs some restorative work and the internal layout is out of character and needs ripping out and re-designing, requiring substantial investment (£.....) to restore it.
- Be compatible with the other uses on the site – the Vivat Trust’s existing lease of the Hall as holiday apartments and a working farm on the surrounding land.
- Enable the farm tenant to live in the farm house and use the cruck barn for farming and suitable farm diversification if desired (for example by way of sale and lease-back to the Authority, who could then sub-let on to the farm tenant).
- In such a way that the buildings could not be sold on to an unsuitable purchaser nor at an unfair profit. This could be done either by attaching a covenant giving us first right to buy back or by “selling” a long leasehold (such as 99 years).
- Preferably putting the buildings in the same ownership/management.

Detailed conditions to be agreed, including an assessment of the reduction in value from unfettered sale on the open market and a commercial appraisal, which has already been requested.

Justification (summary):

- Potential for conflicting / incompatible uses on an intimate site at the centre of the Estate.
- Ensure quality restoration and maintenance of historic buildings (and reduce the risk of demand for further development, which often results from splitting ownership).
- Enable achievement of other national park objectives for the Estate (see Appendix to the Part A report) , including continuation as a living, working farm, with diversification opportunities.

PARTNERSHIP / TRUST FOR THE WHOLE ESTATE

Detail of the Recommendations:

It is considered that the partnership options below could all be pursued whatever is decided about the land and buildings above. However, it should be recognised that the more that is let or sold, the more the potential impact/restriction there may be on a partnership.

(a) Short-term

Refresh existing partnership arrangements in the short-term

There would be an obvious short-term need to review how we work with any new tenants/partners, including how they should fit into the Stanage Forum process, the role of the Estate Warden and how they relate to the campsite, car parks and the National Park Ranger

Service.

(b) Longer-term

Investigate further the pros and cons of setting up a Trust/partnership for Stanage or a wider area, as part of an Authority wide consideration

More research is necessary to weigh up potential pros and cons in full and should be investigated further as part of an Authority wide consideration of Trust potential. As part of this, it is suggested that the Authority might consider building on the Stanage Forum Steering Group by leasing the Estate to them as a more formal Trust or partnership of key stakeholders and funding partners. This should include consideration of whether such a trust/partnership should seek to manage the farm in-house, once the farm tenancy ends (in 5 years time).

There may be sense in broadening the area covered to include the Authority's Eastern Moors Estate and, if the owners were willing to join with us, Sheffield City Council's adjoining land towards Redmires and the Burbage Valley and the National Trust's Longshaw Estate and land around Greens House Farm (bordering North Lees) or perhaps even wider, such as the whole SSSI. The Stanage Forum supports these as possible options.

It will be important for any such Trust to address issues of long-term financial and management viability.

Justification (summary):

- building on best practice in partnership working and integrated management
- potential for pooling resources and increasing the likelihood and range of grant funding and voluntary time commitment
- potential saving of Authority resource input
- greater commitment of partners through shared values/vision for the area
- potential to spread the benefits of the Stanage Forum approach to a wider area

Resources

These are mostly considered above. However, for comparison, below are the resource requirements of leaving things as they are:

Budget for the Estate as a whole:

Staff (directly employed only):	£42,000
Expenditure:	£21,000
Income:	£12,000
Net budget:	£51,000

It is advised that selling the in-bye land would save insignificant amounts in terms of maintenance expenditure and staff costs, as the vast majority is spent on the moorland.

Within that budget:

Hall

Expenditure: Nil but the Vivat Trust estimates that it requires around £..... renovation, which they cannot currently raise.

Income: Nil (on a profit sharing arrangement but heavy maintenance requirements have resulted in no rent for the last 4 years and little prospect of achieving any substantial rent under their lease in the future).

Farmhouse

Expenditure: Minimal maintenance has been carried out at about £500 p.a but it requires an estimated £30,000 to put it in a basic condition suitable to re-let.

Income: As part of the farm, rental element for the house has been negligible but if let on the open market, could realise around £500 per month.

Cruck Barn

Expenditure: Minimal maintenance at c£250 p.a. but at some stage it will require major maintenance and it has not been restored internally at all.

Income: Nil (and no prospect of generating any net income).

By selling the buildings, it is suggested that any saving in staff time would be negligible.

Risk Management

The recommendations above are considered to be a good compromise between withdrawing from some management responsibilities whilst still achieving national park objectives. However there are still some risks which need to be taken into account:

- The previous owner, supported by CPRE are likely to contest the sale of any part of the Estate, seeing it as fragmentation against the wishes of the owner. (Although there are no known legal constraints on selling).
- The Vivat Trust have a proven track record as tenants and we must be sensitive to their existing lease and use of the Hall as holiday apartments but without unfairly favouring them.
- The Stange Forum Steering Group, representing all stakeholders, would rather the Authority retain the whole Estate and manage the farm in-house but have cautiously accepted the recommendations but with some reservations.
- If a new farm tenant is not in place by 29 September 2006, the Authority will need to have a back up plan to manage the hefted sheep flock (which would cost around £.....) for a hold-over period until a new tenant can be put in place.

Human Rights, Equalities, Health & Safety

No human rights or health & safety issues have been identified.

The issues of fairness, open competition and best value, with regard to potential disposal of assets, are addressed within the report.

Consultees

Director of Conservation and Development, Head of Conservation, Conservation Properties Team Manager, Head of Property, Head of Access & Recreation, Head of Finance, Chief Financial Officer, Recreational Facilities and Area Management Team Manager, Area Ranger, Access Officer, Development Control, Historic Buildings Architect, Forestry & Tree Team Manager, Countryside & Economy Team Manager, Archaeology Service, Ecology Service, Estate Warden, Legal Service. (Incorporated into the report and see Appendix to the Part A report for further details).

External

Stanage Forum Steering Group representatives (see Appendix to the Part A report).

Enclosures

Appendix 2 – Detailed comparison to other options

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Notes of meeting held 13 January 2006, to consider planning and development potential of the buildings.

District Valuer's report of 23 February 2006, giving valuations of the buildings

Report Author

Matthew Croney, Land Agent, Conservation Properties Team

Publication date

22 June 2006

Further detailed comparison to other options explored

THE LAND

Option 1 (Recommended): Keep the moorland and in-bye together

Option 2: Sell the in-bye

Option 3: Lease the in-bye separately to the moorland

Pros and cons/issues

Keeping the moorland and in-bye together	Managing the in-bye separately to the moorland (by either lease or sale)
<p>Farming Simplest to continue as now. Current farming system relies on moorland and in-bye. The sheep flock is hefted to the moor but needs in-bye land for lambing, and winter grazing.</p>	<p>Disposal of the in-bye would make the Estate less viable as a farming unit and create difficulties concerning the hefted flock. The in-bye would be fairly easy to let but the moorland on its own may not. In particular, finding someone to purchase the hefted flock (costing around £.....) could prove difficult and would restrict our market to local farmers with their own surplus in-bye land for lambing and off wintering. The alternative of simply not grazing the moorland would have a negative impact on its conservation value.</p>
<p>Protection of core conservation objectives Direct management is the surest way of protecting the conservation value of the in-bye hay meadows and wet pastures, the wildlife links with the moorland (see further detail in Appendix 2) and building on these to achieve the agreed farm objectives over an integrated area of moorland and in-bye.</p>	<p>The conservation values of the land could be protected by agri-environment schemes and cross compliance, although the certainty of protection would be less than under direct management. The risk of loss/deterioration of 6 hay meadows and 4 wet pastures would need particular consideration. If the land were to be managed by others under agri-environment schemes, this would require monitoring and resources for that monitoring.</p> <p>Separate management would make it difficult to achieve a number of the agreed farm objectives, such as 10.2.1 Grazing at sustainable levels with flexibility between moor and inbye, 10.2.3 Maximise the conservation value of all in-bye fields, 10.2.4 Any necessary bracken and weed control should be done by mechanical means if possible, 10.2.5 Organic farming should be welcomed/encouraged, 10.2.6 Farming using rare/traditional breeds will be welcomed, 10.2.7 Enhance all farmland trees and small woodlands and where appropriate, plant new ones, 10.2.9 Widen all hedges, 10.2.10 Provide scrapes (small pools) where appropriate to enhance habitat for upland waders.</p>

<p>Financial – there would be no short-term capital gain. There could still be revenue budget savings by building on partnerships.</p>	<p>There would be a short-term capital gain of an estimated £..... from selling the in-bye, providing funds to invest in retained property. An unpopular decision may lead to a decline in good will and reduction in the investment in time & effort of users and stakeholders.</p>
<p>Historic context Previous owner sold to the Authority so that the Estate would remain intact.</p>	<p>Concerns would have to be handled very carefully and decisions fully explained to avoid bad PR.</p>
<p>Recreation Retains the minor links that exist</p>	<p>The majority of recreation opportunities relate to the moorland However, Ramblers would seek new open access and linking rights of way to be designated and in place on the in-bye land before any change of ownership/management (on top of those in the agreed farm objectives).</p>
<p>Demonstrating best practice/education Optimum opportunity through management of both moorland and in-bye together to ideal standards.</p>	<p>On the in-bye land, we would be restricted to influencing others to manage it well and would have to rely on that to demonstrate management over a wide range of habitats.</p>
<p>Integrated management Continues to demonstrate the benefits of integration linked to National Park objectives.</p>	<p>Would go against this principle.</p>
<p>Local economy</p>	<p>Separation may make it more difficult to maximise the impact the Estate has on the local economy.</p>
<p>Practical</p>	<p>Division of the landholding might lead to a multiplication of disputes and disagreements.</p>

THE BUILDINGS

Each building has been assessed in turn as to whether we could sell it/withdraw from direct management, with the following issues/pros and cons:

The recommendations taken to Resource Management Team were to sell the Hall, farmhouse and cruck barn to the Vivat Trust, with lease-back options on the farmhouse and cruck barn. These were cautiously supported but concerns were raised that best value, fairness and open competition regulations might preclude this. We therefore now seek a “suitable partner(s)” and cannot go straight to the Vivat Trust (other than possibly for the Hall, where they have an existing lease). RMT also requested a commercial appraisal of the buildings, which is now being sought.

(a) North Lees Hall

Pig sties and adjoining field: If the Hall is sold, then it is considered that it would make sense to add the field to the front as a curtilage and the traditional pig sties for storage.

Option 4: Sell the Hall (+ adjoining field and pig sties) on the open market

This is not currently considered to be a viable option. This is because there are few who could maintain this historic building adequately and few (if any) who would be interested in purchasing it subject to the Vivat Trust's existing lease (which ends in 2038).

Option 5 (Recommended): Sell the Hall, adjoining field and pigsties to the Vivat Trust, our existing tenants or other suitable partner (District Valuer advises that it is worth around £..... subject to Vivat's existing lease).

(Sale to the Vivat Trust was cautiously supported by Stanage Forum Steering Group – see Appendix to the Part A report).

Option 6: Maintain as now – in our ownership, leased to Vivat Trust

Issues/ pros and cons:

Retaining freehold	Selling it to Vivat Trust or other suitable partner
<p>Financial – capital Retains higher value in the future, if the Vivat Trust ever leave, including potential marriage value with the farmhouse (estimated at £.....).</p>	<p>Could raise capital (DV values the property at around £.....) to reinvest in Authority properties (if the Vivat Trust have the means to raise this amount, although Vivat may come forward with its own valuation based on a business plan for investment in the property)</p>
<p>Financial – revenue for maintenance Ongoing funding problems for repair and maintenance of this Grade II* Listed Building.</p>	<p>Enables Vivat Trust/other partner to raise a mortgage and funding initiatives to fully repair and maintain their own building.</p>
<p>Practical Ongoing vested interest in being co-operative as tenants and more accepting of our use of our neighbouring property.</p>	<p>New owners may be less co-operative regarding shared services and costs and the use of our neighbouring land and buildings, such as a working farm.</p>
<p>Long-term future If the Vivat Trust are unable to adequately maintain the building, we could, in theory, seek a new tenant/owner but would have to wait until they withdrew and suffer an unhappy period with bad PR etc.</p>	<p>Vivat Trust have a proven track record and ability to manage the building extremely well. There may also be other suitable partners. In addition, a covenant could be put on the sale that the Authority must be consulted on any work to the property, including that which falls outside the planning process. However, if the Vivat Trust want to sell it on, we would have to rely on Listed Buildings legislation for protection, which, although not as strong as direct ownership, ought to be adequate. Buy-back covenants could be put on any sale but this would reduce its value, be difficult to enforce and we'd need to find the capital to buy it back, which would probably be unlikely.</p>

(b) North Lees Farmhouse

Option 7: As now, retain in our ownership and lease as a farmhouse with the land (if retained)

(Favoured by Stanage Forum Steering Group – see Appendix 2 for their views).

Option 8 (Recommended): Sell the farmhouse to the Vivat Trust or other suitable partner

(Some support from Stanage Forum Steering Group for selling it to the Vivat Trust, if the right package can be put in place)

Option 9: Sell the farmhouse on the open market

Comparison of issues/pros and cons:

Retaining as a farmhouse	Selling to Vivat Trust/other suitable partner	Selling to anyone else
<p>Financial: Maximises rental income to the revenue budget.</p>	<p>Could raise capital to reinvest in retained property. (DV values it at £..... or £..... combined with the Hall, due to marriage value). However, the Trust have indicated that they would not be willing to pay as much as this open market value, as they estimate that it would cost a further £..... to fully restore the farmhouse to its original condition.</p>	<p>Realises open market capital value of around £..... but would not capitalise on £..... marriage value of combining it with the Hall.</p>
<p>Repair/maintenance: Requires around £..... expenditure to put it in good condition to re-let, which would be difficult for the Authority to raise. Ongoing maintenance would be at a minimum.</p>	<p>Enables restoration to its original condition and maximises future building repair and maintenance.</p>	<p>Although there are private individuals who look after historic buildings very well, they are perhaps less likely to restore to its original condition or decorate/maintain it in a way which complements the Hall.</p>
<p>Farming: Would demonstrate our support for small living, working farms, showing that they can still be viable with high quality environmentally friendly produce and diversification. Retains ability to adequately supervise livestock in a high visitor area with unfenced roads (and therefore greater need).</p>	<p>Potential for some kind of partnership arrangement with Vivat concerning this building and the Hall. E.g. possibility of retaining a lease-back option but this would impact on its sale value (but potentially putting it within financial reach of the Vivat Trust). If approved in principle this will require further valuation advice. Without such a clause/arrangement would lose the opportunity for anyone to live on site and farm the land (as for sale to</p>	<p>Would deny opportunity for anyone to live on site and farm the land (apart from the Estate Warden at Cattisside). Potential loss of another living, working small farm to become farmland attached to a neighbouring property (thus supporting their farming but following the trend of expansion). However, the land could still attract a new entrant farmer who lives locally and doesn't need a house on site.</p>

	anyone else).	
Practicalities: Possible conflict between Hall tenants and farm tenants.	A logical reconnection of uses of adjoining historic buildings. If no lease-back option, loses potential for on-site presence. The issue of longer-term protection would need to be addressed, i.e. if Vivat decided to sell the farmhouse on.	Selling the farmhouse loses potential for on-site presence (other than the Estate Warden at Cattisside). Greater potential for conflicting uses by introducing a third party.

(c) Cruck Barn

Option 10: As now, retain in our ownership and lease as part of the farm (if land retained)

Option 11 (Recommended): Sell (or lease or set up a partnership) to/with the Vivat Trust or other suitable partner

(Cautious support from Stanage Forum Steering Group re Vivat Trust, if the right package can be put in place – see Appendix 3 for their views).

Option 12: Sell on the open market

Comparison of issues/pros and cons:

Retaining with the land	Selling to Vivat Trust	Selling to anyone else
Financial: No capital gain. Likely to result in more rent for the revenue budget.	Realises capital (DV values it at around £.....) but Vivat are unlikely to be willing to pay full open market value.	Potential to realise full open market capital value (DV values it at around £.....).
Farming: Retains current minimal farming use and if used more by a willing tenant/partner, could enable demolition of modern barn. Enables diversification, making this a more viable farming unit.	Potential for some kind of partnership arrangement with Vivat concerning this building and the Hall. For example, possibility of retaining a lease-back option so that Vivat could maintain the barn but it could be used by the farm. However, this would impact on its sale value. If approved in principle this will require further valuation advice. The issue of longer term protection would need to be addressed, i.e. if Vivat decided to sell the farmhouse on. Could also be restored to its original condition as an attraction in its own right.	Loss of farming use or any use in connection with the Hall.
Practicalities: Possible conflict between Hall tenants and farm tenants if developed as a bunkhouse.	A simplification of management of all historic buildings on the site. A fully restored historic barn could form an attraction in its own	Greater potential for conflicting uses by introducing a 3 rd or 4 th party.

	right.	
<p>Repair/maintenance</p> <p>A new tenant could use it as a bunkhouse, funding maintenance but not full restoration.</p> <p>Losehill Hall would have the option of continuing to use the teaching facilities.</p>	<p>Could enable full restoration to its original condition and high level of maintenance.</p>	<p>Less likely to be restored to original condition. Could be maintained if an economic use could be found for it. However, there are few other uses possible in planning terms, other than a bunkhouse. Services (water, electrical supply and access) are also near their limit.</p> <p>Would have to rely on planning control to protect against inappropriate uses or disrepair.</p>

(d) New barn

Not of any great consequence to the review of the management of the Estate.

The only realistic options are to manage it with the farm land or preferably, to demolish if it is not needed.

(e) Cattiside Cottage

(f) Campsite and Car Parks

It is advised that the use of these buildings / facilities are issues to be considered after the other major decisions about the Estate have been made.

PARTNERSHIPS/TRUST FOR THE WHOLE ESTATE

(a) Short-term

Option 13: Refresh existing partnership arrangements in the short-term

(b) Longer-term

Three options have been considered:

Option 14: Build on existing "loose partnerships" with joint working via memorandum of agreement or similar

Option 15 (Recommended): Establish a partnership or charitable trust to oversee the whole Stanage/North Lees Estate.

(Favoured by Stanage Forum Steering Group – see Appendix to the Part A report for their views).

Option 16 (Recommended as a possible): Establish a broader partnership or Trust covering a wider area, at a landscape scale. Possibly as part of a Trust embracing other Authority properties elsewhere.

(Cautiously supported by Stanage Forum Steering Group – see Appendix to the Part A report for their views).

Issues/pros and cons:

Loose partnerships	Trust for Stanage	Trust for wider area
<p>Financial:</p> <p>Less likely to bring in significant extra resources (as</p>	<p>Opening up further grant sources of funding and allows</p>	<p>Maximises potential for pooling resources and</p>

we're already doing it wherever possible). No "teeth".	other partners to more readily invest in the Estate. This could save the Authority some revenue expenditure and provide greater security for future funding than just one organisation. Also likely to lead to even greater in kind commitment of voluntary time.	increasing the likelihood and range of grant funding and voluntary time commitment.
Integration: Continues at current level	Integrating the Estate, campsite, car parks (and possibly woodlands)	Integrating the Estate, campsite, car parks (and possibly woodlands) with an even wider area. Larger area would perhaps enable different activities to be permitted in different areas to help resolve conflicting uses.
Achievement of National Park objectives: Continues as now.	Building on good practice achieved so far by devolving more responsibility to the Forum, creating an even greater sense of "ownership" to benefit the Estate.	Greater commitment of partners through shared values/vision for the area. Potential to spread the benefits of the Stanage Forum approach. Many of the objectives contained in the Stanage/North Lees Estate Management Plan would be easily transferable to a wider area.
Level of complexity: Simplest to continue as now.	Would be more complex but the Stanage Forum management structure and Steering Group is already in place. It might be prudent to start with Stanage and then move to a wider area if successful.	Would be more complex. Potential difficulties in getting partners with different values to agree (but the Stanage Forum has experience to build on in order to achieve this).
Securing public engagement: Stanage Forum requires ongoing support from PDNPA.	Legally binding articles of association could further protect a democratic partnership approach to working to agreed outcomes.	Legally binding articles of association could further protect a democratic partnership approach to working to agreed outcomes over a wider area. Need to mitigate against it being too big and just a talking shop and too diluted.
Practical/farming:		Such a partnership might overcome problems of "trespass" grazing with our neighbouring farm Might help establish "open moor policy", with consequent removal of fencing from neighbouring moorland.

Option 17 (Recommended as a future possible): A future partnership/Trust could manage the farming operation in-house.

Although this could be set up in the shorter term and potentially give the best conservation benefit, we have a clear steer from the Authority's Asset Management Plan principles that we should reduce direct input to land management where it is not essential to securing Authority objectives on property.

(Strongly favoured by the Stanage Forum Steering Group – see Appendix to the Part A report for their views).

Issues/pros and cons

This in-house option may not be favoured currently by the Authority but might be considered if a partner/Trust can bring adequate resources and experience.

Financial: Revenue budget: The Authority can now enter its land to DEFRA's new agri-environment scheme (The Higher Level Scheme or HLS). In the past we have not been able to and have created tenancies, so that our tenants can put the land in agri-environment schemes. Although further work on the detailed financial implications is required, detailed calculations have been made for our Eastern Moors Estate, which show that a HLS in our name would generate substantially more income than the current rent from tenancies (more than enough to pay for extra farm management staff). If a like-minded partner organisation were interested in helping us to run the farming enterprise, it could then become a very viable option. This option could also make the most of "investment" of voluntary time and effort from stakeholders.

Financial: Capital: There would be less need for the farmhouse, as the Estate Warden could be made partially responsible for livestock supervision. This would enable sale of the farmhouse at full market value without a lease-back clause – see above. However, there would be a need to purchase the hefted flock, at around £....., if the moorland is to continue to be grazed.

Achieving NP objectives: It is the easiest way to achieve the whole range of objectives for the farm, for example including local rare breed cattle, farmed to high EQM standards and perhaps organic. There is an opportunity to genuinely manage the farm as a demonstration of best practice. However, the question has to be asked whether the burden of providing such a demonstration project should fall on the Authority. This is not a "normal" farm and requires something different to the average farm tenant to really make it work. The diversity and strength of opinion of all the interests in the Estate require careful consideration (including the neighbouring farmer on an unfenced moor). The recreational pressure on the Estate is also intense. The existing Estate Management Plan would have to be adhered to and the Stanage Forum properly engaged. This would limit the number of suitable tenants/partners and the potential for conflicts with stakeholders is great. In-house management would also be the most flexible to change and allow for experimentation with fodder crops, traditional hay baling and restoration techniques, etc. Also, Losehill Hall and others could be fully involved in making the most of educational and demonstration potential of the farm.

Other buildings: We would not need to develop the barns as bunkhouses (as another tenant/owner would almost certainly want to do), therefore avoiding potential conflict with Vivat Trust's use of the Hall.

Practical: Would place additional responsibilities on the Authority, including responsibility for livestock welfare and other animal husbandry legislation. Would require more staff time to manage a working farm. It is suggested that there would be a need to employ at least a part-time shepherd/farm manager to work alongside existing staff. The market for potential tenants may be restricted as many could be put off by the number of annual sheep losses due to the unfenced roads and moorland boundary and/or there is likely to be greater pressure from a tenant for a fence to be erected (which has always been resisted as it would spoil the wild open moorland landscape). Also, experience on virtually all of our tenanted farms shows that farming

for a living can direct a lower priority to conservation and a need for more control and encouragement to ensure that wider objectives are met.