



Hampstead Heath Management Plan Review

Workshop Report

Saturday 10th September 2016

Kenwood House



Participants

Susan Rose
Michael Hammerson
Tony Ghilchik
John Beyer

Bob Warnock
Declan Gallagher
Jonathan Meares
Lucy Gannon

Workshop Objectives

By the end of the workshop we will have :

- Reviewed the current plan and understood its rationale and underlying drivers in order to better shape the process and the new plan;
- Interrogated the current plan to review success so these can be built upon; and
- Considered the framework of the new plan, key outcomes and performance indicators.

Agenda

| Timings | Activities |
|---------|--|
| 10.00am | Welcome and Purpose of the Workshop (Sharon Wright, Facilitator) |
| 10.15am | Understanding the Context <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rationale and underlying drivers for the current Plan |
| 10.50am | How far have we come? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reviewing the current Management Plan to consider : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o What has worked well? o What would we do differently now? |
| 11.30am | Coffee |
| 11.45am | Moving Forward <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the main challenges for Hampstead Heath that a new plan should address? - How best can we ensure buy in from stakeholders? |
| 12.45pm | Review of key messages and Close |
| 1.00pm | Lunch |

1. Rationale and Underlying Drivers for the Current Plan

The workshop invited those who had been part of the working groups that had developed the current Management Plan to objectively assess its success and to consider how the new Plan might fully reflect the current context.

After introductions and an update from Bob Warnock on the process for reviewing the Management Plan, participants were asked to reflect on how the current Management Plan had been developed. Key points made were :

- The Working Groups which developed much of the content of the Plan were representative of stakeholders which was a positive of the process
- The Working Groups were given an agreed structure and clear topics to address and this was a useful approach
- The Working Groups allowed specialists to be brought into the discussions, and this was seen as helpful in developing the Plan
- This was the first fully integrated Plan for the Heath and sought to develop a structure which could then be expanded upon for individual topic areas. This is why it is titled 'Towards a Plan...' as it was recognised there was more work to do. It was considered at the time that some areas, such as habitat, would require more detailed work than others
- The Plan usefully considered the area around the Heath, taking account of, for example, planning policies, and what impact this might have on the future of the Heath. This was seen as a proactive approach

While it was recognised that the current plan discussions had taken place almost 10 years ago, participants were in agreement that the process had been well structured and inclusive, and that the current Plan reflected the fact that it was a document which could be built on over time. The fact that this was the first comprehensive Plan for the Heath meant it was naturally a starting point for future work.

It was felt to be particularly important that the review of the current Plan included consideration of the areas around the Heath and the impact policies and developments there might have.

2. Reviewing the Current Management Plan

Participants were asked to consider, with the benefit of hindsight :

- What had worked well in terms of the current Plan; and
- What, if anything, they would do differently in developing the new Plan.

In small group discussion and then plenary, the following points were recorded :

There have been many positive aspects of the Plan's implementation, including the designed landscapes such as Hill Gardens

There is still a need to get right the critical relationship between preserving the Heath and having a space which is open to all. Given the need to balance these priorities, there are a range of activities on the Heath where conflict might arise and it is right that the Plan be used to help manage these

It is still right that the Plan sets the big picture context for the Heath and many of the principles in the document are still valid, but.....

- We need to take an evidence based approach and have more baseline data on which to steer future work on, for example, ecology
- We need to quantify the change we want to achieve and then communicate when we've met our objectives
- The Plan needs to set out resource implications for the various activities it contains
- The Plan needs to continue to take account of the area around the Heath and the implications of policies which may overlap
- It would be helpful to structure the Plan to take account of :
 - Long term principles;
 - A medium term strategy; and
 - Links to Annual Work Plans
- It was felt that this approach would help to manage conflicts where they arise, create a more adaptable approach to planning, and ensure there was no distraction from the big priorities



It was felt to be important that the Plan was not totally rewritten, but rather revised to ensure the key principles were clearly stated and that a medium term strategy underpinned these. The strategy should be evidence based, outcome driven and allow for success to be identified and celebrated.

3. Moving Forward

In order to feed views into the development of the new Plan, participants were asked to provide their views on four areas :

- The process of developing the new Plan, including how best to engage key stakeholders;
- The structure of the new Plan;
- The key priorities and issues the new Plan should address; and
- How best to implement and evaluate the new Plan.

In discussion following points were highlighted :

| The process for developing the new Plan and engaging stakeholders | The structure of the new Plan |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use the Consultative Committee within the Review Process, particularly to look at progress against the current Plan. The suggestion was to use Specialist Groups to do some of the initial work and then to discuss the outcomes at the Consultative Committee - Use the process to create a shared vision and shared ownership with the Heath community. There was no overall view on how best to do this but it was felt that gathering environmental and social data, understanding the problems the Plan is trying to address, and then targeting specific groups (such as cyclists and dog walkers) for their input may be helpful - Engaging with local schools was seen as a helpful approach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Much of the current Plan is seen as still being relevant but it does need to be updated and refreshed to address areas where conflict occurs. There needs to be an understanding of where people interface with 'places' and how best to tackle any issues which arise - The Plan contains too many 'considers' and should instead prioritise the urgent and/or essential activities. This will include an assessment of resource implications if priorities are to be delivered - The new Plan should be a clear strategy document so that everyone who reads it understands the direction of travel for the Heath |



| Key priorities and issues | Implementation and evaluation |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The new Plan is an opportunity to set out good news stories showing how far we have come in delivering key objectives - The Plan should set out a clear ‘story’ of what we want for the Heath in the long term but should clearly manage expectations. Part of the story will be an understanding of the core purpose of the Heath and the values that underpin the City’s work - There needs to be an archaeological survey of the Heath - The Plan should set a clear baseline of evidence and be transparent about how objectives will be monitored and evaluated - There should be a clear communications strategy for the Plan - There needs to be clarity about who will be involved in decision making - The Plan is an opportunity to set out clear policies, allowing conflicts to be managed in a transparent way - It was felt that a 10 year Plan covered too short a period. Rather the Management Plan should establish a framework for the future and be underpinned by a medium term delivery plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We need to be clear when priorities have been delivered, and have a reporting mechanism which allows us to share successes - Use the Consultative Committee to review progress on the Plan - Be clear about timescales for delivery and how they will be monitored - Have a 5 year interim review process so that the strategic pan can be adapted to accommodate changes |

4. Conclusion

Participants were in favour of an 'evolution not revolution' approach to the Plan review. However, while they felt many of the core principles and values were unchanged since the Plan was first developed, they were clear that :

- the Plan should be a long term framework for how Hampstead Health will be managed into the future, supported by a shorter term plan which sets out how this will be delivered;
- the new Plan is an opportunity to give clear messages about the purpose of the Heath and what has been achieved in the last 10 years;
- the structure of the Plan needs to be revised to ensure clarity on vision, values, priorities, outcomes, delivery and resource implications;
- there should be a clear evidence base for the new Plan, allowing stakeholders to understand how priorities have been arrived at;
- conflicts will arise and the Plan should provide a transparent framework for how they are resolved; and
- there should be clear mechanisms for evaluating and reporting progress against the Plan.

