

Cross-sectoral workshop 21 January 2009

Session 5 – Blockers and enablers

1	Manage all land to address flooding / combined with Land Management (for 'win-win' solutions) flow attenuation; storage areas; land drainage
Blockers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear governance and decision-making on land drainage, and an inconsistent approach to planning; • Potential conflict between the availability of land to meet government housing policy (increased numbers) and flooding concerns. Also conflicts with use of agricultural land; • Defining 'appropriate land use'; • Insufficient planners in the system; • Multiple stakeholders, but poor levels of (particularly public) engagement. Combined with this a lack of connection between city centre flooding and upper catchment land management; • Finance, and associated lack of incentive for action by landowners to change land management practices; and • Issues also with upgrading out-dated and over-full systems and a perception that engineering solutions can provide protection from flooding. 	
Enablers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vulnerability mapping – better understanding all elements including where impacts are far from flooding source; • All parties (especially local authority and land owners) should be involved and working together across all sectors, enabling joined up prevention and response; • Ensuring development is in the right place, and incorporates flood management (eg SUDS and wider PPS25 intentions); • Identifying best practice and solutions from outside the region, and internationally; • Adopting uplands management for flood prevention to delay surges; • Better integration into planning and building regulations; • Educating the public and landowners on the wider benefits of management, and raising awareness at and about all levels from strategic flood prevention and attenuation to local flood resistance and resilience; and • Investigating incentives for action, including funding opportunities. 	
2	Facilitate greater uptake of green infrastructure
Blockers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceived lack of political incentive or will, and aversion to the innovation (and perceived risk) associated with GI; • Lack of education about the reasoning for GI - many see it as being solely for biodiversity, and fail to acknowledge wider benefits when faced with costs of development and maintenance; • Lack of research, piloting, knowledge and understanding of the potential ecological and social benefits, and 'real' costs; • Lack of best practice and communication / dissemination of guidance leading to poor uptake; • Financial and other constraints introduced by commercial land valuations and the competition for land, with no financial incentive for action; and • Inconsistent application of GI in plans (eg LDFs) and absence of strategic link up within region. 	
Enablers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning approval and taking a lead, eg encouraging best practice, and setting precedent through planning; • Stronger requirements driven through sustainability appraisal – making developments climate proof and requiring GI; • Better education about the benefits for all levels, including to landowners, to facilitate private sector engagement; • A regional and local indicator for green space poverty; • An agreed means of assigning an economic value to GI; and • The RSS is an opportunity for greater inclusion of GI across Yorkshire and Humber. 	
3	Realign agri-environment and biodiversity schemes towards climate adapted schemes and areas
Blockers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorrect engagement with NFU & Country Landowner Association – conservation-focussed and not incorporating the importance of economics; • Reactive agricultural practices and short term planning at the individual farm level; • A lack of interest from landowners to sign up to stewardship schemes, and overly-bureaucratic system/slow processing of applications; • European policy. 	
Enablers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better availability of information about applications and the aims of schemes; • Incentivising the existing Defra system. Understanding output of these systems; • Determine means of greater stakeholder engagement; • Improved evidence about benefits to the environment (biological monitoring); and • Link schemes together to provide multiple benefits –environmental/economic/social - to develop more attractive schemes. 	

4	Stimulate private sector involvement
Blockers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited integration between public & private sectors (perceived competition/conflict); • Exacerbated by different languages and pressures, this means an imbalance between policy and delivery; • Education and a lack of understanding about what the potential implications of climate change are, particularly at board level, and among SMEs; • The wrong messages being relayed, in the wrong ways and using the wrong language, combined with 'climate change fatigue'; • Insufficient, or insufficient application of, regulation which could/should drive innovation, and conflict between different government objectives/departments leading to regional priorities appearing unclear; and • Lack of financial incentive, or business case, for action. 	
Enablers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remake the economic argument for adaptation since (despite the Stern Review) the private sector remains largely unconvinced. It needs convincing of the benefits of addressing climate change; • Greater dissemination of research case studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify and promote other 'market leaders' and their activities to those who can follow; ○ Attractive proposition/market from involvement ○ Stronger regulatory framework, using different legislation & standards to "force" innovation • Develop sector-led meetings and action regarding climate projections and what they mean, delivered using the appropriate business/economic language; • Investigate and develop financial incentives, incorporating encouragement of auditing schemes which account for 'triple bottom line'; • Carry out appropriate risk assessments to make the case to the region & private sectors and address willingness to pay; • Local and wider organisations with a role include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LSPs are a route to greater involvement and awareness raising ○ CAY (Carbon Action Yorkshire) ○ WRAP ○ Carbon disclosure project ○ Investment fund. 	
5	Ecological connectivity in landuse planning and design
Blockers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat network identification techniques have only recently been developed; • Networks need a regional/sub-regional approach and to be adopted at the appropriate level (eg Regional Spatial Study needs to promote the concept); • Lack of engagement, possibly because outputs not adequately disseminated and planners don't know how to apply them; • Lack of communication and integration between different agencies involved in planning, land use, biodiversity, forestry etc, and across different geographical and political boundaries. 	
Enablers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Networks are not yet connected, but may need to be balanced with other pressures on land and land management; • Highest risk species only occur in our region or specific local area, so wider linkages are not possible; • Raised awareness, and understanding; • Sharing knowledge and practices, including of expert advice, and universities' and researchers findings; • Reducing additional pressures to preventing losses occurring; • Link through from urban to green corridors, including making the most of gardens, cycleways, and encouraging a different view of development to include ecological networks; • Green infrastructure mapping and opportunity mapping; • Stronger partnership at all levels, from EU to local, and incorporation into the Regional Spatial Strategy; and • A more strategic approach to funding, including fiscal incentives for partnership working. 	
6	Provide incentives for public transport including walking and cycling
Blockers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A dominant car culture, encouraged by convenience, cheap ownership and reliability; • A general public and cultural resistance to use public transport, perhaps associated with perceptions of a lack of public transport facilities and issues with personal safety/security; and • Lack of accessible finance and the likely costs of the required investment in public infrastructure, compounded by constraints on how local government can spend locally-levied parking/traffic violation fines. 	
Enablers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Top down approach, led by central government since huge investment is required; • Road pricing as a means of generating financial support; and • Subsidised new routes on public transport to stimulate demand - possible answer is to nationalise public transport. 	

7	Reassess water system as a whole (better water cycle management)
Blockers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of organisations /bodies involved in water management; • As a trans-boundary issue water is not well-considered within existing governance. clearer & better responsibility and accountability at the regional and local levels is needed; • Private sector water companies not felt to be focussed on public well-being; the sector does not fully internalise the wider impact on urban land drainage, pollution etc; • Finance since there is no universal metering and very low costs makes political impetus hard to establish; • Outdated infrastructure – leaking pipelines, no separate grey water systems, limited storage. • Changes to infrastructure at small scale not taken into account • Costs and inflexible timescales associated with infrastructure investment and investment. 	
Enablers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better partnership at all levels, including greater co-ordination of water companies; • A more coordinated approach to water legislation and interpretation to ensure oversight roles are clearly defined and regulations appropriately implemented; • Investigate the potential for subsidies, or for other funding through, for example, Community Infrastructure Levy. This could fund SUDs schemes and be used to retrofit existing buildings; and • Publicise and encourage the wider uptake of meters. 	
8	Develop and encourage new crops and land management methods
Blockers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general resistance to new crops (not just GM) and understanding of the options; • Lack of stable market for new crops; • Lack of belief in climate change to plan for new crops; • Competing demands for land (flood, wildlife, development etc); • Local Authority lacks influence in rural economy/agriculture; • Public perception and opinion, and press coverage, particularly regarding energy and GM crops; and • Time lags necessary to apply new technology and techniques. 	
Enablers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge transfer, through awareness raising and demonstration schemes; • Better understanding of available crops and more applied research and development to inform appropriate farming and reduce perceived risks – combined with integration into agricultural teaching; • Increasing demand for local food would incentivise farmers, combined with examining other means of incentivising farming; and • Supra-national guidelines so that a serious approach can be taken. 	
9	Critically test the identified list of climate impacts – do they reflect strategic priorities of the region
Blockers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC. Adaptation issues need to fit with and/or inform regional priorities - <i>compare this with the view that we need to look at how different climate impacts affect strategic priorities.</i> 	
Enablers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional priorities & decision making should be scrutinising and challenged from a climate change perspective to ensure actions are climate adapted; • Requires coordination at a regional level, and cooperation to integrate climate change measures across the board; and • Embedding wider sustainable development in regional and local strategies. 	
10	Optimise use of our building stock, including retrofitting for climate adaptation
Blockers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many parties involved in the management and use of any given building. Lack of clear responsibility for this; • Conflicts in planning process, particularly where buildings are located in conservation areas or are listed/historic buildings • Lack of regulation - 'sticks' to push the issue - and no statutory powers especially for old buildings; • Regulations covering builders/contractors need enhancing – better policing required for building control and monitoring. • Lack of awareness of risk and understanding of what changes are likely; • Retro-fitting is resource intensive and there are questions about feasibility in some (eg listed) buildings. Focus has been on new build, and there are questions about skills in retro-fitting. • Lack of fiscal and other incentives (VAT etc); • Cost, in particular of renewable energy technologies and SUDs, comparing initial outlay with payback; 	

Enablers

- 'Needs to be a top down approach from government;
- Build political will, and wider understanding through 'hard hitting' advocacy;
- Wider education about the 'language of risk';
- Identify amenable employers and housing associations to develop pilots and examples (eg Kirklees case study);
- Clarify the risks you can address, and identify 'clever' solutions, demonstrating to people what works;
- Investigate financial mechanisms to support demonstration projects; and
- Work with insurance sector to acknowledge reduced risk through reduced premiums/excesses.

Overarching / widely applicable

- Common barriers across many different sectors and issues;
 - Rigid planning is a barrier, and integrating sustainable development into planning delivery in particular;
 - Lack of joined-up working between agencies, and a holistic view in delivery;
 - Greatly lacking engagement in the private sector; and
 - Failure to communicate and ensuring good information is widely available. Wider failure to ensure that adaptation principles are taught in schools.
-
- Community education and engendering a wider understanding of what adaptation is; and
 - Ensure proper risk assessment and management approaches are being undertaken? Since many of the hazards are known, what is the (potential) harm being assessed?