



2 MARSHAM STREET
LONDON SW1P 3EB
01-212 3434

My ref:

Your ref:

32586/165

21 March 1985

Dear Peter,

I am sorry that I was unable to write to you concerning the resource implications of our amendment to Clause 5 of Dr Clark's Bill before Committee stage on 6 March, but as you know, it was agreed in 'H' that morning that we should do all we could to ensure that all six clauses were dealt with in the one sitting.

Having achieved that objective, I can now tell you that it will be possible to achieve a situation in which the resource costs would be minimal. This could be done by relaxing the timetable in Clause 5 governing the preparation and review of the maps.

At present, the Clause carried forward the requirements of Section 43 for the maps to be prepared within two years of commencement and reviewed at future monthly periods thereafter.

However, our amendment carried on 6 March effectively prevents National Park Authorities from beginning work on their maps until the Countryside Commission has issued its guidelines, and the requirement for an annual review thereafter would lead to a virtually continual process of consultation. I do not believe that would be in anyone's interests.

It would therefore, in my view, be desirable to promote further amendments to the Bill at Report stage which would set the clock ticking for the two year period of initial preparation from the date when the Commission's guidelines are issued; and to provide for quinquennial reviews thereafter to mesh in with the statutory arrangements governing the review of National Park Plans as provided for in Schedule 17 to the Local Grant Act 1972.

On that basis the Parks estimate the likely additional costs at no more than £100 per Park per year, ie £10,000 pa in total. I hope you will agree that we could regard such a figure as de minimis and not requiring any adjustments to local authority PES.

I understand that the Countryside Commission, the National Park Officers and the Council for National Parks, who are the prime movers behind Clause 5, would also strongly support those proposed amendments. The CNP are briefing David Clark directly on this so I think we could persuade him of their desirability.

3 APR 1985





Treasury Chambers, Parliament Street, SW1P 3AG

Rt Hon Patrick Jenkin MP
 Secretary of State for the Environment
 Department of the Environment
 2 Marsham Street
 London
 SW1P 3EB

NBIM

2 April 1985

Patrick Jenkin

WILDLIFE AND COUNTRYSIDE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Thank you for your letter of 21 March on the resource implications of the National Park mapping proposals in Dr Clark's Bill. *attached*

Subject to the views of colleagues I am content with the amendments you propose for report stage.

The estimate of total extra costs for authorities of £10,000 per annum raises the general question of whether some new burdens are genuinely de minimis. I have written to you separately about this suggesting a de minimis limit of £100,000. Assuming my proposals in this respect are acceptable then the mapping proposals in Dr Clark's Bill and also those of the proposed new Landscape Areas Special Development Order in William Waldegrave's letter of 11 February would come into this category.

I am copying this letter to the Prime Minister, Members of E(LA), of (H) and to Sir Robert Armstrong.

Peter Rees

PETER REES

02 APR 1965

