

Property Rights, Economics and Environment: Coastal Zone
Strategic Management at the Coast: Stewardship and Partnership
Approaches

By Diane A Dumashie PhD BSc MRICS*

Abstract

It is argued that a truly integrative, dynamic and implementable approach to Coastal Zone Management (CZM*) necessitates partnership with the stewards of the land resource in the coastal estate. Development of this proposition links ideas on culture and the institution of land.

During the early 1990's it was perceived by the author that the process of CZM in the UK, albeit alive with discussion, was being stymied, and momentum toward implementation was slowing down to a near halt. Ten years ago, CZM was considered a management tool that recognising the environmental ethic would succeed in interpreting sustainable approaches into practical policy. Now it can be seen that this tool has and still needs to go through an evolutionary period as society attempts to achieve a balance. The suggestion is that a land resource management solution exists to facilitate a sustainable direction utilising land owners ongoing management approaches, termed Coastal Management.

This paper draws from research over the period 1992-7 that developed and formulated the principles and processes of a strategic management approach to integrating coastal zone management, and to propose a sustainable approach for the future (1). Such an approach is called strategic coastal area management (SCM). A framework is developed that draws together a series of measures that will focus local government effort. An element of this framework is the creation of alliances that encourages strategic management partnership, working with, and for the wider community. Using primary data, this paper explains the partnership efforts.

If CZM is to become more than a concept the current administrative basis needs to acknowledge and accommodate the peculiarities of the coastal area, take on-board people, as well as complimentary mechanisms. This is embodied in the land institution, which is capable of leading as well as delivering change.

Why this is so is explained first by considering the key concepts and their relationship to one another. Next the method of research and case study is briefly described. The coastal organisation provides the context and highlights general emerging patterns. The main discussion centres upon why CZM requires supporting strategies leading onto presenting an

overview of the results in partnerships. This highlights some surprising results and also demonstrates that the ultimate test of sustainable management is the level of actual implementation.

Drawing Concepts Together

Imagine tying together concepts, which span the ages of mankind from the resource of land through to early intellectual thinkers and finally modern day activities. First the geography of the coast that encompasses the concept of space in the **coastal estate**. Second that the concept of land resource management has a social as well as a practical perspective and is termed the **institution of land**. Finally embodying a modern day socio economic demand for coastal land is access for recreation, but in parallel to this demand, is the increasing recognition and positive action to protect land for habitat conservation. It is noticed that these land uses need not be antagonistic, thus these demands are conceptualised within **Leisure Land management**.

All three concepts combined into a process focussed on land resources that is people orientated and dynamic, and all interrelate:

Coastal estate

Foremost the Coastal estate provides a contextual vehicle to grasp the physical spatial area. Understanding this facilitates the assembly of the interrelationship of ideas concerning the physical, economic and organisation attributes found in coastal areas.

The overriding idea to grasp is the concept of activity within space, this is a dynamic thought because of the implications for the ways of living within the ethos of sustainability. One of the greatest difficulties for applied management in the Coastal Estate is identifying homogenous boundaries; recognition of a 'spatial' focus is required because culturally mankind manages in discreet parcels.

The study focus is over the coastal estate incorporating the physical space that identifies three spatial areas corresponding to specific property uses and here are defined with reference to the beach; foreshore and nearshore coastal waters not normally exceeding a depth of 10 metres.

The Institution of Land

Placed within the physical context of the Coastal estate the underlying thread of this thesis recognises that in communities the organisation of land tenure is one of the major determinants of decision making; more particularly choosing what *use* to put the land to. Although the perception is of a static land based system, the fact is that these systems are

subject to changes measured over inter- generational time spans. This is important for coastal estate management.

Changes in the relationship between humankind and land always influences the dynamics in societies and tend to be radical and profound. Such influences (e.g. from feudalism) determine the ways societies interact with land, but there are two basic ideas that are fundamental to dynamic changes, these are Culture and Economics. Property and society evolve together dynamically over time to create a "social institution of property (2) ultimately determining the conditions of industrial, social and political life' (3).

The UK, as an example of the underlying cause of the impact of land rights on society, is today associated with contractual tenures. So the UK institution of land combines economics and culture through the relationship with tenure; or how communities allocate land rights. The duration and rights being enshrined in the doctrine of estates and tenure. Although the Crown technically owns all land (incl. terra firma). Freehold (doctrine of estates) is the highest form of land tenure under the Crown, and is held in perpetuity, with rights to use land as the owner wishes, subject to statute and the inalienable rights of others. Contractual titles, created by the freeholder to lesser interests (doctrine of tenure) benefit from land space if a contract exists known as an 'interest'. Finally alienation is the right of disposal of an interest. This is exclusive in the case of freeholders, but leaseholders may be contractually bound not to sell. Thus "The possession of property rights constitutes the most powerful mechanism, other than military conquest" (4) for resource allocation, but property rights imply law since there has to be an enforcement mechanism.

So land economics is a principal determinant of society's structure and usually considers Private property as a 'social convention [like laws] and thus an artefact. It is a device which fits the social needs of the moment (5). Property ownership represents possession and transferability based upon individual ownership and interests in land. Importantly value is determined by the 'culture of societies' perceptions (6). The importance of culture must not be underestimated since this is the vehicle which redirects economics towards a new direction. Economics is concerned with the problem of survival and resources. It is this rather than culture that provides the forward momentum. But culture instead combines and relates humans with the natural environment thus providing the beacon toward the sustainability goal.

On the one hand, culture shapes what people see, giving them a certain perception of resources and environmental priorities, leading in turn to different appraisals of what constitutes a natural resource in different cultures (7) but Cultures are also subject to change.

On the other hand, economic theory borders on geography, technology, sociology and politics. It is a social science since it has to do with the actions of people, who do not behave in a scientifically predictable way. Economics usefully explains the nature of scarcity of resources and competition for use, directly applicable in many areas of estate management. Such a resource is the limited availability of land. The consequence is that land and property rights become fundamentally important, for these rights provide access to resources.

Indeed the very process of land administration and management includes the determination of right and use of the land. Consequently land management, as a branch of economics, is better described as specialising in:

"social organisation and utilisation of land resources in the attainment of community objectives or, simply, that concerns itself with the efficient management of our land resources." (8)

Thus Estate management decision- making is needed, which in turn ensures that the most suitable *use* is allocated to land, having regard to its physical character, environment, legal and economic features.

Leisure Land

The consequential effect of providing recreational access as a land management function in the coastal estate is an idea defined in Leisure Land. This perceives land management activity as that which combines conservation and recreation land uses as opposed to the commonly held view that these uses are antagonistic.

Leisure land is the economic land use activity by which the thesis may be developed to progress thinking about integrating CZM. Foremost, linking back to the institution of land, the coastal area is not defined in British common law, unlike, for example in the USA State law (Coastal Zone Act 1972), neither is it exclusively a public owned area. This has implications for the need to focus efforts in creating partnerships because public and private ownership is likely to persist over the coastal estate. Consequently recreation pressures exist over land below LWM and above LWM. Thus importantly the 'wet side' is common property, and the 'dry side' is often private property. Thus this activity truly crosses the land and sea divide, termed in this study as the coastal estate.

Methodology

The study developed a method for analysis based on strategic management theory. The methodological tasks arising include:

- Selecting the case study areas,
- Devising a management classification system and identifying the subjects chosen,
- Collecting data by designing appropriate questionnaire structure, and
- Analysis of data in the light of concepts applied.

The Case study area was selected largely by looking at the spread of stated CZM local government strategies across England and Wales. A local authority CZM plan survey (1995) found that few embodied the entire CZM process. This information was overlaid with the coincidence of areas with high demand for coastal recreational access. The resulting case study areas are in Counties of Wales (Dyfed and West Glamorgan) and England (West Hampshire and Dorset).

Human endeavour continually strives to organise, by noting how the coastal estate is organised and by whom created a classification of two main protagonists, the landowners and government (termed regulators) from which management styles can be drawn.

Selection of the landowners in the case study areas focused on those with a coastal location easily identifiable, which for practical purposes excluded private estates with less than 1200 acres. The landowning group was then subdivided into three estate management categories relating to their dominant land needs and purpose: rural agricultural estates (PE), charities, (C) and marine based (M). Selection of the regulators divided between central government and local authority government, the latter was determined by the administrative boundaries falling within the geographical case study areas.

To meet the research objectives primary data was collected from semi- structured interviews. This represented the first attempt at identifying the relationship between landowners and regulators in the context of CZM.

By far the overriding objective of the interview questionnaire was to identify coastal management practices. It was designed to 'capture' information based on business strategy theory, which could be analysed. This paper focuses on the results relating to partnerships.

Coastal organisation

This paper is concerned with the coastal land resource and in the wider sense the institution of land. This starts with developing an understanding of how the coastal estate is managed.

This is structured to the strategic format 'who' manages and the patterns that were discernible from the primary data.

The organisational framework is first illustrated by way of the local authority approach to management through regulation. Next the landowners estate management philosophy, and how they facilitate successful coastal management implementation.

Regulating the Coastal Estate

Coastal zone management as an environmental tool for managing the coastal resource is part of the managers repertoire and becoming more widely known, reflecting the 'greenism' of social perception.

It is within local government planning departments that the gauntlet of CZM has largely been taken up, in spite of CZM non- statutory status. Regulation and allocation of land is a strong feature of the British institution of land. Land use planning is responsible for meeting social objectives, and is linked to the culture of society. Noteworthy is that land ownership controls access but it is land use policy that influences the degree and intensity of use thereby local government can intervene in the land market.

Discernible patterns can be identified in the regulators' management of leisure land, but it is the land use planning framework that by far has the greatest influence. The relevant legislation to the coasts is found in a range of statutes combining land use and complimentary countryside management tools (9). Urban areas are controlled largely through tight building development regulations, having developed on a site specific zone basis. In rural areas, with a protectionist flavour to the land resource development is controlled by reference to special designated areas, and control is bolstered by 'countryside' legislation, focusing on conservation. In addition specific command tools relating to leisure land are also available, such as byelaws and special protection areas.

Combined these tools are not enough in the dynamic decision making environment created by many and varied interest groups. Foremost, there are inherent restrictions if reliance is placed on this single planning system led approach. The need for an alternative approach either in part or in whole became clear in the research, and that there will always be a mismatch between strategy formulation and the ability to implement through the planning system. As a result the CZM process is inextricably bound to the past, and further evolution is being constrained for three key reasons.

1. The planning system is a command control process rather than a truly management one. What is truly required is activity management, which is only partly met by applying byelaws.
2. The coastal area is linear, crossing the urban and rural hinterlands, but the planning system has a bias towards urban development control and is inappropriate.
3. In spite of Government consultation, the planning framework will continue to be constrained within the spatial area above LWM. This does not help the need for activity management that considers as one the space over all coastal lands.

Notwithstanding these restrictions, the planning process is a tried and tested process with clearly definable stages that work. It is subject to continual refinement with Statutes allow for prescriptive guidelines. It is a politicised process and the criteria for judgement are 'material', favourably influencing change over the status quo.

Unfortunately the sole application of this framework to the coast fails to address effectively a strategic area management approach (SCM). However, it should not exclusively be a conservation tool, but one which seeks to balance the needs of different aspects of society, all of which have a legitimate interest. In actuality the regulators must strike a balance, and consider more fully a strategic approach, in which the landowners can play a useful part.

So land is a resource base, which with the need to create a sustainable future, must be considered. This not only introduces a spatial concept to integrating CZM but also the idea of stewardship. The objective is to gain a balance; or in current terms a sustainable future with the emerging regulatory process of CZM. It is compatibility that which is being sought for now by endeavouring to guide CZM programmes towards an integrative strategic alliance.

Managing the Coastal Estate

A fundamental point in CZM is sustainability, achieved through trade offs which needs to be managed proactively by all stakeholders, who in turn must have equal opportunities. Environmental objections to be credible should distinguish between preservation defined as 'long term maintenance', usually without the presence of humans; and conservation which is 'wise management' (10). The latter is stewardship and surely is laudable?

The landowners approach is termed Coastal management (CM) and has an underlying landowning stewardship philosophy and generates continuity. It is the existence of this that lends itself to sustainable coastal land management practices. This is because tied up with land resource management is the emergence of specific actions: stewardship and ownership

in the coastal estate. These contribute to decisions made on land use, and it is observed as well as being at the root of the creation of partnerships to instigate leisure land.

Stewardship requires not only philosophical behavioural patterns but also business patterns; requiring actions to be continually quantified, monitored, and accommodated. Stewardship is a way of thinking laterally and practically embodying strategic management principles. It is the objective of practical estate management, which encompasses foremost the need for profit both for economic returns but also altruism. Combined this creates a propensity towards freehold ownership in this narrow coastal area.

As an example, the Crown Estate Commissioners encapsulates stewardship in their estate planning conservation policy:

"the role of the landowner providing certainty of tenure and ensuring that long term liabilities are not created for future generations by the activities of the present, in ensuring that the Estate itself continues in good heart and produces a proper revenue from its capital assets will continue to be important." (11).

There are several patterns found in the primary data relating to stewardship. Highlighting that land management is holistic, combining people management and resource management which becomes important in leisure land approaches. The arising patterns are grouped into three themes:

Return- Managers seek to achieve the optimum return from landed property, utilising skills concerned with the " prudent management of household affairs" (12), looking both inwards at the micro level, to the estate and property holdings, but also outwards at the macro level, to the economy at large.

Resources- Resource stewardship is an approach that characteristically is holistic in decision making, usefully diverting resources, mindful of capacity and where continuity and commitment is a major influence. Consequently, concern is for both the immediate day to day operations as well as looking to investing to reap rewards for a later generation. Diversity of use on estates and business provides enough resources to be able to be more philanthropic towards the environment to fund conservation.

Relationships- Clearly identifiable within the estates groups there is a strong culture and leadership ethic. In the family context this is necessary to ensure longevity and continuity,

reinforced by their perceptions that under obligations they are to continue the 'landed way'. This is extended into the business 'family' where close relationship exists between estate managers and owners.

Overwhelmingly it became clear in this research that land managers positively contributed to coastal management through initiating and stewarding land management practices allied to recreation and conservation. But the overriding management tool identified is the role of landowning be it ownership or occupation of land. A recent EU study identifies ownership as good management practice; highlighting the National Trust approach and the French successor, Conservatoire de l'Espace Littoral et des Rivages Lacustres (13).

Interestingly, the research also identified that an alternative to regulation for local authority managers may be land ownership. Notable examples and patterns of acquisition strategies occurred in support of coastal management initiative (14). Although acquisition by local authority government is in reality a last resort. To minimise capital outlay, foreshore ownership is considered a tool of access management. Local councils understand the importance of ransom strips, and need to control coastal access in order to undertake objectives such as conservation, and to effect control through ownership rather than rely upon planning policy.

The central theme of landowners is their ability to weigh objectives, termed in this study, stewardship. An important key is freehold ownership, which is tied within the stewardship framework. Furthermore, it enables decision making, good husbandry, finance, matched with administration structures, often generating an estate management pattern allocating use on a utility basis closely aligned with activity demands. The landowners' steward community must not be alienated, as they are the likely providers through best practice estate management. Policy and dialogue is important for strategic thinking but implementation needs resource commitment, such as provided by the private estates/landowners.

In summary, the question that truly has to be asked is: has government failed to meet the requirements of implementation, such as resource provision? As well as the tenure basis that this may demand? Local government still maintains 'blinkers' regarding inclusion of other supporting strategies. The salient themes discovered from the management groups landowners and regulators suggest that management of the coastal estate should be based on a combination of policy and practical land management experience. The reasons why they should consider supporting strategies found in the institution of land is discussed next.

Leisure Land strategy patterns

Turning now to an exploration of Leisure landowning management which can and does contribute to strategic CZM, the investigative thought is how within leisure land, use is distributed and contributes to the equilibrium of the coastal estate.

The research found that there is a stronger emphasis and demonstrable leisure land management in the landowners' group. Why this approach could be considered and combined with the regulator approaches is explained.

The assumption is developed in the research, that landowners successfully manage leisure land. It was seen that two principal use drivers are recreation and conservation where the estate management activity of each may be combined within one landholding. Recreation is economically driven, and conservation is driven by cultural and environmental considerations. Leisure land conceptually enables recreation and conservation to co-exist in an agreed balance. It is important to recognise that 'balance' need not necessarily represent an equal weighting, but that a fair allocation of resources may be intensification of one use over another. It is stewardship that is the means of obtaining decisions in the social framework of the 'institution of land'.

To promote this thought the discussion here explores the 'wise management' elements found in the landowners data set to test the claim for stewards of the coastal estate. It was found that there is reliance on three components identified as being essential. Each is described below.

1. Guardianship
2. Land use and space management
3. Activity control

1. Guardianship

Guardianship of the water and land resource may contribute to implementation, a fact beginning to be recognised worldwide in areas where 'nature and society' relationships are particularly fragile, such as coastal mangroves (15). Demonstrable throughout all management groups, the best guarantee for 'guardianship' or protection is the benefit from FH ownership. So strong is this ethic that alienation becomes a powerful tool.

It is important to recognise that ownership achieves control. As a management tool it was found that above all else it facilitates estate decision-making. That National government recognises the importance for strategic CZM to have "protective ownership of coastal land",

as a tool (16) is important. The role of ownership in nature conservation is fundamental, but without government acquisition funds, the next best thing is to create partnerships with landowners to 'extend the public purse'.

Thus the government countryside agencies' efforts, past and present, must not be underestimated having taken years to establish landowner partnerships. So the importance of land ownership may be justifiable when considering sustainability within leisure land; landowners' stewardship is based upon it, but surprisingly so is government, notably protective ownership, be it large tracts of land, or an urban coastal strip.

Furthermore, landowners need to manage their estate's thus the management of lesser titles involves the need to manage people; thus partnerships, dialogues and relationship-building is a fundamental aspect. Lesser interests also have a role to play particularly in the marine area where the Crown's freehold domination is likely to persist, so the right to make and take decisions may be delegated through tenure.

Ownership then, provides a framework to accommodate often oscillating land use priorities, over varying timeframes which is also dependent upon cultural as well as financial influences. In this case, the two previously considered antagonistic objectives of recreation and conservation it is seen combined into a joint strategic objective within the landowners data set as leisure land. Given the tendency for leisure land to predominate in rural locations the management function is as much about preserving the economic driver of tourism as about conserving species and habitat. Often the leisure strategy is very clearly to preserve the natural environment, while providing sufficient income, thus providing 'eco-tourism'. Leisure land benefits because financial measures are in place for the benefit of the business, where recreation and tourism have shared goals with conservation.

It may be that in the landowners' sector the guiding principle is assumed to be that of profit maximisation, and that this criterion in the public sector is less relevant, but it is revealed that this is not necessarily so. Many of the sub-landowning groups provide community benefits over and above their obligatory regulations, such as the ports, private estates and marinas. Granted charities provide conservation and social benefits but even this is on a pay- as-you-go basis. This highlights the point that conservation has a cost. Conservation must be assessed in terms of returns in line with other land uses, although this may not necessarily be monetary.

Like the charities, estate landowners are crafting stewardship into a leisure-related operation, mimicking in many ways the charities' public relations/ sales approach. The point is that operational organisational evolution involves new approaches for the same ends. So the

charity business grew to the extent that marketing and public relations strategies are necessary in order to continue the business conservation objective. The National Trust continually adjusts land management practices, acquisitive policies and its lines of communication to meet those ends.

Therefore, part of the landowning evolution process is accounting for the external situational environment whereby they initiate dynamic change by operationally diversifying, as shown in the data management approaches.

2.Land use and space management

Fundamentally it was seen that the landowning ethic established pattern is the translation of strategic thought to implementation by decisions made that rely upon a combination of use, income, and alienation. Notwithstanding business objectives, the crucial element in stewardship relies upon the ability to make decisions. By having the ability to justify present capital expenditure. The strategy process requires prioritising over the long term the use of business resources: finance, people and land noting that there is no quick fix solution.

Use is closely allied to financial return, so in order to achieve objectives, this return may be as a result of the use itself or associated uses. The point is to 'pay for itself'. Further, use is also linked to control. Local Authorities marry finance and control to advantage. The Local authority data set showed a propensity to owning coastal areas, often as little as the foreshore, this minimises scarce financial expenditure but controls access to and from the sea. In the UK this is not common but it is seen on a wide scale in countries as Australia where the coastal margin is designated in state public ownership (17). Finance always underpins the activity, which in turn is crucial to motivate action, but the power of ownership is crucial to use.

The change in global institutions and subsequent demand for land for tourism activity has resulted in initiatives in coastal management, incorporating conservation objectives. Landscape management tools provide a framework in which to manage 'space', and it is this that becomes a linking mechanism within landowner diversification practices. Duties of recreation and amenity are statutorily provided for across the managers groups, essentially juxtaposing recreation and conservation through landscape designations and the network of management agreements administered by countryside agencies. Rather narrowly, the local authorities approach is driven by conservation, characterised by landscape and species protection. Stewardship of the land involves landscape maintenance, ownership of, and diversification strategies over it.

3. Activity management

Management of the Coastal estate requires an understanding that the rights in land resources and occupation of that resource are indistinguishable but are nevertheless complimentary. The very strength of landowning is that landowners recognise that activity management is a part and parcel of land use management. The critical feature that is beginning to be understood in CZM circles is that the coastal environment should be perceived as activity management. Local authorities are realising this, albeit they are at an embryonic stage, but are re- focussing on the issue to manage the activities on water as much as those on land.

Turning to the marine environment, activity management predominates. Because of this emphasis the real challenge and thus opportunity remains in the area below LWM. With few opportunities in the marine estate (i.e. below LWM in the UK) for alternative ownership it is here that the lesser titles have to be relied upon. Fortunately, this tenure position is considered satisfactory. Thus ownership of the seabed land is less important, but control of the 'bundle of rights' that exists in the form of activities is important.

Successful examples exist already in the port landowners data set, where the port plans focus equally on land and sea activity management. This reliance on activity management is likely to be the reason why management plans have developed from the marine group, their ability being to conduct management of the water as a spatial entity. Marine operators requiring decision-making powers over the water column relate to “access” control and regulation, which is really activity management. Thus property rights in marine space are adjusted to one of behaviour rather than a strict tenure framework.

In summary, as a result of understanding the structure and organisation of the coastal estate a new direction is proposed which provides a foundation upon which to achieve a balancing position between leisure business needs and that of the environment. Instead of independent approaches it is suggested that partnerships are required with landowners. In deed this may have already emerged and the three broad areas described above are found in other guises and are discussed next.

Public- Private Partnerships

The suggestion is that management of the coastal areas should be based on a combination of policy and practical land management experience. Foremost is the connection between society and land that implies the beneficial inclusion of landowners as a group in resource

management in order to move towards strategic performance. Any process requiring a socio-economic input, such as sustainability needs to take heed of the form of the land ownership pattern. In addition this pattern accounts for public property rights (which are also a cultural feature of society), bearing in mind that these will markedly differ in predominance over the coastal area, particularly below LWM where complications occur in the water column.

Management strategies require co-operation usually based on partnerships, formal or otherwise. Drawing from the patterns identified in the above sections indicates that a basis of a working partnership approach may exist. There are two distinguishable approaches discussed by the research.

Firstly the suggestion that the CZM process in the UK is discernible and predominates in 'wilderness' areas, that is the foreshore is considered a rural environment, with either urban or rural hinterlands. This draws in countryside management with attendant pre conceptions, but this is key in leisure land. Secondly, identifiable joint strategies between land owners and government encompassing the range of tenure rights in the coastal estate were discovered.

1. Countryside strategies

Given that CZM regulation are based on two Statute books, planning and countryside, but that the observation is leisure land management is largely a rural issue, with a countryside hinterland bias. Land in the countryside has been recognised as strategically important; Countryside agencies have ensured the development of landowning liaison procedures, based on both statutory and voluntary methods. This is a good thing.

This finding has important ramifications for CZM implementation:

Foremost, the strength of owners stewarding the land resource is recognised in countryside management by both landowners and regulators at all levels. Stewardship can be identified as being part of central government strategy, by funding the countryside agencies, where there exists a mix of FH purchase and partnership arrangements with landowners focussing on conservation objectives.

Next this not only meets nature conservation objectives but by creating partnerships with landowners effectively extends the public purse. The countryside agencies' efforts have taken years to successfully establish rapport, and they continue to work hard at maintaining this relationship acknowledging the importance of the landowner. This recognition of estate

management as a key activity is fulfilled in partnership management agreements thus releasing resources for management rather than purchase.

Bearing in mind that the landowning conservation activities identified were not always unassisted. Regulatory countryside management involves actively cultivating partnerships with landowners both in landscape designations and nature conservation. Promoting partnership and co-operating through grant-in-aid over a wide range of initiatives. This is combined with liaison initiatives to educate landowners in the conservation value of their sites and to provide an avenue for landowners to obtain specific ecological expertise that can be applied to the estate stewardship function.

Consequently, the role of landowners in conserving rural environments is paramount. Conservation in rural Britain relies upon utilising management agreements within countryside and nature designated areas. National government strategy emphasises the voluntary approach to conservation, and that this is the best means of reaching a wider approach to environmental protection. Countryside agency relationships include partnerships with amenity groups, private landowners, agency and national or local authorities

Thus the voluntary philosophy encapsulated within agreements for conservation and public enjoyment is focused upon by central government policy makers. But it must be emphasised that at the time of the study CZM in the UK has no formal statutory backing, thus policy is largely incorporated into supporting non- statutory documents in the land use process in order to create an opportunity to develop coastal management plans. It is typical across the UK to find coastal CZM and coastal AONB's* becoming one of the same.

There is a high proportion of private owned land in landscape conservation areas (NPA and AONB's, HC's*). Indeed it is the non-statutory HC scheme that is hailed worldwide as the flagship approach to coastal management (18). Consistently, the National Trust landowning coastal portfolio supports the Heritage Coast designation with 40 per cent of the Trust's land overlapping these. Thus demonstrating that protective ownership is not mutually exclusive from other protective measures, and that when the two combine there is a stronger emphasis on securing long term conservation and public benefit.

Notwithstanding the prevalence of these agreements, the rights to compulsory purchase by local authorities still remains a theoretical option.

Finally, then there exists a bundle of rights built within the framework created by the institution of land. There is then an inherent tendency towards a partnership approach,

prevalent particularly in countryside management. This framework in turn encourages liaison by the landowners in exercising their own business objectives.

Landowners lease coastal recreational land, often to local authority tenants, creating a partnership arrangement whereby the tenant takes on responsibilities for visitor management, for example, foreshore leases establishing popular recreational beaches. Benefits also accrue when landowners lease to conservation managers (who may be landowners elsewhere). These relationships actively work together to achieve shared objectives. Also estates may let tenancies that are commonly leased to farmers with covenants that ensure a balance between conservation and economic agriculture practices. This also applies to ensuring that building standards are in keeping with the estate.

It is these countryside partnerships that perhaps demonstrate the greatest success stories in both conservation balance and leisure activity in coastal areas. This begs the question as to whether CM planning in the UK is considered wholly as a countryside affair in the undeveloped stretches; and in the urban areas, as a parks and rejuvenation issue. But the study also found that landowners' coastal strategy has combined into a definable programme with local authorities in several instances. These represent notable examples of joint strategies and are briefly looked at next to ascertain what they can and do contribute to the process.

2. Joint Strategies

Local Authorities are very good at framework development or put another way, strategic planning but the plan is part of the process and does not represent a *fait accompli* to CZM. There is a need for these plans to sit alongside other CM strategy plans to be implementable.

In two specific cases joint strategic approaches have emerged, both of which are driven by the need to balance conservation and recreation within leisure land. The one with regulation being uppermost, the Poole Harbour Aquatic Plan; and the other with visitor management, the Fleet Management Plan.

These outputs provide the strengths of regulatory formulation, and landowning thinking combined with resource implementation.

First, the Poole Harbour Aquatic Plan (PHAMP) strategic aim is to manage activity on the water. This was achieved organisationally via a partnership approach between local government regulators and port and Crown landowners. In common with many joint

strategies the plan forms part of the respective managers' implementation strategies. Thus the port identifies it as part of an integrated approach to CZM.

Notably, this plan evolved from a group formed to assist development control. Building on this the group evolved into a steering group populated by all representatives and by capitalising on the relationships built. Strategic thinking and planning culminated in commissioning the Aquatic Management Plan in 1994, and is overseen by the steering group. This plan was based on two sister documents: a Harbour Survey, attempting to address and re-establish base line data to properly formulate a strategy; the second the crucial implementation management plan (15).

The solution to effective implementation is based on a two- fold approach of byelaws and planning. The Council desired to control the coastal margins through land use and ownership, but recognised the lack of control over water space. Combining the Commissioner's speed byelaws with the respective jurisdictional planning powers over land facilitated implementation. The power in decision making was identified early on as spread among several parties within the steering group.

The partnership represents a strategic approach to coastal management. The PHAMP strategy is clear, concise and highlights the issues, with a philosophy to maintain business and nature ensuring each moves hand in hand. Noteworthy is the compatibility of land use plans and port plans each covering different spatial areas. While the plan was formulated largely by local government leaders, it is the port land occupier-the Harbour Commissioners' responsibility to take the aquatic plan forward.

Second, the Ferry Bridge Management Plan. This plan is a partnership between Portland and Weymouth Borough Council and private Ilchester Estate with limited support from the Crown Estate and Court Leet. It is an initiative which relies on a strategic approach rather than a joint steering group, but each manager's strategic objectives coincide and continue independently but not exclusively.

The Plan is based on a specific site, and driven by the principle of managing activities to ensure the survival of the environment thus seeking to achieve a balance between visitor control and conservation. The local authority had an overriding need to better manage the car park serving the area, which is subject to common land access rights, combined with the landowner's needs of visitor management over the private foreshore. The aim is to provide a plan of action and a policy framework. The strategy evolved from the original intentions which were amalgamated with new proposals, largely based on who could finance works.

This strategy is aimed at hands on programme development and action, viewed as a management document rather than a control document. Thus programme development was set out in the format of a working document style with background, interests, and identifiable needs of the area, proposals for each spatial area, and crucially a means of implementation.

Identification of implementation resources is also seen whereby the warden, funded by the landowner, continues implementation. This is largely achieved by maintaining the Fleet management committee, chaired by the estate members including regular users of the Fleet and English Nature (a government agency).

These two examples demonstrate that the availability of resources is a weakness of governance if it chooses to pursue CZM without other managerial assistance. The landowners are proponents of the action- orientated stewardship approach, putting to good use, strategy elements identified in stewardship. These elements include the degree of leadership, common to both, but also the discipline of landowners to allocate resources, specifically finance. With hard-pressed resources regardless of the organisation, sharing them has to point toward a way forward for the process.

In reality it is discovered that leisure land is managed as a duality: the government centrally through countryside agencies and locally through authority departments, the landowners as part of stewardship. There appears to be an opportunity through landowning to integrate objectives to provide comprehensive CZM, or strategic coastal area management (SCM). The importance of the land resource for coastal management is justified when the data sources are considered; landowners' stewardship forms the basic approach to CM, but surprisingly so does governance, notably protective ownership.

Observations

CZM in the UK has reached a stage of 'thought and action' but lacks a strategic framework to continue progressing to implementation. By and large the process remains locked in the sectoral land planning system. This sectoral system has deficiencies in its capabilities to deliver; but could be bolstered by considering supporting landowner strategies given the UK complimentary 'institution of land'. Looking toward future considerations, the likelihood that CZM will remain as a vehicle in the UK remains uncertain.

This paper has sought to outline one aspect of a framework that proposes to channel strategic thinking into areas where effort is needed from the regulators. Perceptions over the issues are varied but an opportunity is presented by understanding the coastal estate.

The need for the regulators to establish partnerships with landowners is an imperative. The regulatory approach is based on determination of strategy primarily using statutory planning tools and supporting plans. This amounts to a pictorial representation of strategy providing a 'voice' and a means to communicate. However, it is not truly strategic because to date implementation has not largely followed. CZM management requires more than a framework that is based in the implementing Acts associated with planning. Although the planning mechanisms provide a good base for framework development, it is unable to provide the essential flexibility. The requirement becomes not how to get more regulation but how to rationalise and control what already exists and facilitate people and groups to talk and communicate together.

The role of land is highlighted and relates to ownership, which may either be public or private, but nonetheless owned by someone or an entity. Local authorities need to consider utilising this in order to facilitate their own objectives.

Why this is so was discussed and an analysis of an alternative approach based in land resource management particularly implementing objectives in coastal leisure land management. This comprises key issues based in culture, stewardship management and the provision of tenure, through ownership. In a holistic embracing management approach, strategy is played out by crucially controlling elements and resources. A pre-requisite for implementing success is to recognise that activity and/ or space management in the context of the social land structuring is needed. Thus has governance missed the strategic element of land and its ownership?

By establishing the benefits of landowner's successful approaches in strategy, the research enquiry led conclusively to the landowners ability to steward land-use towards conservation, but the key is freehold ownership and the attributes provided within stewardship. This is not to suggest that landowners as a management group are without fault. Indeed some of their practices may have been detrimental, both to society and the good of the land. But what is suggested is that the present day landowner philosophy actually assists many CM leisure land objectives, and this should be taken on board to progress forward the present CZM process.

The comparative case study analysis between CM and CZM identifies the complementary relationship between both management groups. Relationships have been dictated to a degree

by the evolution of society through governance and landownership. In the UK this is based upon the doctrine of Estates and allocation of tenure rights. At times this has been antagonistic. Environment and its resources have always been disputed. This competition for natural resources must not degenerate into a struggle between regulators and landowners, as each attempt to gain the advantage, bearing in mind the property rights that do exist are based on precedent. Relating this to the coast, conflict arises because much of the marine resource is subject to common rights, immediately adjacent to private rights on the land.

Is there not a possibility of bridging the management approaches in order to successfully achieve sustainable coastal management? By aligning with landowner partners to encourage a proactive and inclusive approach progress is likely to happen. Each managerial group brings to the framework different perspectives, tools and action mechanisms. The nature of one is to govern; the other is to realise actions. Landowners initiatives have the benefit of generations of land management experience, governance is only in the early stages of thinking and developing a means to integrate and manage the coasts.

Further reasons not to alienate the land business community from this process, is that they are most likely to be the financial and infrastructure providers. The current cultural management philosophy found in institutional land relies upon three parallel strategic elements: returns, resource and relationships. This however is not a total approach and crucially these three elements need to be balanced with regulatory command and control practices of local authority governance. Highlighting a truly partnership approach.

The need is to build co- operative relationships with the coastal managers to achieve and further balance decision- making within the coastal area. Yet the early attempts to develop CZM largely did not consider landownership.

This leads to the final question ‘what is next?’. Strategy is a demanding process; a plan of action is required. Such a plan would focus upon the inter- relationship of management systems. Overwhelmingly, but in a strategy context not surprisingly, the function of leadership with more thought could create action. This in turn demands a political will.

Strategy needs to continue through increased communication with landowners aided by recognising their cultural identities. Communication channels, including education must be opened. Notwithstanding that communication is a two- way process, landowners must also find ways to make their voice heard; the system, in turn must be organised to make it more receptive to such approaches.

Conclusion

The dynamism of the coastal estate means the land-use planning system has to be supplemented by an active management approach since planning the coast is a strategic issue. Supplementation is likely to come from the landowning community, who recognise completely the spatial elements whose corporate strategies often embody activity management. The opportunity is that the process should be encouraging joint action.

The research is capable of refining theory and suggesting complexities for further investigation, as well as helping to establish the limits of generalisations. It highlighted the need for a more detailed study in the areas of leadership, communication, boundaries and rural/ urban hinterlands. An opportunity for further research is also provided in the context of defining the coastal area in the urban coastal setting of property development above HWM. This would address any potential limitation in the study that is based on a relatively narrow use within leisure land.

These concluding remarks illustrate that a relationship between landowner and regulator can achieve a balance in development and conservation, by embracing functional management of land in the context of strategic coastal management. The study identifies the importance of land ownership and the desirability for landowners co-operation. Indeed it is this which is instrumental to a strategic solution to balancing the needs of all groups. Thus it provides a link between the conceptual process and a pragmatic approach to achieve implementation.

Sustainability is wider than land use planning, deeper than current financial reward and more than simply protecting the environment. It is concerned with man's context of world space and what exists in that space. CZM is unlikely to address this without the support of a mechanism buried in man's philosophy, that is the institution of land.

Footnotes and References

1. D.Dumashie PhD UWCC 2001: Strategic Management at the Coast: Landowners, Local Authorities and Coastal Zone Management.
2. Ratcliff RU 1972 Urban Land Economics, Westport, Connecticut, Greenwood Press.
3. Henry George quoted in Thorncroft.M. 1965 (Progress & Poverty, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Timber &Co Ltd 1926

4. Miles. CWN et al 1995 Aspects of rural Estates, Estates Gazette, London 333.
5. Ditten RB, Seymour JL, Swanson GC 1977. Coastal Resources Management: beyond Bureaucracy and the Market, Massachusetts DC Heath Lexington.
6. Schafer. DP.1984
7. Broek. JOM and Webb.JW. 1973 A Geography of Mankind 2nd Ed, London McGraw Hill Book Co.
8. Christienasen.WKS.1991 Mahoney's Urban Land Economics 3RD Ed. Wellington new Zealand Institute of Valuers.
9. Key legislation includes: The Town and Countryside planning Acts, The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Wildlife and Countryside (Amendment) Act 1985.
10. IUCN 1993 Cross Sectoral, Integrated Coastal Area Planning: Guidelines and Principles for Coastal Area Development, Gland Switzerland.
11. Parish. F 1996 RICS Conference: The Development and Management of the Coastal and Marine Estate in the UK and Europe London November 1996.
12. Christiansen WKS. 1991 Op.cit 8.
13. EUCC 1997 (Draft) The European Social Code prepared by K Rigg.
14. For example Hampshire County Council
15. Intercoast network 1.3.97
16. DOE 1996 Coastal Zone Management- A Guide to Best practice Prepared by Nicholas Pearson Associates.
17. Bird. E.C.F 1985 Coastline Changes a Global review Chichester.
18. tbc
19. Poole Harbour Aquatic Plan issued 1994/5