



Meeting Title:	Local Nature Partnership LNRS Special Session
Date:	23 July 2024
Time:	13:00 to 16:00
Location:	Chacewater Village Hall and MS Teams
Present:	Robin Teverson (Chair), Matt Walpole (MW) – Deputy Chair, Cllr Martyn Alvey (MA), Clare Parnell (CP), Rebecca Lovell (RL), Nick Lawrence (NL), Rebecca Williams (RW) online, Julian Branscombe (JB) online, Cllr Harry Legg (HL) online, Ilya Maclean (IM), Andrea Ayres (AA) online, Simon Jeffrey (SJ) for Mark Rice, Jenny Christie (JC), Emma Browning (EB)
Guests:	David Baker (DB), Marcus Rhodes (MR) from the UofE
In attendance:	Mark Holmes (MHol), Philippa Hoskin (PH), Dougie Handford (DH), Lorna Gaunt (LG) – note taker
Apologies	Vicky Fraser (VF) – CEO, Martin Howlett (MHow), Sian Rees (SR), Phil Mason (PM)

1	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Icebreaker Members were asked to come up with three words that summarised what they wanted from the LNRS:</p> <p>Opportunity, collaboration, resources, clarity on purpose, ambition, action plan, collaborate, achievable, ground breaking, opportunities everywhere, food and business, clarity, comprehension, robustness, opportunity, delivery, useful, declines reversed, aspirational, transportive, dynamic, ambitious, action, resources, clear, collaborative, focussed, delivery, action, success, recovery, inclusive, clear, urgency, climate resilient catchment, easy to understand, positive, deliverable, integrative, collaborative, ecologically feasible and plausible, ambitious, comprehensive, aspirational, transformative, dynamic, resources, ambition, action, resources, clear, appropriate, well resourced, urgent, ambitious, aspirational.</p> <p>Additionally RT would like to see the proposed chapter headings of the ‘working’ document which will be produced as part of the LNRS. ACTION: DH/BR to share chapter headings with RT</p>
2	<p>Mapping scenarios</p> <p>PH gave a summary of the morning’s Mapping Scenarios workshop for steering group attendees who are unable to attend the session.</p> <p>The morning workshop was well attended with about 40 diverse stakeholders. They were presented with the first draft of the opportunities map highlighting where there were discretionary options.</p>

	<p>IM outlined the rationale for the approach taken. Consultation took place with various stakeholders, species group specialists and local and national conservation organisations. After the consultation phase there was an evidence gathering stage, followed by systematic conservation planning which is what is used for producing opportunity mapping.</p>
i.	<p>Geographical spread of the Opportunity Areas</p> <p>MR explained the Cornwall wide and sub regions of Cornwall options for mapping. Scenarios – Cornwall wide distribution of opportunities or higher resolution by using a community area partnership/sub regional area (where the land area is increased).</p> <p>Workshop preference:</p> <p>PH said the morning workshop strongly preferred the sub regional approach across the county but to not use the community area partnership but to use catchment partnerships (higher resolution). It was noted that the IoS had not been forgotten and that a separate exercise would be undertaken specifically for the IoS.</p> <p>Members comments/questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NL asked if there were any resource implications. Answer: there are more options and an increase to 23% of total land. • CP sub regional seems like a better option to avoid risk of missing out North Cornwall, for example. • RL asked if it made a difference ecologically? Answer: It wouldn't make a difference to the distribution of species although there may be a slight difference with connectivity. • Question: regarding the proportion of species – how does relate to the 30% target? Answer: There is scope for an increase to 40% collectively. • Question: does the LNRS look at condition of existing habitats, not just focussing on new habitats? Answer: it also looks at both including opportunities to create new habitat and to improve existing habitats. JC - they wouldn't be in the existing nature network but would be opportunity areas. • NL – there's an aspect of compartmentalisation. • A previous Motion indicated a keenness to work at catchment scale. • NL – how will it land with people? • SJ – this map is terrestrial so connectivity is missing; when rivers are added it will show more coherent connectivity. Habitat is dictated by hydrological boundary and exposure/rainfall. Defining it like that enables target of habitat type and addresses underlying condition. • Question: there are different ways of coming up with the map – will the one being viewed be an iteration of the one presented. Answer: IM would like to see a click function on the map to reveal why it was assigned. • Species have played a part in the assignation of habitat. • MW – there are implications about showing places with opportunity or no opportunity, essentially missing out on all opportunities. IM suggested a ranking system might be a solution? Areas outside the map could indicate what might be done (BNG implications). BNG metric significance multiplier and value for land. • Question: is every bit of land in a catchment? Answer: Coastal strip could and would be included. DH have to prioritise distribution on the map but will be looking at other opportunities however it will be non-statutory. Rivers and bed land will be connected up.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SJ raised an absence of opportunity around Tamar which would be a good opportunity for habitats and connectivity across Tamar. IM answered that the border would be considered – it was on the do list. <p>There is an opportunity to feedback any other points outside the meeting.</p> <p>LNRS Steering Group Decision/Steer:</p> <p>To use a sub-regional approach based on catchments.</p>
ii.	<p>Ecosystem services scenario</p> <p>There are two options: a) to allow ecosystem services software to preferentially select an area that also delivers towards carbon sequestration, soil erosion or flood mitigation, or b) for ecosystem services to not be allowed. Option a) would allow for the inclusion of co-benefits within the Opportunity Areas.</p> <p>Workshop preference:</p> <p>The preference from the morning workshop was that ecosystems should be included. A few people wanted to know more about existing services that had been included and others that had not. The majority wanted option a).</p> <p>Members comments/questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Query: CP – regarding the 50% target, is that based on average values for arable farmers? Answer: the data is there but the biggest difference is how it is delivered on the ground. There is a degree of uncertainty around the figure. CP would like to see a figure more specific to Cornwall but appreciates the time constraints. • Question: Do the benefits of including ecosystems have any negative impact on nature recovery? Answer: there is little impact (a moderate scenario is currently being used). • Question: How does including ecosystems help? Answer: funding wise it can be beneficial as it enables potential funding for natural flood management, etc. and it also brings in people and organisations not just for nature recovery but because of climate change interests, etc. The end product will look exactly the same. <p>Overall the inclusion of ecosystems would give the LNRS a different character. Ecosystem services needs to be done and deliverable. It would have a significant benefit for recovering nature and gives a level of buy in from the community. There are multiple tiered benefits and could invite funding further down the line.</p> <p>LNRS Steering Group Decision/Steer: to understand more later on.</p> <p>ACTION: Keep this on the agenda.</p>
iii.	<p>Willingness layer</p> <p>This was made using layers where perceived willingness to undertake nature recovery exists. For some it was through environmental organisation land e.g., the Wildlife Trust but also National Landscape areas. Also through CC Planning “Call for Sites” where 60 to 70 landowners stated they were interested in delivering BNG and nature recovery. It also used those who expressed willingness through the strategic survey including Forestry Commission, NT, SWW who wanted to be delivering on their land.</p>

	<p>However it is only a proxy of willingness, and so does not democratically capture true willingness across the county. Even if everyone was asked there would always be a subset who respond, likely of those who are more engaged in the process.</p> <p>EB made a point of clarification that needed to be factored into the willingness layer if taken forwards: National Landscapes don't own any of the land and so cannot directly influence nature recovery. However their inclusion is drawing more opportunities into the National Landscapes.</p> <p>Workshop feedback:</p> <p>Don't include willingness as a weighting at the moment but from now onwards, and towards adoption there should be a democratic approach for capturing genuine willingness.</p> <p>Member comments/questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: How is the map used with regards to inclusivity, etc? Who can and who can't support nature recovery will be determined by funding etc. Answer: a willingness layer can be created but not used in weighting. Willingness layer would therefore be used as a tool for project development alongside the opportunity maps but would not be included in the algorithm. The willingness info gathered to date would be useful as we move into LNRS delivery. Where landowner willingness overlap with ACBs - this will highlight areas of potential easy wins. <p>LNRS Steering Group Decision/Steer:</p> <p>Willingness should not be used as a weighting tool.</p>
iv.	<p>The amount of land we include in the Opportunity Areas</p> <p>There are 3 options: a) at least a 10% uplift, b) for the total area of land mapped to be 40% (30 x 30 target plus 10% buffer), c) smallest amount of land required for 30 x 30 target.</p> <p>Member comments/questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MW – add more land for inclusion and for buy in to take action. Recommend aiming for 50%. • NE advised that Defra non statutory Guidance has indicated that 40% is the advised upper limit and that it would need to be balanced with LNRS being a precision tool. <p>LNRS Steering Group Decision/Steer: Be ambitious but within constraints, taking into consideration BNG etc.</p>
3	<p>Emerging Designs</p> <p>The LNP Board were asked to give comment on the look and feel of the proposed LNRS logo. Five members were happy with the design however some felt an alternative would be good. Suggestions include image within the wings, IoS and/or farming related.</p> <p>Section dividers: page spread, priority spread. DH will send to everyone and ask for feedback after the meeting.</p> <p>Member comments/questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RT would like to see a headline on each page, something that draws out the main message.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: will plain language be used. Answer: Yes. • Suggestion - Cornwall Climate Risk Assessment summary document could sit alongside. • Suggestion that details are available online with the document focussed on salient points. <p>ACTION: DH to send section dividers for comment.</p>
4	<p>Emerging story map</p> <p>BR – showcase of emerging story map which will be like a website. This will sit alongside the document and be more artistic and image intensive. It will be a different way of presenting it, it will be on the internet and can be linked from LNP website.</p> <p>Member comments/questions: this was felt to be a good idea.</p>
5	<p>Priorities overview</p> <p>DH explained this was the first step in testing the priorities statements.</p> <p>Definition in Defra guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priorities – the end results that the strategy is seeking to achieve • Potential measures – practical actions to achieve the priorities <p>JC highlighted that priorities should comprise habitats, species and wider environmental benefits.</p> <p>DH gave a presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there were 24 draft priorities for consideration aligning closely with priority habitats, these were categorised in terms of local suitability. • they had 2,000 survey responses (public, key sectors and strategic bodies), and further engagement with over 1,000 through workshops and events, and also through taxonomic experts. • feedback on priorities – the LNRS SG gave written feedback on priorities, on wording, deliverability and any gaps or if anything was inappropriate. • engagement - drafting the wording for the strategy, and will work with specialist groups (Cornwall Catchment Partnership, etc), will get views on draft priorities and measures. • more mapping engagement. • wrap up engagement, which will be a full day workshop as close to the finish before the 13th September LNRS session. • shaping the measures through surveys and workshops. They've identified species and habitats and then measures will be looked at at workshops in August (attributed by others through consultation with others). • Sector delivery workbook will be about how these can be delivered/guidance. • PH added that engagement will be by email as well as in person over the summer on some of the measures and draft outputs. • Funding streams will not be shown for delivering as to keep the document in date.

	<p>Member comments/questions:</p> <p>JC – NE advice is to follow ‘Mapping of measures’ advice. By doing that it will benefit the area that could become of particular importance. Written statement for non-mappable activities. Funding is in place to March next year and the next round of funding is unknown. Everyone is pushing for definition of future funding.</p>
6	<p>Priorities workshop – written feedback</p> <p>Members completed written feedback on priorities, on the wording, deliverability, and whether there were any gaps or anything inappropriate.</p>
7	<p>Timetable for adoption</p> <p>MHol explained that at the 13 September LNRS meeting the Steering Group would decide whether they were ready for the next stage. The ambition is to work towards adoption in February/March but as Cornwall’s local elections are taking place in May 2025 there will be pre-election considerations. As a result the LNRS may go to Full Council for adoption in September. IoS also have elections next year and their Full Council meetings are on 18 Feb, 18 March and 15 April. JC is aware that funding ends in March.</p> <p>Member comments/questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MA has outlined opportunities in letter sent to Defra minister. • The LNRS will also need to go through Neighbourhoods Overview Scrutiny Committee who would want to comment on and recommend adoption. • Pre-consultation by NE and arms length bodies which is 28 days which happens before and after. • Advise using the checklist against everything and make sure it’s all been met beforehand but if there are outstanding bits, NE will say pause and then go to public consultation. • It would unexpected if concerns were raised at pre-publication which had not been raised previously at the pre-consultation stage