



## Meeting notes

<b>Meeting Title:</b>	<b>Local Nature Partnership Board Meeting</b>
<b>Date:</b>	13 September 2024
<b>Time:</b>	09:00 – 11:30
<b>Location:</b>	Online via Teams
<b>Present:</b>	Robin Teverson (RT) - Chair, Matt Walpole (MW) – Deputy Chair (Chair for LNRS Steering Group), Vicky Fraser CEO, Cllr Martyn Alvey (MA), Julian Branscombe (until 10:00) (JB), Cllr Harry Legg (HL), Rebecca Lovell (RL), Sian Rees (SR), Mark Rice (until Rebecca Williams (RW), Clare Parnell (CP), Joanna Clifford-Kitching (until 11:00) (JC-K), Marcus Rhodes for Ilya Maclean (MR)
<b>In attendance:</b>	Philippa Hoskin (PH), Mark Holmes (MHol), Dougie Handford (DH), Bethany Roberts (BR), Lorna Gaunt – note taker
<b>Guests:</b>	For the Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Nature Strategy Steering Group item: Emma Browning (EB), Matthew Odgers-Brown (MO-B) Forestry Commission and Marcus Salmon (MS) Environment Agency

<b>1</b>	<b>Apologies, items of AOB, Minutes, Matters Arising &amp; Actions and Chair's report</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Apologies &amp; items for AOB</b> Phil Mason, Andrea Ayres, Martin Howlett, Nick Lawrence
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Minutes of previous Board Meeting</b> Minutes of the previous board meeting and the special LNRS meeting of 23.07.24 were approved
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Matters Arising and Actions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RT contacted RNAS Culdrose to explore opportunities for nature recovery following on from the success at RAF St Mawgan's – waiting to hear back.</li> <li>• Dorset LNP provided comprehensive notes from the Dorset visit which made a good note of the nature and health aspect.</li> </ul>
<b>1.4</b>	<b>Chair's report</b> (full report circulated with the board papers) Taken as read with the highlights being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the mood messages from the new government are good so far with nature high on the agenda however there's concern about the potential reduction of £100 million for ELMS. We await more details.</li> <li>• RT has been in touch with all Cornwall and IoS MPs and we will start to get meetings back in the diary, trying a tripartite approach with the Climate Commission.</li> <li>• RT has met with Dave Harland, Deputy Chair of the Climate Commission and they will be working closely on a number of issues.</li> <li>• Farming – meeting arranged with Ben Gallant, the new NFU County Advisor. VF would be welcome to attend the meeting.</li> <li>• Seaweed farming – this is an active area and recently a small scale farm license has been granted. The LNP sent letters with key points around planning and sustainability to the MMO, CC and the Crown Estate; only the latter has written back so far.</li> </ul>

	<p>Board member comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perhaps invite Bridget Whell along to the meeting with Ben Gallant</li> <li>• CP said it would be good to know if the £100 million underspend differed according to area? RT could ask as parliamentary question.</li> <li>• SR provided additional seaweed farm information in the chat about specific locations where large seaweed farms were granted licences in 2023 and a parliamentary question referring to Port Isaac.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>2</b></p>	<p><b>Executive Report</b></p> <p>Taken as read with the highlights being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VF thanked PH and the team for the incredible amount of work going on and the board for their advisory role in producing the LNRS.</li> <li>• Council officers would be contributing to the consultation into the reform of the National Planning Policy Framework.</li> <li>• The team reported on the ecological emergency to the Corporate Directors Team and received good responses, especially the endorsement of a Council Nature Recovery Delivery Plan to enable delivery across the whole Council.</li> <li>• The Executive Group discussed how to develop LNP business priorities and would be asking board champions to reflect on the last year and how priorities going forward into 2025 should be set.</li> <li>• Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) RT raised an important point in his report about numbers of planning applications deemed to be subject to BNG in Hampshire. VF would help to get an understanding of Cornwall Council's experience from planning, in case the LNP needs to add pressure.</li> <li>• Farming engagement – regarding the LNRS VF outlined what had already happened and assured members about plans for face to face opportunities for engagement coming up at various locations, on top of 3,500 leaflets being delivered to farming colleagues earlier in the year. The Farming and Landowner Working Group were unanimous that the LNP should have another presence at the RCS in 2025.</li> <li>• Work on the voluntary Marine Nature Recovery Framework continues. A top ten priority list of species and habitats has been drafted, and mapping of existing areas important to these is being carried out, before going to consultation.</li> <li>• Work continues to deliver the Motion for the Ocean with marine conference sessions run by PH's team. Dates of next ones to be shared.</li> <li>• Environmental Enforcement - the amended report has been received from the designers and will be re-published on the LNP website. The text for the proposed infographic has been signed off by the Working Group and will go to designers to produce a poster.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Isles of Scilly update</b> (verbal)</p> <p>RW gave an IoS update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RW reported that the IoS Wildlife Trust were happy with how the LNRS is taking shape. Thanks was given to Cornwall for providing resource and support to the team. They are preparing elected members for public consultation.</li> <li>• Seabird recovery – feasibility of further rat eradication work will be considered in October and there will be fund raising for the initiative in Spring.</li> <li>• Council members have approved a policy for open spaces and verges; the Council would like to work with the Wildlife Trust on some special species.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

4	<b>Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Nature Recovery Strategy Steering Group Item</b> (paper circulated in advance of meeting and taken as read)
	<p>Matt Walpole (MW) as Board Champion CloS Nature Recovery Strategy introduced the item.</p> <p>Members of the steering group were sent the report and draft strategy on 6 September and the interactive mapping tool was shared on 12 September. Now that the draft and maps have been shared we are moving towards the point where it goes to pre-consultation phase.</p> <p>Steering group members were being asked to provide feedback on the draft strategy which will be considered by the Nature Recovery team. It was asked that detailed comments were shared with the team in writing; this session was about comments on structure and style.</p> <p>RW was pleased with progress from IoS perspective with positivity from the Wildlife Trust with how it's shaping up. They have worked really closely with the team and the resource that's been dedicated to them has been good. Currently pleased with what there is in the draft.</p> <p>CP was impressed with it; it had a lot of information in it. Without formatting it was difficult to tell but it does need an easy-to-read page at the front. The way it's written was good. Engagement with land managers and farmers was good; it wasn't prescriptive and explained things well.</p> <p>JC-K was aware that AA had had recent discussions and that previous feedback had been taken on board. Recognised the importance of seeing the maps.</p>
Q1	Does the strategy document text as a whole set the right tone and style of language needed (Note: Further editing and Plain English checks are still needed throughout)?
	<b>Comment:</b> RT – the tone is right; it is engaging and written in language that's understandable. It begs for implementation and delivery.
Q2	In relation to the main strategy document: a. Do the strategy sections function and flow?
	<b>Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RT – would like to have seen it going through the topics. The exec summary and forward/introduction are all fine.</li> <li>• RT – Would like to see something that says clearly – why is this important? It needs to be clear that this is a really key document and something we <u>have</u> to do, not a nice to do. It could use a graphic.</li> <li>• RT – around state of nature we should also say what some of the successes are (if they're not already in there).</li> <li>• RT – put in more about the 30 by 30 target making it clear it's a national and international target. Say it's what we're trying to get to. It needs to be a strong message.</li> <li>• RT – the measures are good but what about how we deliver it? A comprehensive section at the end about where we move on from here would be good, as the Steering Group has always advocated, it's all about deliverability. It needs to be a positive message, that it's doable, and why we're doing it.</li> <li>• SR said the Natural Capital section doesn't quite work. Could provide some suggested wording. RT agreed with SR's point – it does need to be integrated a bit better but important it's there.</li> </ul>
Q2	b. Are they fundamentally suitable to reflect the ambitions of the Local Nature Partnership?
	Approved.
Q3	Does the 'Introduction' section help set the scene in relation to the LNRS and explain what, where, how, when and who (is responsible), including legal status?
	Approved.

Q4	Does the Introduction provide a springboard to help people from different backgrounds and sectors to know why we need to take collective action and why nature is important for us (non-statutory)
	See RT comments above.
Q5	Does the 'The Nature of C&IoS Description of the Strategy Area' (statutory requirement) set out the character of our area, existing levels of designations, the state of nature, pressures? Note that the area spotlights are non-statutory extras we chose to include to help with understanding.
	<b>Comment:</b> HL would like overfishing reworded from IoS to something like North Atlantic to be clear that this is not just relating to local fishers, and is something which they would agree with.
Q6	Does the 'Take Action for Nature Section' set out the priorities and actions needed clearly? (statutory requirement). Are the habitat descriptions suitable?
	<p><b>Comment:</b> EB said the tabulated version is a good way of setting it out.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> HL commented regarding bio-security and invasive species – both need to be mentioned in this section. <b>Response:</b> PH - it is in there but as it's a key pressure for the IoS it needs to be amplified. This will be addressed.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> MO-B – section on trees and woodlands and in the earlier description for Cornwall, there needs to be slightly more mention of mixed and productive woodlands with reference to PAWS as a lot of potential for nature's improvement and recovery. Tabulated form is good and like the way they are hanging together in the section.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> MO-B: the headline action with bullets giving more detail is good and different to other local authorities. For woodland it was clear what the guidance was but that's not the case for all headline actions. <b>Answer:</b> PH agreed there was a mixture of style which needed to be addressed.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> MW - Can the viewer see how the priorities have come about? <b>Answer:</b> PH – there will be an appendix with the methodology which will detail how the decisions were made.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> RT – regarding the statement to develop and deliver cohesive grey squirrel and deer management plans. Important area and need to show unsentimentally around this.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> MS - experts provided feedback asking for measurability on the measures for clarity to farmers or planners about what's expected, and something to be reported against, especially for the second tranche of the LNRS. <b>Answer:</b> PH - there is the overarching 30 by 30 target and Appendix A shows how our LNRS aligns against government national targets but there aren't local figures for targets against different habitats. It is proposed that this should be agreed with stakeholders, as part of any future delivery plan, subject to funding. At this time, there is no system in place or resourcing to measure delivery against individual habitats and no clear mandate from stakeholders. Targets could be informed by the opportunity maps once finalised. MS agreed that it could be iterated by mapping but flagged that some habitats would be more 'winners' and wondered what percentage of uplift there would be for different habitat types, and the effect that might have on some priority statements and targets.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> PH – acknowledged that the tabular format of priorities and actions is liked. We need to double check it adheres to DEFRA data standards.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> CP – on KPI figures, are vague due to lack of information, could we add that some baselines used are not right for Cornwall and IoS and appreciate more work would be needed.</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> PH – there is a sentence in the strategy to confirm the need to review local measures to ensure they align with LNRS priorities</p>

	<p>MO-B added into chat – Forestry Commission can provide baseline and monitoring data for woodlands and trees outside of woodlands. Woodland condition assessments for BNG &amp; ELMS can potentially provide data for woodland ecological condition, plus woodland SSSI, SAC assessments. Potentially CS/ELMs can identify current funded squirrel &amp; deer management.</p>
Q7	<p>Does the Take Action for Nature Section' vision, principles, enablers and best practice section help reduce siloes within habitats and promote/guide good practice? (non-statutory)</p>
	<p><b>Question:</b> MW – on principles and enablers, they could be presented to be more engaging.  <b>Answer:</b> PH – agreed that the principles and enablers need to be rationalised and presented in a meaningful way.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> MO-B liked the inclusion and help and support given for delivery. Wondered if appendix or table to signpost to funding streams for particular actions might be helpful?  <b>Answer:</b> PH – details of funding would be better held on a website alongside useful resources, so they can be kept updated. They would date immediately in a strategy document.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> BL really liked this section but felt what was missing was how this was going to happen at a strategic level? Who was the coordinator of all this, and who would pull together individual actions to make sure it will happen? RT agreed and thought this was fundamental.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> MW raised how the LNP plays a role in delivery and oversight. If it is a collective exercise across county it needs something to keep it going and be kept under review. RT – this is fundamental. If time was available needed further discussion.</p>
Q8	<p>Are there any fundamental changes needed before we proceed to share this with a wider audience?</p>
	<p><b>Question:</b> MS – raised a concern about how much post hoc additional mapping might be required and that any critical changes needed might impact on readiness for consultation? ALBs concerns have not been about the quality of the LNRS, just around timings. <b>Answer:</b> MW – this is well recognised, and the ALBs role was very much valued. PH said this session was about whether the narrative was fundamentally fit for purpose, with a focus on the mapping coming up next. If the steering group felt able to proceed to the next phase there would be multiple points before 11.10.24 the target date for submission, to ensure that the strategy narrative accurately reflected any additional changes to the mapping.</p>
Q9	<p>Are the maps deemed in a sufficient state of readiness (when viewed with the Strategy) to proceed to the pre-consultation stage assessment by Supporting Authorities?</p>
	<p>PH – the whole of map is called Nature Recovery network map and is made up of the existing nature network plus opportunity areas. The version of the maps that has been shared has a breakdown of 15% of Cornwall and Isles of Scilly are included in the existing network and 25% for the opportunity areas. 40% is the ceiling being worked to as guided by wider stakeholders and the steering group. It is noted that Essex currently has theirs out to public consultation and has gone over 40% to about 45% in total.</p> <p>PH explained the opportunity areas breakdown set out in the paper distributed to members. It was noted that the IoS mapping had been done using participatory mapping and would need to be added to the interactive mapping platform so wouldn't be available to view at the meeting.</p> <p>MR and PH highlighted that the mixture of opportunity areas was currently at about 50% Systematic Conservation Planning Model (SCP Model) outputs and 50% post hoc, which were human choices. The steering group were asked to consider the trade-offs and choices; these would also be picked up at the upcoming workshops. Refinement would be made as a result of</p>

feedback given. IoS colleagues would like the whole of the islands to be an opportunity, which would align with Small is Beautiful initiative.

**Member views and questions on the interactive mapping tool shown by BR:**

**Question:** HL – could the opacity be changed so you can see the map underneath the opportunity area for clarity on where it is. **Answer:** PH - It is feedback already received and will take that back to GIS technician to ask if this is possible.

**Comment:** MR was interested in seeing the intertidal opportunities mapping. **Response:** PH said that MRs team had provided good steer and feedback together with the Environmental Resilience and Adaptation team to ensure alignment and complementarity with coastal vulnerability zones, flood risk zones at the coast, and to meet nature recovery ambitions too. Flood Zone 2 is used at the coast as a guide but doesn't break down into individual intertidal habitats. MR pointed out that the opportunity mapping habitat creation didn't occur on existing priority habitats or within the SSSI network, which would need to be considered for coastal realignment.

**Question:** (in the chat) M-OB – are the opportunities only for habitat creation? **Answer:** PH – the opportunities are for both restoration of existing habitats, and creation of habitats.

**Question:** HL – an intertidal area on a rugby pitch (in the Penzance area) is shown as an opportunity but not a deliverable one, are there others? **Answer:** PH – a good example which they will look at and highlights the need for further refinement. MS – there will need to be ground truthing, for example around Port Isaac there are houses, which is now intertidal. Needs to be clear for the public consultation to avoid concerns.

**Question:** MS - Intertidal is a range of habitats, showing coastal intertidal and estuarial intertidal – is that the same with wet grassland? **Answer:** MS - wet grassland is an amalgamation of grasses, rush pastures and coastal flood grazing marsh.

**Comment:** MS – regarding Marazion Marsh intertidal area the SCP has said what should be there, not what it is protected for. It raises issues around climate change - it is about resilience for the future not just restoring what we've lost.

**Question:** CP re farmland in north Cornwall near Polzeath, there are small blocks of acid grass land, and would like to understand the reasoning. How is it mapped? **Answer:** MR - largely because of SCP modelling which runs iterations and each time it works out if it meets biodiversity and ecosystem services' needs. It hasn't fully aggregated yet, causing fragmentation. If grasslands have been in previous Stewardship Schemes and have been improved, the model will try and create opportunities near that. PH – there isn't a coherent layer for Stewardship Schemes but there are data layers. **Comment:** MW - ground truthing is going to be important.

**Question:** JC-K (received papers just before the meeting due to last minute change of personnel) presumably map is not produced in isolation and linked to narrative? How are the priorities that have been identified reflected in the maps? **Answer:** there's been extensive coding, 3,000 survey responses analysed, further refinement and stakeholder engagement which is all reflected in the choices and the decisions embedded in the Systematic Conservation Planning. Actions in the narrative will be visualised as part of the attribute information for each cell.

**Question:** JC-K regarding all the work that's gone into the SCP, what's the rationale for the trade-off between SCP and post hoc additions? **Answer:** PH post hoc additions have been based on further specialised stakeholder steer to reflect the prioritisation process.

**Question:** SR –Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC) aren't visible. At the moment it looks like all areas are protected. **Answer:** PH – with showing of MCZs, which are part of existing nature network, they are restricted by parameters set by Defra but will double check what is and isn't allowed as there has been some confusion below low water following Defra advice on marine. PH thought the MPA reality check would be better in Marine Nature Recovery Framework.

**Question:** MR – regarding multi benefit project for nature, environment, climate resilience, reduction of flood risk, and water quality, etc. the EA Flood Strategy is starting in 2027 and will focus on natural flood risk management approaches. How can these multi benefits that are economically realisable map across, presumably down to EA and other partners to ensure.

**Answer:** PH - opportunity areas are weighted towards wider environmental benefits through the SCP element, and embedded in mapping opportunities but there is more to be done. MR said the model will always consider where there is the highest flood risk mitigation.

In the board papers there were question on the interactive mapping platform but due to lack of time those detailed questions would be covered by the drop in sessions.

MR and JC-K left the meeting.

PH explained further engagement opportunities and MH explained the indicative timeline. Members were being asked if they were happy with the direction of travel and whether there were any areas of fundamental concern and if approval could be given to continue to workshops and further refinement. The additional request was for a delegated decision to submit for the pre-consultation assessment. PH pointed out that the Ios Council was the other supporting authority who, along with Defra arms-length bodies, have the power of veto at the two 28 day consultation stages; PH was working with RW to ensure full scrutiny. MA added that if the deadlines set out in the papers weren't reached the adoption target would move to July 2025 due to the formation of a new administration, submission to the new Scrutiny Committee, and timetabling for the new Cabinet.

**Question:** On the maps MW asked about the useability of them, expectations on how maps would be used? **Answer:** PH - they are aimed at multiple users, they will be used at strategic level by organisations such as LNP and partner organisations, strategic planning in the next Local Plan, opportunity areas will form a strategic multiplier in the BNG metric for financial value for offsetting. They have been told that they can be used to guide agri-environment, they will be used by farm advisors to guide farms and projects, and they also hope they will be used by residents, communities and businesses.

**Question:** MW – the map currently has granulated squares that don't necessarily relate to land holdings. How much might that change? **Answer:** PH – that is a question to ask and get steer on at events as there are some limitations about how the opportunities can be presented. Blocks can be changed to a hexagonal; lines could look too prescriptive is the feedback that has been given so far.

**Question:** MW around financial incentives, what would happen if a square touches on lots of fields for example, does that impact on a planning decision? **Answer:** BR went to a Defra Q&A and for BNG if an area does cut a piece of land in half BNG would be calculated for that the section and the rest would fall outside the strategic significance area. There is a level of specificity in terms of 200m square as being truth.

	<p><b>Question:</b> MW - What other responsible authorities are doing in terms of presentation? <b>Answer:</b> Essex have used hexagons.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> SR are the maps publicly available. <b>Answer:</b> no they are not available at this stage.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> CP – re drop in sessions, what will be done if every farmer says they’ve found something wrong with the maps. <b>Answer:</b> MR – for the existing habitat network a lot should be met by the priority habitat inventory which is mapped on the ground and is much more accurate so try and use that for existing habitat layers. <b>Question:</b> SR – comment in chat - can you use the map outputs to draw broad conclusions about where nature recovery can take place. <b>Answer:</b> MR – could coarsen the data set which would pick out areas. <b>Comment:</b> RT – there needs to be absolute clarity before the workshops as we don’t want this to undermine confidence.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> RT – Although the strategy cannot be updated for 3 to 10 years there needs to be a way (outside of the LNRS guidelines) that they are regularly updated so it shows what’s really going on the ground, to keep it live.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> MO-B – summary of work that needs to be completed before pre-consultation: complete run; urban methodology needs to be completed and applied; coastal wild belt river buffers and priority rivers information needs to be reviewed and comments fed back into final outputs; question around ad hoc/post hoc – different balance of habitats – feedback to feed in; map measures to plot the actions to the blocks/hexagons. Seems to be weighty amount of work. From a Defra or Forestry Commission perspective would need to see a relatively finished map with the above completed so measures can be mapped. Do you consider there is enough time to get the mapping work done? The Strategy document is in good shape. <b>Answer:</b> Urban is in and complete, the peri urban needs to just stitch together. Rivers - info coming in soon from EA and MR says this will be a quick job, coastal wild belt – there is one session in next week and one more to come up, to take closer look. The measures have been discussed with MR and team and just needs inputting. Not anticipating any concerns with getting the above done (MR says it will take one week). Feedback from next week is the only unknown, in terms of fundamental concerns that may come up.</p> <p>MW asked if both sections have been addressed whether the steering group are happy to delegate authority to Vicky Fraser as CEO and another board Member. RT suggested CEO and a non-executive board member who would be a co-signatory – MW. RT said as Board Champion for the LNRS and with extensive knowledge in the relevant area, both broad and strategic, MW would be the right choice. MW was happy for the nomination. CP agreed and the steering group approved this. <b>APPROVED</b></p> <p>Chair made a final comment that 30 by 30 is not far away and vitally important so keen for there not to be too many delays.</p>
6	<p><b>Roundtable</b> (verbal updates) Will be circulated by email.</p>
7	<p><b>AOB</b> None</p>
	<p><b>2024 meeting dates</b> 16 October – Isles of Scilly/hybrid</p>