

LNRS Advisory Board meeting 6 Board Meeting Minutes & Actions

Date: 4th July 2024 12:30-2.00

Venue: Via Teams

Attendees:

Gideon Ben-Tovim (Chair)	GBT	Nature Connected
Rachel Waggett	RW	LCR CA
Judy Clavey	JC	Forestry Commission
Emma Galbraith	EG	LCR CA
John Sanders	JS	Mersey Rivers Trust
Duane Chong	DC	Grow Well-being
Annie Merry	AM	Faiths for Change
Michelle Whalley	MW	Nature Connected
David Davitt	DD	Riverside Housing
Adam Briggs	AB	NFU
Andrew Clark	AC	MEAS
Jo Doolin	JD	MEAS

I Welcome / Introductions

The meeting began with a welcome to all participants. Each attendee was introduced, and their presence acknowledged.

2) Minutes from the previous meeting.

These were accepted as a true reflection of the meeting.

3) Priority list (final draft) – last chance to comment; Andrew Clark/Jo Doolin (MEAS)

AC and JD presented the final draft priority list – this list had been circulated in advance to members and all members have been invited to formally respond using the feedback form by the deadline of 5th July.

AC wanted to stress that for any Statutory protected sites /SSSI's such as within the Estuarine/tidal, priorities/ recommendations can only be listed that go above and beyond what is already in the management plans – so there is a limitation as to what can be proposed in terms of measures etc. Within these designated sites, the LNRS needs to show additionality and the strategy needs to link to work that is already taking place / planned. They are keen to align the LNRS with for example with the blue print for the Mersey.

AC and JD presented each of the priorities and discussion was invited throughout the presentation. Below are captured the key discussion points – note members have been encouraged to respond formally using the comment form by the deadline.

Discussion points.

- *Within the estuary section – can we broaden out the bird species to include “birds and other species”*
- Farmland and hedgerows – the panel were happy with this stating they were good objectives – with a focus on nature and farming practices working together rather than one or the other. The panel felt it was well worded and balanced – there was a query about peatland under this section – and it was clarified that this was peatland specific to farmland, but that peatland is also covered as a priority within the wetland section
- *Urban – again the panel were comfortable and happy with the urban priorities – The discussion and comments focused on ensuring within the measures that “access to nature” should be meaningful. Within consideration of wildlife in urban design – could this wording be altered to include wildlife and habitat? Other comments included “great to see these priorities – they seem achievable and what our residents are asking for”, “absolutely this is great to see – the right stuff we are expecting” “Really pleased to see this in there”*

- Woodland and trees – currently updating ancient woodland inventory – fragments of ancient woodland – make sure that its buffered correctly and put into good management. Buffer / focus on natural regeneration etc. The discussion within this section included a point around *Long established woodlands – which is not covered under ancient woodland – need to add to wording. The panel approved of the three simple priorities that do cover connect/expand/create and manage better. There was a query around using the term expand within the context of ancient woodland – what does that mean – and it was agreed that terminology would make clearer that this means allowed to colonise / naturally regenerate and be better managed so it is in good condition. Other comments included broadening out climate resilience within planting to include appropriate non / native – species choice – given the anticipated climate changes throughout the life of the trees which are being planted today*
- Grasslands – *where does scrub habitat fit – perhaps to include under woodland and trees as important for many species?*
- Watercourses – *heavily modified nature of our rivers in our region – habitat restoration – not just about natural function but also natural restoration – this can be within measures as well. From a farming perspective – it’s really important that crops etc are protected and to allow flood zones within farmland is challenging. This was agreed and the suggestion of allow specific land to flood would be where feasible/economically justified etc – cant do everywhere.*
- Species –*this discussion was around how the priorities within the species list required very specific habitat creation – many other species not listed within this list will benefit from the broader measures that are covered in other priorities – this will become clearer once the measures are written as a list of the other species that benefit from the measures will be listed.*

4) Next steps; Emma Galbraith (LCRCA)

EG provided an update to the panel on the timeline and next steps – including the following two slides

Identifying opportunities for nature recovery

Public workshop 07/06/2024

15 attendees including members of public, Friends Of groups, CICs, record centres, and delivery partners.

Farmer Workshops

24th July (Wirral) & 25th July (St Helens)
Facilitated by farming engagement lead for Cheshire Wildlife Trust.



Landowner workshop 21/06/2024

27 attendees from a variety of organisations: local authorities, National Trust, Peel, RSPB, Green Earth Group, Grosvenor, NHS, Leverhulme

Call for Nature Recovery Opportunities live until 21st of July

Galbraith, Emma

Existing timeline



New timeline



Galbraith, Emma

- 5) Date of next meeting - 30/07/2024
- 6) AOB – GBT thanked the Board for their input and the LNRS for all of their excellent work.