

LNRS Technical Advisory Panel Meeting Minutes & Actions

Date: Wednesday 25th June 11.00 – 12.00

Venue: Via Teams

Attendees:

Tom Burditt (Chair)	TB	LWT
Andrew Clark	AC	MEAS
Ayla Paul	AP	Wirral Council
Emma Galbraith	EG	LCR
Elina-Mariella Doss	EM	Merseyside Biobank
Eric Fletcher	EF	Record (Liverpool)
Joanne Doolin	JD	MEAS
Michelle Whalley	MW	Mersey Forest / Nature Connected
Mike Roberts	MR	St Helen's BC
Lucy Bennison	LB	Knowsley MBC
Phil Smith	PS	UOL
Petrina Brown	PB	Environment Agency
Rachel Waggett	RW	LCR
Richard Scott	RS	Eden Project
Thomas Smart	TS	Natural England
Susannah Gill	SG	Mersey Forest
Tom Burditt	TB	LWT
Dan Foy	DF	Stantec

1) Welcome / Introductions/Actions

TB welcomed the group to the sixth LNRS technical meeting.

2) Matters arising – note additional item added to agenda re ancient woodland inventory

3) Priority List (final draft) & discussion

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.

JD wanted to stress that for any Statutory protected sites /SSSI's such as the Estuary/sand dunes, 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 (JD used natterjack toads as an example). Within these designated sites, the LNRS needs to show additionality and the strategy needs to link to work that is already taking place / planned.

For efficiency of time, JD presented all of the priorities.

TB then opened the discussion to the panel.

Discussion -

Is the wording of the priorities from a generic list provided by NE?

The wording of the priorities has been written from scratch – as a result of input from stakeholder consultation (no sample list was provided and so this is very bespoke to the LCR plan). The priorities have been listed as a result of ranking from the matrix. The language used is comprehensive but worded for a lay audience.

Why have certain species had made it to the list – e.g. Willow tit – and some others –within the invertebrates list for example, which are deemed just as deserving and in need of recovery measures, not listed?

It has been a difficult process to narrow down individual priorities as all are deserving or attention and work, and this final list has been produced as a result of the work so far and the matrix. It is important to consider that other important species not on the list, will benefit from the measures to improve habitats etc – this will be further discussed once measures are developed.

Does invasive species cover plants and wildlife?

Yes – both

How are invasive species classified – is it schedule 9 species or can it be Merseyside specific – such as sea buckthorn which is invasive on the Sefton Coast – but not listed as a schedule 9 species?

It will be Merseyside specific, and it is an important point to make, as non schedule 9 species which would be classified as invasive within certain areas of Merseyside and they do need to be mapped, (they may need to be classified as something other than an invasive species)

What will happen when priorities are cross cutting?

Some measures will deliver on a number of the priorities and this will be demonstrated and further developed within the next part of the LNRS project (mapping and measures)

Is there scope within the LRS to have show positive case studies/ practical examples, to provide inspiration and celebration of existing success stories - for example in the urban context/ community action etc?

Whilst the LNRS needs to be a concise document, case studies could feature within it for example within the description of the strategy area. This will be further discussed as the strategy evolves.

Within woodlands – does this include natural regeneration as well as planting?

The word creation has been used to include both planting and natural regeneration.

TB thanked the panel for the discussion and encouraged members to fill in the feedback form before the deadline – submitting to the provided email address.

4) Ancient woodland inventory data (TS / AC)

TS described the current situation with ancient woodland inventory – in order to map the whole of LCR, they would need to use 3 data sets – from Lancashire, North Merseyside and Cheshire. It is likely that the Lancashire and North Merseyside data sets will be updated but the Cheshire data set (to include Halton and Wirral data) will not be updated in time. The question was asked of the panel whether to use all of the old data, to ensure standardisation of approach, or use the updated data for North Merseyside and Lancashire and the old data for Cheshire.

The panel agreed that the most up to date data should be used, and that where possible they would look at ways to help ensure that the Cheshire inventory, would be as up to date as possible by the deadline of 1st November (Mersey Forest to support this)

5) Next steps (EG)

EG provided a quick update on next steps – to include the mapping and measures – / targeted actions

EG explained how the timeline had been adjusted slightly –

Pre consultation draft for Nov –

Consultation will be in Feb –

Final draft in May – pending approval –

Presented to Local authorities and CA for final approval in the summer 2025.

The meeting ended at this point due to time constraints.

Action Log	Owner (s)
Discuss the group's continuity after LNRS completion.	TB and all participants
Explore opportunities such as carbon capture meadows, soil charter, waste minimization, and youth representation.	RS
Incorporate co-benefits of nature in the climate action plan.	RW
Group to be updated when items are uploaded to specific websites	MW
Panel members to feedback on final draft priority list by 3 rd July	all
Mersey Forest to explore ways of helping to provide updated ancient woodland inventory for Cheshire.	SG

Note: The listed owners are based on the roles and responsibilities mentioned in the provided information. Adjustments may be made based on the participants' preferences or specific assignments during the meeting.