

## Workshop 2A

### Question 1

**What factors should be considered when prioritising areas for habitat expansion?**

- a) **Distribution of current resource – reducing fragmentation, buffering sites, creating networks**
- b) **Current and future species distribution**
- c) **Potential (geology, hydrology, historic land use)**
- d) **Ecosystem services**
- e) **Sustainability of gain**
- e) **Opportunity**
- f) **Other? (imminent land-use change, habitat banking, relative success in habitat delivery to date, rarest habitat.....)**

### Responses

- All factors on the list need to be considered.
- Opportunity is often a main driver.
- Climate change – there are opportunities to address climate change issues through mitigation measures such as habitat creation.
- There is a lack of information about exactly what ecosystem services are.
- Constraints should be added to the list, eg the planning system.
- It is often hard to understand where the balance should be. Connecting one habitat may fragment another. There should be a system for adjudicating these competing issues – could BAP targets be used?
- Also need to look for synergies as there may be room for more than one habitat to co-exist in an area.
- Need to consider existing projects rather than just looking for new ones to start.
- Need to consider natural processes and dynamic landscapes.
- Need to use local knowledge.

### Question 2

**What would be the pros and cons of linking all/ most BAP target habitat expansion with landscape-scale delivery projects? What about species?**

### Responses

- Large scale delivery works for some habitats but not for all of them.
- Need to be aware that some habitats only occur in limited areas.
- Need to work with other initiatives such as Living Landscapes, as some local authorities have already adopted these as delivery plans.
- The NERC duty is being promoted.
- Need to take a pragmatic approach when prioritising where delivery should occur.

- It is good practice to focus on a single issue, such as Water, which combines several habitats and a variety of partners.
- Opportunity maps are a good advocacy tool, they are easy to visualise and understand.
- Be aware of the danger of leaving blank spaces on maps as people assume they are areas with no biodiversity at all.
- HLS targeting should engage more with local experts.
- There is some backing for Natural England's approach to target fewer areas for delivery but not total support.

### Question 3

#### **What are the roles of LBAPs and national organisations, partnerships, in landscape-scale delivery? What about other organisations?**

#### Responses

- The role of LBAP's is to provide the right information to planners, to provide project management and leadership skills, and to work with local groups to achieve delivery on the ground.
- Farmers should be offered incentives to persuade neighbouring landowners to get their land into agri-environment schemes, thus creating better join-up of habitats.
- You need to engage stakeholders such as the public right from the very beginning or you will fail.
- Community assemblies are a good approach – local people make decisions about how public money will be spent in their area.
- There is currently a lack of expertise among habitat creation contractors which could hamper progress for large scale delivery projects.

### Question 4

#### **How can the Partnership (UK Steering Committee, country group) best take forward these recommendations?**

#### Responses

- Offering training courses in conservation skills.
- Providing evidence for the value of eco-system services (phase 2 of TEEB).
- Providing some rough figures for what habitats are worth (some are on Natural England website).