

## Action and Decision Sheet

<b>Conserving &amp; Managing Sub-Committee</b>	<b>7<sup>th</sup> September 2017, Conservation Board Offices, Northleach</b>
Present	Richard Wakeford (RW) – Chair, Mollie Groom (MG), Matthew Darby (MD), Andrew Clark (AC), Mark O’Sullivan (MoS)
Apologies	Rebecca Charley (RC), Nigel Colston (NC), Absent = Charles Mathew (CM)
Also in Attendance	Mark Connelly (MC), Land Management Officer, Anna Clarke; Finance Officer.
Declarations of Interests	None
Public Questions	None
Previous Action Points	11 <sup>th</sup> July 2017 - Approved

Item	Item	Action/ Decision
4	Action points from the meeting held on 11 <sup>th</sup> July 2017	<p>Updates on SOMM. Suggested looking in to applying to the Dulverton Trust as they are keen on wild flowers.</p> <p>Powerpoint was circulated on point 9 from the last meeting.</p>
5	The Natural Capital of the Cotswolds AONB	<p>Cumulus Consultants were commissioned to carry out some work to review the Natural Capital of the Cotswolds. The report is the first part of 4 stages.</p> <p>The Sub-committee felt the report mixed up natural capital with ecosystem services and did not quite achieve what it set out to do. It was, however, a good survey of what the Cotswolds has. The valuation part is needed for the report to be of use.</p> <p>The recommendations from the report are detailed below along with responses from the Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Adapt the Cotswolds AONB Management Plan to incorporate a natural capital approach.</li> </ol> <p>The response from the committee is that we need to be careful what we mean by natural capital. Other elements of capital should be included such as human capital, manufactured capital and financial capital as all these different capitals are interconnected. The current recommendation is too limiting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2) Address the gaps in the evidence</li> <li>3) Develop a set of natural capital accounts</li> </ol> <p>The above two points should have been part of this report. A disappointing response. Resourcing the gaps is an important priority for the board.</p> <p>There is also the need to identify the ecosystem services the Cotswolds could deliver with their value to society and use this to identify payments to land managers</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4) Use the opportunity provided by Brexit to design policy that stewards natural capital assets and rewards the provision of public goods</li> </ol> <p>To decide what we are going to do with this information. Investigate to see if there is a student that could help us to use this information and to see if some of the gaps can be addressed.</p>

		<p>We aren't a pure natural capital organisation, we are here to encourage a greater scale of ecosystem services. Recommendation 1 is too late to do anything specific for current management plan.</p>
6	<p>Post Brexit Farming and Rural Development in the Cotswolds AONB</p>	<p>Summary: To present for discussion a draft proposal for an agri-environment and rural development scheme designed for the Cotswolds AONB</p> <p>Recommendations: That the sub-committee:</p> <p>a) Consider how to ensure the Cotswolds AONB is aligned with the National Parks</p> <p>Unlike National Parks the Board will need to bring people and resources in to the AONB team that are currently elsewhere, either by employing them or by accessing staff employed by Natural England, the Environment Agency and other associated organisations.</p> <p>The Board would need to be seen as the single point for advice by land managers. We would need to recruit a slice of this expertise. A single officer could address all the things of Natural Capital.</p> <p>The Board's case would be stronger if the Chilterns Board was with us in promoting the proposal. I.e the two Boards speaking as one.</p> <p>Develop a relationship and form an alliance with the National Parks so they see the two Board's as part of the delivery of agri-environment and not weakening their argument. Also involve local MPs in making the case for the Cotswolds and that the Board is ideally placed to deliver along with the NPs.</p> <p>Liaise with Natural England (or NE Board members) and show what the Board has delivered in the past.</p> <p>Liz to take opportunities to put the message across at the party conference</p> <p>Keep pushing the argument!</p> <p>b) How can FARMRD and FARMRD Plus be better presented to highlight the differences between the two levels of scheme</p> <p>Was discussed it might be best to present just one out of the two to minimise the length of the report.</p> <p>c) Discuss how to respond to the question of what happens outside the AONB in terms of Agri-environment?</p> <p>In the same way as a National Park.</p> <p>Who is going to run the Agri-environment scheme outside of the protected areas? There is a level of awkwardness here where there are boundaries. It helps to have flexibility of the edges and avoid cutting farms in half. This would have the effect of influencing the setting of the AONB.</p> <p>In future we will no longer be subject to European Audit so there might potentially be more funding made available. The Board and National</p>

AGENDA ITEM 4.

		<p>Parks should be bidding for funding for delivering the enhancement of the area.</p> <p>d) Discuss what happens in other AONBs</p> <p>There will be an England wide scheme operating outside the National Parks (and Cotswolds)</p> <p>Martin could take the lead in speaking on behalf of AONBs</p> <p>If NAAONB is not prepared to support our ambition, perhaps we should set something up with the Chilterns Board.</p>
	Date of next meeting	30 <sup>th</sup> November 2017, 10.00am

(END)

Unconfirmed