

## CNAP strategy Group meeting notes

17<sup>th</sup> February 2022 10am – 12:30

### On line – Lifesize 988627

1. Apologies
2. Previous meeting minutes & October 2021 actions

<b>AP 1</b>	notes together on how big and what sort of projects we could be discussed at the group	<b>MH</b>	<b>Not complete</b>
<b>AP 2</b>	CNPA to consider issue of joined up communication approaches	<b>CNPA</b>	<b>Not complete</b>
<b>AP3</b>	Doodle poll for meeting in 2022	<b>MH</b>	<b>Complete see dates: 17/2, 16/6, 13/10</b>

3. NPPP – consultation responses – Andy Ford
4. Raptor discussion – Sarah Henshall
5. Beaver discussion – Sally Mackenzie
6. Update on Heritage Horizons NBS projects – Matthew Hawkins
7. June meeting – site visit suggestions
8. AOB

### Previous actions and discussion

**AP1** - Discussion on Edinburgh declaration fund and NRF projects to be brought back to group in June – MH

Communications – Josie on board – part of her work plan – RLUP will be part of this to encourage greater engagement (CNPA is a pilot areas for RLUP).

Communications on major projects needs to improve across partners.

Current board not representative for the remit of the RLUP as there will not be enough representation of whole community. The RLUP decisions impact upon land management and more representation of land owning interests need to be greater. However no decision yet on what the RLUP will decide. Information does feed back to the CNPA board form groups like the CNSG. Concern expressed on the CNPA board being the RLUP board.

RLUP may need to extend beyond the CNP boundary to reflect local community boundaries which are split currently by the NP boundary line. It should be independent of the CNPA

### NPPP consultation responses

There was a lot of support for the NPPP cut across many respondents except for land management sector. This included residents and visitors.

Three main response areas on nature objectives:

- Support for objectives on species conservation river restoration, farm sin carbon and biodiversity planning.
- Group of comments where respondents are not clear eg 50% of land for primarily nature, designated sites positive contribution for nature recovery nature networks
- Some stronger objections - woodland expansion, Muir burn game bird and deer density – more polarised views. CNPA looking for middle ground where there is common agreement.

#### Discussion

Deer – still concern in some members about the use of densities as a metric rather than on occupancy and effects as a metric. Concern about CNPA not listening to deer interests. Density is proposed as a communication device within the NPPP but actions around effect are taken forward. We will have to describe the outcome of deer management in terms of the habitat conditions. This is detailed below the NPPP.

NPPP could recognise the timing issues around deer levels. Occupancy level ties impacts to a particular parcel of land. This can allow varying density rather than a blanket density target. Where regeneration has been established higher deer numbers may be appropriate. Should also consider other herbivores such as sheep and hares, they too have effects on habitat.

There will be a formal consultation response document in due course. This will come to CNSG and be publically available. This will include reflections on the submissions supplied.

Muir burn and woodland regeneration and intensity of game bird shooting are all issues relative to conservation. Balance of habitats has changed NPPP could re-emphasise that all habitats, including heather moorland, are important and their methods of management should be supported. However 49% of NP is still open landscapes and we are in a new place where some more woodland in necessary for environmental. Diversity of habitats and landscape and managed mix is really the best way forward this includes open heather moorland.

#### **Raptor Discussion**

CNAP and NPPP – has actions for raptors under a variety of areas from elimination of persecution to habitat improvements and network recovery.

Raptor work on going including ECMP and tagging. However a project could bring together a wider range of raptor work. CNPA can take this forward as it sits between other interests. Project board could be inclusive of main interests. Project could be long term.

#### Discussion

Like to hear more about the eco-tourism and community engagement.

Issues around a raptor study group. Permission to fit tags is complex. Limited number of people who can get permission to fit tags. Process is not open and transparent and accountable and BTO seems to have conflicted interests. The project needs to be objective and broad based. This will include NS, RSG, NTS, GWCT, RSPB etc. Emphasis will be on evidence.

Project will have opportunity for community and volunteers involvement.

Projects lead by CNPA with support, including funding, from others.

**AP2** - Draft project proposal will be brought to the CNSG by end of March – Sarah

## **Beaver**

Introduction and presentation

Summary of actions in the CNAP and beaver sub group. Scot Gov position changed last year.

**AP3** – Beaver Study report will be sent to CNSG end of March by SH

Study conclusion is that migration to NP unlikely because of conditions of the rivers, lack of food and water flow and barriers from hydro infrastructure.

Discussion

Plans for reintroductions – National strategy to look for areas where it can be done with minimum conflict – CNP is high on the list. There have already been some interest for an application from within CNP.

We want CNSG response on the possibility and what they would like to see in any applications. Does the group want to see further studies?

Wildland LTD supportive of beavers in the NP. Need to deal with the lack of riparian woodlands and this needs to be addressed immediately. Willows and aspen are important species.

CNPA could consider a risk assessment on feral pigs as NS has done nationally. CUAG is looking at this already.

There is concern that while good habitat is within the CNP but what about further downstream? How do we address this within the CNP work? Need to find a mechanism to involve down stream interests. Could be as part of an assessment for any translocation process. Consultation should be considered across the whole catchment. Timescales for expansion will be included.

Next steps:

- Formal board paper in June presenting options for the role of the CNPA.
- Beaver sub group still active and will feed back to CNSG

## **Heritage Horizons**

Update on all of the NBS projects.

- NBS officers now in place
- Consultancy contracts are being published with contracts in place by the end of March, slight delay but not a high risk.
- Catchment design contracts a bit later.

Principle work to be completed by end of 2022.

## **AOB**

Next meeting 16<sup>th</sup> June on site – location to be agreed.

**AP 4** – suggestion on site visits for the next meeting in June to MH – All

AP	description	lead
<b>AP1</b>	Discussion on Edinburgh declaration fund and NRF projects to be brought back to group in June –	MH
<b>AP2</b>	Draft project proposal will be brought to the CNSG by end of March	SH
<b>AP3</b>	Beaver Study report will be sent to CNSG end of March	SH
<b>AP 4</b>	suggestion on site visits for the next meeting in June	All