



# Making Space for Nature in Kent and Medway

Developing the County's Local Nature Recovery Strategy

## MINUTES Stakeholder Engagement Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Stakeholder Engagement and Communication meeting 08.05.24, 11:00-12:00, Teams Meeting

### Summary of actions and items agreed.

- 1.1 Items agreed – monthly 1 hour TAG meetings with standing agenda: -
- Review of monthly analytics, alongside...
  - Forward look at communications timeline/planner
  - Monthly review of Stakeholder analysis (to be formulated by MS4N team)
  - Overview of messaging tool kit and comms plan competition

### 1.2 Actions

| Action  | Who   | Status      |
|---|-------|-------------|
| Determine an end date for promoting comment on the Priorities Shortlist (end date is established as end of May)   | RB/CD | Complete    |
| Feedback to Robbie the issues that Adriana experienced with the Priorities for Nature mapping tool  | CD    | Complete    |
| Establish date for Priorities for Nature Mapping tool (Official launch date is set for 3 <sup>rd</sup> June.  | RB    | Complete    |
| Messaging to manage expectations around Priorities for Nature mapping tool to be developed. Also, messaging around how users are kept informed of next steps etc. | RB/CD | In Progress |
| Contact users of Actions for Nature mapping tool to encourage them to take part in this latest tool   | RB    | In Progress |
| MS4N team to update Rachel and Chris prior to next TAG on NUS engagement work – Chris to decide specific group that we will focus on in next TAG                  | CD/RB | In Progress |

## **Attending and apologies**

Charlotte Lewis – Kent Wildlife Trust  
Karen Rigby-Faux – Natural England  
Rachel Boot – Making Space for Nature Project Team  
Chris Drake – Making Space for Nature Project Team – TAG Chair  
Will Maiden – Forestry Commission  
Mollie Amor – Kent Wildlife Trust  
Adriana Consorte-McCrea –  
Kathryn Hearnden – Kent Downs National Landscape  
Sophie Page – Environment Agency  
Alyn Thomas - Communications Manager KCC

### Apologies:

Anne Wynde – Engagement and Consultation Lead, KCC  
Laura Taylor – Engagement and Behavior Change Team Leader in the Environment and Circular Economy team.

### **1. Welcome and approval of March minutes – Chris Drake (Chair)**

No comments from TAG on previous month's minutes

### **2. Overview of April (and March) communications activity and forward look at May and into June – Rachel (10 mins)**

Key points from Rachel:

Looking back a month

– KWT Podcast with Emma Loder-Symonds of Nonington Farms and Liz Milne talking about the LNRS

- Draft Shortlist of Priorities published – 22<sup>nd</sup> April, and comms surrounding this
- Promotion for Shortlist and Measures workshops
- Coastal and Marine workshop – 25<sup>th</sup> April
- Kent Design Conference – 30<sup>th</sup> April
- Living Land Show – 2<sup>nd</sup> May
- Other work – CPRE magazine article
- Suzie Hammond of KCC talking about LNRS at the Heads Estates Summit
- Liaising with libraries to get Learning Pack out.
- Artists selected for our Art Commission

- What's been working – stories about nature recovery in Kent on our socials.
- On website – events page popular, as well as BNG resources, suggesting farmers and landowners, possibly developers and planners are making use of the website.

A month ahead:

- Potential Measures workshop promotion
- Heathfield Show – 25<sup>th</sup> May
- Viticulture engagement
- Farmer/Landowner events throughout June/July
- South of England Show (9<sup>th</sup> June)

CL comment – what is the deadline for promoting comment on the shortlist?

RB/CD – one hasn't been set, but we can double check and let you know. Focus will now be shifting to both Potential Measures and Priorities for Nature mapping tool, so less focus will be given to the Draft Shortlist commenting. Rachel to check about deadline for comment.

CL question – what is the purpose of the artwork project?

RB: We are conscious that we are giving people an awful lot of data, and much of it is quite dry/hard to visually perceive, so we are hoping that by creating artworks we are sparking inspiration about what it is we are trying to achieve for nature recovery – we are following the lead of SERT who did a similar thing with artwork that depicted a fully restored Upper Beult – they received a high level of engagement for the work. We are also planning to use the artwork at various events, possibly engaging more children, but primarily just offering a different way for people to consider what we are doing and engage with us.

Other comments – TAG asked if they are happy to receive direct emails from Rachel in regards upcoming comms, rather than relying on comms planner – group agree that direct emails to the TAG group are satisfactory. KH comments there are issues with the Teams channel, so misses anything shared on that.

SP comments – Maidstone Museum as potential gallery space, or Beaney – for possible exhibition use for artworks in the future.

**TAG comments on this including input on their own respective communications and engagement activity May and beyond please. (10 minutes)**

CL comment – what is the deadline for promoting comment on the shortlist?

RB/CD – one hasn't been set, but we can double check and let you know. Focus will now be shifting to both Potential Measures and Priorities for Nature mapping tool, so less focus will be given to the Draft Shortlist commenting. Rachel to check about deadline for comment.

CL question – what is the purpose of the artwork project?

RB: We are conscious that we are giving people an awful lot of data, and much of it is quite dry/hard to visually perceive, so we are hoping that by creating artworks we are sparking inspiration about what it is we are trying to achieve for nature recovery – we are following the lead of SERT who did a similar thing with artwork that depicted a fully restored Upper Beult – they received a high level of engagement for the work. We are also planning to use the artwork at various events, possibly engaging more children, but primarily just offering a different way for people to consider what we are doing and engage with us.

Other comments – TAG asked if they are happy to receive direct emails from Rachel in regards upcoming comms, rather than relying on comms planner – group agree that direct emails to the TAG group are satisfactory. KH comments there are issues with the Teams channel, so misses anything shared on that.

SP comments – Maidstone Museum as potential gallery space, or Beaney – for possible exhibition use for artworks in the future

### **3. Measuring meaningful engagement –**

CD comments that although we have stakeholder analysis document, it isn't really satisfactory in terms of showing us what areas of engagement is working and what isn't. There are some stakeholders that we are still struggling to reach – Not the Usual Suspects is what we are calling the groups we should really be reaching. As a team we discussed the potential of each officer updating us on their engagement ahead of these TAG meetings, so we can bring to you a bit of insight into what has been happening, and how successful it has been, and any groups that we are struggling to engage with. The main groups that we are focusing on currently are: business, developers, mineral producers and waste sites, health, minority groups, and youth/young adults. We have health and access workshop in July, and we've had a useful meeting with Visit Kent, so there is movement. But our thinking is to bring one sector to you per meeting, and to discuss what actions we have been taking and what else is needed?

KF- From NE perspective, it's incredibly useful. We have new toolkit for our role as Supporting Authorities, and we are keen on pushing NUS's. So NE certainly need the detail, as it will be part of our reporting process.

CL- I think it would be worthwhile. So either a special meeting or focusing on 1-2 groups per session. There is value that within this group, we are engaging with these groups already, so we can see how we can cross-promote and use existing networks. Also, there are questions around

how are we monitoring this engagement? How do we know what success looks like? So perhaps on the Priorities for Nature app we should be asking people if they fall within these groups? Either within the app itself or as part of a follow up email.

ACTION – the team will start to develop this thinking, to ensure we can focus on a particular group at each TAG meeting.

CD – We've also had very useful meetings around inclusive engagement with Adriana, as well as Elysia from KWT, and Susan Hart from Natural England. All were saying similar things to the NE advice published in December – but we are conscious that it takes a long time to foster meaningful engagement, and we are very time-limited in this project. So we may only scratch surface with our attempts at this, but we are committed to starting the process. Even within existing networks, such as those within KCC, we are going in cold, and we are only getting a limited response.

KF – DEFRA and NE do recognize that the process has been squeezed, and we understand this normally takes years to develop, so there are challenges. I would be asking for the evidence that attempts have been made to engage with these groups, who we have reached out to, but we need to ask partners who already have those relationships to do that work for us, when they are doing their events. That's the expectation from DEFRA and NE – we can't expect a team of 5 people to achieve such crucial engagement. We need to think about the wider environmental outcomes too – we want to see how the LNRS will meet "15 minutes from green space". So if we had to prioritise, I would like to see that we are prioritizing around the green infrastructure strategy/15 minutes from green space issue.

CD – We can shape the agenda for the Health and Access workshop around this.

ACM – Schools have clubs – this is a good way to access some of these groupings through these. Christchurch have networks. Also, schools setting up a competition.

RF – We also must bear in mind that this is the 1<sup>st</sup> iteration of the LNRS and within 5-7 years the Secretary of State will call for a review and the process will start again. All this work will be lessons learned – NE in its sign-off will be proportionate in its approach.

SP – this is a good practice run.

#### **4. Developing messaging to accompany the Priorities Interactive Mapping Tool (10 minutes)**

CD explains mapping tool, which is linked to the areas that could become important for biodiversity (ACIB) aspect of the LNRS. This mapping tool is capturing where people want to see the priorities happening. Chris runs the mapping tool to demonstrate how it is used –

what we need help from the TAG with is around the messaging around it – what people are allowed to do etc, or is the current covering note satisfactory

ACM – what if you are a resident and you rent a property? Wasn't clear what box to tick, as there is no category for that – especially for urban residents. Also, you have to enter items individually for the same area. SP – There could be an option for a dropdown that allows you to select multiples. But it has been designed to be as simple as possible to reduce the amount of instructions needed. CD – ACTION - we will feed back to the technical team

CD comments we would like you to consider the messaging to accompany it – this will appear on a webpage, and in our comms surrounding it – can you spot any issues, is there anything else we need to include? CL asks – will we be incorporating video tutorials with this? RB – yes, we will be doing this in the same way that we did for the first mapping tool, ready for the official launch. We will be using the workshops as a soft launch, and also alerting the Actions for Nature mapping tool users – allows us to spot issues. Then package it up with messaging and officially launch it on social media and via newsletter. RB - ACTION establish exact date for Priorities for Nature mapping tool launch.

CD – Karen, there were concerns about what people's expectations might be using this app? Do we need to frame anything with that in mind?

KF – Yes – there were concerns around managing the presumption that if something is entered onto the map, it will automatically be considered as an area where action will take place. It was agreed in other TAG groups that there would be a lot of comms around this.

ACTION – messaging to be developed around mapping tool with specific focus on managing expectations of mapping tool users.

AD asks – as it gets more populated, will people be able to add to something already there?

CD – there is a rating system for each entry.

CL comments – it would be useful to understand journey – from people who are already inputted in the last mapping tool, to people who are coming at this fresh. Will they be kept updated after they have entered things, with what next steps are, how what they have added is important and why? CD – that's something that can be brought out in the messaging around the mapping tool.

CL comments – have you considered incentivizing the mapping tool? Could users be entered into a competition? To encourage the most number of people to use the tool.  
CD – it's something we can consider.

MA comments – following on from Adriana's comment. Are people able to go back in and reedit their entries? In case detail is missed on the first attempt. Can you see your own submissions as a list, and go through and edit.

CD – we will mention it to Robbie and see if it's a possibility. SP comments it may not be possible as you don't log-in. But it could be submitted to an admin? Also, following on from CL comment about follow-up comms – are the last round of users going to be contacted to let them know about this mapping tool?

CD- Yes it makes sense to do that. ACTION – contact users of Actions for Nature mapping tool to encourage them to take part in this latest tool.

**Next Meeting – 4<sup>th</sup> June**