

Responding to the DEFRA Land Use Consultation

17 April 2025

Report of Chief Officer - Planning and Climate Change

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To advise members of the publication of a consultation on Land Use by DEFRA and to provide members with the opportunity to consider a proposed response to enable a formal response to be agreed and submitted.

This report is public

RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) That the report be noted and that the responses to the consultation questions as proposed as Appendix 1 are considered and submitted as the Council's corporate response to the consultation.**

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) are consulting on the preparation of a Land Use Framework (LUF) ¹, which will set out how land should be used in the future. The consultation presents the Government's assessment of the scale of land use change required to meet both the Environmental Improvement Plan (EIP) and Climate Change Act targets, and how these can be achieved alongside the land that is needed for food, housing and energy. A key challenge of the framework will be balancing the need for these competing priorities to be delivered over a finite amount of space, but the Government are making it clear that this is a critical priority over the coming years. The LUF will be a step forward towards this to allow government, businesses, communities and charities to work together towards this shared goal and align local and national ambitions and priorities.
- 1.2 The consultation not only explores how land can serve multiple purposes at once and the ways in which land must be considered for a wide range of varying uses, but also how integrating some of these elements together, such as nature recovery into housebuilding, rather than these competing with one another can allow shared goals to be met. The LUF consultation document states that it *"is not going to tell people what to do with their fields or replace the planning system...[but will] reflect feedback from this current consultation [and] set out a direction for England's land use and recognise the challenges that land managers will need us to address so that they can deliver our shared vision"*.

¹ [Land use in England consultation \(2025\)](#)

- 1.3 The consultation is taking place before a LUF (the framework itself) is formulated to ensure that it will be informed by feedback and therefore include what will make it most useful, what principles will guide it and will allow focus on what changes will be needed for it to be delivered.

2.0 Proposal Details

- 2.1 The consultation document provides some useful background and sets out a vision for land use in England, what it means by land use change and a long term view of land use change. It sets out how, by land areas, England is still predominantly rural, with 85% of the total land area being classed as rural². By population however, England is largely urban, with 83% of people living in urban settlements in 2020³. It also sets out how England's natural capital *"generates an annual flow of benefits, including food production, of £37bn in England alone"*⁴.
- 2.2 As stated there is no framework in existence at this stage, instead the consultation sets out the principles that the framework will cover when formulated. It seeks opinions and views on the principles that will underpin the framework such as land use changes in terms of scale and type that might be needed, as well as the actions government could take to support this.
- 2.2 When published the Land Use Framework will include:
- Principles that Government will apply to policy with land use implications.
 - A description of how policy levers will develop and adapt to support land use change.
 - A release of land use data and analysis to support public and private sector innovation in spatial decision making, and the development of tools to support land managers in practice.
- 2.3 The consultation asks 24 questions through which it aims to encourage a public discussion about how land can better support government's plan for change. The consultation makes clear⁵ that this is the start of a conversation about how land is used in England and that it is the Government's plan for *"policy co-creation"*.
- 2.4 They state that they *"want to involve [us] in developing the policy levers that will enable a fair land use transition"* and that on aiming for policy co-creation they will take account of the contributions from the online consultation and will continue the conversation *"even after the Land Use Framework is published and are considering options for how the Framework could be reviewed or updated over time. This would allow new information such as progress against targets, updated analysis and new agricultural innovation into account. In Scotland, a Land Use Strategy is produced every five years"*⁶.

² See the Rural-Urban Classification for Output Areas in England (2011, most recent year for which data is available):

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/610c08e4d3bf7f044024465a/RUCOA_leaflet_Jan2017.pdf

³ Statistical Digest of Rural England, April 2024:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/661d3b95ac3dae9a53bd3dd3/16_04_2024_-_1__Population.pdf

⁴ 2022 value derived from the ONS publication "UK natural capital accounts 2024":

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/environmentalaccounts/bulletins/uknaturalcapitalaccounts/2024>. Please refer to Section 1.2 of the Analytical Annex for more information on the value of natural capital.

⁵ Page 25 of LUF consultation.

⁶ Page 25 of LUF consultation.

- 2.5 The consultation document is also accompanied by a Land Use Analytical Annex⁷ that provides much of the data behind the proposed approaches set out in the consultation document.

3.0 Details of Consultation

- 3.1 The current consultation runs between 31st January 2025 and closes on 25th April 2025. Members of the Local Plan Review Group received a similar report and the draft responses to the questions (as set out here at Appendix 1) on 14th April 2025.
- 3.2 A copy of the responses to the consultation are set out in Appendix 1. Many of the questions provide the opportunity to provide additional detail with open ended questions, which LCC have done where considered necessary.
- 3.3 To summarise some of the areas LCC has highlighted, the issue of the multifunctionality of land is an area that LCC raises throughout as extremely important, as well as the co-benefits of land use, which is something our adopted Local Plan (Climate Emergency) (2025) has looked to do in many of its policies. LCC also flag where it disagrees with the proposed approach in the LUF consultation, for example raising in question 16 that the climate change scenarios being used are not considered by LCC to be appropriate (2 degrees of warming) and that this should be based upon the UKCP18 RPC8.5 (RCP4.5 at a minimum).
- 3.4 In terms of a timeline for the framework moving forwards, DEFRA state that Government analysis of consultation responses will take place between May and July 2025, and that the Government will publish a response to the Land Use Consultation in the form of a Land Use Framework for England (anticipated in July 2025 but the timing of which is still subject to confirmation).

4.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

	Option 1: To respond to the consultation questions	Option 2: To respond to the consultation with other comments	Option 3: To not submit a response to this consultation
Advantages	The views of the Council will be considered by Government when deciding how to proceed.	The views of the Council will be considered by Government when deciding how to proceed.	None
Disadvantages	None	Dependent upon the extent of any additional considerations, there is limited time to submit the	The formal opinion of Lancaster City Council would not be provided, and an opportunity to contribute to the

⁷ [Land Use Analytical Annex \(2025\)](#)

		consultation response.	consultation would be lost.
Risks	None.	None.	None.

5.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

- 5.1 The preferred option is Option 1, to respond to the consultation as drafted following consultation with Local Plan Review Group.

6.0 Conclusion

- 6.1 The consultation closes at midday on 25th April 2025. The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs state that analysis of consultation responses will take place between May and July, and that the Government will publish a response to the Land Use Consultation in the form of a Land Use Framework for England (anticipated in July 2025 but the timing of which is still subject to confirmation).
- 6.2 As previously stated, when published the Land Use Framework will include:
- principles that Government will apply to policy with land use implications.
 - A description of how policy levers will develop and adapt to support land use change.
 - A release of land use data and analysis to support public and private sector innovation in spatial decision making, and the development of tools to support land managers in practice.

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT (including Health & Safety, Equality & Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing):

There are no impacts identified as the report concerns only a response to a Central Government consultation.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no legal implications to completing and submitting the consultation response.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications at this stage.

OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS, such as Human Resources, Information Services, Property, Open Spaces

There are no other resource implications at this stage.

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The s151 Officer has been consulted and has no comments to add

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no comments to add.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

- (i) [DEFRA \(2025\) Land Use Consultation](#)
- (ii) [DEFRA \(2025\) Land Use Consultation Analytical Annex](#)

Contact Officer: Diane Neville

Telephone: 01524 582335

Email: dneville@lancaster.gov.uk

Ref: N/A

Appendix 1: Lancaster City Council's draft response to DEFRA's Land Use Consultation.

Consultation form: Land use consultation

QUESTION 1: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our assessment of the scale and type of land use change needed, as set out in this consultation and the Analytical Annex?

- Strongly agree
- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree /
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

Please explain your response, including your views on the potential scale of change and the type of change needed, including any specific types of change.

ANSWER: *The Analytical Annex provides supporting analysis for the scale and type of land use change needed. LCC generally agrees with the scale and type of land use change needed, but recognises that better resolution will be needed at regional and local scales via the Local Plan and Local Nature Recovery Strategy.*

QUESTION 2: Do you agree or disagree with the land use principles proposed?

- **Strongly agree**
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

Please provide any reasons for your response including any changes you believe should be made.

ANSWER: *The purpose of the principles, is to transform how government makes policy and the information they provide to decision-makers. LCC are supportive of the 5 principles and consider that co-design (principle 1) is vital to ensure strategies align and are not simply top-down approaches. LCC also strongly agree with Principle 2 in relation to multifunctional land. This approach should already be happening and Local Plan and DM officers in LPAs will always aim for this approach, however the priorities afforded to national housebuilding targets often prevent this from being realised. Principle 3 also has links with work that is being undertaken by LCC at the local level in terms of playing to the strengths of the land and making sure land is used for its best purpose, to the extent that this is possible within the remit of LCC. LCC also strongly support Principle 4 relating to decision fit for the long-term. Land use decisions at a national level have often been more short term based on parliamentary cycles to achieve manifesto aims rather than ensuring the best use of land. The example used in the consultation document in P4 relates to planning for new homes that resilient to climate impacts such as flooding and overheating. This is something that LCC have been strongly focused on for some considerable time now but have met resistance at the national level so this would be strongly supported. Another important example is the need to plan for land use change in areas liable to increased flood risk in future, especially coastal retreat. The new flood risk mapping is an important tool in this. Some farm businesses will have to plan for significant changes and may need greater support to transition, LCC are also in agreement that Land use policy should be responsive to new data*

or opportunities and pressures that arise to ensure that identified needs can be met and new technology and approaches taking advantage of.

LCC also suggest that the inclusion of a new principle could be considered relating the interconnected nature of all land, to ensure that the choice of land is best for neighbouring sites as well as the specific site in question. This factor is now currently treated as a principle for the strategy. For example, factors such as enhancing ecological corridors, avoiding contributing to the urban heat island effect, runoff from agricultural fields into waterways, developments causing inadvertent flooding to neighbouring sites, and the effects of noise and light pollution on nature would also fall under this priority.

QUESTION 3: Beyond Government departments in England, which other decision makers do you think would benefit from applying these principles?

- **Combined and local authorities (including local planning authorities)**
- **Landowners and land managers (including environmental and heritage groups)**
- **Others (please specify)**

ANSWER: The purpose of the principles is to transform how government makes policy and the information they provide to decision makers. LCC consider these principles should be considered and applied by any organisation that deal with land management and land use changes. This would include statutory agencies, utilities and MoD among others.

QUESTION 4: What are the policies, incentives and other changes that are needed to support decision makers in the agricultural sector to deliver this scale of land use change, while considering the importance of food production?

ANSWER: The government are producing a long-term farming road map and a Food Strategy. The incentives will need to reflect various ownership structure like tenancies and consider the wider food chain. LCC consider that it will be important that the issue is considered for food security and food sovereignty, so the farming system becomes more resilient to the risks of climate change and nature loss (like extreme weather events and declines in pollinator populations). LCC also consider that there could be the introduction of a new product classification similar to 'free range' or 'organic' but for products grown or pastured on biodiverse land. This could provide a premium sale price for goods without need for subsidisation.

To implement large scale land use change without a commensurate decrease in agricultural output, a large shift would be needed towards more efficient and advanced farming technologies that can be employed over smaller areas, or take advantage of previously unsuitable areas. LCC therefore consider that some of the incentives and policies should be aimed towards farming innovation as well as for direct changes such as tree planting or enhancing wildlife.

It should also be noted that there are risks of unintended outcomes, with some agricultural businesses responding in category 2, making small changes in the margins, but also increasing agricultural intensity in other areas, as has occurred in the past, e.g. production subsidies in 1970s led to major conversion from mixed farming to arable, requirement for rotational set-aside in 1980s led to reduced uptake of tree-planting and hedge loss continued or increased.

Uncertainty about effects of future climate change on food production (increase in extreme

rainfall events, increased frequency of drought etc.) means it is all the more important to keep the best and most versatile land available for future food production, and therefore to avoid urban development on those soils, as conversion to urban development removes future options for food production when/if required. Farming should also be continued and supported across the entire county not just where it may be most profitable. Change of use to habitats leaves more options available if needed.

QUESTION 5: How could Government support more land managers to implement multifunctional land uses that deliver a wider range of benefits, such as agroforestry systems with trees within pasture or arable fields?

ANSWER: Measures which may help include provision of free training on options, increased financial and technical support for preparation of farm plans (spatial and business) which are needed to inform decision-making about changes for agricultural business. Countryside Stewardship and SFI provided a wide menu of offerings, giving flexibility for farmers and other landowners to develop measures for their land. However, with many uncertainties about economy and farming, farmers are likely to be cautious about change. Therefore good evidence on benefits, lots of good case studies and easy and inexpensive access to business and environmental technical support are needed to support land managers in their decision-making on changes.

Post-Brexit there has been a reduction in confidence in Government over the process of change in agricultural support and agri-environment schemes, including the recent abrupt halt to SFI applications. This is coupled with the public anger among farmers about changes in inheritance tax on farms. There are also concerns that Government may enter trade deals which will increase import of agricultural goods that undercut British produce and are produced to lower standards of environmental practice and animal welfare. Such deals risk undermining the sustainability of British agriculture and make farmers more reluctant to change management or release land for any non-business use.

It may be of assistance to land owners/occupiers to be able to see a dashboard of the number and potential cost of applications submitted regionally and nationally during the application period and the number type and cost of those accepted so they can see whether schemes are over-subscribed and whether funding may still be available before the ceiling budget is reached. Dashboard information from previous years could show analysis of applications and acceptance of schemes.

Small farms and those in more marginal areas are disadvantaged by the preferential funding of schemes that can deliver bigger areas. The administrative requirement on small farms in meeting the reporting requirements of agri-environment schemes and other requirements is proportionally greater than on large productive farms and estates which already employ farm agents and a range of other support. There are additional change costs involved for tenant farmers or where mortgage holder consent is also required.

QUESTION 6: What should the Government consider in identifying suitable locations for spatially targeted incentives?

ANSWER: The proposed approach to spatial prioritisation of outcomes and the spatial targeting of incentives for land use change are going to be set out in the Farming Roadmap and will consider responses to this consultation.

LCC consider that the following should be considered in identifying suitable locations for spatially targeted incentives: Floodplains, areas that drain into water courses, areas

bordering or close to nature reserves and other semiwild areas, riparian zones, areas bordering ancient woodland, areas bordering priority or irreplaceable habitats, areas on or bordering large natural carbon stores such as peatland, areas highlighted in local LNRS strategies, areas of connection between isolated habitats, land close to (or upriver from) flood-prone settlements, land suffering from the urban heat island effect.

The areas need to be large enough to deliver multiple benefits at scale and will typically need to involve multiple landowners. Upland areas and peatland restoration should be priorities due to multiple ecosystem services, including carbon storage, water management and nature conservation and especially because there is no scope for substitution of upland and peat areas. This means, for example, that forestry production which is damaging to upland soils and habitats should move down onto lower ground (where it will also tend to be more productive).

Coastal areas need spatially targeted incentives to support land use changes for expected coastal change and increased flood risk. Coastal habitat restoration should be prioritised. Government needs to provide funding for the coordination, participation and technical support necessary to plan and implement large schemes.

QUESTION 7: What approach(es) could most effectively support land managers and the agricultural sector to steer land use changes to where they can deliver greater potential benefits and lower trade-offs?

ANSWER: LCC consider that the following approach could most effectively support land manager and the agricultural sector:

- Mapping of the areas of greatest potential benefit for each land use change type.*
- Charging Developers a set fee per hectare for changing the use of the highest quality agricultural land (i.e., grades 1,2 and 3a) to a non-agricultural use. The fee could vary depending on the specific grade.*
- Once mapping is complete for LUC incentives, consideration could also be given to allow a system whereby individual land managers can apply to make changes to the mapping for their land (if appropriate criteria are met) this would allow land managers to get involved with the process and would identify and rectify errors made in the mapping process.*

QUESTION 8: In addition to promoting multifunctional land uses and spatially targeting land use change incentives, what more could be done by Government or others to reduce the risk that we displace more food production and environmental impacts abroad? Please give details for your answer. Monitoring land use change or production on agricultural land Accounting for displaced food production impacts in project appraisals Protecting the best agricultural land from permanent land use changes Other (please specify)

ANSWER: LCC consider that the more the government prioritises food production by spatially targeting incentives, the more that changes may become concentrated in less agriculturally productive landscapes. The proposed approach to spatial prioritisation of outcomes and the spatial targeting of incentives for land use change are going to be set out in the Farming Roadmap and will consider responses to this consultation. The LUF states that the principles that are included in the consultation document are intended to transform policy and incentives for land use change in England to protect land for food production which will help to reduce the risk of displacing food production and any associated environmental impacts abroad.

In addition, Local Plans would need to zone areas with protection for food production (LUC categories 2 and 3 supported), and with a strong presumption against urban development. This is necessary because both commercial and housing developments want to target areas with low gradient which are simpler to develop, but are also the most productive for agriculture. Piecemeal urban development increases pressure for further conversion of productive food-producing land to development.

It could also be proposed that there be a consideration of either 'nutrient density' or 'calorific' net gain in developments or changes of use of agricultural land. This would mean demonstrating at the planning stage (or possibly point of sale) that a net increase of food production can be achieved. Note that this would be across the entire land holdings of the farm, and not limited to an application site.

QUESTION 9: What should Government consider in increasing private investment towards appropriate land use changes)

ANSWER: LCC consider that the introduction of a method of sponsorship for land use changes that have co-benefits could be introduced. For example, a farmer wanting to re-naturalise a flood plain within their property, but this is unaffordable to them, or couldn't justify the loss of income-producing land, then the Farmer could apply for a sponsored project, with project details and costs included. A private individual or company could then look over the list of local projects and choose to contribute a monetary sum to sponsor the project either for altruistic reasons, or to prevent flooding or improve water quality etc.

It is considered that this idea could work for some types of project, e.g. water companies have invested in both upland restoration and in some lowland areas in the past., however it is recognised that small farm scale projects may not be attractive for green finance initiatives, as companies and investment institutions are more likely to be looking for large scale projects in which to invest.

An example of this is the funding leveraged for the South Downs National Park project (and there is also at least one initiative in Scotland).

It is recognised that a significant amount of very good quality baseline data would be needed and that there are finance-led reporting requirements, needed to develop trust that the benefits are delivered on the ground. Also, financial investors vary in their requirements, with some willing to invest for reputation reasons, whereas others expect some financial return from investment. Some habitat banks are working with investors, with initial funding followed by a potential return from sale of units. The issue is that most large-scale change needs Government investment in pump-priming funding for projects to become sufficiently attractive for private investment.

QUESTION 10: What changes are needed to accelerate 30by30 delivery, including by enabling Protected Landscapes to contribute more? Please provide any specific suggestions.

- **Strengthened Protected Landscapes legislation (around governance and regulations or duties on key actors) with a greater focus on nature**
- **Tools: such as greater alignment of existing Defra schemes with the 30by30 criteria²³**

- **Resources: such as funding or guidance for those managing Protected Landscapes for nature**
- **Other (please specify)**

ANSWER: LCC wish to highlight that 2030, and therefore “30by30” is only 5 years away. Greater focus on nature in the legislation around protected landscapes (national parks and AONBs) would be welcomed but will this have an impact for these timescales.

LCC would also like to flag that it is vague in terms of direction. It is true that whilst there are constraints on inappropriate development in protected landscapes and some incentives for action to benefit conservation of heritage and nature recovery, for the most part it is business as usual and outside SSSIs farming is as intensive as anywhere else. Increasing incentives in those areas will help, i.e. spatial targeting. Short of introducing compulsory measures or purchasing the land, it is difficult to see how ‘do more’ can be delivered unless farmers opt to do it.

One approach however could be that steps are taken to make it easier to ‘officially’ protect land and landscapes. This could include, for example, new environmental designations which do not require any onerous management or maintenance.

QUESTION 11: What approaches could cost-effectively support nature and food production in urban landscapes and on land managed for recreation?

ANSWER: LCC support the need to support nature and food production and note that the Green Infrastructure Framework will guide principles in relation to this and how land is managed for recreation but consider that this should be widened to include ‘blue’ infrastructure too rather than just green to produce a Green and Blue Infrastructure Framework.

In terms of the approaches that could cost effectively support nature and food production, LCC consider that *there should be stronger requirements in central government planning policy for the provision of fruit trees in the gardens of new builds and that the incorporation of rooftop growing spaces, balcony growing spaces, allotments, and composting sites should also be included, as well as the incorporation of community edible gardens into the corners of parks and other open spaces.*

QUESTION 12: How can Government ensure that development and infrastructure spatial plans take advantage of potential co-benefits and manage trade-offs?

ANSWER: LCC considers that *joined up decisions are vital to ensure that co-benefits are captured, and this approach will make sure that it is a holistic approach. It should be noted that, building upon that previously set out in the NPPF, the recent publication of the Planning & Infrastructure Bill (March 2025) sets out the requirements for newly established strategic planning authorities (which includes combined authorities, upper-tier county councils and unitary authorities) to prepare a Spatial Development Strategy (SDS). SDSs are intended to result in more strategic planning at a sub-regional/regional level.*

LCC also consider that *there should be the introduction of a requirement in the creation of spatial plans that each piece of land should be multifunctional and deliver co-benefits. SDSs would allow for these plans to be developed from the bottom up, instead of from the top down, which could potentially better identify co-benefits.*

QUESTION 13: How can local authorities and Government better take account of land use opportunities in transport planning?

ANSWER: By mapping local transport infrastructure and highlighting any gaps or deficiencies. This would allow potential transport projects that require land use change to be identified and prioritised earlier within the planning process. Consideration should also be given to prioritising fully planned and costed projects over speculative projects.

It is important that transport planning takes full account of the impacts of severance, considering not only the direct/immediate effects on species and habitats but also the effects on potential future ecological networks, e.g. via Local Nature Recovery Strategy and Green and Blue Infrastructure Planning. In addition, where new road or rail improvements lead to portions of land being left which are not viable for agricultural use the opportunities for land use change should explore and assess all the local options, which should include any opportunities for nature recovery, for better sustainable travel and public access to greenspace or local food production in addition to any scope for other development. Opportunities should be sought to reduce severance effects of existing transport infrastructure in addition to considering additional transport development through safer and more accessible crossings for non-motorised users and for wildlife (such as green bridges). Transport infrastructure should also have multiple uses such as including renewables. Authorities should be aspirational in identifying opportunities for future cycleways and green access routes even if not all the sections are fully deliverable initially.

QUESTION 14: How can Government support closer coordination across plans and strategies for different sectors and outcomes at the local and regional level?

ANSWER: LCC consider that this could be achieved through funding coordination posts/teams which are cross departmental to ensure that departments are not working in silos. This would support better and more holistic land use planning which recognises synergistic and competing land uses.

The government could also provide more training and other interdisciplinary support for those working with landowners. Without informed 'buy-in' by landowners it will not be possible to achieve the change envisaged in the framework.

QUESTION 15: Would including additional major landowners and land managers in the Adaptation Reporting Power process (see above) support adaptation knowledge sharing? Please give any reasons or alternative suggestions

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

ANSWER: Adopting a template format to these reports could potentially reduce the financial burden of reporting and standardise the outputs, which would make it easier to directly compare reports from different organisations. At present, the freeform format of the reports allows these to vary greatly from one another in terms of detail and content, which makes them less accessible to support adaptation knowledge sharing. However, any template proposed would need to be formatted accordingly such that it could be used across all sectors and land use types.

QUESTION 16: Below is a list of activities the Government could implement to support landowners, land managers, and communities to understand and prepare for the impacts of climate change. Please select the activities you think should be prioritised and give any reasons for your answer, or specific approaches you would like to see.

- Providing better information on local climate impacts to inform local decision making and strategies (for example, translating UK Climate Projections²⁹ into what these mean in terms of on-the-ground impacts on farming, buildings, communities and nature)
- Providing improved tools and guidance for turning climate information into tangible actions (for example, how to produce an adaptation plan for different sectors)
- Developing and sharing clearer objectives and resilience standards (for example, a clear picture and standards of good practice for each sector under a 2°C climate scenario³⁰)
- Supporting the right actions in the right places in a changing climate (for example, prioritising incentives for sustainable land uses where they will be most resilient to climate change)
- Other (please specify)

ANSWER: *It is considered that all of the activities listed in the bullet points should be implemented to support landowners, land managers, and communities to understand and prepare for the impacts of climate change.*

For bullet point 1, providing better information on local climate impacts to inform local decision making and strategies into what these mean in terms of on-the-ground impacts on farming, buildings, communities and nature would be very useful, in the same way that providing improved tools and guidance for turning climate information into tangible actions would be useful as set out in bullet point 2.

For bullet point 3, LCC strongly agree that a standard for best practice would be invaluable for set warming scenarios. However, it is not considered that a 2 degree climate scenario is appropriate, and instead the bar for adaptation should be based on UKCP18 RPC8.5 (RCP4.5 at a minimum).

QUESTION 17: What changes to how Government's spatial data is presented or shared could increase its value in decision making and make it more accessible?

- Updating existing Government tools, apps, portals or websites
- Changes to support use through private sector tools, apps or websites
- Bringing data from different sectors together into common portals or maps
- Increasing consistency across spatial and land datasets
- More explanation or support for using existing tools, apps or websites
- Greater use of geospatial indicators such as Unique Property Reference Numbers (UPRNs) and INSPIRE IDs to allow data to be more easily displayed on a map
- Other (please specify)

ANSWER: *LCC consider that bullet points 1, 3, 4 and 6 would be the most useful in adding value (Increasing consistency across spatial and land datasets and more explanation or support for using existing tools, apps or websites). Some types may need more regular and extensive surveys to update the data regularly.*

QUESTION 18: What improvements could be made to how spatial data is captured, managed, or used to support land use decisions in the following sectors? Please give any reasons for your answer or specific suggestions.

- Development and planning: such as environmental survey data
- Farming: such as supply chain data and carbon or nature baseline measurements
- environment and forestry: such as local and volunteer-collected environmental records
- Recreation and access: such as accessible land and route data
- Government-published land and agricultural statistics

ANSWER: *LCC have not provided an answer to this question.*

QUESTION 19: What improvements are needed to the quality, availability and accessibility of ALC data to support effective land use decisions?

ANSWER: *LCC have not provided an answer to this question.*

QUESTION 20: Which sources of spatial data should Government consider making free or easier to access, including via open licensing, to increase their potential benefit?

ANSWER: *LCC support open data access and consider that all spatial data should be free and easier to access.*

QUESTION 21: What gaps in land management capacity or skills do you anticipate as part of the land use transition? Please include any suggestions to address these gaps.

- Development and planning
- Farming
- Environment and forestry
- Recreation and access
- Other (please specify)

ANSWER

LCC anticipate the following gaps:

- *Development and Planning – Ecology expertise is missing from many planning departments. Net zero and climate adaptation spatial planning is an expertise missing from many planning departments.*
- *Farming – expertise in sustainable and regenerative farming may be limited in many areas*
- *Other – renewables skills (e.g. installation of solar farms/wind turbines) may not be able to keep pace with demand*

QUESTION 22: How could the sharing of best practice in innovative land use practices and management be improved?

ANSWER: *LCC consider that one approach could be to introduce an annual award for innovation in the relevant land use sector. The submissions of these could then also be used to collect a database of case studies and best practice.*

QUESTION 23: Should a Land Use Framework for England be updated periodically, and if so, how frequently should this occur?

- **Yes, every 5 years**
- Yes, every 3 years

- Yes, another frequency or approach. Please provide details.
- No
- I don't know

ANSWER: *LCC consider that 5 years is a practical timeframe and also aligns well with timescales for Local Plan Reviews.*

QUESTION 24: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed areas above? Please include comments or suggestions with your answer.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree /
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

ANSWER: *LCC have not provided an answer to this question.*