




**Making Space  
for Nature  
in Kent and Medway**  
Developing the County's Local Nature Recovery Strategy

## Priorities Shortlisting Workshop Report – Part 1

2nd May – 9th May 2024



## **Making Space for Nature in Kent and Medway**

Making Space for Nature (MS4N) is working with partners and stakeholders to collaboratively develop the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Kent & Medway (LNRS). These strategies result from the 2021 Environment Act, with 48 to be created across England with no gaps or overlaps. Developed at a landscape scale by the Responsible Authority (with Kent County Council taking on this role for Kent and Medway), the LNRS will agree and map the local priorities and associated actions for nature recovery and wider environmental benefits, that collectively will deliver a nature recovery network for England, ending the decline of nature and supporting its recovery.

Making Space for Nature will develop:

- Spatially framed strategy for nature – focussing action to where its most needed and/or where it will deliver the greatest benefits.
- Framework for joined-up action, developed with those that will be instrumental in its delivery.
- Set of agreed priorities for nature recovery, with measures to deliver.
- Shared vision for nature recovery and the use of nature-based solutions in Kent and Medway.
- Ambitious but realistic and deliverable plan, linked to supporting mechanisms and finance.

More detail on the project can be found on the [Making Space for Nature website](#).

### **The MS4N Priorities Shortlisting Workshops**

Between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> May 2024, a series of workshops were held to consider the priorities shortlisting for nature in Kent and Medway. The purpose of these workshops was to get further stakeholder input into the refinement of the priorities for the Kent and Medway Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

Three half-day workshops were held at three different locations (West Malling, Folkestone and Sevenoaks). In total, 82 people attended, representing 54 different organisations, bodies, businesses, affiliations etc. For more details see the attendance report online at [Workshop Reports | Making Space For Nature Kent](#).

This report outlines the outcomes of the discussions in consideration of:

1. Does the LNRS suitably cover all habitats that are a priority for action in the county?
2. Does the priority shortlist sufficiently address the pressures faced by nature in the county?
3. Are any additional priorities required?

4. Are any of the priorities unrealistic or unachievable?
5. Is there anything considered not a priority?

In addition to summarising what stakeholders told us, the report also details how we will be using this to inform the resulting second draft of the LNRS priorities.

The general consensus of the workshops was that the draft priority shortlist addressed the needs of nature and its recovery in Kent and Medway, sufficiently tackling the pressures within its scope and ability to do so. It was acknowledged that the shortlist was still rather long and would benefit from further refinement – however stakeholders struggled to identify which of the priorities could be taken out. Some specific amendments and suggestions for restructuring were arrived at. This included the creation of a top level of priorities, focussing on broad habitat types or areas of priority. How the priorities have been revised following stakeholder input is detailed in the Redrafted LNRS Priorities report, online at [Workshop Reports | Making Space For Nature Kent](#).

In addition to the group discussions, a voting activity was also undertaken to help frame the discussion around the priorities and how they may be shortlisted. Part 2 of the Priorities Shortlisting Workshops Report details the outcomes of this voting activity and considers what this may tell us as we work towards finalising the priorities for the county's nature recovery strategy. This report can be found online at [Workshop Reports | Making Space For Nature Kent](#).

This report is a reflection of stakeholders' views and opinions. Views and opinions do not indicate fact. No inference should be taken from the manner or order in which the priorities are presented.

The MS4N project team would like to thank all those that attended the workshops and so enthusiastically took part in the discussions.

## **Background to how we've got to the draft LNRS priorities shortlist**

The Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) will set out the priorities, in terms of habitats and species, for recovering or enhancing biodiversity and consider the contribution that this may also make to addressing wider environmental issues with nature-based solutions. In addition to identifying the county's priorities for nature recovery and enhancement, the project will also define the potential practical actions necessary to progress towards achievement of the priorities.

This is an important stage of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy preparation, as it establishes what the strategy is seeking to achieve, and the potential measures needed to support the ambitions. Whilst working with partners and stakeholders is important to the whole process, it is during this part of the project that we particularly require meaningful

engagement - the stakeholders will be the delivery partners for the Strategy's priorities and actions. We also want to ensure that the priorities reflect what's most important to the people and organisations in Kent – to ensure it really is a LOCAL Nature Recovery Strategy, reflecting our local nature and environmental needs.

At the end of January and throughout February 2024, a series of workshops were held across the county to identify with stakeholders the pressures facing nature and the priorities that needed to be the focus of action to tackle these pressures and recover nature.

These five workshops were attended by a total over 200 people, representing 137 different organisations, bodies, businesses, affiliations etc. All sectors identified as relevant to the development of the LNRS were represented at the workshop, with exception of the health sector - the project has subsequently followed up with this stakeholder grouping.

Input to this initial stage was also achieved via online surveys and self-led workshops, using a toolkit provided by the project.

The outputs of this stakeholder input were:

- Pressures, threats and challenges for Kent and Medway's nature - those identified at the workshop were reviewed to determine which were in scope for the LNRS to address or influence and then edited into a list to be used in the priorities shortlisting process. The list also served as a check towards the end of the priorities development work to ensure all pressures were being addressed. The pressures collated with also be used to inform the strategy area description.
- Priorities for Kent and Medway's nature - over 800 priorities that stakeholders identified they would like to see for the county. These form the starting foundation of the LNRS priorities development.

These 800 priorities were then taken through a refinement process to create the draft LNRS priorities shortlist, that we will consider at the MS4N Priorities Workshops. This process, which resulted in 69 draft priorities for the LNRS, is summarised at the end of this document and the full report [Creating the Kent and Medway Local Nature Recovery Strategy draft priorities shortlist](#) can be viewed online.

The full [final draft priorities shortlist for the Kent and Medway Local Nature Recovery Strategy](#) document, and the [pressures](#) they aim to address, can both be viewed on line.

## 1. Does the LNRS suitably cover all habitats that are a priority for action in the county?

From workshop	How its addressed
Greater enhancement of our infrastructure networks and develop partnerships to deliver local corridors	There already is a sub priority and action relating to infrastructure networks.
Development of Thames [river/estuary/coast] resilience	Estuary and open coast already covered by under coastal priorities. Specific focus on Thames, and appropriateness of this, will be determined by opportunity mapping.
Drainage channels/ditches, conflict between need to improve drainage because of climate change and desirability of preserving ancient hedges and freshwater habitats.	All actions will need to be undertaken with consideration of impact on other habitats.
LM1 – Water quality, high nutrient levels/nitrogen not specifically mentioned, should it be a priority in it's own right?	To be picked up under action for this priority.
Ponds/storage (related to climate change resilience)	Covered by actions for ponds sub-priority.
Lowland meadow is one of the most species rich habitats, if the projects it to protect/promote biodiversity it should logically include lowland meadow	Already covered by lowland meadow sub-priority.
Low representation of recreational spaces (e.g. sports clubs), could be added to urban. Golf courses and cricket grounds can include ancient woodlands, nightingales etc.	Referenced under new land management priority <i>Publicly accessible open spaces managed for both wildlife and people.</i>
Review in relation to species, esp bumblebees	Species links to be picked up under dedicated LNRS priority species work.
Heathland [and other habitats] not so well known, therefore may not be adequately recognised in priorities. May also occur with other priority habitats, e.g. Ancient Woodlands. So CON1 could include Heathland. [to capture mosaic of habitats, importance of being adjacent to each other]	New priority for successional habitats (mosaic habitats and scrub) now included - <i>Protection from loss and damage of open mosaic habitats found on previously developed land and low level scrub, providing the structural diversity for the benefit of species which rely on the early successional habitats.</i>

	<p>Heathland and acid grassland priorities now combined into new sub priority – <i>Retain, restore and extend the county's acid grassland and heathland habitat mosaics, to improve the species diversity these limited habitats in Kent and Medway support.</i></p>
<p>The importance of industrial sites on north Kent marshes. One of the most prime developments in Europe , needs greater protection. Brownfield sites.</p>	<p>New priority for successional habitats (mosaic habitats and scrub) now included - <i>Protection from loss and damage of open mosaic habitats found on previously developed land and low level scrub, providing the structural diversity for the benefit of species which rely on the early successional habitats.</i></p> <p>Sub priority of <i>Protection from loss and damage of open mosaic habitats found on previously developed land for the benefit of species which rely on the early successional habitats</i> and a number of associated actions and supporting measures.</p>
<p>Scrub- more emphasis on the management of this successional habitat</p>	<p>New priority for successional habitats (mosaic habitats and scrub) now included - <i>Protection from loss and damage of open mosaic habitats found on previously developed land and low level scrub, providing the structural diversity for the benefit of species which rely on the early successional habitats.</i></p> <p>Sub priority of <i>Increase the extent of low level, scrub/successional habitat, providing a mix of young and mature scrub to enable structural diversity and the support of a wide range of species. Link this scrub habitat with hedgerows, woodland and other habitats to support wildlife corridors</i> and a number of associated actions and supporting measures.</p>
<p>Wildflowers/ farmland arable plants</p>	<p>Priority associated with this moved from farm habitats to grassland habitats, with rewording to <i>Protect, restore and increase fields with a diversity and abundance of arable weeds and wildflowers.</i></p>
<p>Gardens- ban on plastic grass and restriction on non-permeable</p>	<p>Outside scope of LNRS but can look to influence with supporting</p>

hard landscaping	measures.
Farmland woodland	Agroforestry and silvopasture referred to under priorities for woodland, nature based solutions (NBS3 soil health) and land management and land use.
Restoring ghost/dew ponds- managing more standing water	Covered under pond priority.
Include wildlife in urban areas	Already covered by urban priorities.
All rivers and streams achieve good ecological status- River Beult SSSI should have been named.	Priorities cannot refer to locations.
Peat bogs	Covered under lowland mire.
Wetlands	There are wetland priorities.
One line on heathland - but group wondered if this should be a high priority as it is rare, or low as Kent's geology, limits the range and it is better represented in other counties.	Heathland is one of five grassland priorities within the LNRS.
MAR7 fish nursery areas need linking to MAR4 seagrass – as these beds are nurseries.	Ecosystem and NBS benefits of seagrass fully reflected in amended coastal sub priority – <i>Reverse the decline in seagrass off Kent's coast to protect this important habitat for marine species and their breeding grounds and nurseries; and to preserve its vital function as a blue carbon store.</i>
Urban greenspace – important features in parks and gardens – connecting features, but consider the importance of sports field and municipal green space etc – even in terms of water management, connectivity etc	Now specifically referenced under land management and land use priority.
Sandy areas – for reptiles	Habitat requirements for specific species will be steered by the priority species work.
Habitats on development zones – features such as hedgerows and ponds need to be kept where possible.	Covered under potential measures for urban habitats.
Some habitats are irreplaceable and this needs to be noted. BNG	Irreplaceable habitats are mapped under LNRS Areas of Particular

won't replace these.	Importance for Biodiversity.
Urban habitats can be an opportunity for connectivity between countryside (an important corridor) – could include roadside verges in this.	Covered under potential measures for urban habitats. Roadside verge management included as a potential measure under a number of priorities.
Allotments	Covered under potential measures for urban habitats.
Cliffs	Inclusion as additional priority habitat for coastal to be considered by Delivery Group.
Ditches	Inclusion as additional priority habitat for coastal to be considered by Delivery Group.
Chalk reefs	Covered by dedicated sub priority under coastal habitats.
Ponds – PD1 should reflect that ponds that could have high ecological value should be restored, and not just focus on those that already have ecological value	Priority amended to include ponds which have ecological potential.
Urban settings not represented thoroughly enough – we worry urban ecology is under threat, and more is needed to connect habitat in urban settings. Open mosaic habitat PDL is strict criteria that doesn't include some of the vital corridors in urban settings. We need a strategic approach to connecting/managing the green space in urban areas. Also, low quality urban green spaces can cumulatively have a big impact on urban biodiversity.	Dedicated urban sub priorities addressing both connectivity and high quality urban green space.
Wooded vegetation is being lost in Kent. We need to ensure small bits aren't lost ie woodland shaws.	To be considered by Delivery Group.
Wood pasture and parkland isn't on there – potentially best habitat for variety of species	To be considered by Delivery Group.
Breeding bird habitat ie scrub for red-listed species ie nightingales	Habitat requirements for specific species will be steered by the priority species work. Specific scrub sub priority included.



Good quality, semi-improved grassland hugely under-recorded, lost in development plans. Might only take a small nudge to restore.	To be considered by Delivery Group.
Wider buffer for riparian corridors needed – could be 3D	Included under freshwater priority.
Legacy tree planting – ie giving trees the right space to grow, not having monocultures down the same street, native species.	Noted for potential measures.
Hop farms	To be considered by Delivery Group.
Road and railway-side verges – connectivity and nature highways – what is the baseline?? They are a barrier to wildlife so wildlife bridges and tunnels need to be considered. Using roadside and public transport links to create and determine corridors.	Covered under connectivity priority.
Heathland (HL1) – using the words ‘protect and enhance’ rather than ‘increase’ – it’s unlikely heathland will increase in Kent, but we need to protect what we have. COUNTER POINT: Heathland scrub management – instigating grazing, conflict and disturbance. There is an opportunity to increase and recover heathland rather than just protect it. Removing certain pressures will allow it to thrive.	Heathland priority amended to Retain, restore and extend the county’s acid grassland and heathland habitat mosaics, to improve the species diversity these limited habitats in Kent and Medway support.
Woodland – emphasise on the habitats that actively managed woodlands provide – actively managed woodlands are more diverse and ecologically resistant than those left unmanaged – WD1 – changing wording from ‘appropriately managed’ to ‘actively managed’.	Done

## 2. Does the priority shortlist sufficiently address the pressures faced by nature in the county?

From workshop	How its addressed
Health agenda, accessibility, health and wellbeing. Green space/social prescribing	How we provide for this agenda to be focus of July workshop.
Light pollution	Supporting measure included under urban sub priority.
Urban is missing – ran out of stickers and really wanted to put urban as a priority. Urban sprawl should be the focus i.e. development adjacent to green space	There already a section on urban environment. The LNRS is not designed to prevent urban sprawl but will direct development and growth to areas of least impact and through actions and supporting measures, and via BNG, will steer new development to provide better for wildlife.
Climate change resilience – is it sufficiently covered? More ponds, storage, reduced abstraction. Note that in Wales planning has a hierarchy where new developments must provide rainwater harvesting, etc. Measures could be part of planning system.	These have been picked up within actions and supporting measures under relevant habitats.
Water stress (urban, water re-use; SUDS; farm and land management; water for re-use (harvesting); climate induced drought; lack of standing water)	These have been picked up within actions and supporting measures under relevant habitats and priority groupings.
Urban areas link to strategy needs to be clearer, emphasis ecosystem benefits.	Urban sub priority and associated actions/measures specifically refers to NBS in urban areas.
Deer	Management of deer covered by sub priority and associated actions/measures.
Habitat loss in urban environments due to climate change adaptations-e.g. insulation fills in holes for nesting birds.	This is a very localised, specific pressure that is not within the remit of a landscape scale, spatial strategy to address – but it is noted and the urban priorities cover better provision for wildlife in urban areas.
Traveller sites increasing exponentially, causing loss of priority	Not a matter for the LNRS to address.

habitats. Makes it an area of development not identified.	
Farmland and the knowledge share from people on the land and conservation groups back to DEFRA. What is practical and what is needed.	All relevant feedback is provided to Defra via the NE Senior LNRS Advisor as part of their role.
Education for all the population	Outside scope of the LNRS as a priority but is noted throughout supporting measures where relevant.
Tackling pollution ie. Water/oil/ gas/ electric/ mining companies	Outside scope of LNRS – regulatory matter.
Council/nature focused gov body to audit BNG measures	Kent County Council ecological advice service provides advice to all the county's planning authorities on BNG.
Monitoring of existing populations for the impacts of climate change.	Monitoring requirements has been noted where relevant under supporting measures.
Not properly managed green tourism, e.g. wild camping	Outside scope of LNRS.
BNG does not consider the original large biodiversity net loss.	Outside scope of LNRS.
Lack of knowledge/interest of decision makers and landowners	Addressed under supporting measures for relevant priorities.
Planning legislation - too many loopholes for developers and planning officers to use against nature.	Outside scope of LNRS.
Sewage- quality and control of seawater around Romney Marsh	Outside scope of LNRS.
Plastic waste invasive in food chain	Outside scope of LNRS.
Intensive farming methods, the greatest of all. The latest research on the decline of birds points to intensification of farmland as the main reason for the decline in birds/flora/ insects. promoting nature friendly-farming will deliver the single greatest area for wildlife.	Land use and land management priority includes sub-priorities, actions and supporting measures for nature friendly farming.
Commercial foraging	Outside scope of LNRS.
PFOS- forever chemicals	Use of chemicals has been addressed under urban priority and land management & land use priority.
Hormones in sewage discharge	Outside scope of LNRS.

Meat production and factory farming	Outside scope of LNRS.
Interfering with the natural flows and structure of water courses.	<p>Is addressed by freshwater priority and related sub-priorities, actions and supporting measures – specific reference in sub priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>All rivers and associated catchments achieve good ecological status or potential, with more naturally functioning rivers, free from physical modifications and artificial barriers, that are able to move dynamically and have diverse habitats, flows and channel shapes. Rivers are connected with their floodplain and a mosaic of wet habitats.</i></li> <li>– <i>Protect headwater streams and restore a natural channel shape, allowing them to function as part of a mosaic of seasonally wet habitats including grasslands and woodlands, providing resilient flows to rivers and supporting a wide range of wildlife.</i></li> <li>– <i>Chalk streams reach good ecological status and provide high quality river habitat, with natural and uninterrupted flows along their permanent course and well managed ephemeral headwater streams. Chalk streams are protected from pollution, with a more natural channel shape, to support characteristic flora and fauna. The quality and quantity of groundwater on which chalk streams rely is protected.</i></li> <li>– <i>Restore clay rivers to a more natural channel shape, removing physical modifications and the impacts of historic alterations and restoring a mosaic of connected wetland habitats along the floodplain and headwater streams.</i></li> </ul>
Noise pollution - agreed that mitigating this via woodland and planting was a co benefit – similar to woodland and planting being used to mitigate air quality and regulate temperature in urban	Urban sub priority includes noise pollution – <i>Increase the extent of green space, trees and hedgerows within urban areas to not only provide more habitat for wildlife but also deliver other benefits</i>

areas.	<i>including urban cooling, air and noise pollution regulation and surface water management.</i>
Building on floodplains (utilising floodplains for holding water)	Building on floodplains outside scope of LNRS but use of floodplains for water storage is covered.
SRG1: human attitude to Ragwort- seen as evil but vital for species such as cinnabar moths. Better managed but not eradicated.	Ragwort not specifically mentioned in any measure.
Climate change resilience - recognise the need to maintain balance in habitats and be aware that interventions will have unintended consequences.	Noted.
MAR6 – oyster beds – lots more marine INNs that could be included.	Noted in relevant action.
Net Gain points – risk of poor delivery to detriment of native habitat – e.g pine trees in wrong place	Outside scope of LNRS to address but role of LNRS in metric may reduce the risk of this.
Disturbance – by humans with dogs – ground nesting birds – particularly skylark.	Included as action ( <i>Protection of habitats and species sensitive to disturbance by employing site management, and other measures, which support connection to, and experience of, wildlife but ensures our most sensitive sites remain undisturbed.</i> ) and under land management and land use sub priority <i>Publicly accessible open spaces managed for both wildlife and people.</i>
CS2 chalk streams – how when so many insecticides/herbicides flushed into system?	Outside scope of LNRS to address.
Buffers/connectivity	Included throughout priorities and measures.
Transport pressures replacing cars/bikes?	Outside scope of LNRS to address.
Processes not covered – species abundance (e.g. invertebrates to link in)	Species abundance is overall aim of LNRS.
Agriculture – not integrated enough	Outside scope of LNRS to address.
Understand the mistakes which caused loss.	

Natural regeneration and approaches are missing and a bit more challenge	Natural regeneration included as a potential where known relevant – further opportunities to be identified in consultation with habitat experts.
Species abundance – how to get less priority species less protected.	Concerns noted.
Marine – bottom trawling	Marine is not within scope of LNRS but all marine pressures/priorities will be picked up next year as KCC develop “Plan Sea”.
Protection of cliffs from recreational activities – eg climbers and kite surfers)	Cliffs not currently identified as priority habitat. Inclusion to be considered by Delivery Group.
Non-native planting from development – ie cherry laurel seems to be everywhere	Covered under urban priorities.
Co-existence of ecosystems – eg beavers with humans/other species. ie landowners need support with how to co-exist with these species	Noted.
A need for monitoring and speedy action and enforcement ie use this as a relationship building exercise with rural policy	Outside scope of LNRS to address but noted.
Focus for Kent is nutrient issues eg Stodmarsh	Noted – opportunities to address with nature based solutions identified.
Lack of monitoring across all species/taxa to understand what we have and if we are improving – Can LNRS deliver a structured monitoring programme?	Role of monitoring in relation to LNRS not yet understood – detail to come from Defra.
Incentivisation for reducing pheasants?	Outside scope of LNRS to address.
There is a lack of grazing management to enable priority habitats	Noted as supporting measured on relevant sub priorities.
Relationship between nature recovery and infrastructure with farming- more support for smaller farms needed.	Outside scope of LNRS to address but noted as challenge to delivery.
Dog pressure on NNRs and SSSI's keeping them in unfavourable condition – need more alternative green spaces for dog walkers	Addressed under accessible space sub priority within land management and land use.

Need bigger buffers around woodlands to protect them from climate change impacts.	Included.
Village green buffers are being lost because despite LPA initially rejecting plans due to green buffer, planning inspectors will overturn this decision.	Outside scope of LNRS to address.
Change in ownership – results in overgrazing or human intrusion – there is a lack of security in tenureships – so difficult to commit to nature recovery...	Outside scope of LNRS to address but noted as challenge to delivery.
RIV1 – LNRS can't address the point source of pollution – but the priority makes it look like it can.	To be considered by Delivery Group.
Soil pollution	Covered with soil health sub priority.
Fly tipping	Outside scope of LNRS to address.
Lack of habitat management	Addressed by potential measures

Additional comments received on the published pressures list:

- Extraction of resources: wood – remove from list as this is not a pressure. Actively managing woodland is good for the ecosystem, therefore removing wood is not a pressure. This is confusing and conflicts with woodlands being managed. We'd be better off using our own wood rather than import it.
- Habitats that were once used for something (man-made habitats) need to be maintained. The pressure of 'doing nothing' on these pieces of land e.g. chalk grassland, heathland, coppiced woodland.
- Rewording and revising the wording of certain pressures.
- Land take (built environment).
- Paving over (built environment).
- Wood (extraction of resources).
- Agricultural run off (land use).
- Inappropriate land management – could be changed to lack-of land management.
- Lack of understanding – why things have worked and why they haven't. We need to learn from it to manage our land more appropriately.

- Non-native planting – could be a positive and is used in forestry – e.g. climate change will see this happen and we should look for more climate resilient species.
- Hedgerows – planting with a mix of species to make it more resilient (this could be a mix of native and non-native) – rather than a monoculture.

### 3. Is there anything considered not a priority?

From workshop	How its addressed
Chalk grassland- it is going very well, already being increased/ recognised/managed and a very small percentage of what's in Kent. We should invest more into clay- lowland meadow.	The LNRS area of Kent and Medway is significant for its chalk grassland and therefore this habitat is retained. The priority focuses on looking after what we already have rather than extension. The LNRS includes a priority for lowland meadow which as well as focusing on what we have aims to also extend this habitat. Therefore action is targeted to what is needed for ach habitat in recognition of what had/is already underway.
WD2 – deer management – not necessarily a priority; a priority in particular woodlands of Kent, could be certain species of deer caused more trouble than others?	Priority to be retained as extent of concern for this pressure and need for it to be addresses has been apparent throughout stakeholder engagement. This comment came from an workshop in east Kent on the coast – but west Kent workshops fully supported this as a priority. If not addressed in parts of Kent it is currently a problem for, likely to become more widespread and even more problematic.
SB1 – scrub removal – some unmanaged scrub can be good, needs rewording, maybe a figure to aim for.	Priority removed – scrub management referenced as action for relevant priorities. Scrub retention included as a priority under successional habitats.
RIV1 – some river barriers can be beneficial - possible reword to include artificial barriers?	Changed to artificial barriers.



CON 3 - The county's highway, cycleway, pathway and PROW networks acting as functional networks for wildlife.	Removed as priority and now as a potential measure.
Woodland cover WD1 – Kent already has high tree cover...however not the case for all districts – so varied approach to a priority?	WD1 now focusing on existing - retaining and management.
HL1: does this deliver greatest benefit for biodiversity, or would it divert investment/land use from more useful habitat types?	There was wider support for a priority for heathland from the workshops, so retained.

#### 4. Are any of the priorities unrealistic or unachievable?

From workshop	How its addressed
Planning e.g. failure to protect Ancient Woodland, therefore priorities can't be achieve without compliance and enforcement	Noted – how planning can support LNRS (and how LNRS can support planning) to be focus of workshop with planners in July.
WD3 – 19% - is this achievable? What is baseline? Esp in face of climate change. Not achievable in LNRS timeframe.	This is the county target set by Kent's Plan Tree – Kent County Council's tree establishment strategy.
Prioritisation of woodland management, but deer and squirrel management needed to enable expansion of native woodlands	Management of deer covered by sub priority WTH10 and associated actions/measures.
New species migration - how easy is it to control?	Supporting measures suggest approaches rather than definite controls.
Protection of ancient woodland seems unachievable due to prioritisation by government of housing or road expansion.	Noted – how planning can support LNRS (and how LNRS can support planning) to be focus of workshop with planners in July.
Connecting small clusters of habitat, how do we actually go about that. E.g. trees removed form Coldharbour roundabout in Aylesford causing larger gaps between habitats.	LNRS role in planning should go some way to addressing fragmentation impacts of planning and other LPA decisions.
RU1: All rivers/streams achieving good ecological status and free from modifications. (maybe in the long term)	To be considered by Delivery Group and Board.
FRG2: Fragmentation caused by arterial roads, very expensive to build bridges over existing roads	Highways England have indicated an intention to develop a strategic programme to address fragmentation caused by their road network.

<p>Question on Traditional Orchard TO1 - even many commercial orchards are economically unviable, so how can Traditional Orchard survive – if that is the only route– should this priority be seen as unachievable, if there are no obvious measures to “rescue” Traditional Orchards?</p>	<p>Noted – to be considered during development of potential measures.</p>
<p>Increasing woodland cover NBS1– unless deer and squirrel pressure reduced – it should sit here. WD4 on restoration of native trees – also put here – for same reason, but also Kent well wooded and lots of initiatives already.</p>	<p>Addressing deer and squirrel pressures is a sub priority for woodland, trees and hedgerows.</p>
<p>Heathland HL1– dog pressure here on small amount of Heathland in Kent makes it unviable and – geology means little scope to extend, and other countries “do” heathland better.</p>	<p>There was wider support for a priority for heathland from the workshops, so retained</p>
<p>VS1 Vegetative Shingle – it was wondered what real impact LNRS could have on this?</p>	<p>Noted – to be considered during development of potential measures.</p>
<p>MAR7 fish nurseries – it was wondered what real impact LNRS could have on this?</p>	<p>To only be considered for nurseries in intertidal areas, within scope of LNRS.</p>
<p>RIV1 Rivers – if LNRS can’t address the point source of pollution – should it be moved to Important but not urgent, or is this such a vital issue, the LNRS should be used to also give this one visibility – so best left in Must Remain? RIV1 – a tall order! Could this be focussed on one river at a time or look at certain catchments that are more ‘in need’ or easier to achieve first. All rivers are working to Catchment Improvement Plans with their own aims but to achieve the goals.</p>	<p>To be considered by Delivery Group and Board.</p>
<p>Saline lagoons – at risk of sea level rise and coastal protection – won’t be possible to save all of them and they are difficult and expensive to recreate.</p>	<p>There was wider support for a priority for saline lagoons from the workshops, so retained.</p>

MAR8 – on seals – remove.	Retained for now – need to understand why it was considered unrealistic for seals.
WD4 – because of ash and elm – replanted areas may die because of infections.	Disease resistant variants are available and these are specifically referred to in potential measures.
MAR6 – Sustainable management of native oyster beds	Noted – to be considered during development of potential measures.
HL1 – Increase in extent of high quality lowland heathland	Noted – to be considered during development of potential measures.
CL1 – Difficult to achieve in light of sea walls	Noted – to be considered during development of potential measures.
CR2 – Difficult to achieve	Noted – to be considered during development of potential measures.
FRG2 – Difficult to achieve retrospectively	Highways England have indicated an intention to develop a strategic programme to address fragmentation caused by their road network.
RIV1 – reversing some physical modifications to rivers where they exist to accommodate development may be impossible.	Noted.
AW1- Arable weeds – buffer strips are realistic, but to expect farmers to incorporate arable weeds amongst their crops is not.	Noted – to be considered during development of potential measures.
NBS1 – This isn't possible, as the remediating quality of trees is not as effective as widely assumed. Some trees are responsible for releasing VOC's in their own right, so statistically they do not improve air quality to a great degree.	Priority removed.
AC1 – access and connection – doesn't make much sense – probably needs re-wording. Density of public use on certain habitats is a threat to the sensitive habitat. Encouraging access in the right way that isn't detrimental to the habitat or its species.	Priority removed – wildlife sensitive access now covered by potential measures under land management and land use priority.
OM1 – could be problematic from a planning perspective – would	Will need to discuss how OMH on PDL balances with prioritisation of

BNG factor in this? Often brownfield sites are looked at as the most sustainable for development and government policy allows more brownfield builds. More shared understanding of brownfield sites as important habitats.	brownfield for development – to be picked up at planners workshop in July.
Funding - Most of what is on the shortlist as they all cost money or need landowners permission; priorities that rely on public funding; all of it if money is not forthcoming; need to know cost of delivery in order to answer whether deliverable or not.	Purpose of LNRS is to identify areas where investment and action should be targeted to deliver to greatest gains.
Timeframe of 5-10 years – things like canopy cover are not achievable in that timeframe.	Scope of LNRS in terms of timeframe of iterations and longer term goals to be considered by Delivery Group and Board.

## 5. Additional comments following prioritisation exercise and discussion

From workshop	How its addressed
CR2: Rewrite: Monitor the migration of all new species into the county as a result of changing climate with strategies for control of invasive/pest species.	Monitor the migration of new species into the county as a result of a changing climate, with proactive strategies for both naturalised species and the control invasive/pests.
Review wording, some are protect, other increase or extend. Look at consistency, might inform Must' vs Important, e.g. should start with stopping the decline/loss [restore, increase subsequently]	Reviewed and amendments made accordingly.
Some of the priorities are potential outcomes of others or enable them e.g. buffering enables rivers, streams and springs priority	Links between priorities and measures, and any reliance, to be identified once priorities and measures are finalised.
Heathland priority should include restoration and better management and must remain.	Priority retained. Restoration included in priority and management included as a measure.
SB1: unmanaged scrub is important habitat. Reword to include figures of how much reduction and in what areas	Priority removed – scrub management referenced as action for relevant priorities. Scrub retention included as a priority under successional habitats.

AW2 combined with AW1 and both must remain.	Merged and retained.
CON2 and FRG2 can be merged and are a priority	Fragmentation and connectivity priorities merged.
WD1 native woodland and AW1 Ancient woodland - is this in hand already with Plan Tree etc? Move into Important but not urgent.	There was wider support for the woodland priorities from the workshops, so all retained.
Feeling that FRG1 CON2 and CR1 have similarities and could be merged.	Merged and retained.
URB1 Increase the extent of green space, trees and hedgerows within urban areas. Not always possible for particularly built-up areas of course...but important to protect what you have got and look for new sites too...	Protect added to URB3 so that it now reads <i>Protect and increase the extent of green space, trees and hedgerows within urban areas to not only provide more habitat for wildlife but also deliver other benefits including urban cooling, air and noise pollution regulation and surface water management.</i>
FRG2 – fragmentation by arterial roads – links to above priority, very important. Is the money or funds for green bridges as effective as buying missing links (land)? Funding/BNG all important including roads.	Highways England have indicated an intention to develop a strategic programme to address fragmentation caused by their road network. Other measures to be considered.
LM1 – lowland mire – don't put off for 5 years otherwise it will be gone!	Priority retained.
CON3 – this priority should encompass access for people as well as wildlife	Access for people cannot be included as a priority in the LNRS – access for people to be addressed through wider environmental benefits.
SRG1 – This is covered by CG1, lowland meadow and acid grassland	Priority has been edited and broadened to create a high level, overarching priority for grasslands.
Do we make the woodland we've got better as priority as a realistic ambition rather than increasing to 19%?	Now have two sub-priorities – one to improve and better manage; the other to extend/increase.
Anything that involves climate resilience must be prioritised as urgent.	Climate resilience included as overarching priority.
RIV1 – Feel this is very important but unachievable in 5-10 years	Noted.

Chalk streams – stronghold in Kent. No chalk streams are marked as SSSI so LNRS could fix this.	Chalk streams are sub priority habitat within freshwater.
FM1 needs to note that “advisors input is needed” and “maximising environmental benefits of land in schemes”	Included.
AW1 – use the word “invasive tree” as “non natives” can be good in some cases.	<i>Changed to - Ancient woodland, and ancient and veteran trees, are protected from loss, with damaged areas restored through management and the removal of invasive and problematic non-native trees and plants. Areas of ancient woodland are buffered and better connected.</i>
Arable weeds – increase/improve rather than restore. Is doable by ELMS and is measurable.	Increase and improve added to priority.

## 6. Other comments

- Funding/finance is only part of the total resource – volunteer army contribution/passion should not be underestimated.
- Change wording to brownfield sites; not just industrial OHM1.
- Lack of metrics or background to property rank the priorities.
- Should “low hanging fruit” be priority or not – considered that is where opportunities are is a key consideration for LNRS.
- Ensure that species rarity is based on vulnerability to extinction.