



## Making Space for Nature in Kent and Medway

Developing the County's Local Nature Recovery Strategy

## Nature Recovery Mapping Workshop Report Mapping feedback and proposed action 12th – 26<sup>th</sup> September 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 Nature Recovery Mapping Workshops**

Between 12<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> September 2024, a series of workshops were held to get stakeholder input into the mapping of potential measures and initial thoughts on how this might shape the “areas that could become of particular importance for biodiversity”.

Five full-day workshops were held at five different locations (Folkestone, Birchington, Lenham, Rainham and East Malling).

The purpose of the workshops was to effectively ground truth the desk-based mapping work, with stakeholders having the opportunity to interrogate the mapped potential measures and the layers that would inform and make up the LNRS's Areas that Could become of Importance for Biodiversity (ACIB). The accuracy of the layers would be critical to ensuring the ACIB directed action and investment to where it will deliver the greatest gains for nature, and wider benefits, within the framework of the county's priorities for nature recovery.

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.

## General mapping methodology queries

Functional land associated with designations	Can we consider this under connectivity mapping – is this a missed sub-priority/measure?
KLIS opportunity mapping	Have limited information on how KLIS habitat opportunities data was created (dates back to 2005) – but is still online. Is there any value in looking at this? Need someone “who knows” to check validity of this data!
Colour of mapping – not accessible for those with colour blindness.	I appreciate that I dictated the colours based on those we’d used for each habitat in the formatting. But accessibility must be ensured so please can you adjust mapping colours?
Mapping method transparency	Be more explicit in mapping method what the data actual provides/what it considered. Produce a more comprehensive metadata set for all the mapping.

## Mapping revisions

Measure which were mapped and included in ACIB in first draft
Measure which were mapped but excluded from ACIB in first draft
Measure which were not mapped in first draft

**Intention is to map all measures and, where possible, refine sufficiently to include in ACIB.**

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
<b>Connectivity</b>				
CON	Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bottleneck mapping alone is not sufficient for presenting a full picture of the connectivity priorities of the county.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connectivity mapping to be reviewed and revised.</li> <li>All areas identified as excluded from original connectivity mapping outputs to be reviewed once mapping updated.</li> </ul>	-
CON	Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important to use species information to support prioritisations of connectivity and corridors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>KMBRC and KWT to discuss how priority species could be built into connectivity mapping.</li> </ul>	-
CON1.1	Connectivity for APIB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connection between APIB is limited because of bottleneck mapping limitations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review this map once connectivity mapping is updated – does it sufficiently create links?</li> </ul>	Not currently
CON1.2	Fragmentation and bottlenecks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bottlenecks are very big and therefore create a lot of ‘noise’ – result is that they are not directing action effectively.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connectivity mapping to be reviewed and revised.</li> <li>Maps for habitats to be reviewed to check for completeness.</li> </ul>	Not currently



Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bottlenecks are not identifying the fragmentation/connectivity priorities sufficiently for each habitat.</li> </ul>		
CON1.3	Farm clusters assisting connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Missing – should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At very least, map existing farm clusters as baseline for measure – not to be included in ACIB.</li> <li>Identify where additional new clusters are needed, based on revised connectivity modelling overlaid with farm cluster gaps from baseline.</li> </ul>	Potentially yes
CON2.1	Infrastructure fragmentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LNRS identified and submitted priority areas for National Highways – suggest this is used to map CON2.1 so it aligns.</li> <li>Can we sense check this map, which was produced anecdotally, to check that no major connectivity issues identified by revised connectivity mapping and intersecting with road network have been missed.</li> <li>Add to map by identifying where connectivity priorities intersect with other roads, railways and major infrastructure.</li> <li>National Highways, national rail and Kent Highways existing bridges and tunnels to be used to identify retrofit areas – where assets exist in connectivity priority areas.</li> <li>Would suggested mammal roadkill incidents record also provide evidence for priority locations?</li> </ul>	Potentially yes
CON3.1	Areas essential for connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beult missing from map.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connectivity mapping to be reviewed and revised.</li> <li>All areas identified as excluded from original connectivity mapping outputs to be reviewed once mapping updated.</li> </ul>	Not currently
CON3.2	Using infrastructure for connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gillingham disused railway.</li> <li>Refine 3.2 based on 4.1 and habitat data.</li> <li>Appears to breach where PRoW hits or coincides with a road. Misleading should ‘look’ similar to KCC PRoW maps.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are we able to include disused railways/lines in the mapping – do we have a suitable data layer?</li> <li>Should we refine/prioritise this measure – or should we be looking for every opportunity and therefore make this a broad county-wide measure?</li> </ul>	Not currently

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not show all of the KCIII England coast path.</li> <li>Should make the distinction between PRoW as functional wildlife corridors and PRoW crossing arable with little associated wildlife value.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check PRoW mapping for missing and amended data.</li> <li>Would it be appropriate to cut out PROW across arable or high grade agricultural land?</li> </ul>	
CON3.3	Wildflower habitat on verges etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could the bottlenecks include priority species, this will highlight genetic bottlenecks as well as landscape bottlenecks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>KMBRC and KWT to discuss how priority species could be built into connectivity mapping.</li> </ul>	Not currently
CON4.1	Migration routes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feasibility to be determined by outcome of species prioritisation and see if sufficient knowledge of ecology distribution and life history habitat needs.</li> <li>Toad crossings are well known – KRAG?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do our species group hold any data/information on migration routes or corridors that could be used for this measure?</li> <li>If not able to map this time identify as evidence need within LNRS.</li> <li>Tony and KWT to discuss how priority species could be built in.</li> </ul>	Unknown if can be mapped at all. If cannot be mapped; to be removed as mapped potential measure.
CON4.2	Buffer zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is defined as an ‘significant habitat’? - Dartford doesn’t have anything?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define what has been classed as ‘significant habitat’ within mapping methodology.</li> <li>Connectivity mapping to be reviewed and revised.</li> <li>All areas identified as excluded from original connectivity mapping outputs to be reviewed once mapping updated.</li> </ul>	Not currently
<b>Land management and land use</b>				
LM1.1	Nature friendly farming – clusters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> <li>To refine, focus on land adjacent to rivers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline map as per suggested revised mapping for CON1.3 – need to consider how to refine or whether we need to. Refinement could be based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>connectivity mapping (would then be same map as CON1.3).</li> <li>anecdotal evidence from NE and KWT on priority areas for new clusters.</li> <li>land adjacent to rivers but would need to determine justification for this criteria.</li> <li>anecdotal evidence from catchment partnerships on priority areas for new clusters.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Potentially yes

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
LM2.1	Targeted action for nature recovery - connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas do seem isolated across the county. Sittingbourne, Faversham – large areas of arable not mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connectivity mapping to be reviewed and revised.</li> <li>• All areas identified as excluded from original connectivity mapping outputs to be reviewed once mapping updated.</li> </ul>	Yes
LM3	Climate induced pressures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas do seem isolated across the county. Sittingbourne, Faversham – large areas of arable not mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mapping approach to be revised.</li> <li>• All areas identified as excluded from original mapping output to be reviewed once mapping updated.</li> </ul>	-
LM3.1	Farmland at risk of climate change impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestions of risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water stress/drought/shortage.</li> <li>• Groundwater levels.</li> <li>• Flood risk.</li> <li>• Coastal squeeze.</li> <li>• Crops most susceptible to flood risk.</li> <li>• Crops most susceptible to extreme heat.</li> <li>• Disease</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where we have maps of water stress, flood risk and coastal squeeze, etc could these be overlaid with Arable and Horticulture in CEH to identify areas of farmland at most risk?</li> <li>• Measures LM3.1 and LM3.2 essentially the same – especially when mapped. Change to one measure using LM3.2 but the map for LM3.1 as the basis – if we can't map 3.1, we put this as an evidence need.</li> </ul>	Potentially yes
LM3.2	Climate resilience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maps miss too many large arable areas of Kent that are susceptible to climate change impacts.</li> <li>• Linking between arable lands and North Downs should be priority – North Downs connects the arable to areas on chalk lands, woodland, and wet woodland, as well as successional habitat and urban and coastal areas. Is a holistic approach not preferential, especially in terms of climate resilience?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mapping considers connectivity but not in relation to climate resilience. With farmland at risk not mapped, the current mapping excludes other areas – can we find a way to better map the priorities under LM3? See suggestion for baseline mapping for LM3.1 – would this be the same basic map for this measure.</li> <li>• Look at wording for priority and measure.</li> <li>• Measures LM3.1 and LM3.2 essentially the same – especially when mapped. Change to one measure using LM3.2 but the map for LM3.1 as the basis – if we can't map 3.1, we put this as an evidence need.</li> </ul>	Yes
LM4.1	Agri diffuse pollution		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map all freshwater habitats in farmland as baseline for measure – not to be included in ACIB unless it can be refined.</li> <li>• Potentially refine by identifying the most sensitive</li> </ul>	Not currently

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sites to agri diffuse pollution – on location or habitat basis – if this is definable? Or base on anecdotal.</li> </ul>	
LM5.1	Management of public disturbance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify heavily visited sites by using data on road access/car parks/advertises sites (PROW) to identify honey pot sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested method would be too time consuming for this approach but could we collate visitor sites and overlay some sensitivity testing?</li> <li>• At very least map all sites (e.g. country parks, nature reserves, WT/FC/NT/EH etc sites) as baseline for measure – not to be included in ACIB unless it can be refined.</li> </ul>	Not currently
LM5.2	Sacrificial and honey pot public sites		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could we map roughly by adding a buffer to sites identified by LM5.1?</li> <li>• Or should it remain unmapped and identified as an evidence need in LNRS?</li> </ul>	Not currently
<b>Grasslands</b>				
GL	General connectivity of grassland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Misses connections between Capstone, Hempstead and Darland Valley.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mapping approach to be revised.</li> <li>• All areas identified as excluded from original mapping output to be reviewed once mapping updated.</li> </ul>	-
GL	General grassland mapping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bias towards chalk areas, excluded lowland meadows.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mapping approach to be revised.</li> <li>• All areas identified as excluded from original mapping output to be reviewed once mapping updated.</li> </ul>	-
GL1	Chalk grassland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Underlying data appears to have gaps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- North Foreland</li> <li>- Thanet cliff tops and plateau</li> <li>- Strips between Stone Bay and Joss an and onwards to Margate.</li> <li>- Botany Bay</li> <li>- Foreness point</li> <li>- Existing chalk grassland areas in poor condition that are mapped on the PHI layer but are not designated and are not shown on the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GL1 mapping does seem to have not picked up the existing chalk grassland habitat of Thanet and potential for this habitat in Thanet. Check data.</li> <li>• Check wider data on chalk grassland to ensure existing areas have not been missed.</li> </ul>	-



Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
		map. - Chalk grassland extends further west to border.		
GL1.1	Chalk grassland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> <li>Use NCS surveys to map chalk areas most in need of management/ restoration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity (unprioritised) map that's not included in ACIB.</li> <li>NCS surveys – speak to NE.</li> <li>Refine with anecdotal evidence of significant/critical areas for habitat if available.</li> </ul>	Potentially yes – NE to advise on significant/ critical areas
GL1.2	Increase chalk grassland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The pink outlines of the chalk grasslands are huge compared to the actual grassland areas, so this is very ambitious in terms of ‘increase the extent of ...’</li> <li>The map makes it look like the grasslands are more connected than they actually are.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are we confident that extent is correct.</li> <li>Should we prioritise further with input from NE (Dan Tuson)?</li> </ul>	Yes
<b>GL1.4</b>			<b>Note that this should actually be GL1.3 – there is no GL1.4 potential measure.</b>	-
GL1.4	Chalk grassland connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chalk – creating connectivity between dry valleys.</li> <li>Number of areas missing from connectivity mapping.</li> <li>Use UPZ or total capture zones to prioritise areas for water supply for chalk grassland – especially chalk slopes.</li> <li>Misses large areas of fragmented chalk grassland: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanet chalk grasslands</li> <li>North Downs</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do dry valleys provide a mapping input?</li> <li>Is UPZ or total capture zones a useful layer for defining functional links?</li> <li>Connectivity mapping to be reviewed and revised.</li> <li>All areas identified as excluded from original connectivity mapping outputs to be reviewed once mapping updated.</li> </ul>	Yes
GL2.1		<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes
GL2.2	Grazing marsh restoration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NE has map layer of grazing marsh. If you overlay designation should show areas of grazing marsh that aren't designated and can be enhance to make better grazing marsh or wetland.</li> <li>From RSPB post workshop (see pdf map annotated) - areas circled as green on the map are areas which we think have potential but haven't been included yet. The large area around Worth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will suggested method provide anything different/better than the current mapping approach of Waders zone, habitat survey, clipped to ALC grades 3-5 and flood zone?</li> <li>Amend map using RSPB comments.</li> </ul>	Yes

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
		<p>could be more wetland but could still present opportunities. We also wondered about Cleve Hill where the solar farm is - this could be restored to grazing marsh but obviously is in the near term locked into solar. Also a few areas of potential which we think are probably errors the red area is the Thames and the blue areas are waterbodies. Also there seem to be a couple of areas within Cliffe which are designated but highlighted as potential. Also the little bits identified as potential within the infrastructure structure of the power plant at Wallend on the Hoo peninsula are unlikely to be suitable.</p>		
GL2.3	Reconnect rivers with floodplains	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could the EA provide any mapping about flood plains?</li> <li>• Lidar data can be used to map areas within 100m of a river which sit at or below the river level. These would be key areas to allow flood waters to move to. Used for CS option 'making space for water'. SERT have data, used in Darent Valley project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speak to SERT and EA about availability of data that could be used for this.</li> <li>• If no data available, identify as evidence need in LNRS.</li> <li>• Suggested approach using Lidar sounds beyond scope of mapping work for now - identify as evidence need in LNRS.</li> </ul>	Not currently
GL3	Lowland meadow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs better mapping – suggested sources for baseline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- map all the neutral grassland/any fields which aren't showing arable – use WW2 maps, arial photos, see which fields have not been ploughed in last 80 years.</li> <li>- Seek info from various Meadow Trusts around Kent.</li> <li>- KMBRC meadows data.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Grassland in High Weald – neutral lowland meadows not recognised in mapping in this area – should be a priority.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity (unprioritised) map that's not included in ACIB.</li> <li>• All areas identified as excluded from original mapping outputs to be reviewed once mapping updated.</li> <li>• Could we refine layers for the lowland meadow potential measures by basing on where we know these Trusts/Groups exist – using deliverability as a defining criteria?</li> </ul>	
GL3.1	Maintain good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good quality lowland grassland is very small and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity</li> </ul>	Potentially yes

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
	quality lowland meadow	<p>fragmented so mapping extent would not matter if maintenance was over whole parcel (for this purpose). If the issue is can't tell high quality from any site in management, can this be mapped as GL3.2 as at least this is an aspiration to increase quality until it can be more formally surveyed. CS data used to be mapped on Magic – is it still? Searchable by option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be mapped - lowland meadows is a specific definition under section 41 Priority Habitat so saying it is 'too broad' – it is vanishingly rare both nationally and in Kent. All lowland meadows are mapped Magic, and most have stewardship options, so are traceable via NE.</li> </ul>	<p>(unprioritised) map that's not included in ACIB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All areas identified as excluded from original mapping outputs to be reviewed once mapping updated.</li> <li>• Refine with anecdotal evidence of significant/critical areas for habitat if available.</li> <li>• Use the fact that there is an associated Trust/Group/stewardship as a proxy for it being managed and therefore good quality?</li> <li>• To be picked up by baseline habitat mapping – and potentially refined into priority areas. But check all within noted data layers are picked up.</li> </ul>	
GL3.2	Increase lowland meadow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can we map buffers around every lowland meadow?</li> <li>• Land close to existing lowland meadows are a start.</li> <li>• Note absence of lowland meadows in High Weald. Appreciate that almost all pasture grassland in the High Weald has potential to be improved to lowland meadow and could appear as 'white land' but how do we differentiate between measures on different areas of white land? Could use landscape character areas?</li> <li>• Do not agree no reliable measure. NE has mapped species rich grassland. This would help map and create corridors of potential. Should use NT stewardship agreements.</li> <li>• The Romney Marshes grade 1 land is also very good species rich land and it does not have to be exclusive of food production but achieve both.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of buffers for this measure was previously suggested as alternative mapping option by KWT – apply?</li> <li>• Based on suggestions, devise mapping approach for this potential measure.</li> </ul>	Potentially yes
GL3.3	Lowland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connectivity mapping to be reviewed and revised.</li> </ul>	Potentially yes

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
	meadow connectivity			
GL3.4	Neutral grassland establishment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why just free draining soils?</li> <li>• Potential measure 3.4 is restricted to just grassland on floodplains, neutral grassland is found on other areas than flood plains. This coverage for the measure should be broadened to cover areas where lowland meadow is typically found. Mapping methodology free draining soil would not typically be found in flood zone area.</li> <li>• Mapping misses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Beult Catchment</li> <li>- Marden</li> <li>- Rother</li> <li>- Medway</li> <li>- Stour</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revisit mapping methodology as seems to miss opportunities for neutral grassland establishment.</li> <li>• All areas identified as excluded from original mapping outputs to be reviewed once mapping updated.</li> </ul>	Yes
GL4	Acid grassland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mapping misses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Heathlands/Greensand Ridge Tunbridge area.</li> <li>- Lowland Heathland and Acid Grassland near Dartford.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Does mapping include acid grassland in Fawkham – looks like it might. Suggest this is chalk grassland.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Check mapping and add in/remove areas as appropriate.</li> </ul>	-
GL4.1-4.4	Acid grassland and heathland management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity (unprioritized) map that's not included in ACIB.</li> <li>• Refine with anecdotal evidence of significant/critical areas for habitat if available.</li> </ul>	Potentially yes – if NE (or others) can advise on significant/ critical areas
GL4.5	Create acid grassland		<i>No further action to refine map</i>	-
GL5.1-5.2	Arable wild plants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity (unprioritized) map that's not included in ACIB.</li> <li>• Refine with anecdotal evidence of</li> </ul>	Potentially yes – if NE (or others) can advise on

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
			significant/critical areas for habitat if available.	significant/ critical areas
GL5.3	New arable wild plants areas	<i>No feedback</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>No further action to refine map</i></li> </ul>	-
<b>Successional habitat</b>				
SH	Successional habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> <li>Sites should be targeted for a particular species.</li> <li>RSPB have nightingale data which could be overlain to identify previously developed land and good successional habitat.</li> <li>Priority habitat index contains previously developed land.</li> <li>North Kent coast has lots of rare bees such as shrill carder -on open mosaic habitat – these areas need to be in LNRS map.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use PHI to map extent of the habitat opportunity (unprioritized) map that’s not included in ACIB.</li> <li>Refine with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>important areas for inverts and other associated species data?</li> <li>anecdotal data from RSPB, Buglife and BBCT?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Potentially yes – if RSPB, Buglife and BBCT can advise on significant/ critical areas.
<b>Woodland, trees and hedgerows</b>				
WTH1.1-1.3	Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity (unprioritized) map that’s not included in ACIB.</li> <li>Unless there is a way of identifying significant/critical areas of this habitat (anecdotally).</li> </ul>	Potentially yes – if FC, WT and NE can advise on significant/ critical areas.
WTH1.4	Management	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes
WTH1.5	Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity (unprioritized) map that’s not included in ACIB.</li> <li>Unless there is a way of identifying significant/critical areas of this habitat (anecdotally).</li> </ul>	Potentially yes – if FC, WT and NE can advise on significant/ critical areas.
WTH2.1	Extend existing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Omission of Oaken wood - mostly PAWS (plantation on irreplaceable ancient woodland soil). Remaining wooded areas need expanding to compensate for loss to current and planned quarry expansion – Oaken Wood does not appear to be on</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check whether Oaken Wood is on AWI. If not eligible for APIB should it be mapped on ACIB?</li> <li>Query - have we applied sufficient expansion sizes? Is this something that will actually be addressed under WTH2.5 – look at whether the</li> </ul>	Yes



Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
		<p>APIB map.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capstone valley areas – Margins for extension for each small woodland needs to be joined together to form a continuous woodland. To avoid islands and loss of existing. Finding difficult focusing on singular habitats and they need to be considered in combination.</li> </ul>	new mapping picks up this area.	
WTH2.2	Highway trees	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	No – cannot be mapped; to be removed as mapped potential measure.
WTH2.3	Convert unproductive land	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes
WTH2.4	More trees in hedgerows	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map location of hedgerows by allocating field value to proportion of field boundary. Add these values to a hedgerow layer. By extension, could add another layer to record number of trees in hedge (stretch target).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any thoughts on how this would enhance mapping? Is this appropriate?</li> </ul>	Not currently.
WTH2.5	Connectivity		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All woodland connectivity mapping needs reviewing.</li> <li>Consider if mapping is appropriate once updated.</li> </ul>	Unknown – revised connectivity modelling may be too extensive.
WTH2.6	Plant more urban trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coastal chalk grassland walks and habitat above cliffs very important. Best not to designate tree-planting along chalk clifftops.</li> <li>Marked an area for more planting but it is actually an already specific habitat type – Dartford Heath been mapped for woodland planting but it is lowland heath and acid grassland.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have we applied the correct habitat exclusions for this measure and other tree planting maps? Need to ensure chalk cliff tops, lowland heath and acid grassland removed. Any other habitats?</li> <li>Can LPAs provide anecdotal evidence to help refine this?</li> </ul>	Not currently. Need input from LPAs (and others) to refine.
WTH2.7	Shade for	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	No – cannot be

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
	livestock on farmland.			mapped; to be removed as mapped potential measure.
WTH3.1	Restore trees lost to disease	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity (unprioritized) map that's not included in ACIB.</li> <li>Do maps exist of areas of lost trees that could be used to prioritise/target areas?</li> <li>Or are there areas of Kent more affected (anecdotally) that we could use to map?</li> </ul>	Not currently.
WTH3.2	Restore trees lost to disease	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity (unprioritized) map that's not included in ACIB.</li> <li>Do maps exist of areas of lost trees that could be used to prioritise/target areas?</li> <li>Or are there areas of Kent more affected (anecdotally) that we could use to map?</li> </ul>	Not currently.
WTH4.1	Woodland resilience - management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity (unprioritized) map that's not included in ACIB.</li> </ul>	Not currently.
WTH4.2	Woodland resilience – PAWS	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Not currently.
WTH4.3 and 4.4	Resilience through connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity (unprioritized) map that's not included in ACIB.</li> <li>Can we anecdotally identify key woodland sites in the county to apply this measure to?</li> </ul>	Potentially yes – if FC, WT and NE can advise on significant/ critical areas.
WTH5	Ancient woodland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>///plank.topped.draw Ancient woodland in area not mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check data layer</li> </ul>	
WTH5.1	Ancient woodland management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not sure ancient Tree Inventory should be part of this mapping as different to ancient woodland, and not necessarily a biodiversity priority? Use only Ancient Woodland inventory.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measure only relates to ancient woodland – remove ATI records? Mapping method states - Mapped the Ancient Tree Inventory only, where status is Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW).</li> </ul>	Yes

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
WTH5.2	AW buffer zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will map be created – unclear from mapping notes if just waiting on data?</li> </ul>	Unknown
WTH5.3	Ancient and veteran trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Areas missed for ancient and veteran trees in Dartford – are we using the data from Ancient and veteran tree inventory and/or Treezilla?</li> <li>Fawkham Green – are these Ancient and Veteran trees within Saxten and Cages Wood (which is AW and LWS), rather than solitary? (I could be wrong). There are other A &amp; Vet trees – some mapped, some not (yet) which are solitary in the Parish</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check ATI and AVT – do they hold records for Dartford. Is Treezilla an appropriate additional data source?</li> <li>Check data to see – is record for Fawkham Green incorrect?</li> </ul>	Yes
WTH5.4	AW connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Areas missed in Dartford between two ancient woodlands that need to be included.</li> <li>Reconnecting the Blean is the top priority for woodland recovery in Kent (Woodland Trust).</li> <li>Mapping suggests there are limited areas where AW connectivity could/should be undertaken? The layer is old, but why not use the hedgerow data from the 1990s habitat survey? Which was pretty comprehensive!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clare Russel at DBC to advise on locations.</li> <li>All woodland connectivity mapping needs reviewing.</li> <li>Can we look at methodology for this as it does not seem to focus on AW.</li> <li>Can we use anecdotal to prioritise AW areas for connectivity.</li> <li>Does hedgerow mapping provide any assistance?</li> </ul>	Potentially yes – if FC, WT and NE can advise on significant/ critical areas.
WTH5.4 & 5.5	AW connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relationship of 5.5 and 5.4.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 5.5. is mappable can we use this to inform mapping of WTH5.4 – there should be some correlation at least.</li> </ul>	Potentially yes – if FC, WT and NE can advise on significant/ critical areas.
WTH5.5	Isolated block	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why have blocks &lt;20ha only been used to map this measure?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is &lt;20ha appropriate – why was it selected?</li> <li>Once agreed, need to clarify why the limit was applied within methodology.</li> <li>Is this a potential measure or are isolated blocks actually the way we map the AW connectivity measures?</li> </ul>	Potentially yes – if FC, WT and NE can advise on significant/ critical areas.
WTH6	Wet woodland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure wet woodland with Blean complex is represented.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check map.</li> </ul>	
WTH6.1	Wet woodland	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
	management			
WTH6.2	Wet woodland pond creation	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes
WTH7.1 buffers	Gill woodland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rather than map with such a large buffer, use EA 8m buffer?</li> <li>Can't expect to focus on a few woodland areas to save, as needs connectivity between multiple valleys.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check with EA premise for buffer and apply.</li> <li>Is High Weald able to anecdotally prioritise areas?</li> </ul>	Potentially yes – if HWNL can advise on significant/critical areas.
WTH7.2	Restore gill streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would be sufficient to just map gill streams.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline mapping of gill streams.</li> </ul>	Potentially yes – if HWNL can advise on significant/critical areas.
WTH8.1-8.2	Hedgerows management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity (unprioritized) map that's not included in ACIB.</li> </ul>	Not currently
WTH8.3	Hedgerow buffers	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Not currently
WTH8.4	Hedgerow connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will map be created – unclear from mapping notes if just waiting on data?</li> </ul>	Unknown
WTH9		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Orchard map – unclear whether potential community orchards included, and what is indicated. Is this all of the traditional orchards in Kent? Is this just the orchards identified for increase? Is this just the agreed “potential” areas of orchard agreed with stakeholders/farmers?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify with mapping methodology</li> </ul>	
WTH9.1	Restore orchards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restoring lost orchards – data from first edition ordnance survey maps of historical non-woodland features now lost.</li> <li>PTES did mapping &amp; PH layer for traditional orchards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is this data available – would it be any better than that provided by Orchard Network?</li> <li>Does PTES data offer anything further?</li> </ul>	Yes
WTH9.2	New orchards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mapping methodology for “new community orchards” should look for wider opportunities than just based on historic traditional orchard locations?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But no suggestion how....Any ideas on how to?</li> <li>Does PTES data offer anything further?</li> </ul>	Yes

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PTES did mapping &amp; PH layer for traditional orchards.</li> </ul>		
WTH10.1	Deer management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can we anecdotally prioritise areas where management is most needed?</li> </ul>	Unknown
WTH10.2	Sensitive to deer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can we anecdotally prioritise areas where management is most needed?</li> </ul>	Unknown
<b>Freshwater habitats</b>				
FW1.1	INNS management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>INNS mapping is missing</li> <li>Not sure where the old Biodiversity Opportunity Areas are in these maps. E.g. the Watsum channel is not shown as an area where better natural function could be restored to the existing wetland habitats. The peatland soils here lend themselves to better carbon capture if they were wetter.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use INNS mapping.</li> <li>Look at why the Wantsum was not identified for this and other floodplain related measures.</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW1.2	Undo modifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undo historical physical modification - Wingham/Little stour - priority- remove/mitigate west stour mouth pumping station and landscape scale project to restore these rivers. Currently priority chalk river but will never get better until this is done.</li> <li>Barriers to fish passage need removing down river to allow re-connection to aamin rivers/tidal sections.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EA and SERT to review and determine if suggested modification removal is appropriate to be included - from both an ecological and engineering perspective.</li> <li>Check with EA, SERT and Rivers Trust whether barriers to fish passage was one of the considerations when identifying the sites for the data layer used for this measure.</li> </ul>	Yes
FW1.3	Natural shape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If we don't have data for mapping available, do we move this to the unmapped management measures for the priority? And identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW1.4	Open culvert rivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have councils given info on culverts or would they be covered by EA data?</li> <li>Does the data include River Habitats survey info?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check with EA and SERT what data the set covers.</li> </ul>	Yes
FW1.5	Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the Thames Fish Migration road map been used?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check with EA and SERT what data the set covers.</li> </ul>	Yes



Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
FW1.6	Protected freshwater sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlight where protected freshwater sites are? There aren't many.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be mapped.</li> </ul>	Potentially yes
FW2	Clean water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nothing in the Romney Marshes.</li> <li>Map priority areas where road run-off needs stopping by geology - so clay areas become priority area for land management changes as SuDS will not work here. Look at London work on mapping road pollution to rivers and undertake in Kent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reviewing mapping to identify why RM is excluded - is this exclusion an error or correct?</li> <li>Consider if road run off mapping is an evidence need that needs to be referenced in the strategy?</li> </ul>	
FW2.1	Agricultural land discharge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches.</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW2.2	Reduce diffuse pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches.</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW2.3	Discharge points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches.</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW2.4	Buffer strips	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does this work for Medway's main navigation?</li> <li>Should more headwaters be included in this?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EA to advise if there are any navigation issues relating to this measure.</li> <li>SERT to review headwater inclusion.</li> </ul>	Yes
FW2.5	Road runoff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thames data on run-off?</li> <li>Highways maps of drains to show where it is being redirected into watercourses.</li> <li>Could prioritisation be on roads where there is likely to be more heavy metals - e.g. M20</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to review if any of this data offers opportunity to enhance/refine the mapping.</li> </ul>	Yes

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use EA pollution incident maps?</li> </ul>		
FW2.6	CSO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Essential to mark WWTW and where they discharge - must put maps together with IDB.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches.</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW3	Sufficient supply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very little in the Low Weald - why are headwaters not included? Seems to focus on Greensand.</li> <li>What is mapped seems to include dry valleys (i.e. not ephemeral streams)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check mapping</li> </ul>	
FW3.1	Abstraction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could we map areas with highest risk? There are heat maps available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A map of high risk areas would be a suitable map for this measure but where is it available from and what is the source of the data?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW3.2	Infiltration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measure as in report - unmapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can we map key recharge areas and chalk stream winterbournes - as a baseline for this measure but not to be included in ACIB if too broad.</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW3.3	Slow the flow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Slow the flow' measures could be applied on many headwater streams with no intensive agriculture. e.g. river Dudwell.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In order for this to be included in ACIB, is there a way of prioritising areas across mapping?</li> <li>Having reviewed map, are we sure this isn't sufficiently refined already for inclusion?</li> </ul>	Potentially yes
FW3.4	NBS	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	
FW3.5	NBS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map headwater streams as a baseline for this measure but not to be included in ACIB if unable to refine/prioritise.</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW3.6	NBS		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW4.1	Breaking field drains	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW4.2	River banks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could use 'Keeping Rivers Cool' mapping, and RHS mapping from EA (captures riparian complexity).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would using this enhance any of the mapping for this sub priority?</li> </ul>	Yes

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
FW4.3	Re-naturalise	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes
FW4.4	NBS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Areas mapped for river corridor doesn't include the Beult. Could use the SSSI restoration plan?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check mapping.</li> </ul>	Yes
FW5.1	Safeguard headwater streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Huge lack of mapping, not all relevant headwaters are included.</li> <li>This has a lot of gap, and the area that is mapped is not known by NE staff (Ben Thompson).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check mapping</li> <li>In order for this to be included in ACIB, is there a way of prioritising areas across mapping? Can NE prioritise anecdotally?</li> </ul>	Potentially yes, if NE can advise on priority areas.
FW5.2	Wetlands in headwater areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches.</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW5.3	Renaturalise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches.</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW6	Chalk streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vital that we have mapping for this habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mapping to be developed</li> </ul>	
FW6.1	Development away for winterbourne streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has been suggested by NE that this is not an appropriate measure for LNRS.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change to - "safeguard winterbourne streams and key recharge zones for aquifers feeding chalk streams"</li> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches. Potentially map winterbournes and recharge zones for chalk streams?</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS?</li> </ul>	Unknown

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
FW6.2	Farming rules for chalk streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches. Potentially map all chalk streams as extent of this habitat?</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW6.3	Restore natural processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches. Potentially map all chalk streams as extent of this habitat?</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW6.4	Gravel stream beds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches. Do we have priority areas for targeting gravel seeding in chalk streams?</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW6.5	NBS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches. Potentially map all chalk streams as extent of this habitat?</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW7.1	Restore clay river banks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches. Potentially map all clay rivers as extent of this habitat?</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> </ul>	Unknown

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS.</li> </ul>	
FW7.2	Remove obstructions	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes
FW 7.3	Riparian trees	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes
FW 7.4	Gravel riffles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches. Do we have priority areas for targeting gravel riffles in clay rivers?</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS?</li> </ul>	
FW 7.5	Wetland habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlight Beult SSSI - not in favourable condition due to physical modification and barriers. These should be a priority to remove (Ben Thompson).</li> <li>Only includes some really small streams</li> <li>Beult catchment should be included here. A lot of flooding and potential flooding.</li> <li>Only some headwater streams highlighted on the map - should apply to all headwaters?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check links between SSSI and wider catchment - has this been addressed?</li> <li>Check mapping.</li> <li>In order for this to be included in ACIB, is there a way of prioritising areas across mapping? Can NE/EA prioritise anecdotally?</li> </ul>	Potentially yes – if NE/EA can advise on priority areas.
FW8	Ponds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None of the measures are currently mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches for all measures.</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW9.1	Fen and bog management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches. Potentially map all lowland mire as extent of this habitat?</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future</li> </ul>	Unknown



Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
			LNRS.	
FW9.2	Fen and bog buffers	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes
FW9.3	Water retention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches. Potentially map all lowland mire as extent of this habitat?</li> <li>Should we combine this measure with 9.1 and just map as habitat extent with management measures? If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS.</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW9.4	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes	Yes
FW10.1	Reedbed management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches. Potentially map all reedbed as extent of this habitat?</li> <li>Should we combine this measure with 9.1 and just map as habitat extent with management measures?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS.</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW10.2	Reedbed creation in quarries and lakes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map unused quarries and similar open water sites?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there a data layer for disused quarries?</li> <li>What about open water sites - can we map these too?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW10.3	Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there optimum places along river corridor or within catchments that we would want to see reedbeds - defining criteria rather than actual locations. For instance do we map to areas based on demand for NBS benefits? Or do we have locations to map instead - who might be able to</li> </ul>	Unknown

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
			advise?	
FW11.1	Reservoirs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Just 1 reservoir? Can we look beyond WFD? Including lakes.</li> <li>Bowl Water borders Kent so should be considered.</li> <li>Monkton Nature Reserve (reservoirs of farmer), Thanet Earth also had reservoir. Broadoak reservoir planned. Stodmarsh Lakes RAMSAR site. West Bere Lakes.</li> <li>Graveney - 3x reservoirs?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review data layer and mapping to ensure we're picking up all reservoirs.</li> <li>Could we also include lakes? Do we have the data to do that?</li> </ul>	Yes – unless new mapping means that it is no longer sufficiently discrete.
FW11.2	River valley wetlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Romney Marshes - could this create conflict?</li> <li>Vast majority of these areas are reclaimed /tidal marshes (link to 11.5). Many of these areas hold the line and they are unlikely to be suitable for freshwater, if anything they should be intertidal wading marsh.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do we know what this comment relates to - is it conflict with agriculture?</li> <li>Can we check mapping and ensure its just freshwater wetland opportunities that are mapped. Will this help thin out areas?</li> <li>Is there any way we can refine - could it be done in relation to freshwater wetland habitat assemblage species?</li> </ul>	Potentially yes
FW11.3	Create wetlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regularly flooded fields could easily be converted into valuable wetland habitat.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there some way of identifying regularly flooded fields and use this as basis for mapping? Or any other way to map, even if it can't be included in ACIB?</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW11.4	Connectivity		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to review connectivity mapping.</li> </ul>	Unknown
FW12	Lowland drains and marshes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None of the measures are currently mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SERT to look at possible mapping approaches for all measures.</li> <li>If we're not able to map, move to unmapped management measures for the priority?</li> <li>Identify this as evidence need to inform future LNRS?</li> </ul>	Unknown

Urban

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
URB		South Sittingbourne appears mainly 'white' as showing no areas of biodiversity opportunities - that may be due to a lot of the land being grade 1 but please reassess for options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review reasons for white space.</li> </ul>	
URB1.1	Grass cuts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use B-lines as baseline map.</li> <li>Can BBCT provide anecdotal areas where this should be prioritised for pollinators?</li> </ul>	Potentially yes if BBCT can provide locations – may still not be refined enough. If cannot be mapped, should be moved from mapped measures.
URB1.2	Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data missing from mapping - Thanet, Sheppey, Gravesham,</li> <li>Key larger natural spaces in Dartford is missing such as central park which is 33Ha etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connectivity mapping to be reviewed and revised.</li> <li>Should this mapping include existing greenspace overlaid with connectivity mapping.</li> <li>Can LPAs advise on priority areas?</li> </ul>	Potentially if revised connectivity mapping refines opportunities or LPAs are able to suggest priority areas.
URB1.3	Enhance green space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several urban centres completely missing – Dover, Thanet, Folkstone, Faversham and Sittingbourne.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connectivity mapping to be reviewed and revised.</li> <li>Connectivity bottlenecks seems to be excluding these urban areas – revisit mapping approach.</li> </ul>	Not currently
URB1.4	Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing Associations are using GIS for mapping their trees as part of maintenance regimes, we have maps of where they are.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would tree assets in urban area show us where gaps exist? Could these sorts of datasets be used to map this measure? Could be that highways street teams hold similar datasets we could use?</li> </ul>	Not currently – if cannot be mapped, remove as mapped potential measure.
URB1.5	Green bridges etc in urban	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	No – cannot be mapped; to be

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
				removed as mapped potential measure.
URB1.6	Natural river banks	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes
URB2.1	Greenspace delivering for nature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is this only focussed on ‘major urban areas’?- centres of population in small urban areas also need benefits.</li> <li>Missing Dartford marshes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Query application of just urban – if method retained, include why in mapping approach description.</li> <li>Check data layer</li> </ul>	Yes
URB2.2	Conservation cuts on areas for pollinators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roadside nature reserve, bee road site mapping method would result in more sites identified for Tunbridge Wells? Considering the urban setting here, seem to be lacking here on the map itself.</li> <li>Missing areas that already have conservation cuts etc in Dartford.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This map does appear lacking - check mapping as there are very few areas identified.</li> <li>Where did conservation verges record come from?</li> <li>Should Beelines be applied too?</li> </ul>	Yes
URB2.3	Ecological features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use swift mapper and urban areas to identify areas for swift brick.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can we get data from swift mapper – could map for swifts at least?</li> <li>Are there any other similar “mappers” that would allow us to prioritise species specific installations?</li> <li>Or would it actually be best to just make this a blanket requirement?</li> </ul>	If cannot be mapped, to be removed as mapped potential measure
URB2.4	Restore urban rivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can we take urban cut of relevant FW1 measures to create mapping layer for this measure?</li> </ul>	Potentially if urban cut can be undertaken.
URB2.5	Tree establishment to low canopy cover	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tree cover action to add: target areas of highest priority in the UK Tree Equity Score- <a href="http://uk.treeequalityscore.org">uk.treeequalityscore.org</a></li> <li>Thanet area completely covered – this needs refining. The area has not historically had woodland or hedgerows and was predominantly open landscape. Historical maps showing where woodland existed would help focus where more woodland might be more appropriate. Tree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could we look at this to see if it provides better definition.</li> <li>Can LPAs advise on priority urban areas for tree planting?</li> <li>Have we applied correct habitat exclusions for this measure – exclusions need to be consistent with those applied to WTH tree planning measures?</li> </ul>	Potentially if LPAs can advise on priority areas.

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
		<p>planting needs to be done carefully – natural regeneration needs to be promoted more frequently and mixed woodland, scrub and grassland areas promoted rather than just woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Showing for tree establishment- but areas shown are actually other priority habitats such as marshes</li> </ul>		
URB3.1	Tree NBS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tree planting in conflict with coastal grassland along Thanet coastline.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can LPAs advise on priority urban areas for tree planting?</li> <li>Have we applied correct habitat exclusions for this measure – exclusions need to be consistent with those applied to WTH tree planning measures?</li> </ul>	Potentially if LPAs can advise on priority areas.
URB3.2	Natural flood management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential to look at water company priorities where CSO issues are particular a problem and target NBS to these areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map high risk surface water flooding urban areas as opportunity (unprioritized) map that's not included in ACIB.</li> <li>Does CSO offer another mapping layer if data is available?</li> <li>Can we refine with mapping layer or anecdotally prioritise areas where NFM would be most appropriate?</li> </ul>	Potentially if we can identify urban areas where NFM is most appropriate.
URB 3.3	Temp cooling		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can LPAs advise on urban heat island risk areas?</li> </ul>	Potentially if LPAs can advise on heat island risk areas.
URB3.4	Naturalise urban rivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can we take urban cut of relevant FW1 measures to create mapping layer for this measure?</li> </ul>	Potentially if urban cut can be undertaken.
URB3.5	Target greenspace to where its most needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not all green infrastructure has been incorporated in Dartford</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check GI mapping.</li> <li>Need to check deprivation data being used as mapping seems to be missing a lot of areas based on feedback (see list at end of document).</li> </ul>	Yes

**Coastal**

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
CL1.1	Green the grey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map hold the line areas of coast as opportunity (unprioritized) map that's not included in ACIB.</li> <li>Can we anecdotally prioritise areas where measure is most needed?</li> </ul>	Potentially if we can identify where most needed – EA?
CL1.2	Wildlife refuges	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes
CL1.3	Remove hard defences	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes
CL1.4	Restoration	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes
CL1.5	Removal of hard defences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hard defence removal perhaps not appropriate for certain areas marked – e.g. those around power stations and semi-urbanised areas. Reference to Thames Estuary 2100 Hold the Line – Policy 4.</li> <li>Ensure engagement with Thames Estuary 2100 and Medway Estuary and Swale Strategy. Ensure areas marked as 'Hold the Line' are compatible with any proposed managed realignment initiatives.</li> <li>Transforming the Thames has already completed some significant mapping of opportunities for retreating coastal defences and softening defences.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check locations for this measure and CL1.3 with Environment Agency.</li> <li>Check whether Transforming the Thames offers additional information.</li> </ul>	Yes
CL2.1	Saltmarsh and mudflats roosts and nesting sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yanlet Creek - inclusion in measure to address recreational disturbance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add to mapping for CL2? Three separate mentions of this as a sensitive site needing management.</li> </ul>	Yes
CL2.2	Saltmarsh and mudflats – fish nurseries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity (unprioritized) map that's not included in ACIB.</li> <li>Can IFCA help anecdotally prioritise areas where measures are most needed?</li> </ul>	Potentially if IFCA can advise on priority areas.
CL2.3	Saltmarsh and mudflats – space for nesting birds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity (unprioritized) map that's not included in ACIB.</li> <li>Can RSPB help anecdotally prioritise areas where measures are most needed?</li> </ul>	Potentially if RSPB can advise on priority areas.
CL2.4	Saltmarsh and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity</li> </ul>	Potentially if EA

Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
	mudflats – restoration		(unprioritized) map that’s not included in ACIB. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does EA have maps of areas at risk of coastal squeeze that could assist with mapping priority areas?</li> </ul>	can advise on priority areas.
CL2.5	Link wetlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mapping did not work as it identified inland wetland sites – needs to be coastal wetland sites – functional links.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remap.</li> </ul>	Yes
CL3.1	Seagrass pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gaps where ZSL would have things mapped</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data layer to be sought from ZSL.</li> </ul>	Yes
CL3.2	Invasive removal	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes
CL3.3	Increase seagrass	<i>No feedback</i>	<i>No further action to refine map</i>	Yes
CL4.1	Chalk cliffs and reefs management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity (unprioritized) map that’s not included in ACIB.</li> <li>Does INNS layer from KMBRC provide any refinement?</li> </ul>	Potentially if INNS data is relevant.
CL4.2	Chalk cliffs and reefs disturbance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>No feedback</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>No further action to refine map</i></li> </ul>	Yes
CL5.1	Native oyster beds – no take zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why only Thames Estuary for MPA/MCZ?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check on mapping refinement – is this because oyster beds only occur in this area? If yes, need to add to mapping methodology.</li> </ul>	Yes
CL5.2	Native oyster beds – INNS removal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>No feedback</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>No further action to refine map</i></li> </ul>	Yes
CL5.3	Native oyster beds – substrate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>No feedback</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>No further action to refine map</i></li> </ul>	Yes
CL6.1 & 6.2	Saline lagoons safeguard and buufer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Saline lagoons – there are measures relating to <i>buffering</i> existing saline lagoons and <i>safeguarding</i> existing lagoons, but no measure relating to <i>creating more</i> saline lagoons. Do we have data to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a creation measure - CL6.3 - but not mapped – could we map opportunities anecdotally? See below.</li> </ul>	Yes



Measure ref	Detail	Feedback from workshop	Action	Can revised measure be included in ACIB?
		be able to map opportunities for more saline lagoons? Otherwise, this could be noted as an unmapped measure?		
CL6.3	Saline lagoons creation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hasn't identified potential areas to create saline lagoons. Should they overlay areas of potential saltmarsh creation?</li> <li>RSPB mapping possible areas.</li> <li>There is an opportunity for creating more saline lagoons at Lydd Ranges ///kitchens.providing.rebounds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tom Cook (EA) suggested overlay approach – is it worth speaking with him to seeing if this could be a valid approach to mapping this measure?</li> <li>If not, could be map opportunities anecdotally – would EA, NE and RSPB be able to assist?</li> <li>Consider Lydd Ranges opportunity.</li> </ul>	Potentially if EA, NE and RSPB can advise on areas.
<b>CL7 and CL8</b>			<b>Note that numbering got confused – CL7 relates to shingle and wildlife disturbance should be CL8.</b>	
CL7.1-7.4	Vegetated shingle management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map all measures based on habitat extent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map the extent of the habitat as opportunity (unprioritized) map that's not included in ACIB.</li> <li>Can we anecdotally prioritise areas where measures are most needed?</li> </ul>	Potentially if we can get advice on where to prioritise.
CL8		Mapping wrong – inland sites mapped – but missing most of Medway Swale estuary features – refine with bird/seal data?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to check which map this is as CL7 maps were renumbered to CL8 for workshops because of error in numbering (CL7 was vegetated shingle and this was not mapping for that).</li> <li>Think this is referring to the map labelled by KWT as CL7.2 / CL7 but actually relates to CL8 – but not clear what mapping method was for this and therefore cannot assess legitimacy of comment!</li> </ul>	
CL8.1-8.2	Wildlife disturbance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can we do broad mapping of sites sensitive to leisure pressures? Speak to BirdWise, RSPB, ZSL – anyone else?</li> </ul>	Potentially if we can get advice on most sensitive sites.
CL8.3	Seal haul out sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be mapped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will map be created – unclear from mapping notes if just waiting on data?</li> </ul>	Unknown.

<b>URB3.5 Target greenspace to where its most needed – mapped using major urban areas within the most deprived area (using IMD data).</b>
Realmwood, Timpson Wood and Old Park and Chequers Wood on edge of Northgate and Barton Wards – 2 of the most deprived in East Kent. Landscape <b>blank</b> to Fordwich and Stodmarsh – deliver health and wellbeing as on edge of density built estates (Canterbury).
Use fingertips.phe.org.uk and look at the most deprived wards in a district.
Murston & Milton Regis are areas of significant deprivation which require more nature recovery. (Murston 20.1% and Milton Regis 17.8.5 deprivation – Swale average 14.9%)
Medway is missing? Very little green space in Strood/Rochester/Chatham conurbation. Needs to be accessible. Wards requiring attention- Luton/Chatham Central/Gillingham North/ Gillingham South/Rochester East/Strood South/Twydall/River.
Canterbury City centre, particular wards- Barton/Northgate/Wincheap which are areas of deprivation and nature deprivation.
Ashford North, again areas of deprivation for humans and nature deprivation. ( Stanhope 29.9%/ Beaver 21.9%/ Bockhanger 18%/ Norman 16.5%/Aylesford and East Stour 16.11% - Ashford average 11% deprivation)
Faversham – parts of Faversham have deprivation and need nature spaces
Herne Bay, particular Heron ward- area of deprivation
Dartford. Wards-Swanscombe/Temple Hill/Princes/Darent. These areas are all significant areas of deprivation (15.2-16.7%- Dartford average 9.5%)
Tunbridge Wells. In particular Sherwood Ward, area of significant deprivation (14.8%- TW average 7.3%)
Queenbrough and halfway areas of deprivation. 17.9%, Swale average 14.9%.
Tonbridge and Malling. Snodland East and Ham Hill, East Malling and Trench are significant areas of deprivation, need more nature restoration.
Sevenoaks. Swanley, St Marys and Swanley White Oak wards are significant areas of deprivation. Will need more nature restoration.