

Change Log LNRS:

General Text Updates:

Edit	Section of LNRS	Suggested action	Status: Will edit be made?	Status: If edit is not going to be made, explain why.
<p>6.6 Urban Wildlife</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urban Greening - to me, these actions can be local as well as district, borough, city 2. Creation of above ground drainage - only mentions local but could this not also be district, borough and city? 3. Pocket Forest - could be local too 4. Wildflower strip management - could be local 5. Managing roadside verges - could be local 6. Green roofs and walls could be local 7. & 8. Urban wetland & Tree planting - misses local but mentions all the others 9. Wildlife garden - A great thing to do locally in a public place! 10. Compost can be local or larger 13. Wildlife crossing - regional comes last here but comes first on community empowerment which seems to make more sense as it is the largest scale. 	6.6	Make changes as per suggestion	Yes	
<p>Request for mention of chalk streams in North West Essex. Following text may fit in to strategy:</p> <p>Around 200 chalk streams exist globally, with 85% in southern and eastern England. These streams, often referred to as "England's rainforests," are vital ecosystems, supporting diverse wildlife with</p>			No	Existing reference to chalk streams in LNRS, p.195.

pure, clear water from underground chalk aquifers. East Anglia is home to approximately 118 of these streams, with several located in Essex				Small portion of Essex riverine habitats.
Typo on p.20 under pollution subheading: 'pollution <u>for</u> agriculture and rural land use' should be ' <u>from</u> agriculture'	4.2 p.20	'pollution <u>for</u> agriculture and rural land use' should be ' <u>from</u> agriculture'	Yes	
<p><u>Coastal Grazing Marsh - page 156</u></p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Restoration of existing grazing marsh, including the use of pumps, sluices and bunds to improve hydrology, fencing and corrals to improve grazing management and harrowing to restore rills.</u> • Creation of new grazing marsh, using LiDAR, hydrological and grazing infrastructure. • Climate adaptation of grazing marsh, using water storage facilities to hold excess winter water for use during the breeding season and solar pumps to maintain surface pools. • <u>Predator management, by installing barrier fencing.</u> <p>Scale of action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional <p>Nature recovery benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Additional breeding habitat</u> for lapwing, redshank, avocet and oystercatcher, increasing overall population resilience in the face of climate change and predation pressure. • Provides extra roosting areas for internationally important populations of wintering wildfowl and waders. • Provides additional habitat for water voles, brown hare and scare ditch invertebrates. 		<p>Add in underlined points</p> <p>Rename 'to Creation and Restoration'</p>	Yes	

<p>Wider benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains heritage, both as a landscape and individual features. • <u>Maintains food security and rural jobs by maintaining livestock farming.</u> <p><u>BuDS section - page 158</u></p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Create new beach nesting bird islands by using dredged sand and shingle material placed in the intertidal area.</u> • Reduce saltmarsh erosion and promote accretion leading to the development of saltmarsh vegetation by deposition of sand and shingle material in front of eroding saltmarsh. • Restore existing saltmarsh using a variety of innovative methods including BuDS, coir “sausages” and geotextile. <p>Scale of action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional <p>Nature recovery benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Additional breeding habitat for birds reliant on disturbance free beaches</u> • <u>Provides extra roosting areas for internationally important populations of wintering wildfowl and waders</u> • Can restore existing saltmarsh and help to support a diverse range of fauna and flora only found on Saltmarshes • Supports and contributes to coastal habitat diversity and increases resilience of the populations of species found within them 				
--	--	--	--	--

Wider benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helps to sequester carbon by reducing saltmarsh erosion and promotes accretion and the development of new saltmarsh • <u>Enhances flood and coastal defences by reducing direct wave action on vulnerable seawalls</u> • May help to support socio-economic activities by preventing coastal erosion at key points in natural harbours • With careful management can create space for wildlife and recreational activities to co-exist • Will evolve and adapt to future climate driven sea level change and continue to provide wider benefits for a number of years. 				
<p>“Species naming convention varies throughout. Pick one and apply to all - e.g. capitals for first and second names (Floating Pennywort) and give full names (hawthorn -> Common Hawthorn)”</p>	Executive Summary, general comment	Use same naming convention where possible.	Yes	
<p>“There are four Lawton principles - Bigger, Better, More and Connected. The last two commonly get joined together as has happened here.</p> <p>If it is too late to change this, suggest referring to this in the text and explaining how you have combined them.”</p>	Executive Summary, page 6		No	Valid comment, however, adding ‘more’ principle would be a large structural change to document without adding much value.

				The hope is that 'more' habitat will be created by following the three principles of 'bigger, better, and connected'.
Farmland – add “good soil health” so that it reads “The yield and quality of food production is dependent upon good soil health and pollination by invertebrates”. Referring to soil health broadens this more and acknowledges the key role soil health plays on wider landscape, habitats/species, water retention, watercourse buffering + food production.	Executive Summary, page 9	Change can be made as suggested: add 'good soil health'	Yes	
Cut public consultation page from final draft	Pages 208-209	Cut pages	Yes	
<p>Paragraph needs adding acknowledging deep peat sites in Essex and that these will be safeguarded from potentially damaging designations.</p> <p>Potential actions from John More based on advice from Natural England:</p> <p>In general, the approach would be to sort/restore natural hydrological function to an area/site - block up/remove drainage...</p> <p>LNRS Measures (some suggestions from the discussion and chat - see also my original email which had some potential measures)</p> <p>Restore natural hydrological function to enhance existing wetland habitats and species, in particularly looking to restore X habitat (fen/bog/wet woodland) which is a local priority.</p> <p>Create new areas of fen and reedbed where possible expanding and connecting existing sites.</p>	<p>6.7 Freshwater and wetlands</p> <p>8.3 Freshwater</p>	<p>Add unmapped measure:</p> <p>13. Safeguard deep peat sites</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>Restore natural hydrological function by blocking up or removing drainage features on site.</p> <p>Where removal of trees on deep peat is proposed, Peatland Decision Support Framework (July 2023 Decision support framework for peatland protection V4.pdf) tool should be used to inform decisions.</p> <p>Scale of action:</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	

A more general measure about enhancing wetland areas - Removal of vegetation to prevent succession to woodland (bogs/mires).	and wetlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local Nature recovery benefits: - Habitat for rare and specialist <p>Wider benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stores and sequesters carbon - Slows the flow of water on the landscape <p>Add following paragraph : 'Essex is home to a handful of deep peat sites. These areas serve as invaluable carbon sinks and are a unique habitat for a variety of plant and animal species, many of which are specially adapted to the acidic, waterlogged conditions of peatlands. Safeguarding these sites is essential not only for preserving their unique biodiversity but also for maintaining their role in carbon sequestration and water regulation.'</p>		
Worth linking LNP community project mapping to strategy, if not already mentioned. This mapping can be used as a tool for local groups to collaborate and pool their efforts.	P.202	Under 'Local Communities' on p.202, replace 4 th bullet point ('link with other communities..') with: 'Add your group to the Essex Local Nature Partnership's	Yes	

		online community map to connect and collaborate with other local community groups working to protect and restore nature'		
Add a point about choosing appropriate plant species for urban greening, considering climate, soil type, and maintenance requirements.	6.6 Urban Section	May be an old comment that was implemented in previous edits as already included on p.128, Priority 1. Urban Greening	Yes	
Include references to ditches instead of underground pipes for developments where appropriate.	6.6 Urban Section		No	No reference to underground pipes in draft strategy.
Mention the need for ground nesting bird areas to be away from PROWs to avoid disturbance.	6.6 Urban Section		No	Already included under farmland action 1 (p.119).
"There should be a specific measure to encourage the installation, or retrofitting of species boxes, for example Swift or bat boxes, on buildings."	6.6 Urban Section	Add bat boxes to measure 1 (urban greening).	Yes	
Clarify the role of Local Plans in the Introduction (Chapter 3) and emphasise its importance.	3. Introduction (section 3.2 what the LNRS offers)	Add points under 'For local authorities, the LNRS': - "Assists in complying with the biodiversity duty placed on public authorities by the Environment Act 2021."	Yes	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Provides information that may be a ‘material consideration’ in the planning system.” <p>Link most recent NE guidance in appendices</p>		
Include more explicit guidance on embedding LNRS goals into planning policies and local action plans.	Section 9. Actions	Links with above and below edits	Yes	
<p>Address specific issues around Epping Forest SAC, including mitigation measures and SANG policy.</p> <p>Under the ‘Local authorities’ heading in section 3.2 we would suggest adding in a bullet seeking authorities to develop and implement protected site strategies.</p>	Not specified – but potentially 6.1 trees and woodland	<p>Phrasing provided by NE..</p> <p>Add additional point under ‘What the LNRS offers for Local Authorities’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Helps LPAs, together with key stakeholders, develop and implement protected site strategies to address challenges faced by particular protected sites.” 	Yes	Specific references to Epping Forest may not be appropriate in suggested locations as other specific groups/sites not mentioned in this way.
“Scrub and Mosaic” section to be clearer on what “mosaic” means in this context.	Section 6.3 (pages 98-99)	Add definition provided by EWT: <i>An area with a mixed coverage of scrub, grasses and other flowering plants that supports a variety of vegetation heights and structures, providing important habitat for small mammals, birds and insects.</i>	Yes	

Integrate brownfield sites into appropriate habitat actions.			No	Several mentions of value of biodiverse brownfield sites already in strategy. For example, p.148, measure 8 in Freshwater and Wetlands.
LNRS should encourage citizen science / county recording efforts.	Section 7. species priorities		No	p.203 Citizen science already mentioned here.
<p>“Ex industrial” and “brownfield” both used in the LNRS, and this could be simplified by just referring to one to avoid confusion.</p> <p>Rob Smith: “lack of ex-industrial/brownfield, this habitat type isn’t mentioned in the ‘grassland’ section on page 192, but is mentioned in page 90 – “1.</p>	<p>Across the LNRS but more specifically section 7. Species Priorities</p> <p>Page 192</p>	<p>Use the term brownfield throughout document</p> <p>Guidance sought from Place Services: <i>I don’t think ‘brownfield’ should be included</i></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	

Enhance mosaic of ex-industrial grassland along the Thames....” Can you work this into p192? And on p90, can this be expanded to include post-industrial sites generally, but with a particular focus on the north side of the Thames?”	Page 90	<i>in grassland, but it is an omission in this part of the strategy. It might be worth adding some text in the ‘Grassland and Meadows’ section along the lines of: “Flower-rich grassland is often an important component of open mosaic habitats, such as those found on aggregates sites and previously developed land (brownfield).”</i>		
<p>Heathland use in strategy needs clarification. It’s used in the map title, but then not in the grassland section. Remove “Heathland” and “meadows” to avoid confusion and just have “grassland”?</p> <p>““heathland” has a scattering of mentions throughout the document but isn’t specifically covered either as a separate habitat type or even in the “grassland” sections on page 88 (section 6.2) or p192. I think it deserves a mention above and beyond acid grassland. There are opportunities to maintain/expand/restore heathland at some parts of Epping Forest e.g. Cuckoo Pits, arguably Shenfield Common, Norton Heath (all now secondary woodland) and the secondary woodland parts of Mill Green Common, Danbury Ridge, etc”</p>	<p>Page 42 – 43 Section 6.2. pages 88 -89</p> <p>Page 88 Page 192 Section 6.2 grasslands</p>	<p>Remove Heathland from map title p.43</p> <p>Addition from Place Services p.193: <i>I would suggest amending that paragraph to: “Acid grassland habitat is restricted to the areas of more recent sands and gravel surface geology, predominantly in the southern half of the county and is also found in a mosaic with the few areas of heather heath that are now found in the county, the most notable being Tiptree Heath, Epping Forest, Millgreen Common and several locations on the Danbury Ridge.”</i></p>	Partly	Only a very small proportion of the county is heathland hence why it is not covered as a separate habitat type.

Lee Valley suggested adding “Enhance quality of existing grassland habitat” to BETTER HABITAT PRIORITY so that it reads as “Enhance quality of existing grassland habitat, minimise or eradicate threats to grassland habitats”. This could be delivered through BNG or other funding streams.	Page 89, Section 6.2 Grassland and Meadows, Biodiversity Priorities		No	Current phrasing and format makes the same point. The fact that it is under ‘Better’ means it is enhancing the habitat type.
Change wording from “particular” to “potential” on page 29.	Page 29 Section 5. Maps	<p>Changing to ‘potential’ may confuse APIB terminology but point is valid and first use of ‘particular’ is erroneous.</p> <p>Change first paragraph of p.29 to: “All creation opportunities” maps present all locations that could be used as creation opportunities, prior to any restraints being added. Locations where there is overlap with areas of particular importance for biodiversity (APIB) have not been removed from the all opportunities maps</p>	Yes	
Include very clear perspective on links with ELMS and LNRS.	Section 4.4 support mechanisms and Section 6.5 farmland	Providing some more clarity on p.15 ‘What the LNRS offers for landowner and farmers’: “Aids farmers and landowners in the design of environmental	Partly	Because LNRS is a static document we are

	– begins page 116	schemes under ELMS, such as SFI, Countryside Stewardship and Landscape Recovery.”		unable to make specific reference to funding programmes which may change throughout lifetime of document, however we’re planning on providing more detailed info to support delivery once published.
Section 3.2 “What the LNRS offers” – Add in “ for developers, the LNRS highlights key land for nature recovery which are also the areas that development footprints should avoid where possible to avoid habitat loss”.	Section 3.2 What the LNRS offers , begins page 15	Add bullet point to p.16 under ‘For Developers, the LNRS’: “Highlights key areas that development footprints should avoid where possible to maintain opportunities for habitat creation”.	Yes	
Add in key guidance in regards to LNRS for planners from here: Natural environment - GOV.UK	Section 3.2 What the	Add following points to ‘For local authorities, the LNRS’:	Yes	

	LNRS offers , begins page 15	- Assists in complying with the biodiversity duty placed on public authorities by the Environment Act 2021. Provides information that may be a 'material consideration' in the planning system.		
Emma Gray feedback: There is one line in section 3.2 of the document that I think might need a bit of a tweak to the wording: "Could provide a focus for environmental schemes under ELMS such as Landscape Recovery Schemes and Countryside Stewardship" "I'm a bit worried that farmers are going to think this might mean that Natural England will use the LNRS to assess ELMS applications, or even that ELMS schemes in an LNRS identified priority area might be paid at a higher rate. I wonder if we could either take this line out, or rephrase it to something like: "Aids farmers and landowners in the design of environmental schemes under ELMS, such as SFI, Countryside Stewardship and Landscape Recovery."	Section 3.2 What the LNRS offers, begins page 15	Replace "Could provide a focus for.." with "Aids farmers and landowners in the design of environmental schemes under ELMS, such as SFI, Countryside Stewardship and Landscape Recovery."	Yes	
Explicitly elaborate on the fact that the strategy is not in itself an enabler of delivery.	Section 3.2 What the LNRS offers, begins page 15	-	No	LNRS should be considered an enabler of delivery.
Clarify what is meant by and/or reword "green and blue space" as it is unclear as to whether this can also be land used for food production.	Introduction / Top 10 aims p.7	Expand definitions within glossary of green space. Amend definition to the below: Green Habitats/Spaces: 'Areas primarily composed of vegetation, such as forests,	Partly	Blue habitats/spa ces already defined in glossary.

		meadows and urban parks, that provide habitat for wildlife, recreational space for people and various ecological benefits. May also include biodiverse features within the farmed landscape such as field margins managed for wildlife or agroforestry.'		
<p>The Foreword by Southend-on-Sea City Council on page 126 states that Swifts: "nest in roof spaces and other suitable nooks and crannies and are becoming more and more common above Essex roof tops".</p> <p>However, the national statistics such as the BTO Breeding Bird Survey 2023 show a continuing decline in England with a 52% decline in the East of England between 1995 and 2022 (page 27). Although there is not a county-specific breakdown, I'm not aware that Essex is significantly different to other nearby counties despite some successful local projects. Therefore I think the reference to "...more and more common..." should be deleted.</p> <p>Link: https://www.bto.org/our-science/publications/breeding-bird-survey-report/breeding-bird-survey-2023</p> <p>Download: https://www.bto.org/sites/default/files/bto_incc_rspb_breeding_bird_survey_report_2023.pdf</p>	Page 126 – foreword by Southend on Sea	<p>Elias requested edit of foreword from Southend City Council on 21/02/25.</p> <p>Chased on 19/03/25.</p> <p>Appears factually inaccurate so will remove and discuss further at SA 1-1.</p> <p>Change phrasing to: "Swifts, for instance, are migratory birds that visit the UK every year to breed, nesting in roof spaces and other suitable nooks and crannies."</p>	Yes	
Potential actions on page 178 state: "Swift: ...Create new nest sites, by installing a nesting box in your garden or on your house".	Page 178	Delete 'in your garden or'	Yes	

<p>"in your garden" should be deleted, because swift boxes should be installed on buildings to be successful as whilst Swifts do nest in ancient trees elsewhere in the world there are none in England, e.g. see the advice from the RSPB: https://www.rspb.org.uk/helping-nature/what-you-can-do/activities/create-a-high-home-for-swifts</p> <p>Swift bricks are preferable to boxes for many reasons as I state in my consultation submission.</p>				
<p>Section for local authorities could include specific reference to making improvements to Council owned land eg. Parks and open spaces enhancement and managed for nature/wildlife.</p>	<p>Section 3.2 What the LNRS offers</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>Too similar to 'green and blue space delivery' to make separate point.</p>
<p>More reference to the use of the maps in section 3.2 "what the LNRS offers" – this will be helpful for LPAs / developers / NP groups – having reference to this upfront makes the clear links to the maps</p>	<p>Section 3.2 What the LNRS offers</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>The mapping is intrinsically linked to the strategy so hopefully the use of the mapping is inferred throughout all points.</p>
<p>Needs more detail to be purposeful.</p> <p>Benefit - better situational awareness for people - brings in data from a range of places and provides single point for mapping etc. for a wide range of habitats</p>	<p>Section 3.2 What the LNRS offers, begins page 15</p>	<p>Add short paragraph at the end of 3.2 referencing support mechanisms in 4.4.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

Signposting to organisations to help with support/delivery?				
<p>"Landowners / farmers can benefit from an uplift in the BNG multiplier if their land is in a Strategic Opportunity so this should be highlighted in what the LNRS can offer for landowners."</p> <p>"BNG opportunities of being in an opportunity area should be mentioned as for landowners and farmers, if their land is in an area of Strategic Opportunity (top 15%) then it offers them an uplift in the BNG multiplier."</p>	Section 3.2 What the LNRS offers, begins page 15	p. 15, Landowners and farmers, add point: "Land within strategic opportunities is eligible for an uplift of 15% in BNG credits."	Yes	
"3rd bullet of For Community groups and individuals - it's not clear whose objectives are being aligned with neighbourhood plans ? is it the objectives of the LNRS?"	Section 3.2 What the LNRS offers, begins page 15	3rd bullet For Community groups and individuals, p.15, change to: "Provides opportunities to incorporate nature recovery into neighbourhood planning."	Yes	
For community groups and individuals, last bullet point: "It's not clear how the LNRS aids in the establishment of new local community groups as it is unlikely to provide funding to help with establishment costs etc. More clarity should be provided to show how it can help with their establishment or the wording changed to show that it can help community groups to focus their nature recovery efforts. "	Section 3.2 What the LNRS offers, begins page 15	<p>Delete bullet point.</p> <p>Replace top bullet point with: 'Guides new and existing local community groups in their efforts to restore nature by mapping strategic opportunities and outlining focussed priorities and actions for those areas.'</p>	Yes	
"in section Local Authorities (and elsewhere throughout the document e.g page 29 bullet 2.3) whilst Green Infrastructure is listed in the Glossary of Terms "green and blue space" is not - blue infrastructure / space should also appear in the Glossary."	Section 3.2 What the LNRS offers, page 16		No	Blue space and blue infrastructure already included.
For environmental non-governmental organisations (NGOs) – the point "Fosters collaborative efforts across the county, generating greater ambition for nature recovery", would benefit from the mention of	Section 3.2 What the	Make suggested edit: "Fosters collaborative efforts across the county, through environmental	Yes	

<p>‘environmental plans and policy’, which is a reference to national plans already included under Appendices 1.</p> <p>Suggested text is as follows: “Fosters collaborative efforts across the county, through environmental plans and policy, generating a greater ambition for nature recovery”</p>	LNRS offers, page 16	plans and policy, generating a greater ambition for nature recovery”		
<p>“Could the developers section be expanded to business more generally. An extra bullet could remark on how local businesses could invest in nature recovery in ways that bring commercial and resilience benefits to their business”</p>	Section 3.2 What the LNRS offers, page 16		No	Value in homing in on developers and getting their buy in as they are major players in how land is used. No clear link to commercial benefits in the strategy but could be expanded on in later LNRS iterations.
Anglian water suggested mention of Ardleigh reservoir	Simon’s foreword	Elias emailed Simon on 04/03/2025 for feedback.	No	Ardleigh is much smaller than the two reservoirs mentioned. Hanningfield

				and Aberton are also managed more strictly for nature and include many protected sites.
Spelling error: canvas is spelt wrong	Section 3.3, page 17	Fix typo.	Yes	
<p>Consider adding underlined text.</p> <p>5. To boost the use of nature friendly practises in urban areas across the county, to improve spaces for biodiversity and people. <u>To create a greener, more natural and healthier environment for all, rich in wildlife and distinctive in character.</u></p>	Top 10 aims of nature recovery, page. 10	Change to: "To boost the use of nature friendly practises in urban areas across the county, to improve spaces for biodiversity and people, and to create a greener, more natural and healthier environment for all."	Yes	<p>"Distinctive in character" is perhaps too vague for the top 10 aims.</p> <p>All other aims are succinct enough to fit in one sentence.</p>
<p>Consider adding highlighted text:</p> <p>"7. To prioritise the creation of new native woodland in ways that link with existing native woodland, maximise wider environmental benefits, and strengthen local landscape character. This includes considerations of both new planting and natural regeneration and to improve the management of existing woodland to enhance biodiversity."</p>	Top 10 aims of nature recovery	Discussed further with NE as there is a concern around keeping aims succinct.	No	NE agreeable to leaving out these comments to keep aims clear.

<p>Add in highlighted text:</p> <p>9. "Use of nature-based solutions to strengthen the resilience of coastal and marine environments against the effects of climate change, including rising sea levels, coastal erosion and warmer conditions, as well as human pressures including disturbance, development and pollution."</p>	<p>Top 10 aims of nature recovery</p>	<p>Change to: "To strengthen the resilience of coastal and marine environments against the effects of climate change, including rising sea levels, coastal erosion and warmer conditions, as well as human pressures including disturbance, development and pollution, by utilising nature-based solutions."</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>9. "I would change 9 as it's not only coastal and marine environments that need to increase their resilience, but also coastal communities in accordance with the National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy which includes as one of its 3 core ambitions "A nation ready to respond and adapt to flooding and coastal change: Ensuring local people understand their risk to flooding and coastal change, and know their responsibilities and how to take action."... this could include the incorporation of SUDS features, but also become more understanding of the need to adopt 'softer' approaches to coastal management, including managed realignment. Those living near to the coast are going to need to take more measures to protect themselves from coastal change in the future as there won't be public funding available to defend everywhere that's currently defended."</p>	<p>Top 10 aims of nature recovery</p>	<p>9 and 10 are being revised as determined by LNRS Working Group in response to multiple comments critiquing these aims.</p>	<p>Partly</p>	<p>Too much information for the top 10 aims. Strategy goes on to discuss measures for different areas so content later in document may cover this point.</p>
<p>Review of Geology and Soils section Natural England feedback: FOR CONSIDERATION</p> <p>"The Geology and Soils section requires review to ensure the priorities and measures are in-scope of the LNRS. Geology and soils are pivotal to nature recovery efforts and determining where habitat creation should occur or would be most successful. Consideration should be given to whether this would be better explained in the introductory sections,</p>		<p>Check Geology and Soils section to make sure actions benefit nature recovery rather than soil health.</p> <p>Measure 5.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

<p>with in scope priorities and measures being moved to relevant habitat sections.”</p> <p>Bigger habitat priority – We would suggest using the terms geology and active processes rather than using geodiversity as a bit more user friendly. If you keep it in, it would be useful to define. Important here is to emphasise the importance of maintain natural process – coastal and fluvial erosion and deposition – these are critical in both maintaining geological diversity and ecological diversity – strong mutual benefit.</p> <p>Better habitat priority - Managing sites for geology can increase habitat diversity and biodiversity - (see examples of Purple Horizons Nature Recovery Projects)</p>		<p>Add Nature recovery benefit: ‘Rare geological features can provide environmental niches for unique and vulnerable species.’</p> <p>Measure 6. Add action point: ‘Increase public awareness of the importance of soil health to food webs, and thus the wider ecosystem.’</p> <p>Measure 2. Add action point: ‘Safeguard areas with unique geology that supports rare habitat.’</p> <p>Remove measure 4.</p>		
<p>P170, first paragraph. It is important also to make a wider statement about Essex’s geology here. Perhaps: An underlying geology of chalk, clay, sands and crag exposed along the eroding coast, and revealed in quarries and pits, overlain by river and glacial deposits left behind during the Ice ages.</p>	<p>Section 6.9 Geology and soils Page 170</p>	<p>Add to foreword: “Essex has an underlying geology of chalk, clay, sands and crag exposed along the eroding coast, and revealed in quarries and pits, overlain by river and glacial deposits left behind during the last ice age.”</p> <p>Approved by Geo Essex on 25/03/25</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Can we add something about active processes that also have a significant role to play through erosion and weathering? This means that nature recovery vitally depends upon the geology – the rocks and sediments</p>	<p>Section 6.9 Geology and</p>	<p>Look to include term ‘active processes’ if it fits/adds value.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Unsure where this</p>

beneath the land surface – <u>as well as the active processes that act on them.</u>	soils Page 170	Discussed further with NE and this is not essential.		fits/adds value.
“Is the ‘bigger’ priority actually bigger, or even has the capacity to be bigger, other than to prevent erosion of geology/soils.”	Section 6.9 Geology and soils Page 170		No	
“No mention at this stage of mudflats as being considered geology and soils – yet they are included in the State of Nature section – does this fit better under coastal and marine sections?”	Section 6.9 Geology and soils Page 170		No	Relevant mention in State of Nature summary under Geology and Soils. Mudflats referenced in Coastal and Marine priorities.
Natural England are suggesting the following highlighted text to be added to P189, 3rd paragraph – “Geology and soils vary widely. The characteristic intertidal habitats of Essex are mudflats and saltmarsh. Dynamic coastal habitats of sand, shingle and shell are present in several, more exposed parts of the coast, while the high ground in the northwest corner of the county, around Saffron Walden, holds the most significant natural chalk outcrops <u>as well as boulder clays deposited by glaciers.</u> The land to the south and east is characterised by a combination of chalk and London clay. <u>Active processes still modify the Essex landscape for example erosion along the coast.</u> ”	Section 8. state of nature today (starts on page 186)	Amend to the following: “natural chalk outcrops as well as boulder clays deposited by glaciers. The land to the south and east is characterised by a combination of chalk and London clay. Active processes still modify the Essex landscape for example erosion along the coast.”	Yes	
P198, first sentence - Suggest adding in ‘active processes’		Add: “active processes”		

Geology and active processes influence habitats like wetlands, forests, and grasslands, creating diverse landscapes that support biodiversity.				
Urban areas, accounting for 11% is mentioned twice (page 9 and page 189) and farmland being 68% is mentioned twice (page 189 and page 103). The reference seems to be the Essex GI Strategy and when I went into the strategy, the figures are actually 18% urban and 61% farmland.	Section 2 and 8	<p>Urban should read 18% Farmland 61%</p> <p>Need to change phrasing to 'Around two thirds' on page 190.</p> <p>Outstanding 11% listed on page 190.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
Page 190 – population stats in future tense for 2024 so amend to be past tense.	Bottom of page 190	Change phrasing to: "As the human population in Greater Essex increased from 1.9 million to over 2 million by 2024, and continues this upward trajectory, it is crucial that nature is considered across our urban landscape."	Yes	
Paragraph 1: "elsewhere in document the length of the coastline has been presented in km whereas here it's in miles - there should be consistency"	Section 8. state of nature today, page 187		No	350 miles is how the length of Essex's coast is communicated by other ECC sources. Round number is more

				memorable and appealing than 563km.
P206, Ecologists title - It would be worth broadening this title out as the ideal is that all specialists are using a nature recovery lens. Suggest rewording as: Ecologists, geologists and other specialists.	Part D Section 9. Actions (page 206)	Change 'Ecologists' to 'Ecologists, geologists and other specialists'	Yes	
If it doesn't take up too much space or mess up the design of the contents page, add the appendices subheadings into the contents page – and list the appendices in the contents page with a page number for each	Contents page 2 – 3	Add page numbers to Appendices content list on page 212.	Partly	Would cause issue with formatting. Appendices has own contents list p.212.
Consider defining “nature” earlier in the document, in the introduction somewhere? Natural England have shared a definition that we could consider using (review other definitions as we want to include one that best fits within the contents of the LNRS) : “Nature encompasses the natural beauty, wildlife and geology that underpins landscape character. It includes habitats on which our most precious species depend. Nature also includes our historic and cultural connections with Nature.”	Executive summary or introduction ?	Add NE definition to Executive Summary.	Yes	
Section 4.2 Causes of the problem, there are additional local pressures relevant to Essex worth setting out here, one example would be recreational disturbance.	Section 4.2 Causes of the problem	Add third paragraph in 'Overexploitation' section: "Particularly high levels of recreational disturbance around Essex's coastal habitats can also adversely affect biodiversity in these areas."	Yes	

No. 2 – Reference to Mink - should be American Mink	Section 4.2 Causes of the problem, page 20	Change ‘mink’ to ‘American mink’	Yes	
No. 4 – “mentions ‘stable river levels’ – it would be better to <u>mention sustainable natural flows</u> . Stable water levels can be created artificially by weirs and structures causing other problems for river ecosystems, but flow is a more accurate term to describe what is needed. Both flow and levels do of course go up and down, but sustainable natural flows are desirable. Mention is made of farmers’ abstraction but water companies’ abstraction for public water supply and industry is also key.”	Section 4.2 Causes of the problem, page 20	Replace ‘stable river levels’ with ‘sustainable natural flows’. Change to: ‘abstraction of water for agriculture, public water supply, and industry.’	Yes	
Comment: “water companies are also subject to the Biodiversity Duty and measures set out in the Environment Act 2021.”	Section 4.3 Solving the problem, page 22		No	Unsure where this would fit in context of existing text.
p.27 4.5 Wider environmental benefits and co-benefits of nature recovery 1st para - explain what ecosystem services are – this is a public-facing document, and some readers will not be familiar with the concept of ecosystem services.	Section 4.5 Wider environmental benefits and co benefits of nature recovery	Add text: ‘ecosystem services, the benefits that us humans receive from natural ecosystems, and resilience.’	Yes	
In the below para, add a link to the climate change adaptation manual: “Implement adaptive Land Management practises that consider local ecological conditions, climate change impacts , and biodiversity priorities, add adjust farming practises accordingly to support nature recovery”	Section 9. Actions (page 201) landowners/farmers	Add link as suggested: Climate Change Adaptation Manual - NE751 on the phrase ‘climate change impacts’	Yes	
Add the following text: “The National Character Area and Landscape Character Assessments and AONB Management Plan applicable to your landholding will help you to identify the key characteristics of the landscape to strengthen.”	Section 9. Actions (page 201)	Add suggested, with links, under ‘Landowners/farmers:’	Yes	

	landowners/ farmers			
"We consider that the Farmers/Landowners section should have a call to - 'understand your connectivity to freshwater habitats and the water journey through your land downstream'. Explore opportunities to reduce risks to raw water quality from surface water runoff and soil loss."	Section 9. Actions, page 201	Add point under Landowners/farmers: "Consider your connectivity to freshwater habitats and the water journey through your land and explore opportunities to reduce risks to raw water quality from surface water runoff and soil loss."	Yes	
"Mention opportunities for <u>Natural Flood Management</u> which tie in with floodplain habitats and wetland enhancements. These need key links with Environment Agency, LAs, communities and landowners. Sustainable urban drainage is mentioned in next section but also required are solutions for sustainable rural drainage to retain wet habitats in the catchment headwaters <u>and throughout the landscape</u> if we are to mitigate ongoing biodiversity loss and climate change. "	Section 9. Actions (page 201) landowners/ farmers Page 202, Local Authorities	Broader action point on water being added: "Consider your connectivity to freshwater habitats and the water journey through your land and explore opportunities to reduce risks to raw water quality from surface water runoff and soil loss."	Yes	
"Suggest text as follows : "Scale up and grow ambition for win-wins for communities, landowner income/diversification, human wellbeing and healthier environments for people and wildlife. There is much talk of maintaining and retaining habitats and species but in reality this has not been achieved through well intentioned plans over the last 50 years – much more ambition is required to turn things around". "	Section 9. Actions (page 205) environmental organisations and charities		No	No clear action identified. Action points need to be kept succinct to be usable.
While each action includes a designated 'scale of action' (regional, local, household, etc.), there is a need for additional clarity on accountability—specifically, identifying who is responsible for delivering each action. The habitat specific actions in Section 6 need to have a strong link to the	Section 6 and Section 9		No	Identifying named organisations or people accountable

targeted group actions in Section 9 to ensure the actions are delivered by those able to deliver them.				for specific actions is out of scope of the LNRS.
“Support Mechanisms” section could be better expanded upon! Where possible, more information about how the LNRS will be delivered (alongside the support mechanisms identified). Such as how the LNRS will be: managed, funded, resource allocation, timelines, ongoing maintenance, when the LNRS will be reviewed. This could be supported by making a link between actions in section 6 and the LNRS top 10 aims / biodiversity priorities. Make sure section 4.4 is not just focussed on landowners/farmers. Add in local authorities and local community support mechanisms.	Section 4.4 support mechanisms (page 23) and Section 6		No	Information from DEFRA regarding LNRS delivery not yet given at time of publication. ECC and LNP can produce supplement ary resources to cover these elements.
Section 9 actions currently don’t prioritise the most critical actions for the focussed groups. Need to identify which ones take precedence to achieve the LNRS goals. This could be done by numbering them in order of importance.	Section 9 Actions		No	May want to leave open for people to prioritise what works for them, keeping the document user friendly.

Section 9 actions for local authorities need to be strengthened – as they lack strong connection to the specific habitat based actions in section 6.	Section 6 vs Section 9 ACTIONS		No	Section 9 actions are designed to be succinct and sit separately to section 6 which are habitat specific.
Consider inclusion of a how to flow diagram related to off-site BNG delivery and LNRS. Include more detail regarding the use of the LNRS for guiding off site BNG would be beneficial, including guidance on how to manage planning applications which falls within a strategic opportunity area.			No	Out of scope. Can be created as a separate document to support LNRS delivery after publication.
Need to adjust Action F (the last action on the list) for Local Authorities in Section 9 – as this is NOT supported by Rochford DC/ Braintree / CPBC. Many actions fall outside of LPA boundaries and no clear guidelines on how monitoring / reporting duties will be funded for LPAs. This action raises concerns for RDC about deliverability (the wording needs revising as it currently is). Local Authorities do not want to be held account for monitoring and reporting on the LNRS.	Page 202 (Section 9 Actions for local authorities).		No	Under the Environment Act 2021, LPAs must already ensure that all planning permissions deliver at least 10% BNG. The

				LNRS assists in determining what these actions should be in any given strategic opportunity area.
Make reference to “Riverside strategies” through the Thames Estuary 2100 plan – for local authorities in Essex who are required to produce a riverside strategy. This could either be added into Section 9. Actions or it could go in the appendices policy context section.	Either appendices or section 9 Actions.	Add to appendices/policy context.	Yes	
Should we reconsider how we refer to different groups in section 9 – as it is unclear who is coordinating the engagement of these groups in delivering the strategy and ensuring that actions are completed. A concern of risk of not delivering these outputs if it is not managed effectively. Need to make the purpose of section 9 very clear so as to avoid confusion! Who is implementing and managing the actions in section 9? Need to make it clear these groups are not held accountable.	Section 9 generally		No	ECC is unable to enforce the actions in this strategy, rather just encourage them where possible.
Need for further details on how LNRS works with future developments where they cross over with strategic opportunities. Further details on this could help to ensure that developments and the objectives of the LNRS work hand in hand in delivering the best outcomes for the area – particularly important to include this for LPAs.	More generally – BNG / Actions/ Local Plans LNRS	Addressed in a previous action in Change Log. Edits made to ‘What the LNRS offers for local authorities’.	Yes	
List of Partners, need to add: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suffolk and Essex Coast and Heaths National Landscape Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT) 	Page 210	Add:	Yes	

Bird Aware Essex		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suffolk and Essex Coast and Heaths National Landscape • Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT) • Bird Aware Essex 		
List of Partners: we would welcome the inclusion of Anglian Water on the list of partners as we note that Northumbrian Water are already included.	Page 210	Add: Anglian Water	Yes	
<p>Section 3.2, 'What the LNRS Offers'?</p> <p>This section could emphasise that, for developers, the LNRS provides useful information on the most appropriate planting that will enhance existing habitats that border the development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	Section 3.2 What the LNRS offers		No	Section already highlights that LNRS provides guidance on measures. LNRS doesn't offer specifics on appropriate species to plant so may be misleading.
No.2 in top 10 aims – the % increase from 14% to 25% is unclear and not very tangible. More detail to provided soon after this statement on how it is going to be calculated. Might need to note that 14% is the coverage of the APIB map within the statement.	Top 10 aims, page 12		No	<p>Addressed in end note.</p> <p>May need to wait for DEFRA to provide guidance on</p>

				monitoring and reporting.
No. 3 – “Not just leaving the space but enhancing and making the most of those areas (e.g. rough grassland could be enhanced to be a species-rich grassland)”	Top 10 aims, page 12		No	Suggested phrasing doesn’t add significant value to the aim and could alienate landowners/ stakeholders .
No. 6 - Lee Valley would like to add “and features for biodiversity” so the sentence reads “incorporation of green spaces and features for biodiversity in its planning and management”. The inclusion of integrated or retro-fitted features for biodiversity, would benefit key species such as Swift.	Top 10 aims, page 12	Change Aim 6 to: “To ensure that new development of all kinds, of all scales and in all locations prioritises the incorporation of green spaces and features that improve biodiversity in its planning and management strategies and is consistent with the Essex LNRS.”	Yes	
No. 8 – Lee Valley suggested the including habitat creation in this aim, by adding “or through the creation of new species rich habitats” to the end of the sentence, so it reads “restoring and recreating those that have been lost or damaged or through the creation of new species rich habitats”.	Top 10 aims, page 12		No	The term ‘recreating’ already covers this and Aim 8 is focussed on connecting existing pockets of

				rich biodiversity.
No.8 – Uttlesford DC would like to see “chalky grasslands” mentioned in the 8 th top 10 aim	Top 10 aims, page 12		No	Chalky grassland is not a broad habitat across Essex so doesn’t fit with scope of top 10 aims.
No. 9 – add in “freshwater” to the strengthening resilience to climate change. We suffer just as many issues with extremes in weather (flooding and drought) from inland water sources in Essex.	Top 10 aims, page 12	Rewrite aim 10 based on consultation feedback with LNRS Working Group support: “10. “To enhance the water quality and quantity, and resilience of freshwater habitats through nature-based solutions that filter and slow water as it runs from source to sea.”	Yes	
No 9 and No 10 of the top 10 aims – Uttlesford DC think that these need clarity on wider ecology/habitat of waters / rivers and landscape together.	Top 10 aims, page 12	See previous	Yes	
No. 10 – “Include the importance of improving water resources / quantity”	Top 10 aims, page 12	See previous	Yes	
General suggestion: “Adding some specifics on invasive non-native species as a stand-alone aim.”	Top 10 aims, page 12		No	High level of scrutiny already received on top 10 aims.
Please explain in the LNRS how ‘other areas of particular importance for biodiversity’ were identified (what's the criteria for these) in the Areas of Particular Importance for Biodiversity.	General comments		No	APIBS set out in guidance

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide commentary on how to prioritise nature recovery for areas that have multiple/overlying strategic opportunities. • Section 9/ Part D includes the following action for local authorities: 'Embed the goals and objectives of the LNRS into planning policies and guidance documents, including local plans and action plans, to ensure that development decisions prioritise biodiversity, habitat restoration and green space provision.' This could be clearer on what should be embedded into planning policies and guidance documents. Is it the biodiversity priorities for each habitat or relevant actions? • A composite map for each LPA area would be useful within the pdf so we can be clear what opportunities exist where. • Appendix – NSIPs are briefly mentioned but as they can often be so environmentally damaging due to their scale consideration should be given to including an NSIP chapter rather than appendix. • We are concerned that there is a risk that the increased housing targets will conflict with some parts of this strategy. 	from Colchester			<p>from Natural England.</p> <p>Ecologists will need consulting before undertaking any habitat creation and can advise on specific actions – outlined in strategy on p.29.</p> <p>Too much detail for scope of section 9.</p> <p>Interactive mapping will be more user friendly. Boundaries likely to change within lifespan of</p>
--	-----------------	--	--	---

				<p>this document.</p> <p>NSIPs mentioned in appendices. Not much more to say in relation to LNRS to include additional section.</p> <p>LNRSs are not in themselves a blocker to development and can conversely be a tool in delivering sustainable development through highlighting BNG opportunities.</p>
Invasive non-native species and biosecurity are mentioned in a couple of measures. However, as INNS can have a significant impact on habitats, we	Page 124 (action 10,		No	INNS already

recommend that these should be noted as cross-cutting themes that underpin all priorities.	section 6.5 farmland), page 145 (action 4, section 6.7 freshwater), page 166 (action 12, section 6.8 coastal			considered in multiple priorities throughout section 6 and elsewhere. Unclear where to add this as a cross-cutting theme.
<p>“It may be helpful to make reference in the Strategy to the role that the natural environment can have to play in adding positive benefits to the historic environment. It can be used to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. conserve and enhance heritage assets 2. improve the setting of heritage assets 3. improve access to heritage assets 4. create a sense of place and tangible link with local history 5. create linkages between heritage assets and local nature recovery sites <p>It can be used to improve the condition and setting of heritage assets and to improve access to them. Likewise, the historic environment can help contribute to the quality, character and distinctiveness of green spaces and the natural environment by helping to create a sense of place and a tangible link with local history.”</p>	General comment	<p>Add into wider benefits on select relevant actions where possible.</p> <p>Add ‘creates a sense of place and tangible link with local history’ to measure 6 in section 6.1.</p>	Partly	Worth considering in future iterations of LNRS, discussing how this can be imbedded in strategy at an early stage. Focus needs to be kept on biodiversity.
we recommend that you consider the following factors in relation to the historic environment:	General comment	Some phrasing included in wider benefits sections of specific actions.	Partly	This level of focus and detail may be out of

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Strategy should acknowledge links between nature recovery sites and heritage assets in the area and set an appropriate methodology for considering prospective locations. 2. To what extent is the historic environment affected, both positively and negatively, by habitat creation proposals? 3. How, if at all, have recent and ongoing BNG or similar projects considered the historic environment in developing habitat enhancing land management plans? 4. Are there any conflicts between the Strategy's proposals for nature recovery or enhancement and the historic environment? 5. Are there opportunities for biodiversity enhancements that would benefit both the natural and historic environments that should be included in the Strategy? <p>The Strategy should set out how landowners and land managers can best look after known and unknown historic environment features and the wider historic landscape on BNG offsite settings.</p>				focus of the LNRS which must predominantly focus on improving biodiversity
<p>"LNRS should prioritise restoring degraded ancient woodlands, protecting ancient and veteran trees from harm, and promoting best practices for sustainable woodland management. This includes addressing the threats posed by invasive species, pollution, and human disturbance, all while ensuring that woodland ecosystems continue to function as essential carbon sinks and buffers against climate change."</p>	General comment, woodlands	Add point under action 6: "Manage risk of introduction of harmful species, such as Honey Fungus, by adopting strict biosecurity measures in the care of veteran trees."	Yes	<p>Restoration of PAWS already first priority and mapped.</p> <p>Veteran trees buffered in mapping.</p>
<p>"LNRS must prioritise strategies that enhance landscape connectivity, focussing on creating and preserving ecological corridors that link fragmented woodlands."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. "By enhancing permeability across landscapes, LNRS can create robust ecological networks that support greater species richness, strengthen habitat resilience, and reduce the risks 	General comment		No	<p>General comment – too vague to make specific edit. Woodland strategic</p>

associated with isolated ecosystems, such as inbreeding and localised extinctions.”				opportunities are already weighted to be in areas that provide connectivity.
“LNRS should promote a comprehensive strategy for tree canopy expansion that includes a balanced combination of natural regeneration, the restoration of ancient woodlands, and targeted, location-specific tree planting efforts.”	General comment		No	Already covered in LNRS.
<p>“LNRS should prioritise enhancing tree cover in urban areas, aiming to increase green infrastructure in ways that deliver both ecological and social benefits.”</p> <p>“LNRS should promote urban greening efforts that include community-driven projects, ensuring local ownership and stewardship of newly created green spaces. Careful selection of tree species suited to the urban environment will also be essential, as they need to be resilient to pollution, climate extremes, and limited growing space.”</p>	General comment, urban		No	Already included in Urban Priorities section (6.6).
“Resources such as the Ancient Tree Inventory and Ancient Woodland Inventory should be integrated into the strategies.”	General comment, data	Add in end note with links linked to woodland measure 6 after ‘veteran trees’.	Yes	
“must be integrated into broader local policy frameworks, including Local Plans, Neighbourhood Plans, Green Infrastructure Strategies, and health and well-being strategies”	General comment		No	Covered under section 9.
“LNRS should include clear, measurable targets for expanding native woodland and tree canopy cover, particularly in urban and periurban areas. This should involve conducting ‘tree equity’ assessments”	General comment		No	Measurable target of 18,000 hectares of new woodland in Essex – Woodland

				Bigger habitat priority.
<p>“Establishing specific recovery targets for woodland species”</p> <p>“should address reversing species declines, enhancing habitat connectivity, and increasing resilience to threats like climate change and habitat loss.”</p> <p>“integrated monitoring and reporting frameworks are essential”</p>	General comment		No	<p>LNRS designed to focus on habitat creation rather than specific species.</p> <p>Habitat connectivity key part of mapping value index.</p> <p>Awaiting guidance from Natural England on monitoring and reporting.</p>
<p>“LNRS should map opportunities for buffering and connecting existing wildlife-rich habitats”</p> <p>“Recommendations may include:</p> <p>a. Buffer Zones: A minimum buffer of 50 metres should be maintained between new developments and ancient woodlands to prevent disturbance and degradation. Greater buffers may be</p>	General comment		No	Already considered in mapping.

necessary for major engineering works or other high-impact activities. Root Protection Areas: For ancient and veteran trees, a Root Protection Area (RPA) should be established, calculated as 15 times the trunk's diameter or extending five meters beyond the canopy, whichever is greater. This ensures that tree health is maintained and that development activities do not compromise root systems."				
"should include fully-costed action plans with clear sources of funding. This includes exploring opportunities for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and Environmental Land Management (ELM) schemes"	General comment		No	Out of scope.
"Protected landscapes, such as national parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), should be fully integrated into LNRS" b. "should prioritise these areas for habitat restoration, species recovery, and community engagement initiatives."	General comment		No	Already included in mapping.
"should mandate robust tree retention standards to ensure responsible development practices. This includes: a. Thorough Tree Surveys: Conducting comprehensive tree surveys during initial site investigations to categorise trees by health and quality (A, B, C or U) and developing a clear Tree Retention Plan to inform planning decisions. Tree Protection Plans: Creating Tree Protection Plans that safeguard tree root systems and establish Construction Exclusion Zones (CEZs) around retained trees to minimise disturbances and ensure their long-term survival."	General comment		No	Out of scope.
"Glossary of Terms should be listed in the Contents page so it's easier to find"	General comment	Amend as per suggestion.	Yes	
"Feel actions would work well being presented as a table, to make a more standard form of Action Plan table, which can be easily monitored. It would also enable better cross referencing etc."	General comment, Part B, starting page 76		No	Actions will be presented clearly in online mapping.

				Compliment ary document post- publication could be made with actions in table.
"Don't think that it's usual to have individuals' names mentioned ie Tim Simpson in last sentence."	Appendices, 3, LNRS working groups and special interest subgroups, page 227	Check and consider removing.	Yes	
"As well as mentioning who the supporting authorities are, it should also be highlighted that ECC are the Responsible Authority."	Appendices, 3 LNRS Delivery: Key partners, page 226	Add underlined text: Supporting Authorities in Essex, which have been working with ECC, <u>the Responsible Authority</u> , since the LNRS regulations and guidance were released by DEFRA in March 2023, have contributed local data and expertise, including local wildlife site data and species records.	Yes	

Freshwater/Coastal Text:

Edit	Section of LNRS	Who?	Suggested action	Status: Will edit be made?	Status: If edit is not going to be made, explain why.
Finalise Measure 12, incorporating RBI and South Essex partnership into the partners list.	Section 6.7 Freshwater, page 153	EWT	<p>Change wording of measure 12, p.153: 'Support local catchment based partnerships, that plan and implement coordinated action to improve rivers and estuaries, working with landowners and industry.'</p> <p>Put links in an end note and include: https://www.thames21.org.uk/improving-rivers/south-essex-catchment-partnership/ https://www.thames21.org.uk/catchment-partnerships/roding-beam-ingrebourne/</p>	Yes	
Update terminology from "ghost pond" to "lost pond" in relevant sections.	Across the LNRS – Ghost pond map page 54/55 and freshwater section 6.7	EWT	Replace 'ghost pond' with 'lost pond' throughout document.	Yes	
Add a reference to fish passes where relevant.	Section 6.7 freshwater		<p>Change phrasing of action 5 'Removal of barriers to fish passages' REMOVE 's' – subsequent phrasing should be 'fish passage'.</p> <p>Add action point around introducing fish passes where needed along watercourse to allow migration past barriers.</p>	Yes	

			Ensure clickable link is an endnote in printed version of strategy.		
In addition to water quality – need to mention the importance of quality riparian habitats and effectiveness of flood plains (somewhere in freshwater section).	Section 6.7 freshwater	Bidwells		No	Included in river buffer creation measure. Avoided use of the word riparian here to keep the document accessible to general public.
Lee Valley suggested adding “in-channel features” to BETTER HABITAT PRIORITY so that it reads “through the enhancement of in-channel features, river wildlife buffers”. In-channel enhancements can have a huge impact on the habitat quality of the watercourse.	Section 6.7 freshwater, page 141, Biodiversity Priorities	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Change to: “Improve ecological status and quality of water bodies through the enhancement of river wildlife buffers, <u>creation of in-channel features</u> , reconnection of the floodplain, flood storage and sustainable drainage systems.”	Yes	
<p>“Water and habitat quantity needs to be specifically woven into these, lots of areas of freshwater habitat have been reduced or harmed. Quantity and quality are important.”</p> <p>“Creation of ponds as well as restoration (Many have been lost forever in arable areas).”</p>	Section 6.7 freshwater, page 141, Biodiversity Priorities	Environment Agency	<p>Under 4.Management of invasive species add following action to list: “All users of waterways should adopt personal biosecurity measures following the ‘Check, Clean, Dry’ procedure for clothing and equipment.”</p> <p>Add action point: ‘Strategically manage the eradication of INNS, for example working from upstream to downstream along a river system.’</p>	Yes	Quantity point raised by EA added elsewhere in strategy as result of feedback.

<p>“Strategic control/management on INNS eradication (upstream to downstream, not starting in the middle).”</p> <p>“Zero tolerance for presence of certain INNS (e.g. floating pennywort, water primrose) Giant hogweed and Japanese knotweed are reduced to a tiny proportion of their numbers 20 years ago in north Essex through targeted eradication.”</p> <p>“Biosecurity is overlooked – ‘Check, Clean, Dry’ is mentioned in the marine section but not with freshwater. Boating, kayaking, anglers, dogs in rivers etc all are important to consider.”</p>			<p>Reduce some content where not adding value to make way for additional points.</p> <p>Under action 2, Freshwater and Wetlands, add action point: ‘Where ponds have been lost permanently, create new ponds in the landscape to compensate for those lost.’</p>		
Action 1 – “The action noted highlights the role of farmers, which is key however it should also note the importance of identifying and dealing with misconceptions.”	Section 6.7 freshwater actions, page 143	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority		No	Out of scope for this section.
Action 3 – add “and blue” so it reads “Green and Blue Infrastructure creation and enhancement to improve water quality”. This also links to retrofitting sustainable drainage systems for example.	Section 6.7 freshwater actions, page 144	Anglian Water		No	Priority is specifically referring to green infrastructure. Sustainable drainage and

					creation mentioned elsewhere.
Action 4 – “The Authority is supportive of managing INNS however only Himalayan Balsam is specifically mentioned but other species will also have a huge impact for example Floating Pennywort and New Zealand Pygmyweed.”	Section 6.7 freshwater actions, page 145	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Add action: “Remove other INNS such as Floating Pennywort and New Zealand Pygmyweed and dispose of plant matter securely.”	Yes	
Action 5 – “It is important to ensure the barriers to fish passage on the county boundary along the Lee Valley are noted.”	Section 6.7 freshwater actions, page 146	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority		No	<p>The data we have used does not go beyond boundaries shown.</p> <p>May be too specific/out of scope.</p> <p>Actions need to be applicable across whole county.</p>
<p>Action 5 – On river connectivity ‘fish passage’ (not ‘passages’)</p> <p>This is vital for species survival but also for function of all healthy river ecosystems. Rivers need to flow</p>	Section 6.7 freshwater actions, page 146	Environment Agency	Passage change made in earlier comment.	Yes	

<p>and allow life up and downstream. Too many of our rivers are stagnant behind impassable weirs which encourage accumulation of warm de-oxygenated water where little species richness remains. It damages river ecology, and this habitat can be fairly easily recreated in still water ponds. We need to prioritise flowing natural rivers with sediment transport and all natural river functions.</p> <p>Perhaps retitle: 'Removal of barriers to natural river processes and fish passage.'</p>					
<p>Talk to Alan Johnson RSPB, about adding in possible World Heritage Status listing into their foreword. This was Alan's suggestion and he could advise on where this is best placed in the RSPB foreword.</p>	Page 154	RSPB	<p>Add underlined to first paragraph p.154, 6.8 Coastal and Marine foreword: "The Essex coast is a big, dynamic, and complex landscape that is globally important for nature <u>and a candidate World Heritage Site.</u>"</p>	Yes	
<p>Action 8 – "If the land characteristics allow it would be good to explore this within sub-catchments to main rivers above drinking water abstraction points. Larger scale wetlands could help slow flow and drop sediment prior to entering main rivers."</p>	Section 6.7 freshwater actions, page 148	Anglian Water		No	<p>Justification can be given for large-scale wetland creation further downstream so as to connect and add value to coastal</p>

					habitats – therefore neither should be prioritised, and all options explored where there is opportunity.
“special mention of opportunities on mineral sites is desirable – most restoration plans for habitat get weakened prior to completion and little is left as wet habitat of much interest as most is returned to poor farmland with little biodiversity or public access.”	Section 6.7 freshwater actions, page 148	Environment Agency	Add ‘mineral extraction sites’ to list on measure 8.	Yes	
Action 9 – “This should be encouraged to use the same methodologies and sampling frequencies to make data comparable and build a varied data set. This also shouldn't just focus around areas that people are biased to presume are going to be worse (i.e. around outfall pipes, alongside farmers fields etc), the data should build an overall picture of river health through productive and collaborative partnership.”	Section 6.7 freshwater actions, page 150	Anglian Water	Change phrasing in action point to ‘gather more detailed and consistent information’	Partly	Too much detail here may dilute sentiment.
Action 10 – “awareness raising of water quality issues – must include	Section 6.7 freshwater	Environment Agency	Added ‘and quantity’ to phrasing.	Yes	

issues around water quantity as well.”	actions, page 151				
Action 11 – “suggest Action is changed to Use water improvement funds, such as Water Industry Nature and Environment Programmes (WINEP), to eliminate all adverse ecological impact from pollution sources, using nature-based Solutions where possible. NbS are often not feasible but traditional solutions can still deliver the benefit”	Section 6.7 freshwater actions, page 152	Anglian Water		No	Nature based solution should be prioritised so as to maximise biodiversity benefit. LNRS is identifying strategic opportunities for habitat creation.
Action 11 – “Water improvement Funds delivered to reduce impacts of pollution <u>and also abstraction.</u> ”	Section 6.7 freshwater actions, page 152	Environment Agency	Add: ‘and water abstraction’	Yes	
Action 12 – “mention source to sea as a catchment-based approach.”	Section 6.7 freshwater actions, page 153	Environment Agency		No	Not sure this adds value to this section, however, ‘source to sea’ terminology now used in top 10 aims.
“This section may benefit from knowledge of a linking project; the Environment Agency’s, Working with Natural Processes (WWNP). The project aims to protect, restore and emulate the natural	Section 6.7 freshwater actions	Environment Agency	Link to policy context section	No	May be out of scope for this section of the LNRS.

functions of catchments, floodplains, rivers.”					
Paragraph three: “might be worth mentioning the East Atlantic Flyway has been put on the UK Government's Tentative List for Natural World Heritage Status”	Section 6.8 costal, Biodiversity Priorities, page 154	ECC		No	Unclear where this fits in this section.
“descriptions are quite vague – what is a coastal/marine habitat – more detail here before the actions are explained.”	Section 6.8 costal, Biodiversity Priorities, page 155	Environment Agency		No	Suggestion unclear.
Action 2 – general comment: “Although managed realignment is a recognised method for preventing coastal squeeze on saltmarsh and allowing the habitat to naturally claim the land behind as the sea level increases, this can be difficult to find suitable locations to implement. Removing solid flood defences could contradict requirements to raise solid flood defences to protect communities and infrastructure assets against flooding.”	Section 6.8 costal actions, page 157	Anglian Water		No	Priority is valid and has been subjected to scrutiny of experts already.
Action 2, Action paragraph 1 – “the word 'retreat' should be changed to 'realignment'”	Section 6.8 costal actions, page 157	ECC	Change to realignment as suggested.	Yes	
Action 2, Action paragraph 2 – “insert words 'sections of' after 'removal of' so it reads Consider removal of sections of coastal	Section 6.8 costal actions, page 157	ECC	Make change as requested.	Yes	

defences ... as this is how a managed realignment is usually delivered. Suggesting that the whole of the defence is removed, might make the public more nervous about what the impacts will be. Leaving the remainder of the defence in situ will produce a calmer environment where forces are reduced significantly.”					
Action 3 – general comment: “Beneficial re-use of dredged material can be very useful for increasing sediment load in an area and allowing salt tolerant plants to colonise. However, typically these sorts of schemes require some sort of retaining feature to keep the sediment in the intended area and reduce the amount lost to tidal movements. Especially as it's already been highlighted in the previous point that increasing sea levels are eroding the edges of the saltmarsh already. I expect that this point will be considered in implementation but is not outlined in the strategy that other management would be required in combination with the use of dredged material.”	Section 6.8 costal actions, page 158	Anglian Water		No	Detailed considerations such as this would be planned into any project using BUDS – extra info on this in strategy would be out of scope.

Action 3 – “Replace the word ‘sausages’ with coir rolls.”	Section 6.8 costal actions, page 158	Environment Agency	Change ‘sausages’ to ‘coir rolls’.	Yes	
<p>Action 3 & 4 – “This information must be linked to the Gov.Uk information on Flood Risk Activity Permits”</p> <p>“Specifically, developers will need to contact The Environment Agency’s to ensure compliance with The Environmental Permitting regulations (2016).”</p>	Section 6.8 coastal actions, page 158 and 159	Environment Agency		No	As with all measures, developers should be seeking expert ecological advice before undertaking them. This should be particularly clear for anything coastal.
Action 4, 10 & 13 – general comment: “If not managed correctly, weirs and sluices can cause stagnant water and allow bacteria to grow. As an unintended consequence, if these sluices are opened to reduce water levels in the habitat, this could cause spikes in bacteria for any nearby bathing waters or shellfish harvesting areas.”	Section 6.8 costal actions, page 159, 164 and 176	Anglian Water		No	LNRS recommends that ecological and expert technical advice is sought when planning such projects to mitigate against unintended consequences such as these.

Action 5 – “we would recommend that the section <i>Minimise disturbance to coastal and marine sites</i> is interpreted correctly as addressing risks of <i>significant disturbance</i> causing conservation harm to the habitats and species concerned.”	Section 6.8 costal actions, page 160	BASC		No	No clear justification for change of phrasing
Action 6 – general comment: “It would be interesting to see the scope of these wardens increased to provide benefits outside of monitoring nesting activities. Local knowledge and records of litter, algae blooms etc can be useful when investigating water quality issues on the coast, like eutrophication, and allow better management.”	Section 6.8 costal actions, page 161	Anglian Water		No	Out of scope
Action 8 & 9 – could be combined into one. “Most examples of Seagrass improvements have involved transplanting individuals into the area so they are essentially saying the same thing.”	Section 6.8 costal actions, page 161	Anglian Water	Action 8, remove ‘and new sites’ from action point.	Yes	
Action 10 – “Livestock shouldn't be kept in fields adjacent to water bodies near by the bathing waters due to additional bacteria loads they introduce.”	Section 6.8 costal actions, page 164	Anglian Water		No	Out of scope

Action 11 – “Shouldn't the focus be on preventing the plastics and litter getting into the waste water or surface water systems through engagement and education instead of adapting these systems to better remove them at the end?”	Section 6.8 costal actions, page 165	Anglian Water		No	Both education and system adaptation are valid pollution reduction actions.
Action 11 – Wider benefits: “Fisheries are currently classified by levels of E.coli in freshwater, so yes, removing pollution will improve quality but as mentioned in other comments, birds and livestock can contribute to bacteria levels at the coast and have unintended impacts on fishery classifications.”	Section 6.8 costal actions, page 165	Anglian Water		No	Out of scope
“Alongside transplanting and planting eelgrass, monitoring of the natural spread and existing meadows is also vital. EA has evidence that dwarf eelgrass is spreading of its own accord in north Essex, so planting is probably not necessary at many sites.”	Section 6.8 costal actions	Environment Agency	Add as action point b under 8: ‘Monitor natural spread of seagrass around coastal sites.’	Yes	
“floodplain habitats seem an omission here- they cover a huge area, and many are currently delivering poor value for farmers and biodiversity.”	Section 8. State of Nature today, 8.3 freshwater and wetlands, page 194	Environment Agency	Place Services input: <i>On page 193, the third paragraph could be amended to “Permanent pasture along the river valley floodplains...”</i> <i>On page 195, I would suggest deleting the para that starts “Many sections..” and the bullet point list of species and replacing it</i>	Yes	

			<p><i>with my original text, which I think provides better context:</i></p> <p><i>“Essex rivers do not demonstrate any distinctive plant communities, probably due to their history of modification and the influence of agriculture run-off and other sources of pollution. However, there are many sections that support a diverse marginal and aquatic flora, with characteristic species such as Purple Loosestrife, Reed Sweet-grass, Water Dock, Branched Bur-reed, reedmace and Common Reed.</i></p> <p><i>Common Reed is also a common component of the Lowland Fen type vegetation found along the floodplains of our rivers, often in association with willow plantations. These are generally composed of a mosaic of tall herbaceous species such as Hemp Agrimony and Great Willowherb, alongside sedge beds, Reed Canary-grass and marshy grassland. The best examples include species such as Small Teasel, Greater Tussock Sedge.”</i></p>		
On page 192, the table of grassland types and species, and the text following has got a bit confused (I think it was compiled from some of my narrative text):	Section 8.2	Place Services	Implement suggested amends.	Yes	

<p>'Chalk boulder clay grassland' should read 'Chalky boulder clay grassland' and the species should include Sulphur Clover, but not Lesser Calamint</p> <p>Lowland Meadow grassland should say Neutral grassland</p> <p>'Nationally significant acid and chalk grassland' should come out and that should be 'Lowland Meadow grassland' with the same species</p> <p>The fourth paragraph after the table, delete 'Acid and chalk' at the start</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendices Text

Edit	Section of LNRS	Who?	Suggested action	Status: Will edit be made?	Status: if edit is not going to be made, explain why.
Add Butterfly Conservation to list of "our partners" in the strategy.	Our partners page 210	Butterfly Conservation	Add Butterfly Conservation to list of partners p.210	Yes	
Define "mosaic" in the glossary	Appendices 6. Glossary of terms – pages 244	Public consultation feedback	Addressed previously. EWT provided definition: <i>An area with a mixed coverage of scrub, grasses and other flowering plants that supports a variety</i>	Yes	

			<i>of vegetation heights and structures, providing important habitat for small mammals, birds and insects.</i>		
Develop a chapter or expand the appendix on Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) due to their environmental impact.	Appendices begins on page 212	Colchester CC	Add mention of NSIPs to Local Authorities list on p.202 'ensure large scale developments, such as NSIPs comply with LNRS guidance'	Yes	
Develop monitoring and reporting section of the LNRS (in the appendices?) outlining the "information map" POA between reviews. Outline the review process. Outline how information will be kept up to date between reviews. Outline the additional element of mapping that will be included in future revisions of the LNRS "map of where actions have been taken in opportunity areas" (step 2?).	New section in appendices?	ECC		No	No guidance on monitoring and reporting yet given by DEFRA. No funding set aside for delivery as of yet.
Categorise taxa (such as the interactive maps) in the species long list table in the appendices.	Appendices 5. Species long list	EWT / Species subgroup		No	Large edit to recategorise all of these – alphabetical may be equally useful as is. Can look to incorporate in future iterations of LNRS.
P213. Policy context – include reference to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Levelling Up and Regeneration Act (LURA) duty (Refer to previous comments on the map section) 	Appendices (starts on page 212)	Natural England	Suggested wording:	Yes	

Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (legislation.gov.uk)			<p>“Section 245 (Protected Landscapes) of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 places a duty on relevant authorities in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) in England, to seek to further the statutory purposes of the area. Within Essex LNRS projects within Dedham Vale National Landscape and Suffolk and Essex Coast and Heaths National Landscape should seek to align to statutory AONB management plan aims and objectives in their design and delivery. It will also be important within the National Landscape and its setting that the design</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			and spatial arrangement of the LNRs is in keeping with the special qualities of the National Landscape, and opportunities to enhance special qualities plan are seized.”		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P213. Policy context – include reference to: National Landscapes Management Plan – a document providing the agreed policy for an individual National Landscape (legally known as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or AONBs) for a five year period. It describes the AONB, sets out the statutory purpose of the AONB designation and meets the duty on AONB local authorities to produce and review a Management Plan every five years. The document includes objectives and policies to support the delivery of the National Landscape’s vision and statutory purpose. • Management Plan – Dedham Vale National Landscape (dedhamvale-nl.org.uk) and • Management Plan – Suffolk & Essex Coast & Heaths National Landscape (coastandheaths-nl.org.uk) 	Appendices (starts on page 212)	Natural England		Yes	

<p>Glossary of terms – add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape Character Assessment - Landscape and seascape character assessments - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) local landscape character assessments can be found here: Landscape character assessment database for the UK and Ireland - Landscape Institute • National Character Area - Natural England - National Character Area Profiles - National Character Area Profiles (nationalcharacterareas.co.uk) • Landscape Character Area (definition can be found in here: Landscape character assessments: identify and describe landscape types - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)) • National Landscape - National Landscapes - Home (national-landscapes.org.uk) • AONB Management Plan Management Plan – Dedham Vale National Landscape (dedhamvale-nl.org.uk) and Management Plan – Suffolk & Essex Coast & Heaths National Landscape (coastandheaths-nl.org.uk) • Climate Change Adaptation Manual - Climate Change Adaptation Manual - NE751 (naturalengland.org.uk) 	<p>Appendices (6. Glossary of terms)</p>	<p>Natural England</p>		<p>Yes</p>	<p>Have added only those referenced in the document.</p>
<p>Try to address HOW the vision to have green and blue habitats covering 25% of the county by 2030, will be achieved / applied at district and borough level. What does this look like locally and are we able to include figures on the APIBS for each local authority area?</p>	<p>Appendices / APIBS</p>	<p>Braintree DC</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>Whole strategy goes to outline strategic opportunities for this vision. 25% objective won't necessarily be</p>

					spread evenly across county. Delivery will be determined by individual landowners so can't guarantee that specific percentages will be delivered.
More inclusion and reference to the role of town and parish councils should be included. They could be added to both sections "what the LNRS offers" and Section 9. Actions as key stakeholder groups.	Pages 201 (Section 9 actions) and 3.2 what the LNRS offers (page 15)	Braintree DC	Add under 'Local Communities' on p.202 – 'Develop nature plans for your local parish council in line with the Climate Commission target.'	Yes	

Trees / Woodlands Text:

Edit	Section of LNRS	Who?	Suggested action	Status: Will edit be made?	Status: If edit is not going to be made, explain why.
Add Invasive Non-Native Species into the trees and woodland section.	Section 6.1 trees and woodlands (begins on page 78)	Woodland subgroup	Removal of INNS added to Action 4.	Partly	

Add Grey squirrels' management into the trees/woodland section.	Section 6.1 trees and woodlands (begins on page 78) (imbed into existing deer management measure on page 81?)	FC	Change action 2 to: "Manage deer and pest species to allow for natural regeneration of woodlands" Add action point: "Consider trapping grey squirrel populations where ring barking is persistent"	Yes	
"We note the important role of shooting in deer management. We were interested that grey squirrel was not mentioned, as the success of planting and regenerating woodland depends on effective management of both deer and grey squirrel."	Section 6.1 trees and woodlands	BASC	Addressed in previous comment.	Yes	
Consider the inclusion of "pest and disease" into the trees/woodland section.	Section 6.1 trees and woodlands (begins on page 78)	woodland trust	Possible drafting of specific INNS measure as per above.		
Strengthen the wording of the action on protection of veteran and ancient trees, e.g. "give them appropriate room and root protection area."	Section 6.1 trees and woodlands page 85, measure 6	woodland trust	Add text to action points: "Leave ground undisturbed, creating a root protection area,	Yes	

			5m from the canopy edge or 15 times the tree's diameter (DBH), whichever is the greater."		
Mention of specific tree species within the trees/woodlands actions (EFI to advise).	Section 6.1 trees and woodlands	ECC		No	May be out of scope of LNRS – breakdown of specific species not mentioned in any other habitat section.
Include a 2 page spread on woodland creation/woodland management initiatives and projects (in Essex) at the end of the trees/woodland section. E.g. Essex Forest Initiative, Ground Control Wildfell, Hole Farm, Thames Chase.	End of Section 6.1 trees and woodlands	Woodland subgroup		No	Documentation/comms around case studies can be picked up as separate strand of work for LNRS delivery.
Highlight the role of tree councils and tree warden networks, look to include somewhere in the actions of the trees/woodlands.	Section 6.1 trees and woodlands	woodland trust	Add point into the 'Local Communities' actions page 204, 'assist in the formation of tree councils and warden networks, encouraging a community forestry approach'	Partly	

<p>Dave Bigden Feedback:</p> <p><i>"I am concerned that there is no mention or reference to Thames Chase Community Forest throughout the document. There is also no mention of the importance of Community Forestry to landscape, people, and nature. The Forestry Commission Foreword references the importance of the urban treescape and urban greenspaces yet, Thames Chase or Community Forestry/Forests is not mentioned, and we have been working on this in this landscape for almost 35 years! As you know, Thames Chase CF now works across 98 square miles which takes in much more of the Essex landscape and is perfectly and strategically placed to link the Essex and London LNRS's. I am concerned that the Community Forest (which has transformed landscapes and transformed lives since its inception in 1990) is not being acknowledged within our landscape. If this is the case, an opportunity is being missed and Thames Chase should be recognised as an essential partner in the recovery of our landscape, its nature and our communities. I think Community Forestry should be included and definitely more made of the fact that we (as are London) are very fortunate to have Thames Chase Community Forest working at landscape-scale for people and wildlife in this part of Essex."</i></p>	Section 6.1 trees and woodlands	Thames chase	<p>Place Services have contributed addition for page 193.</p> <p><i>"There have also been large areas of woodland planted around the county more recently, most notably in the Thames Chase Community Forest, where 160 hectares of woodland and scrub have been planted since 1990."</i></p>	Partly	<p>Thames Chase Community Forest is in list of partners.</p> <p>Case studies will be highlighted in LNRS delivery process. Community forestry terminology used in above edit.</p>
--	---------------------------------	--------------	---	--------	---

Is there scope to amend from 'encourage' to 'support' farmers and communities in nature recovery? We would say encourage suggests less active or committed resources from Essex County Council.	Top 10 aims for nature recovery	Farmer/landowner		No	<p>Support suggests a commitment to resource and at time of writing we don't have resource to support.</p> <p>While we can't change the text in the strategy, should funding be put in place for delivery, it is our intention that we will support landowners.</p>
Connection made to the maps and tree/woodland actions - it is important that there is some further explanation provided that planting should only be provided where ecologically appropriate.	Trees / woodland maps and link to text	Thurrock Council	Already included in Urban section so copy terminology and place as an action point under 'Plant Native Tree Species': "Seek advice to ensure that the "right tree is planted in the right place", and ensure a management plan is in place to care for the tree/s after planting."	Yes	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Measure 1 refers to the restoration of PAWS but there is no specific action for these sites. - Measure 7 should reference standing and fallen dead wood and have different habitat value. - Measure 9 Spelling error, should read for 'from' Local Seed". 	Section 6.1 trees and woodlands	Thurrock Council	<p>Add action point under 'Increase presence of dead wood': "Standing deadwood should be left standing where safe to do so for its unique ecological value."</p> <p>Fix spelling error: 'for' to 'from' on measure 9 as suggested.</p>	Partly	All action points are equally relevant to PAWS.
<p>Natural England have suggested the following highlighted additional text:</p> <p>""Bigger habitat priority: To create 18,000 hectares of new woodland across Essex, taking a right tree, right place approach."</p>	Section 6.1 trees and woodland (priorities)	Natural England	<p>Email sent to Forestry Commission on 11/03/2025 and authorised on 13/03/2025.</p> <p>Add to woodlands bigger priority: ", taking a right tree, right place approach."</p>	Yes	

<p>The intention of the first measure is not sufficiently clear and requires simplification. It reads as multiple measures grouped together which could be split for clarity.</p> <p>p.82, “Whilst all tree planting is encouraged, plant tree species to reflect local conditions, <u>landscape character</u> and management objectives of the local site.”</p> <p>p.82, point 3. “Plant native tree species”, under wider benefits add: <u>Planting native tree species, especially those characteristic of the local area helps to strengthen the character of the local landscape.</u></p> <p>p.85, point 5. “Integrate a mosaic....”, under wider benefits. Change “enhances landscape aesthetics” wording to “<u>enhance local landscape character</u>”.</p>	<p>Section 6.1 trees and woodland measures (action)</p>	<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Change phrasing of measure 1 to: “Enhance existing woodlands, including Planted Ancient Woodlands (PAWS), by encouraging natural regeneration”</p> <p>Underlined text to be added in.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Add in highlighted text below: Intro: “Old and ancient woodland in Essex is buried, as it has without exception been subject to human management and modification over thousands of years, but it falls into two main types <u>which are characteristic within the Essex landscape.</u>”</p>	<p>Section 8. State of Nature today (trees and woodlands text) p.190 8.1 Trees and Woodlands</p>	<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Add underlined text.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

Include a point about the need for planting for climate change resilience to ensure tree planting successful in the long term. This could be native and non-native, to suit the changing climate.	Section 6.1 tree and woodlands measures	Braintree DC	Phrasing already included under measure 3: "consider the inclusion of some non-native non-invasive species that could be suited to changing, warmer conditions."	Yes	
Add in a measure or add to an existing measure: that any young trees require appropriate after care in order to be successful in the long term.	Section 6.1 tree and woodlands measures	Braintree DC	Add action point to measure 3: Carry out appropriate after care for young trees, ensuring they are adequately hydrated and mulched, and that tree guards are removed before they become constrictive."	Yes	
Measure about protecting existing trees – include the point that this must be in line with tests for making a tree preservation order.				No	Actions already included around protecting ancient/veteran trees.

					Buffering veteran trees on mapping.
There is no mention of the need for rotational coppicing of scrub in many sites to maintain the habitat in a range of successional stages. This is different to thinning as stated in the priorities.	Section 6.1 Trees and woodlands measures	Thurrock Council		Yes	Measure detailing these actions under Scrub and Mosaic section: "5. Selective cutting or coppicing of scrub habitat"
General comment: "We note that scrub habitat is a priority for Essex, a habitat also favoured by shooting, either in its own right or as the margin to existing woodlands. Our members' actions to protect woodland from excessive browsing of deer and grey squirrel also supports scrubby habitats."	Section 6.1 Trees and woodlands measures	BASC		No	Seemingly no specific action required here. Out of scope to mention specific organisation in this measure.
"More could be made of replacement of trees to compensate for loss of ash and elm which were key hedgerow trees. Much of Essex will look denuded without ash and few hedgerow trees have been planted for decades or in many cases, centuries. A county or national campaign would be great. These could include more riverside trees and more species such as crack willow, white sallow, goat willow, native black poplar, oak, field maple, hawthorn, hornbeam where natively occurring etc."	Section 6.1 trees and woodland, biodiversity priorities	Environment Agency	Add action point under '1. Hedgerow Planting', p.110: "Replace lost species in hedgerows, such as ash and elm, that have succumbed to novel disease."	Yes	
"Either here or in the hedge section more mention could be made of ancient trees and pollards for the future."	Section 6.1 trees and woodland OR Section 6.2 Grasslands	Environment Agency		No	Measure 6. already included in woodland section details protection of veteran trees. More detail

					added elsewhere as per other action points.
<p>No. 10 – “may benefit from further links to the environment agency Natural Flood Management scheme.”</p> <p>“Proposed developments, such as woodland creation that are situated within the floodplain of waterbody classed as ‘main river’ may require a Flood Risk Activity Permit. We recommend seeking advice from the Environment Agency to ensure that developments of this nature do not endanger the stability of banks, interfere with a regulator access to the bank or impact our flood risk assets.”</p> <p>“We strongly recommend the LNRS includes a link to the Flood Risk Activity Permits website, to encourage those exploring the idea of woodland creation to contact the Environment Agency for advice. By excluding this information, there is a risk of developers of woodland developments not adhering to The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 legislation.”</p>	Section 6.1 trees and woodland, actions, page 87	Environment Agency	Include mention of Natural Flood Management scheme as bullet point under Action 10.	Partly	Specific legal guidance around ecological and environmental implications of schemes is not covered in LNRS and expert guidance is encouraged before undertaking any activities on the landscape. Perhaps out of scope of LNRS to go into more detail than this.

Grassland Text:

Edit	Section of LNRS	Who?	Suggested action	Status: Will edit be made?	Status: If edit is not going to be made, explain why.
How to reduce invasive species in areas of grassland is missing from the priorities?	Section 6.2 Grasslands	Brentwood DC		No	<p>INNS perhaps not as damaging in managed grassland as other habitat types.</p> <p>Grassland 'invasives' are debatable, for example ragwort is considered invasive but equally is native and a food plant for lots of pollinators.</p>
"may benefit from links to the environment agency Natural Flood Management scheme, which includes funding for projects with aims to; reduce local flood risk using NFM; provide wider benefits to the environment, nature and society, to name a few. One of the eligible NFM measures includes soil and land management."	Section 6.2 Grasslands	Environment Agency		No	Included in woodland section. No relevant action in grassland section.

<p>No Mow May Measure – Natural England feedback</p> <p>“Care needs to be taken to target ‘No Mow May’ appropriately. Use of the phrase ‘where appropriate’ would be useful or references to ‘No Mow May’ could be targeted to the urban section of the strategy. “</p> <p>The comments about ‘No Mow May’ are relevant to the management section on page 91.</p>	<p>Grasslands measures / actions</p>	<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Add “where appropriate” to grassland measure 2, p.91.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Natural England –</p> <p>“We welcome mention of the dry acid grasslands of the Thames terrace gravels. It should be noted however that the geology of the TTG is often mixed, where chalk is near the</p>	<p>Section 6.2 Grasslands measures / actions</p>	<p>Natural England</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>Out of scope of foreword. May reduce accessibility.</p>

surface, and so TTG can have a calcareous expression.”					
p.97, point 7 “Introduce seeds of appropriate...” under wider benefits add: Using local seed reinforces local distinctiveness within the landscape.	Section 6.2 Grasslands measures / actions	Natural England	Add wider benefit under grassland measure 7, p.97: “Using local seed reinforces local distinctiveness within the landscape.”	Yes	
“Would be good to mention use of meadow seed collection or local ‘green hay’ in this section – The Woodland Trust and others have used it to great effect, and it produces a small local market for species rich meadow produce and is a great good news story to tell. It’s a great way to transfer orchid and small local seed which won’t store well or can’t be bought.”	Section 6.2 grasslands, biodiversity priorities, page 89	Environment Agency	Measure 7, p.97, first action point change to: “Take advantage of the historical remains of meadow seedbanks where possible, transferring seed or green hay from the donor site.”	Yes	

<p>BETTER HABITAT PRIORITY: “‘Increase use of organic fertilisers’ seems an odd way to phrase things – whilst chemical fertiliser can jeopardise species richness organic fertiliser can be worse as it tends to be tricky to perfectly align with crop need- so NPK is usually not balanced to crop need, and pollution occurs with over-fertilising crop, soil and rivers through runoff. Organic fertiliser may improve the soil with organic matter but overall <u>less</u> fertiliser is the key message to get over rather than more. (The River Wye is thought to be very badly polluted with organic fertiliser from intensive poultry manure for instance). Legally fertiliser should <u>always be targeted to crop need at the time</u></p>	<p>Section 6.2 grasslands, biodiversity priorities, page 89</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>Grassland measure 3, p.92, first action point change to: “Reduce use of fertilisers. Replace chemical fertilisers with organic where possible and with consideration for local water ways. Avoid using any fertiliser wherever possible, instead prioritising management that creates healthy soils.”</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
---	---	---------------------------	--	------------	--

of application. It might be better to say 'Reduce or cease use of chemical fertiliser and pesticides on habitats. Consider switching to organic fertiliser if required and accurately match fertiliser usage and timing to crop and soil need'. "					
No. 1 – "This section must be mindful of current preferred tidal flood risk management policies and TE2100 aspirations for policy units – not all tidal defences will be raised in Essex in the future therefore more frequent over topping resulting in tidal floodwater on the landward side of certain defences should be expected as time passes."	Section 6.2 grasslands (actions), page 90	Environment Agency		No	Out of scope. Should be considered in specific site management plans and hopefully landowners at risk are already aware.

Urban Text:

Edit	Section of LNRS	Who?	Suggested action	Status: Will edit be made?	Status: If edit is not going to be made, explain why.
"Brownfield sites (or previously developed land) should be covered in the urban section. These are often important habitats for invertebrates and early successional communities and are an important habitat in Essex."	Section 6.6 Urban Pages 126 -	Natural England	Add to action 14: "Monitor biodiversity on brownfield sites as they can often become important habitats for invertebrates and early successional communities."	Yes	
BIGGER HABITAT PRIORITY – "we would welcome the inclusion of rain gardens in this list to demonstrate the importance of retrofitting sustainable drainage systems within existing urban areas that are at risk of surface water flooding or minimise the risk of surface water flooding elsewhere."	Section 6.6, Biodiversity Priorities, page 127	Anglian Water	To urban bigger habitat priority, p.127, add underlined: "...street trees, community gardens, and <u>SUDS</u> ." Also see below addition of rain garde in measure 2.	Yes	
No. 2 – "would be good to see more made of reducing the overloading of drainage systems during intense rainfall events. Rainwater that does not need to enter the drainage system will have knock on effects to water recycling ability during storms, thus the more that can be kept out or at	Section 6.6 urban measures / actions, page 129	Anglian Water	Add wider benefit points to Urban measure 2, p.129: - Reduces the volume of water entering the sewerage network, thus helping to reduce	Yes	

least slowed will ultimately benefit water quality.”			combined sewer overflows		
No. 7 – “would be good to see more made of reducing the overloading of drainage systems during intense rainfall events. Rainwater that does not need to enter the drainage system will have knock on effects to water recycling ability during storms, thus the more that can be kept out or at least slowed will ultimately benefit water quality.”	Section 6.6 urban measures / actions, page 132	Anglian Water	Add to ‘Wider Benefits’ of measure 7, p.133: “Reduces the risk of overloading drainage systems during intense rainfall events.”	Yes	
Action 12. Is “River valleys” the right title in the urban context. Would urban rivers or watercourses be more accurate?	Section 6.6 Action 12	Natural England	Change measure 12, p.136, to: “Urban watercourses”.	Yes	
Action 12. “River valleys” seems like an unusual title – riverside habitats/habitat corridors might be clearer.	Section 6.6 Action 12	Environment Agency	Changed to “Urban watercourse” as per above.	Yes	
“The priorities and measures talk more to existing urban areas and less to design ambition for new developments. The GI standards, Urban Greening Factor and Essex Design Guide should be referenced in the supporting text or appendices. “	General Section 6.6 Urban measures / actions	Natural England	GI Standards and Essex Design Guide already included in appendices.	No	

Measure 15. Third para, after citizen science. Insert 'Promote the use of new technology and mobile recording apps.'	Section 6.6 urban measures / actions	Natural England	Add to measure 15, third action point, p.138: "Promote the use of new technology and mobile recording apps."	Yes	
Natural England: "It would be appropriate to include reference to urban peregrines, which can adopt prominent nesting locations such as cathedrals / church spires or other city / town centre locations (e.g. Colchester 'Jumbo' water tower, EWT Thameside Nature Park gantry cranes). These present excellent opportunities to engage the public around nature."	Section 6.6. Urban measures / actions	Natural England		No	Urban peregrines indeed a good way of engaging public but it is unclear what action is being suggested here.
p.133 8. "Tree Planting", add under wider benefits section: Improves streetscapes and pride of place, creating more attractive places where people live and work	Section 6.6.page 133	Natural England	Urban measure 8, p.133, wider benefits, add: "Improves streetscape and pride of place, creating more attractive places where people live and work."	Yes	
No. 9 – "how about specific mention of drought tolerant plants to help use water wisely? The wider benefits section mentions	Section 6.6 urban measures / actions, page 133	Anglian Water	Urban measure 9, p.134, add action point: "Use drought tolerant planting	Yes	

<p>greener gardens. During droughts we may well be advising customers not to water lawns as it will come back when rains return so instead prioritise water use. Would this Wider Benefit be better re-phrased to drop the Greener and replace with 'A more diverse garden'...</p> <p>Essex is one of the driest counties in the country and certainly in the Anglian Water region we have identified climate change impacts (drought and flooding) as one of the greatest for this area - we would therefore seek to influence that whilst gardens are beneficial for wildlife, they are not too 'water intensive' or effective measures to reuse water are employed such as rainwater harvesting."</p>			<p>schemes and harvest rainwater from roofs to reduce mains water usage."</p>		
<p>P136 12. "River valleys" add under wider benefits section: When planned at scale, river bank areas offer the opportunity for "greenway" creation for the movement of pedestrians and cyclists through green riverside corridors away from main roads within urban areas and out into the wider countryside.</p>	<p>Section 6.6. page 136</p>	<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Urban measure 12, p.136, wider benefits, add: "When planned at scale, riverbanks can become green corridors offering the opportunity for movement of pedestrians and cyclists from urban areas into the wider countryside."</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Avoided adding "greenway" wording because we haven't used this terminology anywhere else in the strategy.</p>

it would be beneficial for the LNRS to contain more information on how to design for climate change including examples of useful ecological features and referencing of studies or advice around this subject.	Section 6.6 urban measures	Braintree DC		No	Measures already identified for climate change mitigation. Suggestion may be out of scope. More info on specific design guidance to be added to appendices.
<p>Before the final paragraph of the Foreword, add a new paragraph as follows:</p> <p>“As urban areas grow and change there will also be opportunities to improve access to nature for residents, for example by creating or expanding country parks. Southend-on-Sea City Council has a long-standing ambition to create a new country park on its northern edge to increase access to natural green space for residents in the eastern part of the city, and form part of the wider South Essex green infrastructure network.”</p>	<p>Page 126</p> <p>Foreword by Southend-on-Sea City Council</p>	Southend CC	Southend Urban foreword, p.126, add at end: “As urban areas grow and change there will also be opportunities to improve access to nature for residents, for example by creating or expanding country parks. Southend-on-Sea City Council has a long-standing ambition to create a new country park on its northern edge to increase access to natural green space for residents in the eastern part of the city, and form part of the wider South Essex green infrastructure network.”	Yes	

No. 14 – “Actions should also include reference to 'natural flood management' as such measures can be many and small interventions across a catchment to slow flows during periods of intense rainfall and reduce the risk of flooding and consequent impacts on the drainage system. Wider benefit = reduces the risk of flooding”	Section 6.6 urban measures / actions, page 137	Anglian Water		No	Not relevant to measure 14. Reference to slowing flow and flooding risk reduction mentioned elsewhere.
No. 14 – add “and connectivity” so that it reads “assess the biodiversity and connectivity of areas under your management” Add “and protecting the wider environment” to the end. Understanding the connectivity of biodiversity/habitats is key.	Section 6.6 urban measures / actions, page 137	Anglian Water	Urban measure 14, p.137, action point, change to: “Assess the existing biodiversity and connectivity of areas under your management as an important first step to creating new spaces for wildlife and protecting the wider environment.”	Yes	
“We recommend further information is added to this section to educate groups, particularly “householders” (referenced under ‘scale of action’), on the potential flood risk they may experience. We encourage ‘householders’, to check the Gov.uk website ‘ Check the long term flood risk for an area in England ’”	General Section 6.6 Urban measures / actions	Environment Agency		No	Out of scope for LNRS as isn’t necessarily an action that helps nature recovery.

"Urbanised areas are often situated along waterbodies classed as 'main river'. Section 6.6 should have regard for information on Flood Risk Activity Permits "	General Section 6.6 Urban measures / actions	Environment Agency		No	Unclear on where to include this.
--	--	--------------------	--	----	-----------------------------------

Species Priorities Text

Edit	Section of LNRS	Who?	Suggested action	Status: Will edit be made?	Status: If edit is not going to be made, explain why?
Additional Measure for Turtle Dove priority species: Reduce herbicide use to allow native arable plant regeneration as a seed food source for mating pairs.	Section 7. Species Priorities (Page 177)	Natural England	Add to p.177 table, Turtle Dove Potential Actions: "Reduce herbicide use to allow native arable plant regeneration as a seed food source for mating pairs."	Yes	
Crested Cow Wheat Amend first measure – "Protect, expand and enhance grasslands with existing ..." Additional measures - Reintroduce/maintain coppicing and open rides and glades in woodlands.	Section 7. Species Priorities (page 178)	Natural England	p.178 table, Crested Cow Wheat, Potential Actions, change to: "Protect, expand and enhance grasslands with existing populations of crested cow wheat." Add potential action: "Carefully plan coppiced woodland management, to	Yes	

Connect woodlands/increase suitable habitats. Prevent spray drift onto arable margins on known sites. Road verge management with arisings removed.			incorporate rides and glades” Add ‘coppiced woodland’ as habitat type.		
“Crested cow-wheat: establish new areas on appropriate soils (sulphur clover p184) could be done this way too with green hay and subsoil incorporation to manage soil fertility as per comments RE Dorset County Council earlier.”	Section 7. Species Priorities (page 178)	Environment Agency	Covered in above change by reference to expanding grasslands with existing populations. Also covered by a previous EA edit requesting additional text referring to green hay from donor sites.	Yes	
Swift Additional measure – incorporate swift bricks into new developments.	Section 7. Species Priorities (page 178)	Natural England	p.178 table, swift section, add potential action: “Incorporate swift bricks into new developments.”	Yes	
Swift Additional measure – include targets for installing nest boxes, either retrofitting or on new buildings.	Section 7. Species Priorities (page 178)	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority		No	Out of scope of this section in LNRS. Adding potential action around adding swift bricks into new development as per above.

"water voles - establishment of wet ditch networks in wetlands and floodplains would hugely benefit water voles and are an easy win to link networks of habitats for species resilience."	Section 7. Species Priorities (page 178)	Environment Agency	p.178 table, Water Vole potential actions, add: "Establish wet ditch networks in wetlands and floodplains."	Yes	
Water vole Amend first measure - Eradicate mink and monitor.	Section 7. Species Priorities (page 178)	Natural England	p.178 table, water vole potential actions, change phrasing to: "Eradicate mink and monitor."	Yes	
Barbastelle bat Additional measures - Connect key woodlands with foraging sites to other woodlands. Keep deadwood in-situ.	Section 7. Species Priorities (page 179)	Natural England	p.179 table, barbastelle bat potential actions, add: "Connect key woodlands with foraging sites to other woodlands." and "Keep deadwood in-situ."	Yes	
Lapwing Additional measure - Manage sward heights through grazing in the autumn/early winter to create the ideal short sward for March and the reduction of	Section 7. Species Priorities (Page 181)	Natural England	p.181 table, Lapwing potential actions, add: "Manage sward heights through grazing in the autumn and early winter to create the ideal short sward for March and reduce	Yes	

grazing over the breeding season.			grazing over the breeding season.”		
“Lapwing: restoration of wet grassland/ditch network would be key and would boost other species such as snipe, woodcock, redshank, water rail, moorhen and waterfowl: numbers of all of which have declined. Target former key sites from mid-20th Century.”	Section 7. Species Priorities (page 181)	Environment Agency		No	Wetland creation not specific enough for potential actions in this section of LNRS.
Adder Additional measures - Landscape scale habitat creation / expansion / improved connectivity. Reduce recreational disturbance and increasing public awareness.	Section 7. Species Priorities (Page 182)	Natural England	p.182 table, Adder potential actions add: “Reduce recreational disturbance in key locations and increase public awareness.”	Yes	
Green winged orchid Amend measure – Manage grazing, with lighter grazing during key periods such as flowering.	Section 7. Species Priorities (page 183)	Natural England	p.183, Green Winged Orchid potential actions, amend to: “Manage grazing, with reduced grazing during key periods such as flowering.”	Yes	

Additional measure – Manage grazing/cutting to keep soil fertility low.			Add action: “Cut and collect to keep soil fertility low.”		
“The glow-worm is a species which also benefits from active habitat management, particularly along rivers and in wet woodlands so it would be good to see that specifically mentioned in the LNRS. For example, scrub clearance and coppicing have been found to be beneficial to glow-worms in Essex. Scrub clearance on the seawall at Creeksea has also benefited the flood defence and glow-worms.”	Section 7. Species Priorities (page 185)	Environment Agency		No	Unclear how to put this as an action without risking clearance of beneficial habitat.
“Recommended for inclusion: Brent goose. The Waterbirds in the UK 2012/13 report found that Britain supports 35-40% of the international	Section 7. Species Priorities	ZSL		No	Species were only included within species shortlist if it was felt that the more generalised actions identified within the habitat actions section weren’t specific

<p>population of dark-bellied Brent geese during winter. The population overwintering if the UK is heavily concentrated in the south-east with many estuaries in this region supporting this species. For example, dark-bellied Brent geese are present in nationally important numbers on both the Stour and Orwell estuaries.”</p>					<p>enough to assist in the recovery of these species.</p> <p>Checked individual species listed here and below with EWT to check for any anomalies that might have met inclusion criteria.</p>
<p>“Recommended for inclusion: Starry smoothhound. IUCN Near Threatened species. Uses the estuary as pupping grounds and nursery habitats for their young. They are an understudied shark species with limited data. However,</p>	<p>Section 7. Species Priorities</p>	<p>ZSL</p>			

commercial interest in them is increasing”					
“Recommended for inclusion: Tope. Tope is a Critically Endangered shark species which uses the estuary as pupping grounds and nursery habitats for their young, making it an important habitat for breeding success. They are also the only species in the genus Galeorhinus, making them evolutionarily distinct and the only representatives of a unique and irreplaceable part of the world's biodiversity.”	Section 7. Species Priorities	ZSL			
“Recommended for inclusion: Spurdog. Vulnerable with a decreasing population trend according to IUCN. They have very	Section 7. Species Priorities	ZSL			

long gestation periods of 24 months and a long generation time of up to 40 years making them vulnerable to overfishing.”					
“Recommended for inclusion: Sea bass - commercial importance.”	Section 7. Species Priorities	ZSL			
“Recommended for inclusion: Spiny seahorse (IUCN Vulnerable). Short snouted seahorse.”	Section 7. Species Priorities	ZSL			

Scrub/Hedgerow/Farmland Text

Edit	Section of LNRS	Who?	Suggested action	Status: Will edit be made?	Status: If edit is not going to be made, explain why?
Natural England: “We would like to see reference to nightingale as an iconic species benefitting from scrub habitats in the habitat Foreword text. Areas within the North Thames Estuary and south of Colchester are	Section 6.3 Scrub (page 98 – 99)	Natural England	Mention Nightingale in foreword.	Yes	

particular strongholds for this species.”					
Natural England have suggested adding the highlighted text to the existing measure: “p.100, point 1 “Plant Scrub habitat...” “Prioritise planting of <u>locally sourced</u> native species adapted to local environmental conditions <u>and landscape character</u> .”	Section 6.3 Scrub (page 100)	Natural England	p.100, measure 1 change to: “Prioritise planting of locally sourced native species adapted to local environmental conditions and landscape character.”	Yes	
p.110, point 1 “Hedgerow Planting...” Wider benefits “Enhances the visual landscape, providing scenic beauty and cultural significance <u>where locally characteristic species and hedge laying patterns are used and where new hedging highlight traditional field patterns and re-introduce hedgerows lost to field amalgamation</u> ”	Section 6.4 Hedgerows (page 110)	Natural England	p.110, measure 1, wider benefits, change point 3 to: “Enhances the visual landscape, providing scenic beauty and cultural significance where locally characteristic species and hedge laying patterns are used.”	Yes	Small suggestion cut to keep succinct point.
“More mention of hedgerow trees and a farmland action plan to tackle ash loss across the farmed landscape.”	Section 6.4 Hedgerows, actions	Environment Agency	Covered in previous EA edit.	Yes	

Natural England suggesting highlighted text p.120 5. “Integrate Woodlands within the farmed landscape” “create new woodland habitat alongside the farm to landscape, preferably with native species <u>characteristic of the area.</u>	Section 6.5 Farmland	Natural England	p.120, measure 5, add following action point: “Integrate Woodlands within the farmed landscape” Change second action point to: “create new woodland habitat alongside the farmed landscape, preferably with native species <u>characteristic of the area.”</u>	Yes	
Natural England suggesting highlighted text P123 - Point 8 – include in action to survey disused pits and quarries on farmland for their potential for Nature Recovery – important both for their biodiversity and geodiversity.	Section 6.5 Farmland	Natural England	p.123, measure 8, add action point: “Survey disused pits and quarries on farmland for their potential for Nature Recovery.”	Yes	
The farmland sections of the Essex LNRS primarily focus on farmland that is used to grow crops. RDC recommends additional sections are included here to discuss nature recovery in relation to	Section 6.5 Farmland	Rochford DC		No	Consideration for future iterations of Essex LNRS.

farmland being used for other means – in particular solar farms or other rural diversifications (such as campsites).					Unclear where to add in current farmland section. Other habitat type actions also relevant to none-arable farming sites.
BIGGER HABITAT PRIORITY: “Dislike use of ‘setting aside’ as too similar to ‘set-aside’ a formal yet temporary land management practice – consider “making space for... and enhancing” ”	Section 6.5 Farmland, page 117, biodiversity priorities Page 122, Action 7	Environment Agency	Change to ‘putting aside’/‘put aside’ where appropriate Change action to say ‘Identify space...’ on action 7. P.122.	Yes	
“Heading is "Create wildlife buffers" and whilst adjoining habitats are mentioned, it would be good to see direct mention of their ability to help protect raw water quality in the county's rivers too. The following could also be added to the list of actions (particularly for land managers) in this section: 'understand your land's connectivity to watercourses and consider wider buffers in	Section 6.5 Farmland, page 118	Anglian Water	p.118, measure 1, add nature recovery benefit: “Filtrates water run-off containing chemicals and soil from fields before it reaches local watercourses.” Add action point: “Create riparian buffers around watercourses to filtrate run-off.”	Yes	

key areas to intercept and filter out surface water runoff alongside watercourses'."					
No. 2 – "Wider benefits - it would be useful to add the following bullet point to this section: 'retain and or slow the flow of water over land prior to the watercourse thus reducing risks to water quality'."	Section 6.5 Farmland, page 119	Anglian Water	p.199, measure 2, wider benefits, add: "Slows the flow of water over the landscape, improving quantity and quality of water reaching waterways."	Yes	
No. 2 – "recommend an additional bullet point under "wider benefits", stating "supports flood management"	Section 6.5 Farmland, page 119	Environment Agency	p.199, measure 2, wider benefits, add: "Supports flood management."	Yes	
No. 5 – "may benefit from hyperlinks to the Environment Agency Natural Flood Management scheme "	Section 6.5 Farmland, page 120	Environment Agency	Add some more detail into action 2. "Consider the use natural flood management techniques to hold water on the landscape for longer, where appropriate"	Yes	
No. 9 – 'Increase use of farmyard manure, compost and living mulches' - we would recommend that increased use of cover crops is added into this section as an action,	Section 6.5 Farmland, page 123	Anglian Water	Change phrasing to "living mulch/covercrops" p.123, measure 9, wider benefits, amend	Yes	

as cover crops are grown in the period between main crops and have similar benefits to farmyard manure, compost and living mulches. In the Wider Benefits sections, last bullet - add 'excess nutrients' after 'chemicals'.			to: “Reduces environmental impacts associated with chemicals and excess nutrients.”		
--	--	--	---	--	--

Mapping Methodology/Mapping text:

Edit	Section of LNRS	Who?	Suggested action	Status: Will edit be made?	Status: If edit is not going to be made, explain why.
Provide further details on strategic creation opportunities and their assessment methodology. Provide detailed methodology for the selection of "Strategic Creation Opportunities." Explain why some areas have been “cut out” (which is the removal of APIBs). Explain how local APIB sites are not a constraint on opportunity areas, but national APIB sites are – and explain WHY. Explain how “other areas of particular importance for biodiversity were	Appendices section 2. Mapping methodology and bring up to mapping section (higher up in the strategy)	Rochford DC / Natural England / Other SA's / Farmers and landowners / Colchester CC	Ground Control revising methodology	Partly	Commercial sensitivity limits information shared

identified” and a bit unclear to include in the legend? Natural England suggested it would be helpful to include the data sets used in the mapping process.					
Refine the mapping methodology to show how 'other environmental benefits' influenced the selection of opportunities.	Appendices section 2. Mapping methodology and bring up to mapping section (higher up in the strategy)	Natural England	Ground Control revising methodology	Partly	Commercial sensitivity limits information shared
More detail required as to the criteria used for each assessment (B3 the multi criteria evaluation analysis). Multiple landowners have stated this is unclear.	Appendices 2 mapping methodology	Landowner	Ground Control revising methodology	Partly	Commercial sensitivity limits information shared
Add a clear definition for marine boundaries (inter-tidal vs sub-tidal and what is being presented in the LNRS) in the glossary as well as methodology.	Section 5. Maps (coastal map pages 58 – 59) and appendices section 6. Glossary	EWT and coastal subgroup	Mapping has been revised so issue may have been resolved in mapping presentation.	TBC	
Clarify eligibility for BNG uplift schemes for adjacent sites. Clarify whether sites outside strategic creation areas are eligible for BNG uplift.	Section 4.4 support mechanisms / section 5.1 how to use the maps (pages 28 – 29)	Rochford DC	Clarified in conversation with Rochford officers. Uplift only applicable to		

			strategic areas.		
Clearly indicate in mapping if currently planned developments (as per Local Plan) are considered a constraint on site identification.	Appendices section 2. Mapping methodology	Epping Forest DC		No	No longer a mapping constraint as not listed as such in strategy.
Make “how to use the maps” more focused on HOW to use the maps, rather than a description of what the maps are. It is important and right that the section includes details of how individual landowners can raise concerns about how their land has been characterised by the maps (post any consultation).	“How to use the maps” section (pages 28 and 29)	NFU	Interactive maps made more user friendly and methodology revised.	Partly	Strategic opportunities on land do not create an obligation but do provide guidance on nature recovery and offer reward via BNG uplift.
Insert new links to mapping portal onto strategy PDF.	Section 5. Maps	ECC		TBC	
Address point about the role (or lack of role) of APIBs in the strategic significance BNG metric (both baseline and intervention). Address point about whether enhancement of poor condition APIBs would be considered for strategic significance in metric in methodology.	Appendices section 2. Mapping methodology and/or “How to use the maps” section (pages 28 and 29)	Nattergal	Strategic enhancement opportunities for grassland and woodland now included and can overlap with locally designated APIBs.	Yes	

Ensure clear distinctions between priorities (end results) and potential measures (specific actions); ““Would it be clear to someone using the Local Habitat Map what actions are being proposed, where they are being proposed, and why these actions are being proposed as the most important things to be doing?”.	Linking together section 5. Maps and section 6. Habitat priorities and actions	Natural England	Changes to phrasing of actions have been implemented so that actions read as instructive.	Yes	
Clarify mapping between spatial and non-spatial measures, by stating which actions are mapped and why ones are supporting (more clearly than currently exists). “In the category of supporting actions, you have included some potential measures which could be expressed as unmapped measures.”	Section 6. habitat priorities and actions	Natural England	Add map symbol to mapped actions and explain symbology at start of section 5.	Yes	
Refine wording for consistency across priorities and measures. Wording for certain actions/measures to be more actionable and clearer wording.	Section 6. habitat priorities and actions	Natural England	Refine wording of measures and make more instructive.	Yes	
Explicitly acknowledge the integration with other relevant plans and strategies.	Section 6. Habitat priorities and actions?	Natural England		No	Covered in Policy Context.
Natural England have suggested the following: In section 5.2 ‘Areas of Particular Importance for Biodiversity (APIBs)’, the	Section 5.3 “APIBs”	Natural England	Section 5 has been revised.	Partly	

<p>accompanying text should preferably be amended to read (with additional text highlighted):</p> <p>Areas of particular importance for biodiversity (APIBs) include: national conservation sites; local nature reserves; and 'other areas of particular importance for biodiversity'. The APIB map presents the current situation of natural spaces in Greater Essex. APIBs cover 14% of the Greater Essex LNRS region in total. All input datasets correct as of February 2024. Please note, the APIB list of sites is set out in section 106(5) of the Environment Act 2021 and the LNRS Statutory Guidance. It is not exhaustive and does not include all existing habitats of importance for biodiversity, only those sites listed. The Priority Habitats Inventory is not shown in the APIBs map.</p>					
<p>"Maps 1 and 2 have the same name and it appears the same para of explanatory text yet the key is much longer and specifies many more types of site - different headers should be used for the different maps. Ie is Map 1 - All areas of Particular Importance for Biodiversity?"</p>	<p>5.2 Areas of Particular Importance for Biodiversity (APIBs), Page 30 to 24, map 1 and map 2</p>	<p>ECC</p>	<p>Now amended.</p> <p>Map 2 listed as 'Areas of particular importance for biodiversity (APIBs) by designation'.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

“More explanatory info re how the Combined Strategic Creation Opportunities have been determined should be provided. Too many categories in the key and very difficult to tell some of these apart”	5.3 opportunity maps, page 35	ECC	Moved to the appendices as may be of interest to some but not the most useful map and may cause confusion.	Yes	
Natural England feedback: “ Section 245 (Protected Landscapes) of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 places a duty on relevant authorities in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) in England, to seek to further the statutory purposes of the area. Currently National Landscapes (Deham Vale and Suffolk and Essex Coasts and Heaths) are not shown. Consider the opportunity for flagging the National Landscape when selecting mapped measures within the areas. “ – essentially requesting ECC to map measures on national landscape areas where there are strategic opportunities within national landscapes.	Strategic opportunity maps	Natural England		No	Not included but may be considered for future LNRS iterations.
The approach to urban opportunities should be consistent across LPA areas. Both in terms of the methodology and strategic significance.	Strategic opportunity maps / urban opportunities	Natural England	Methodology revised subject to	Partly	Urban opportunities not strategic.

<p>The mapping methodology section needs to include the urban opportunity mapping methodology.</p> <p>Urban mapped opportunities would benefit from greater granularity with all urban opportunities displayed on the interactive mapping.</p>			<p>commercial sensitivity.</p> <p>Mapping more granular with move from 0.25km hexagons to 0.01.</p>		
<p>Add commentary somewhere that details when APIB maps (and other maps) are going to be updated.</p> <p>RDC will be undertaking a Local Wildlife Sites Review in the coming months. If sites are added or removed from our list, will the LNRS mapping be updated to reflect these changes? And/or will the same apply if the boundaries or status of national conservation sites etc. change?</p>	Text around map updates	Rochford DC		No	APIB layer static through lifespan of strategy with dates when data correct as of listed on strategy.
<p>The text mentions that “Nature recovery opportunities within urban areas do not form part of the strategic creation opportunity areas”. Greening urban developments is a key theme in the national 25-year plan, the Environmental Improvement Plan.</p>	Section 5.1, How to use the maps, page 28 and 29	Environment Agency		No	Urban opportunities not classed as strategic as parcels of land not practicable to be used for habitat banking

Urban areas have their own environmental challenges, such as flood risk and increased hazards to the people, property and the environment. By excluding urban areas from the “Combined Strategic Habitat Creation Opportunities map” may lead to missed opportunities for communities to engage in restoring, managing and protecting nature in their areas (aim 4 of the top aims for nature recovery). This may weaken their engagement in the National Planning Policy Framework and the relevant Local Authority’s local plans.					where already built upon. Now with more granular mapping, we have lots of other habitat type strategic creation opportunities entering the urban areas so hopefully addresses issues raised.
Some of the hexagons don’t seem to relate to their proposed habitat opportunities – e.g. river habitats	Combined Strategic Habitat Creation Opportunities map	Environment Agency	Issue should be resolved with updated mapping.	Yes	
“Difficult to understand what the polygons actually mean, they are not user friendly and not linked to any maps of waterbodies, perhaps more work needs to be done to show real opportunities and contacts for organisations who could help.”	Opportunity Map for Freshwater Standing Water Habitat, pages 46 to 49	Environment Agency	Issue should be resolved with updated mapping.	Yes	
Would it be possible to include reference to Transforming the Thames (TtT) in the Essex LNRS as a delivery mechanism for coastal and marine habitat enhancement and creation? TtT would help contribute to the Essex LNRS ambitions of the creation of 4,000ha of new coastal habitat and 1,000ha of new marine habitat.”	General Comment, coastal and marine habitat, maps	ZSL		No	Unclear where to add this. Where possible, the LNRS has not named specific projects so as to be inclusive of all NGOs and

					projects working in the region.
--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------------

Mapping Edits (the spec / agreed works with Ground Control)

Edit	Section of LNRS	Who?	Suggested action	Status: Has the edit been made?	Status: If edit not going to be made, explain why.
Improve granularity of mapped opportunities/measures. Smaller hexagons at 1 hectare now used to improve granularity.	Opportunity maps (strategic and all opportunities)	Natural England Local Authorities Farmers/Landowners	Approach to presenting opportunity areas	Yes	
Granularity of mapped “actions” and links back to potential measures section. Depending on capability of final software used to present the maps, when you click on a site on the map and the actions box pops up – there should be a further link to take you to the wider environmental benefits (either signposting in the strategy or a link that takes you to it). A version control system must be enacted so that older versions (on which BNG metric calculations for previous sites were based) remain available for the life of existing agreements (30+ years for BNG but likely more than 50 years once developments are built out).	Strategic opportunity maps	Natural England	Mapping of measures/actions	TBC	
Explore presenting 2 layers for each species – data since 1990 and then more recent data (e.g. last 10 years) to show change in distribution of species.	Species Maps	Species subgroup		No	Worth keeping content

					succinct and there's a risk of overwhelming with maps.
EWT to share additional species data.	Species Maps		Data received from EWT.	Yes	
Opportunities can now be displayed on locally designated sites. Local designations no longer need to act as a constraint on the opportunity areas.	Strategic and all opportunities maps	Natural England	Enhancement opportunities now mapped on these areas.	Yes	
Review woodlands within and outside of APIBs and mark those suitable for enhancement – do we have time to do this? Include a layer which highlights existing woodland habitats (outside of APIBs) to enhance the comprehensiveness of the mapping. Could a layer be included for existing grassland/freshwater/coast/marine?	Opportunity mapping	Rochford DC / Forestry Commission	Enhancement opportunities now mapped on these areas.	Yes	
RDC also recommends incorporating the Areas of Particular Importance (APIBs) shapefile layers into the habitat-specific maps (ideally as a point/dot on the map).	APIB maps and habitat maps	Rochford DC	All layers available on same map.	Yes	

<p>“Strategic Sites selected by Local Authority”</p> <p>Sites in Harlow and Southend to be added into individual habitat layers – rather than a separate layer on their own (Harlow have requested their sites be added into the individual habitat layers) (there is a document that identifies which sites are what habitats in teams)</p>	Strategic opportunity map and all opportunity maps	Harlow and Southend		Yes	
Mapping Miscellaneous					
Edit	Section of LNRS?	Who?	Suggested Action	Status: Has this edit been made?	Status: If the edit is not going to be made, explain why.
Final presentation of maps to be in GIS format (not citizen space).	Interactive Maps	Feedback from multiple sources / ECC		Yes	
Implement a numbering system for the 0.25 km ² hexagonal grid cells for easier reference. Rochford have raised this in both the supporting authority consultation and the public consultation.	Interactive maps TBC	Rochford DC		No	Unachievable given the sheer number of hexagons now that they have

					been reduced in size.
Include production dates on all maps and indicate future update frequency.	All maps	Rochford DC		No	Strategy to be dated – maps static after publication.
Potentially incorporate plantilifes “important fungus areas” and “British Bryological Society’s Vice County All-time Red List Hectad Count” data sets into LNRS opportunity mapping analysis.	Opportunity mapping value Index	Natural England		No	Not included in this iteration of LNRS.
If possible, enhance the interactivity of the APIB maps – allowing users to click on the shapefiles to access detailed information such as the areas name / habitat designation / other relevant characteristics.	Interactive maps	Rochford DC		No	Not practicable in this iteration of the LNRS.
Final interactive habitat maps to include a feature that highlights areas where they have a higher value (quality) of opportunity of a DIFFERENT type of habitat. E.g. one area could be lower quality woodland but be higher quality freshwater habitat.	Interactive map	Rochford DC	All opportunity mapping can be used for this purpose and will sit as layers in	Yes	

			interactive mapping.		
Clearer links between tree and woodland actions outlined in section 6.1 and the online mapping resource (same for all strategic habitats – not just tree and woodland). The document lists habitat species actions while the map shows potential areas for these actions. But there are difference in wording and numbering which create confusion. Need better alignment between the document and the interactive map.	Linking measures in the strategy document and measures identified using interactive mapping	Rochford DC / ECC	The reason for this is because ECC were limited to word count and formatting using citizen space. We should be able to align better with the final maps as long as we don't have limitations on text. Can ensure the numbers match up between the number of the measures in the strategy.	Yes	
Harlow would like site names to be added to their strategic sites – when you click on the sites on the interactive map.	Final interactive maps	Harlow Council		No	May not be practicable for

					this iteration of the LNRS.
--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------