

# Responses to the December 2026 Durham Local Nature Recovery Strategy Consultation

Consultation Response	Responsible Authority comments
Developer supports the overarching priorities, encourages implementation of the strategy that avoids creating unnecessary barriers to development viability or inadvertently restricting the delivery of housing and employment land, particularly on the edges of existing settlements, which often represent the most sustainable locations for growth	Noted.
OA 20-02 - what about inclusion of the two National Trails alongside the railway path network? also important for nature connection, being close to it and people valuing nature.	National Trails added to the example in QA-2-01.
OA3-03 - conservation not conversation	Text changed.
I agree because the priorities recognise that nature recovery must be coordinated, long-term, and landscape-scale, focusing on habitat connectivity, ecosystem resilience, and evidence-based action rather than isolated or short-term measures.	Noted.
I believe it is important for DCC to protect local nature reserves and habitats across the county and the ones it owns which are managed by the countryside service team. Which I believe is really important part as they do the day to day site management.	Noted.
The writer has transformed a new-build urban garden over four years into a thriving, chemical-free wildlife haven. Their efforts have attracted a diverse range of species, including birds, insects, mammals, and amphibians, with many birds now overwintering thanks to regular feeding. Despite this success, the writer is worried that nearby motorbike activity is damaging this valuable habitat and believes the area needs protection.	Noted.
Many of Durhams LNR are in a poor state of management	Noted.
Misplaced and needless development of open spaces, especially for burgeoning housing development, is detrimental to environment, wildlife, economy and human well-being.	Noted.
Must have regular baseline data to determine condition.	Noted.
Broad support for the LNRS. The Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRS) should allow uplift in Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) where clear opportunities for ecological enhancement exist and are supported by the relevant ecological advisor. Conversely, they note that sites should not be required to deliver specific enhancements where these would be inappropriate or unsupported due to the absence of suitable habitats.	LNRS does not mandate so landowners can deliver any nature recovery action they deem suitable. The uplift to BNG cannot be applied outside of the mapped habitat areas as per BNG guidance.

<p>Broadly support the aims of the LNRS and welcome the acknowledgement that its measures are not mandatory. However, believe the Statement of Priorities should be strengthened to ensure the LNRS does not hinder the delivery of development sites and is clearly aligned with existing and emerging planning policy. They recommend adding a new overarching priority to emphasise integrating nature into policy and decision-making. Support Priority OA-4 on promoting sustainable, nature-friendly farming and request that it remains in the final LNRS.</p>	<p>Wording on role of LNRS in planning / development has been slightly altered and is sufficient. Not including new priority on policy as the LNRS role in plan making is already defined.</p>
<p>County Durham contains significant stretches of two nationally important trails—the Pennine Way and the King Charles III England Coast Path—which play a key role in connecting people with nature and acting as ecological corridors. Request that these National Trails and Public Rights of Way be explicitly referenced in the LNRS, noting that their verges can be effectively managed for nature recovery and provide valuable public access and wellbeing benefits. (response repeated)</p>	<p>National Trails added to the example in QA-2-01.</p>
<p>The priorities and potential measures seem comprehensive, although I am not an expert.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The recovery of nature is crucial to the well-being of everyone, as well as an important goal in its own right. There has been so much destruction in recent decades.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>These are good general principles that can be applied across the region. No reason to disagree with these. Good use of resources to target survey work to species of interest.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Support for nature recovery in the Durham area but the strategy currently lacks meaningful engagement with landowners and practical mechanisms for delivery. Recommend adding a new priority recognising and supporting landowners, including through diversification such as renewable energy projects that contribute to carbon reduction and net-zero goals. They also urge better collaboration with developers and land managers so that land management plans can deliver both nature recovery and climate benefits, and call for planning applications aligned with the strategy’s aims to be positively supported.</p>	<p>New overarching priority has been added. Multiple benefits are part of the LNRS, LNRS cannot dictate LPA responses to planning applications, but will inform decision making.</p>
<p>Supports the LNRS priorities and agrees with the strategy’s focus on high-quality, nature-friendly place-making. They ask the Council to ensure the LNRS is applied proportionately so it does not hinder viable development or create unintended constraints on meeting County Durham’s housing and employment needs. They emphasise that the LNRS should remain an informative, non-statutory tool and not be treated as a restrictive designation, and request clear messaging to that effect. They also encourage aligning the LNRS with the upcoming Local Plan review and recognising the substantial biodiversity contributions already delivered through modern development practices.</p>	<p>Noted, Local Plan will be influenced by the LNRS in line with guidance.</p>
<p>While we welcome the LNRS and overarching priorities, we feel that they could be improved by recognising the opportunities for engagement, funding and skills development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Resurvey of the LWS should mention the need for consistent and standardised criteria, to establish a robust baseline.</p>	<p>Noted. Criteria exist.</p>
<p>There is inconsistency across the LNRS, as well as within the overarching priorities, on how those managing land are identified. It should be as inclusive as possible to include farmers, landowners and land managers (with this last group often excluded from the list). Much of the LNRS area will be managed by neither a farmer nor landowner, so this is an important omission.</p>	<p>Land managers added where appropriate.</p>
<p>You seem to have covered the correct priorities</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>You encourage people to use open spaces to come together then implement parking charges to prevent families and those disabled people from enjoying them.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<p>A 2023 UC Berkeley study found that childhood exposure to glyphosate may increase the risk of serious illnesses later in life, including liver cancer, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease. Although some UK councils are reducing pesticide use, many still apply glyphosate in public areas for cosmetic purposes. Urges councils to adopt a three-year phase-out plan</p>	<p>Noted. Herbicide reduction will form part of green space management options added into U1-03</p>
<p>add in "Positively support Planning Applications that meet the goals and priorities set out within this strategy."</p>	<p>LNRS cannot dictate planning policy / decisions but will inform decision making.</p>
<p>The actions proposed are broadly positive. Mineral sites already include substantial calcareous grassland within their restoration plans. With some adjustments, these plans could increase the amount of this habitat by reducing areas of open water—another priority habitat, but one not represented in the mapped mineral sites</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>I agree because the habitat priorities focus on protecting, restoring, and connecting the most valuable and vulnerable habitats, using evidence-led measures that support biodiversity recovery, climate resilience, and long-term ecological function rather than piecemeal action.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Of course, reclamation and reinstatement are worthy goals but surely the first priority must be to arrest further deterioration and halt further development?</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Urban - these measures should also incorporate blue infrastructure.</p>	<p>Blue infrastructure added.</p>
<p>Running Waters and Wetlands (RW): Comments have been previously provided on this measure, and we would welcome a separate meeting to discuss.</p>	<p>Meeting arranged.</p>
<p>The reference to swift boxes and their value for other species in U1-05 is positive, but the LNRS should align with National Planning Policy. LNRS should specify that new housing developments include, on average, one swift brick per dwelling in line with CIEEM and BS42021 guidance. The document should also require protection of existing swift nesting sites, or—where this is not possible—ensure equivalent mitigation to replace any loss. (response repeated)</p>	<p>LNRS cannot dictate planning policy / decisions. Protection covered by legislation. Reference to NPPG / NPPG and swifts added.</p>
<p>RW1-03 'support healthy river habitats'... and coastal waters?</p>	<p>Noted. Coastal waters outside of LNRS boundary.</p>
<p>C1-01 'protecting sensitive areas of the coastal margin through path rationalisation'. Include the coastal margin.</p>	<p>Noted and included as part of the LNRS.</p>
<p>11.6.1 'minimising impacts on local wildlife' - the coastal section appears light but when read alongside the other measures it isn't.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The habitat priorities also seem comprehensive.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Can measure U 1-04 where it mentions "urban spaces such as gardens, schools" be expanded to include the National Trails, coastal margin and public rights of way as these can also act as corridors for people and nature via the creation of contiguous linear habitat and stepping stones.</p>	<p>National Trails added to the example in QA-2-01.</p>
<p>The principles are generally supported, but appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures must remain flexible, as they will vary from site to site. It should also be acknowledged that not every priority can be met on every development, since multiple factors influence what biodiversity enhancements are feasible. Therefore, priorities should be assessed and determined individually for each site. (response repeated)</p>	<p>Noted, LNRS is advisory.</p>

Support the proposed habitat restoration and enhancement measures and recognise the opportunities a nature recovery strategy can bring for ecological improvement and climate resilience. However, stress that the LNRS must be delivered in a proportionate way that does not impose unreasonable constraints on development viability, site assessments, or Biodiversity Net Gain delivery. Clear scope, balanced objectives, and measures that avoid undermining housing delivery are essential to ensure the LNRS supports both nature recovery and sustainable growth.	Noted, LNRS advisory and informs decision making.
I feel insufficient priority given to hedgerows, including the bush and tree species. Very poor quality in general, maintenance, other than trimming, is virtually non-existent so higher priority is needed as it has such an influence on other aspects such as connectivity and general bird protection	Is a measure in place to improve hedgerows - unmapped so applies to all hedges in the county.
The organisation is broadly supportive of most priorities and measures but raises concerns about Measure W1-02, which proposes using Tree Preservation Orders or Local Wildlife Site (LWS) designations to protect ancient woodland and veteran or ancient trees. They note that these features already receive strong protection through existing national and local policy, and that LWS designations must follow scientific criteria—not be applied solely because ancient trees or woodland are present. Similarly, Tree Preservation Orders require specific amenity tests. Because these designations follow separate statutory processes, they request that Measure W1-02 be removed from the final LNRS.	Added text to W1-02 on meeting criteria for TPO and LWS.
Generally supportive of Measure W2-01 to increase the area of native woodland. However, we would like to reiterate that once published, the inclusion of land in the LNRS is not a statutory designation and does not confer any protection or prevent land uses. Indeed, any nature recovery measures will have to work in favour of landowner and tenant farming practices.	Noted
The priorities only include native broadleaved woodland management. Although the tight targeting within the LNRS is understood to be important in order to focus resources, there are significant nature benefits available in mixed and coniferous woodlands, particularly as sustainable forestry is mentioned within NE011 and W 3-01	Priority: W 3: All woodland types are managed appropriately to enhance their biodiversity and their wider ecosystem services. Intention is that this covers all woodland. But text changed to make this clearer.
Appreciates the importance of preserving the favourable conservation status of protected species and enhancing biodiversity value of the areas that it builds in. Developments include a variety of wildlife and biodiversity enhancement features including bat/bird boxes, wildlife corridors and grassland, hedge and watercourse enhancement and SUDS.	Noted.
Because I do	Noted.
There are some inconsistencies and inaccuracies on where priority species are mapped.	Noted, there are data limitations.
So many areas have been overlooked and ruined habitat.	Noted.
The species lists also seem comprehensive. although again I am not an expert.	Noted.
We agree with the suggested approach to strengthen biological recording for notable species.	Noted.
Developer is committed to building high-quality housing developments encompassing large verdant areas of open spaces and landscaping that supports natural habitats to flourish. The company appreciates the importance of preserving the favourable conservation status of protected species and enhancing biodiversity value of the areas that it builds in. Developments include a variety of wildlife and biodiversity enhancement features including bat/bird boxes, wildlife corridors and grassland, hedge and watercourse enhancement and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.	Noted.

Whilst the principles are broadly agreed, the appropriate enhancement and mitigation can differ on a site-by-site basis and, therefore, it is key that flexibility is retained to allow this.	Noted.
Should be recognised that not all priorities can be achieved on individual development sites. There are many factors that need to be taken into account when looking at opportunities for biodiversity and, therefore, it may be that the priorities are prioritised as not all types of enhancements will be able to be delivered. It is appropriate that this is recognised and the determination of priorities for enhancement should be undertaken on a site-by-site basis.	Noted.
You seem to have missed out schools for urban habitat improvements and connectivity	Schools mentioned in U1-04.
Management of existing limestone grassland within quarry sites and the creation of limestone grassland to support these species forms large proportion of restoration schemes. Sites in the uplands can be managed sensitively and restored to suitable habitats for Northern/Durham Argus – initial plantings of Rock Rose as part of grassland creation.	Noted.
Lots of potential for the coast. It brings together the whole document.	Noted.
Start looking after the countryside and rural districts. I walk and see litter and furniture dumped Why? Because you charge for removal of household goods.	Noted.
The importance of conifer crops for red squirrel is recognised in Priority M2 however as mixed and conifer woodlands are not included in the LNRS their significance in supporting this species has been minimised.	Mapped measures prioritise native woodland the M2 measure and appendix 2 promote conifer and mixed woodlands.
All round positive actions and objectives, including the benefits of restored quarry sites can offer to the biodiversity of the region. Actions are generally aligned to conservation habitat creation within restored quarries, but with flexibility in planning and amendments to schemes opens possibilities to support more LNRS priorities	Noted.
Further mention of Heritage Coast, Heritage Coast Partnership and the Management Plan required. Also the ECP National Trail running through it as a mechanism for nature connection on people's doorsteps. No mention of storm overflows and discharges in the sea, which gets washed up on beaches, impacts on marine life / birds on the beaches and sea from plastic pollution.	Further text added, other issues outside of the LNRS Priorities.
Focusing on wildlife that is at risk particularly endangered must be addressed first.	Noted.
I am satisfied because the Statement of Priorities is clear, coherent, and evidence-based, sets out a sensible strategic direction for nature recovery, and aligns habitat, species, and landscape-scale action into a consistent framework that can be built on through effective delivery and local engagement. It is something that, if there are any opportunities I would like to take part in supporting!	Noted.
I'm largely satisfied with the targets / goals, but I question the implementation. Does the left hand know what the right hand is doing with rapid mass development and sprawl across green belt land being considered / approved?	Noted, LNRS informs decision making.
Successful delivery of the statement of priorities would deliver a significant benefit for nature. The delivery of many priorities will have positive impacts on others. For example, measure W4-02 Plant new species rich native hedgerows with hedgerow trees would also benefit R1-02. Appropriate land management is in place to secure adder populations and expand increase their distribution.	Noted.

<p>Broadly support the Overall Statement of Priorities, concerned about how they will be implemented—particularly the use and interpretation of mapped “opportunity areas.” The LNRS must not be considered in isolation from the emerging Local Plan. OA4 on nature-friendly farming is welcome, but measures on land expected to be allocated for development should remain flexible so they can transition into permanent green infrastructure or BNG habitats rather than impose rigid prescriptions that hinder delivery. Overall, implementation should be proportionate, evidence-led and aligned with the Local Plan, with mapped opportunities treated as advisory and subject to ground-truthing, while also recognising viability considerations and County Durham’s urgent housing and employment need.</p>	<p>Noted, LNRS is advisory.</p>
<p>Broadly supportive of the content of the Statement of Priorities. We welcome the Responsible Authority’s recognition that the ‘LNRS is a strategy and does not mandate what must be done, rather it says what could be done.’ We would like to reiterate that LNRSs should not mandate land use and instead should help to inform the local planning process alongside other material considerations. The identification of land in the Local Habitat Map for nature recovery is not mandatory and should not act as a barrier for the Council when allocating land in the emerging County Durham Local Plan.</p>	<p>Noted, LNRS is advisory.</p>
<p>Agree with the Overall Statement of Priorities, some concerns remain about how the priorities will be implemented, especially the selection and use of mapped “opportunity areas,” and we ask that the LNRS is not considered in isolation from the new Local Plan with implementation proportionate, evidence-led and aligned with the Local Plan. Mapped opportunities should be treated as advisory and ground-truthed, and with careful regard to viability and County Durham’s pressing housing and employment needs.</p>	<p>Noted, LNRS is advisory.</p>
<p>We strongly encourage Durham to include mapped measures on allocated sites and in built-up areas as these areas have great delivery potential. Developers should be encouraged to see the LNRS as an opportunity and in no way a constraint.</p>	<p>Allocations are now mapped and additional supported text added.</p>
<p>The priorities are all excellent, but it is not clear to me what the next steps are, and how we maintain momentum or monitor progress.</p>	<p>Noted - DEFRA information on review held in Statement of Priorities (SoP).</p>
<p>Acknowledge the value of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) but concern that its broad, generic mapping may conflict with more accurate site-specific ecological assessments, which should take precedence in planning decisions. Caution that LNRS designations could be misinterpreted or misused to constrain development, emphasising that the LNRS is only one material consideration among many and must be applied with clarity regarding its purpose and limitations. To ensure balanced decision-making, they highlight the need for the LNRS to be clearly defined, avoid imposing undue burdens on development viability, and recognise competing planning requirements such as Biodiversity Net Gain, nutrient neutrality, and up-to-date technical evidence</p>	<p>LNRS is advisory. Importance of site data to inform interventions and the purpose of the LNRS is noted in the SoP.</p>
<p>Requests that the document give wider recognition to the importance of enabling people to sustainably access and connect with nature and the coast. They recommend referencing the Pennine Way National Trail within the North Pennine National Character Area description and acknowledging the King Charles III England Coast Path and its coastal margin in relation to the Coastal Grasslands Reconnected Project. These national trails should be highlighted both for their role in connecting communities with nature and for their potential contribution as ecological corridors</p>	<p>Noted and national trails added into LNRS text.</p>
<p>It would be useful to have the National Trails marked as an opportunity for people and nature connection</p>	<p>Noted, relates to unmapped measures so not included on Local Habitat Map.</p>
<p>Be good to have both APIB tab together to easily see what is possible. It would be good to have an explanation of what is covered by the layers and what isn't / can't</p>	<p>Information held in the SoP, the ancient woodland</p>

be. If the APIB layer isn't on but ancient woodland is it looks like the coastal dunes e.g. Castle Eden Dene doesn't exist. Also mention of dunes being an irreplaceable habitat in the SP but doesn't have a layer.	mapping is a measure which cannot overlay with the APIB hence the coastal dune mapping. Checks by ERIC NE on irreplaceable habitats.
Extremely useful presentation of the evidence for habitats.	Noted
Good but the reference to Ponds, fens and swamps was poor - particularly RW3 - 01	Mapping of RW3-01 changed and expanded.
The local habitat map is clear, well-structured, and easy to interpret, allowing users to understand habitat locations and priorities without specialist knowledge, although I feel it could be more elaborate and informative to better support detailed understanding and local action	Noted
I have used it to look at the area I think needs to be looked after and nurtured and nothing has been highlighted. This shows it has been overlooked and can be highlighted and addressed	Noted
The Local Habitat Map is clear and easy to use. Request that transparency controls be added to the published LNRS Local Habitat Map. This would allow users to adjust the opacity of layers, enabling more precise viewing. This precision is beneficial for landowners, farmers, and developers, as it helps them more clearly identify and subsequently assess the feasibility of meeting one or more LNRS priorities on their land interests.	Noted, option being examined prior to publication
The map is easy to use, we consider it would be beneficial if additional features were added. For instance, include a link to the specific measures identified in the LNRS and a persona-based filtering (i.e. farmer, resident, landowner, etc.) was provided as an option to navigate across the Local Habitat Map to enable clear identification and distinction between high-level strategy and potential personal action.	Considered, but deemed not practical.
The Local Habitat Map is clear and easy to use, but the broad, overlapping opportunity zones risk giving the impression that land is protected, which is not the intention of the LNRS. It should be made explicit that these areas do not restrict development and represent opportunities for enhancement that can occur alongside growth. A more targeted way of identifying opportunities would help avoid misinterpretation, particularly when informing local plan-making.	Noted, points covered in the SoP.
Unclear which areas have existing important habitats and which simply have potential to support habitats – we feel this should be very clearly differentiated.	Noted.
“Areas that Could Become of Particular Importance for Biodiversity” is a very vague term as in theory anywhere could become important given enough resources, this could therefore benefit from either removal or further details. Additionally, this should be a policy decision considered along the need to deliver new homes, employment land and infrastructure and is a matter that should be deliberated through the Council's new Local Plan process. The potential component measures are widely drawn covering extensive areas of land over and above what is considered reasonable.	Measures mapped against defined parameters, LNRS will inform the Local Plan and is advisory.
We would recommend that options are provided for the exporting of shapefiles, this will allow planners to accurately map areas within/outside the LNRS and plan accordingly.	Information will be provided to the LPA in an agreed format.
It appears there is no overlap between areas identified to secure and expand the adder population and the slow worm population, however it would be expected that there is some overlap of the habitat of these species.	Noted, mapping used the most up to date data available.
Multiple layers can't easily be seen when overlaid.	On-going work on presentation/functionality.
Hard to differentiate when multiple layers are displayed, each layer requires selecting separately where polygons are overlapping.	Noted.
Can't search/select areas by area/polygon to show priorities within a wider area of interest. Only features are selectable by point.	On-going work on presentation/functionality.

Some mapping shows targets with pre-existing habitats e.g. woodland priorities shown on areas with existing or newly planted woodlands	Dataset are not 100% accurate, ground truthing to check measures are appropriate is mentioned in the SoP.
National Trails could be added to the Habitat Map so that they can more easily be related to opportunities for nature recovery	Noted, relates to unmapped measures so not mapped.
The potential component measures appear to be very broadly defined, covering extensive areas of land which should it all be used as suggested would leave very little land for meeting Durham's home building requirements. It is unclear which areas currently contain important habitats, and which merely have potential to support them; this distinction should be made explicit. "Areas that Could Become of Particular Importance for Biodiversity" covers a very large area but is a vague term that could technically be applied anywhere. Decisions of areas to target for nature restoration/enhancement should be considered alongside the need to deliver housing, employment land, and infrastructure, and therefore should be addressed through the Council's forthcoming Local Plan process	Noted, Measures mapped against defined parameters. LNRS is advisory
The following areas I believe could be added to the Durham City Green Corridor: St Margaret's Allotments; St Margaret's Churchyard; and the area between Potters Bank and Durham School (Observatory Hill). These areas are important Urban Areas which include a wide range of trees, hedges, meadows, and associated birds, insects, amphibians and mammals.	DCGC boundary is not generated by the LNRS.
Takes too much time and you need an element of expertise to use it properly	Noted.
There needs to be an assessment of habitat quality to inform where there might be opportunities for enhancement and long term positive management. At present it just maps habitat in quantitative terms	Insufficient condition data available to map.
I was not able to open it	Noted.
No swift nests marked on the map	Noted, nests do not form part of the APIB or ACB.
The areas shown on the local habitat map for W1-04 restore PAWS do not align with the areas identified as ancient woodland by Natural England, clarification is requested on why these areas have been included and how they have been mapped.	Used Durham County Council Ancient Woodland mapping in agreement with the working group as it is more accurate.
The field has various wildlife, Kites, Buzzards, Cuckoos, Woodpeckers, Deer, Newts, Bats, Barn Owls also various flowers species including Durham Orchids the bottom of field is ancient woodland. No one in our village would like to see this field disappear as we have lost numerous wildlife due to 3 housing sites that have been built in our tiny mining village.	Noted.
This wooded area extends into the woodland that forms the perimeter of much of the University Hospital of North Durham site. With the extensive wooded area around the hospital it would be great to know how the hospital can support this strategy. Nature and health have a real connection.	Noted.
Willow Tit, previously recorded at Pity Me Carrs LNR, is not mentioned in the current documents. Local observations suggest that a lack of recent management has allowed willows to spread, threatening existing habitats. As coppicing is known to benefit Willow Tits, it is suggested that similar management policies should be reintroduced, to protect both biodiversity and adjacent homes.	Willow tit mapping is being revised, information passed to site manager.
Identifies field currently mapped for woodland as for a potential location for mapping for grassland measures, given the species diversity on site.	Field mapped as G1-02 alongside woodland measures.
Identifies field currently mapped for woodland as for potential mapping for grassland measures	Field mapped as G1-02 alongside woodland measures.

Want to see this area planted with native woodland. In my opinion it is highly suitable as it would expand and connect existing woodland in the area. It would protect nature and prevent this land being lost due to housing development.	No action required, note LNRS does not prevent development.
Site already a significant biodiversity greenspace and so the "buffer and connect priority grassland" is grossly inadequate and the site should have been designated a Local Nature Reserve	Measure is appropriate using available data.
Site is already of particular significance to biodiversity due to omission off wildflower meadowland, site should be declared a Local Nature Reserve.	Noted.
Fields identified on the plan are the Estates better silage/grazing land and would like to be kept in this form for the farms management (response repeated).	Noted. The LNRS is advisory only, management decisions are with the landowner.
Locations with existing planning permissions for business and industrial activities are mapped as G3-01, mapping should take this into consideration.	Noted, Mapping is not 100% accurate, but the LNRS is advisory and will not affect current permissions
Willow has been coppiced, and the site is proposed for development.	Noted, the LNRS is advisory and does not prohibit development.
Proposed site for development or has development opportunity (response repeated)	Noted, the LNRS is advisory and does not prohibit development.
Site proposed for grassland measures as well as BR2-01	Fields mapped as G1-02 as well as black grouse measures.
Confluence of Browney and Wear. In need to flood plain reconnection to reduce sediment entering the river wear and restore a more natural river system.	Noted.
Area needs greening, could we provide green walls, such as M&S in Newcastle. Outdoor seating area, cafe seating outside buildings with trees etc Any planters should be SUDS Rain Garden Planters.	Noted.
There are opportunities for grassland measures at this location with a mix of acidic and neutral grassland indicators so holds potential for restoration.	Noted, not mapped as no strategic linkages.
Site may have potential for Small Pearl Bordered Fritillary measures	Mapping check underway
This area also hold potential for River restoration following the River Skerne.	Additional areas mapped.
Mineral site is being promoted for economic development rather than typical restoration.	Noted, the LNRS is advisory and does not prohibit development.
Object as decisions are more appropriately made through the Local Plan, its unclear as to the data underpinning the mapping and measures should be proportional and based on site level surveys. The site is arable and so not a suitable to priority location for biodiversity recovery. Better locations for mapped measures exist in the locality (response repeated).	LNRS is advisory and only informs the Local Plan. Text in SoP addresses other concerns. No changes to mapping proposed.
Council- owned land is excluded from the mapping.	Council owned land is outside of modelled parameters.
The southwest of this Site is mapped as BR3-01. Measures should be proportionate, flexible and led by site-level surveys, especially for polygons such as BR3-01 that are very widely drawn. The Site has been in long-term intensive arable use. There are also extensive alternative areas in the wider landscape to support BR3-01 that may be less suitable for meeting County Durham's housing needs	Noted, the LNRS is advisory and does not prohibit development.
A small area in the northeast is mapped as U1-01 (accessible wildlife habitats), but the polygon appears to fall largely on existing residential structures, suggesting a potential mapping error.	Urban mapping refined.

Relates to BM5-01; suggests better locations for the mapping of this measure (response repeated).	Mapping of BM5-01 refined and this may address the concern at these locations.
Southern area of the site mapped as W1-01. Closest ancient woodland is >250m away, also mapped as W4-02 but there are no semi-natural habitats to connect to.	APIB layer shows Ancient Woodland adjacent
Given the extensive areas of woodland and grassland already present east of the site, conservation efforts would be more effective working to enhance the condition of existing mature woodland instead of restricting homebuilding in area that lies adjacent to residential properties and has existing local infrastructure.	Noted, the LNRS is advisory and does not prohibit development.
G1-02 was mapped throughout the site due to the presence of calcareous grassland northeast of the site however the current land use as intensively managed farmland with high nutrients will mean it will be costly to achieve this in this location.	Noted (G1-02 accounts for high fertility)
W1-01 and W4-02 apply across the site. Developer objects to this designation being used to block future development, noting that Natural England's advice supports development near ancient woodland where impacts are properly mitigated. This approach aligns with the NPPF, which protects irreplaceable habitats but does not rule out well-designed adjacent schemes. Access to high-quality natural spaces is important for residents' wellbeing, proximity to valuable habitat should not automatically prevent development.	Noted, the LNRS is advisory and does not prohibit development.
The majority of the site is mapped as G1-02 however no priority grassland was found in the area surrounding the Site. There are extensive areas of farmland north of the Site which would be suitable for creating larger and more continuous G1-02 and less suited for residential development due to being further from existing urban infrastructure.	Noted, the LNRS is advisory and does not prohibit development.
W2-01 mapped in the northwest of the Site, it's understood that this would increase the size of existing woodland however the woodland will remain isolated. More effective to create an area of woodland running east to west north of the site without restricting the amount of land available for providing homes	Noted, the LNRS is advisory and does not prohibit development.
Relates to BR1-01 and BR1-03; suggests better locations for the mapping of this measure (response repeated).	Mapping of these measures refined, and this may address the concern at these locations.
RW2-03 falls within the easternmost edge of the site. This area contains existing buildings so will not be suitable for creation of riparian habitats.	Buildings removed from polygon.
U1-01 is mapped over the A689, it is not clear if this has been mapped correctly. Developer considers access to wildlife to be important.	Urban mapping refined.
The site overlaps with W1-01 and W4-02. Although long term intensive arable use means it has low ecological value, it sits within a semi-natural corridor linked to the Browney Valley, with extensive woodland, wet woodland and riparian habitats. Conservation efforts should be concentrated on improving condition of existing habitats rather than restricting development on land adjacent to housing and enhancement to the north of the site.	Noted, the LNRS is advisory and does not prohibit development.
The proposed measures are broadly suitable given the site's proximity to the watercourse and its potential to strengthen hydrological and riparian functions. Implementation should remain flexible and proportionate, targeting areas where ecological gains are highest rather than applying actions uniformly across land already influenced by nearby housing and infrastructure. The site is appropriately identified for riparian enhancement, with priority placed on opportunities such as bank naturalisation, improved riparian vegetation, and fish-supporting measures that do not conflict with drainage or flood-risk requirements (response repeated).	Noted.
W2-01 mapped, probably due to woodland along the A1(M), is not suitable at this location, more suitable opportunities exist to the north and north west.	Noted, the LNRS is advisory, based on best available data, and suitability of measures

	should be informed by site level data.
The site is mapped as which we consider inappropriate. G1 02 is intended to enhance connectivity between priority grassland networks or act as a buffer to them, however this site does neither. More suitable locations lie to the north of the plantation woodland.	Noted, the LNRS is advisory, based on best available data, and suitability of measures should be informed by site level data.
The eastern and southern edges are mapped as BR3-02, but these areas are narrow, isolated and constrained by development, tree lines and woodland, limiting their value. Measures should therefore be applied proportionally and flexibly, informed by site level surveys and ground truthing of mapped areas	Noted, need for site level information contained within the SoP.
The site is mapped for RW1 01 and G1 02. While both measures are supported in principle, neither is well placed within the site boundary (response repeated).	RW1-01 mapping has been refined which may address the concern at this location. Mapping principles for G1-02 are sound.