

Biodiversity Assessment - Final report

Walkmill Community Woodland, Whitehaven

January 2023

Prepared by Assistant Ecologist Abbie Smith BSc (Hons) on behalf of:



West Cumbria Rivers Trust Keswick Convention Centre Skiddaw Street Keswick CA12 4BY



Archer Ecology Ltd

Registered Address: Britannia House, Marshalls Yard, Gainsborough, Lincolnshire, DN21 2NA 07583 802069 | 01427 811643 | www.archerecology.co.uk | Company number 13449810



Archer Ecology Ltd | Company no. 13449810 Britannia House Marshalls Yard Gainsborough Lincolnshire DN21 2NA

	Report Overview
Scheme reference	Walkmill Community Woodland, Whitehaven
Works overview	Management and enhancement of 36ha community woodland
Revision	Version 1 (Final)
Issued	30.01.2023
Prepared by	Abbie Smith BSc (Hons) – Assistant Ecologist
Reviewed by	Helen Archer BSc (Hons) MCIEEM – Principal Ecologist



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Archer Ecology Ltd was commissioned by West Cumbria Rivers Trust to complete a Biodiversity Assessment with respect to habitat improvement works proposed at Walkmill Community Woodland in Whitehaven, West Cumbria as part of the Wilder Walkmill Project. The project intends to implement a number of habitat management interventions for the purpose of benefitting wildlife and biodiversity whilst enhancing opportunities for recreational use.

This Biodiversity Assessment appraises the extent of habitat loss/modifications required to facilitate the works and determines the potential for positive biodiversity credits to be achieved as a result of implementing the restoration proposals. The Biodiversity Assessment involved a desk study and review of ecological data contained within a supporting Preliminary Ecological Appraisal issued by Archer Ecology Ltd in September 2022. This included an ecology walkover completed on the 26th and 27th July 2022 by Principal Ecologist Helen Archer BSc (Hons) MCIEEM and Abbie Smith BSc (Hons). During the walkover, baseline data were recorded on the site's current habitat composition, condition, area and floral species, as well as the presence of any invasive non-native species, where present and observable.

The Biodiversity Metric 3.1 Calculation Tool was used to generate a pre-works and post-works comparison of biodiversity units as a result of the restoration proposals. The biodiversity calculator indicates a **GAIN** in habitat (area) biodiversity units of **+11.13 units (+5.86% change)** post-works which falls below the standard National biodiversity net gain expectations (i.e., +10%) mandated as part of the Environment Act 2021. The scheme is expected to result in a **GAIN** in habitat (linear) biodiversity units for hedgerow units of **+1.56 units (+100% change)** and a **GAIN** in habitat (linear) biodiversity units for river units of **+0.97 units (+177.27% change)** post-works which exceeds the standard National biodiversity net gain expectations (i.e., +10%) mandated as part of the Environment Act 2021.

This outcome assumes that areas of compensatory planting have successfully established and that a plan of adequate, long-term management and monitoring is implemented to ensure longevity for up to 30 years.



CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	5
2.0	METHODOLOGY	7
3.0	RESULTS	9
APPEND	DIX I – RESTORATION PROPOSALS	14
APPEND	DIX II – EXTENDED PHASE I HABITAT MAP	15
APPEND	DIX III – BIODIVERSITY CALCULATOR INPUT	17



1.0 INTRODUCTION

NB: This biodiversity assessment has been prepared with reference to the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal report issued by Archer Ecology Ltd in September 2022¹ and should be read in conjunction with this supporting report.

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 Archer Ecology Ltd was commissioned by West Cumbria Rivers Trust to complete a Biodiversity Assessment with respect to habitat improvement works proposed at Walkmill Community Woodland in Whitehaven, West Cumbria as part of the Wilder Walkmill Project The project intends to implement a number of habitat management interventions for the purpose of benefitting wildlife and biodiversity whilst increasing opportunities for recreational use (hereafter referred to as 'the application site'). The study area lies beyond the south-eastern periphery of the rural village of Moresby Parks and comprises a 36ha, former open cast coalmine which has since been subjected to intensive afforestation.
- 1.1.2 The central extent of the proposed works area centred at Ordnance Survey Grid Reference (OSGR) NY 00661 19058 - is shown in Figure 1, below.



Figure 1 – Location and extent of Walkmill Community Woodland project

¹ Archer Ecology Ltd (2022) *Walkmill Community Woodland, Whitehaven – Preliminary Ecological Appraisal_September 2022.* Archer Ecology Ltd (unpublished).



1.2 Objectives

1.2.1 The purpose of this biodiversity assessment is to determine a pre-works and post-works comparison of biodiversity units through applying the Biodiversity Metric 3.1 Calculation Tool. This is achieved using information pertaining to the onsite habitat condition, area and species composition, which are assessed against the predicted impacts arising from the works.

1.3 Proposed Works

- 1.3.1 In line with the tender document provided as part of the commission, it is understood that a range of habitat management interventions are proposed for the purpose of benefitting wildlife and biodiversity whilst increasing opportunities for recreational use. These interventions are intended to address a number of current risks to the ecological heritage of the site, including the development of a monoculture woodland, loss of existing meadows to scrub encroachment and potential damage to rare and inherent species or orchid *Orchidaceae*.
- 1.3.2 It is understood that extensive thinning is proposed for the purpose of maintaining the quality of trees and to establish a functioning woodland habitat of varying cover and character. Thinning is also required around footpaths to increase ambient light ingress and to prevent waterlogging, whilst improving pedestrian access.
- 1.3.3 The plans also indicate re-routing the existing beck into the valley bottom, close to the car park, and the creation of new ponds across the southern and northern portions of the community woodland. It is further proposed that native wildflowers are introduced within the 'Secret Valley' to increase floristic diversity.



2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Overview

- 2.1.1 The biodiversity assessment was undertaken following guidance contained within CIRIA publication *Biodiversity Net Gain Good Practice Principals for Development*² and involved the following components:
 - A desk-based assessment using Multi Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) website³, to identify statutory protected nature conservation sites, such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), National Nature Reserves (NNRs) and Special Area of Conservation (SACs) occurring on or within significant proximity to the site.
 - The assessment also included a review of pre-existing ecological data for the works area, including the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) issued by Archer Ecology Ltd in September 2022⁴. The PEA contains the results of an ecological walkover survey completed on 26th and 27th July 2022 (see Appendix II), together with data on non-statutory designated sites and Priority Habitats.
 - Measuring habitat parcels on the ground, combined with the use of online measuring tools (including Google Maps Area Calculator Tool⁵) and a review of the proposed development works referred to within the general arrangement plans.
 - Identifying habitat distinctiveness and undertaking a condition assessment based upon the Natural England Joint Publications JP029 - Biodiversity Metric 3.1 Technical Supplement issued in 2022⁶ and other appropriate condition criteria.
 - Application of the biodiversity mitigation hierarchy.

² Baker, J., Hoskin, R. and Butterworth, T. (2019). *Biodiversity net gain - Good practice principles for development*. CIRIA

³ www.magic.gov.uk accessed December 2022

⁴ Archer Ecology Ltd (2022) *Walkmill Community Woodland, Whitehaven – Preliminary Ecological Appraisal_September 2022.* Archer Ecology Ltd (unpublished).

⁵ Google (2021) Daft Logic – Google Maps Area Calculator V6.20 [online]. Google. Available at: https://www.daftlogic.com/projects-google-maps-area-calculator-tool.htm [Accessed 5th December 2022].

⁶ Panks, S, White, N., Newsome, A., Nash M., Potter, J., Heydon, M., Mayhew, E., Alvarez M., Russell, T., Cashon C., Goddard, F., Scott, S.J., Heaver, M., Scott, S.H., Treweek, J., Butcher, B., and Stone, D.(2022). *Biodiversity metric 3.1: Auditing and accounting for biodiversity – User Guide.* Natural England.



- Identification of any irreplaceable habitats (with reference to Technical Note 3.1 of CIRIA guidelines) and/or invasive, non-native species occurring within the works footprint.
- An assessment of predicted direct and indirect impacts arising from the works, including habitat clearance, disturbance and retention. This would take into account any offset activities, where applicable.
- Inputting existing habitat data into the '*Biodiversity Metric 3.1 Auditing and accounting for biodiversity Calculation tool*', issued April 2022, in addition to data pertaining to predicted post-works habitat types and condition as a result of completing the scheme. This would be used to determine a biodiversity unit scoring.
- A review of changes in biodiversity units as a result of carrying out the works.
- 2.1.2 This Biodiversity Assessment was undertaken by Assistant Ecologist Abbie Smith BSc (Hons) a qualifying member of CIEEM of Archer Ecology Ltd who has experience undertaking and assisting with numerous Biodiversity Assessments.



3.0 RESULTS

3.1 Desk Based Assessment

3.1.1 The PEA included a search of statutory and non-statutory designated sites through consultation with Cumbria Biodiversity Data Centre (CBDC).

Statutory designated sites for nature conservation

- 3.1.2 The application site does not fall within the boundary of any nationally or internationally statutory designated sites. The PEA identified that three Special Area of Conservation (SACs) occurs within a 10km radius of the application site. No nationally designated sites for nature conservation occur within a 2km radius of the application site. The proposals are considered as falling outside of the potential zone of influence with respect to these statutory designated sites for nature conservation. Such designated sites are, therefore, not considered to be a potential receptor with respect to the proposed works.
- 3.1.3 Subsequently, the application site is considered as falling within an '*Area not identified in local strategy*' with respect to strategic significance.

Non-statutory designated sites for nature conservation

- 3.1.4 CBDC identified seven County Wildlife Sites (CWSs), five Sites of Invertebrate Significance (SIS) and one Local Geological Site (LGS) within a 2km radius of the application site. These non-statutory designated sites are considered to be of importance to nature conservation up to a local level.
- 3.1.5 Moresby SIS is located within Walkmill Community Woodland and Keekle, River SIS and is located >25m south of the study area. Given the distance between the SIS and the application site, and its invertebrate heritage (including marsh fritillary *Euphydryas aurinia*), interactions are expected between the two.
- 3.1.6 Subsequently, the application site is considered as falling within an '*Area identified within local strategy*' with respect to strategic significance.

Priority Habitats

3.1.7 A search using MAGIC identified an area of 'Good quality semi-improved grassland' at 5m beyond the western boundary of the site, along with 'Purple Moor Grass and Rush Pasture' at >300m west of the site periphery. Under the current proposals, it is understood



that these habitats will be fully retained. Subsequently, the application site is considered as falling within an 'Area not identified in local strategy' with respect to strategic significance.

3.2 Baseline Survey

3.2.1 An overview of all on-site habitats and predicted impacts is given in Table 1, below, which encompasses a total, combined footprint of 36ha.

Existing JNCC Habitat (Inspired Ecology Ltd, 2022)	Biodiversity Metrics calculator – Habitat equivalent (Crosher <i>et al.</i> , 2019)	Total area / length	Lost	Enhanced	Retained	
A1.1.2 – Broadleaved Woodland – Plantation	Woodland and forest – Other woodland; broadleaved	9.1743ha	0.19452ha	-	8.97978ha	
A2.2 – Scrub – scattered	Heathland and shrub – Mixed scrub	0.1221ha	-	-	0.1221ha	
J4.1 – Hardstanding	Urban – Developed land; sealed surface	0.8633ha	-	-	0.8633ha	
A1.2.2 – Coniferous woodland – plantation	Woodland and forest – Other coniferous woodland	0.082ha	-	-	0.082ha	
C3.1 – Tall ruderal	Sparsely vegetated land – Ruderal/Ephemeral	0.5311ha	0.0327ha	-	0.4984ha	
G1.2 – Standing water – Mesotrophic	Lakes – Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	0.0955ha	-	-	0.0955ha	
B5 – Marshy grassland	Wetland – Purple moor grass and rush pastures	2.5294ha	0.068ha	-	2.4614ha	

Table 1: Overview of Habitats and Predicted Impacts



Existing JNCC Habitat (Inspired Ecology Ltd, 2022)	Biodiversity Metrics calculator – Habitat equivalent (Crosher <i>et al.</i> , 2019)	Total area / length	Lost	Enhanced	Retained
C1.1 Bracken – continuous	Grassland – Bracken	0.2521ha	0.0661ha	-	0.186ha
A1.3.2 – Mixed woodland – plantation	Woodland and forest – Other woodland; mixed	16.4402ha	0.37149ha	-	16.06871ha
A2.1 – Srcub – Dense	Heathland and shrub – Mixed scrub	0.1622ha	-	-	0.1622ha
B2.2 – Neutral – semi-improved	Grassland – Other neutral grassland	5.7478ha	0.18629ha	1.7516ha	3.80911ha
G1.2 – Standing water - Mesotrophic	Ditches	0.0535km	-	-	0.0535km
G2.2 – Running water – Mesotrophic	Ditches	0.0691km	-	-	0.0691km
G1.3 – Standing water – oligotrophic	Ditches	0.0149km	-	-	0.0149km

3.2.2 No irreplaceable habitats were recorded within the works footprint.

3.3 Predicted Impacts and Compensation

- 3.3.1 With reference to the scheme description under Section 1.3 of this report, the site preparatory activities are expected to result in the thinning of trees, scrub and grassland maintenance including the removal of scrub and ruderal vegetation, together with a small area of heather being removed to accommodate a pond. A large expanse of neutral grassland is being enhanced with a meadow grassland mix, as reflected in Table 1.
- 3.3.2 In line with the proposed renovation interventions, described in Section 1.3 of this report, an overview of created habitats is given in Table 2, overleaf.



Created Habitat	Biodiversity Metrics calculator – Habitat equivalent (Crosher <i>et al</i> ., 2019)	Total area / length
Play area	Urban – Developed land; sealed surface	0.0016ha
Wetlands	Wetland – Reedbeds	0.23848ha
Seepage ponds	Ponds (Non-Priority Habitat)	0.00659ha
Online ponds	Ponds (Non-Priority Habitat)	0.32641ha
Offline ponds	Ponds (Non-Priority Habitat)	0.27682ha
Invert	Ditches	0.00059km
Channel Infill	Ditches	0.01567km
Ditch Cutting	Ditches	0.0358km
Ditch Blocking	Ditches	0.0822km
Cascade	Ditches	0.04082km
Bifurcating Channel	Ditches	0.04705km
New Sinuous Channel	Ditches	0.03046km
Hedgerow	Native Species Rich Hedgerow	0.1996km

Table 2: Overview of Habitat Creation

3.4 Pre-works and Post-works Comparison of Biodiversity Units

- 3.4.1 The information contained within Tables 1 and 2 was inputted into the Biodiversity Metric
 3.1 Calculation Tool, in addition to information pertaining to the condition, distinctiveness and ecological connectivity of each habitat to the wider landscape (see Appendix III).
- 3.4.2 The Biodiversity Metric 3.1 Calculation Tool was used to generate a pre-works and post-works comparison of biodiversity units as a result of the restoration proposals. The biodiversity calculator indicates a GAIN in habitat (area) biodiversity units of +11.13 units (+5.86% change) post-works which falls below the standard National biodiversity net gain expectations (i.e., +10%) mandated as part of the Environment Act 2021. There is also a GAIN expected in habitat (linear) biodiversity units for hedgerow units of +1.56 units (+100% change) and a GAIN in habitat (linear) biodiversity units for river units of +0.97 units (+177.27% change) post-works which exceeds the standard National biodiversity net gain expectations (i.e., +10%) mandated as part of the Environment Act 2021.



3.4.3 This outcome assumes that areas of compensatory planting have successfully established and that a plan of adequate, long-term management and monitoring is implemented to ensure longevity for up to 30 years.





Walkmill Community Woodland - Biodiversity Assessment_ January 2023

Archer



APPENDIX II – EXTENDED PHASE I HABITAT MAP



100 m







A1.1.2 - Broadleaved woodland - plantation A1.2.2 - Coniferous woodland - plantation woodland - plantation XX A2.1 - Scrub - dense B2.2 - Neutral grassland - semi-improved C3.1 - Other tall herb and fern - ruderal G1.2 - Standing water G1.3 - Standing water G2.2 - Running water 100 m 50

APPENDIX III – BIODIVERSITY CALCULATOR INPUT

Existing Habitats

		Habitats and areas		Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic sig	mificance			Ecological baseline		1	Retention o	ategory bio	liversity value		Bespoke
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Ārea (hectare	istinctiveness Sco		Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic Significance multiplier	Suggested action to addres habitat losses	Total habitat units	Ārea retaineo	Area enhanced	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Area habitat lost	Units lost	compensation agreed for unacceptable loss
1	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	9.1743	Medium	4	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no lo strategy	b Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	36.70	8.97978		35.92	0.00	0.19	0.78	
2	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.1221	Medium	4	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no lo strategy	o Low Strategic Significance	1	distinctiveness habitat required	0.49	0.1221		0.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	
3	Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.8633	V.Low	0	N/A - Other	0	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no lo strategy	b Low Strategic Significance	1	Compensation Not Required	0.00	0.8633		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
4	Woodland and forest	Other coniferous woodland	0.082	Low	2	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no lo strategy	o Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	0.16	0.082		0.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	
5	Sparsely vegetated land	Ruderal/Ephemeral	0.5311	Low	2	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no lo strategy	o Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	3.19	0.4984		2.99	0.00	0.03	0.20	
6	Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	0.0955	Medium	4	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no lo strategy	o Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	0.38	0.0955		0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	Wetland	Purple moor grass and rush pastures	2.5294	V.High	8	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no lo strategy	o Low Strategic Significance	1		59.07	2.4614		59.07	0.00	Unacceptable Loss	Alternative Compensation √	Yes
8	Grassland	Bracken	0.2521	Low	2	Condition Assessment N/A	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no lo strategy	o Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	0.50	0.186		0.37	0.00	0.07	0.13	
9	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	16.4402	Medium	4	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no lo strategy	o Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	65.76	16.06871		64.27	0.00	0.37	1.49	
10	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.1622	Medium	4	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no lo strategy	o Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	0.65	0.1622		0.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	
11	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	5.7478	Medium	4	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no lo strategy	o Low Strategic Significance	1	distinctiveness habitat required	22.99	3.80911	1.7516	15.24	7.01	0.19	0.75	

	Existing river type		Habitat distinc	tiveness	Habitat o	condition	Strategic sig		Watercourse encroachment		Riparian en	croachment	Our more than a	Ecological baseline		Rete	ntion category	y biodiversit	y value		
Baseline ref	River type	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier	Extent of encroachment Multiplier e		Extent of encroachment	Multiplier	action	Total river units	Length retained	Length enhanced	Units retaine	d ^{Units} enhanced	Length Lost	Units Lost
1	Ditches	0.0535	Medium	4	Poor	1	Low potential/action not identified in any plan	Low Strategic Significance	1	No Encroachment	1	No Encroachment	1	Restore	0.21	0.0535		0.21	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	Ditches	0.0691	Medium	4	Poor	1	Low potential/action not identified in any plan	Low Strategic Significance	1	No Encroachment	1	No Encroachment	1	Restore	0.28	0.0691		0.28	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	Ditches	0.0149	Medium	4	Poor	1	Low potential/action not identified in any plan	Low Strategic Significance	1	No Encroachment	1	No Encroachment	1	Restore	0.06	0.0149		0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00

Enhanced Habitats

					Baseline habi	tats				
Baseline re	f Baseline habitat	Total habitat area (hectares)	Baseline distinctiveness band	Baseline distinctiveness score	Baseline condition category	Baseline condition score	Baseline strategic significance catego	Baseline strategic significance score	Baseline habitat un	. Suggested action to address hat ts losses
11	Grassland - Other neutral grassland	5.7478	Medium	4	Poor	1	Low Strategic Significance	1	22.99	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)

Proposed Habitats

									Pos	t development/ pos	t intervention hab	itats									
			Distinct	liveness	Co	ndition	Strategic sign	nificance				Temporal multiplier				Difficulty multiplies	rs			Comments	
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Årea (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic Strategic significanceposition multiplie	c Standard time t target or condition/year	o Habitat created in advance/years	Delay in starting habitat creation/years	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to targe condition/years	Final time to target multiplie	Standard difficulty of creation	Applied difficulty multiplier	Final difficulty of creation	Difficulty multiplier applied	Habitat units delivered	Assessor comments	Reviewer comments
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.0016	V.Low	0	N/A - Other	r 0	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no k strategy	Low Strategic Significance	o	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	O	1.000	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Medium	0.67	0.00		
Wetland	Reedbeds	0.23848	High	6	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no k strategy	Low Strategic 1 Significance	12	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	12	0.652	Medium	Standard difficulty applied	Medium	0.67	1.88		
Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	0.00659	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no k strategy	b Low Strategic 1 Significance 1	3	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	3	0.899	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	0.05		
Lakes	Ponds (Non-Priority Habitat)	0.32641	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no k strategy	b Low Strategic 1 Significance 1	3	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	3	0.899	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	2.35		
Lakes	Ponds (Non-Priority Habitat)	0.27682	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no k strategy	b Low Strategic 1 Significance 1	3	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	3	0.899	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	1.99		

		Proposed habitats		Habitat distinctiveness		Habitat condition		Strategic significance					Te	mporal multiplier				Difficulty risk n	ultipliers		Hedge uni
Baseline ref	New hedg number	Habitat type	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic position multiplier	Standard Time to target condition/years	Habitat created in advance/years	Delay in starting habitat creation/years	Standard or adjusted time to targ	Final time to targe condition/years	Final time to target multiplie	Standard difficulty of creation	Applied difficullt multiplier	Final difficulty of creation	Difficulty multiplier applied	delivered
1		Native Species Rich Hedgerow	0.1996	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no lo strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	12	0	0	Standard time to target condition app	ilied 12	0.652	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	1.56

	Proposed habitats		Habitat disti	nctiveness	Habitat	condition	Strategio	c significance				Tempo	ral multiplier				Difficulty r	nultipliers		Watercourse e	ncroachmen	Riparian encr	oachment	
Baseline ref	River type	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significanc	Strategic e position multiplier	Standard Time to target condition/years	Habitat created i advance/years	Delay in starting habitat creation/years	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final Time to target multipli	Standard difficulty of creation	Applied difficullty multiplier	Final difficulty of creation	Difficulty multiplier applied	Extent of encroachment	Multiplier	Extent of encroachm	enfMultiplier	delivered
1	Ditches	0.00059	Medium	4	Poor	1	Low potential/action not identified i any plan	Low Strategic Significan	ice l	1	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	1	0.965	Low	Standard difficulty appli	ed Low	1	No Encroachment	1	No Encroachment	1	0.00
2	Ditches	0.01567	Medium	4	Poor	1	Low potential/action not identified is any plan	Low Strategic Significan	ice l	1	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	1	0.965	Low	Standard difficulty appli	ed Low	1	No Encroachment	1	No Encroachment	1	0.06
3	Ditches	0.0358	Medium	4	Poor	1	Low potential/action not identified is any plan	Low Strategic Significan	ice l	1	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	1	0.965	Low	Standard difficulty appli	ed Low	1	No Encroachment	1	No Encroachment	1	0.14
4	Ditches	0.0822	Medium	4	Poor	1	Low potential/action not identified is any plan	Low Strategic Significan	ice l	1	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	1	0.965	Low	Standard difficulty appli	ed Low	1	No Encroachment	1	No Encroachment	1	0.32
5	Ditches	0.04082	Medium	4	Poor	1	Low potential/action not identified is any plan	Low Strategic Significan	ice l	1	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	1	0.965	Low	Standard difficulty appli	ed Low	1	No Encroachment	1	No Encroachment	1	0.16
6	Ditches	0.04705	Medium	4	Poor	1	Low potential/action not identified is any plan	Low Strategic Significan	ice l	1	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	1	0.965	Low	Standard difficulty appli	ed Low	1	No Encroachment	1	No Encroachment	1	0.18
7	Ditches	0.03046	Medium	4	Poor	1	Low potential/action not identified is any plan	Low Strategic Significan	ice l	1	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	1	0.965	Low	Standard difficulty appli	ed Low	1	No Encroachment	1	No Encroachment	1	0.12

