

Response to representations for planning application APP/25/00162 and Listed Building Consent applications APP/25/00182 & APP/25/00179

Material Considerations:

1. Footpath closures & diversions during construction	2
2. Impact on Sailing Club	3
3. Impacts on parking during construction	4
4. Impacts on parking post-construction	5
5. Impacts on integrity of buildings	6
6. Impacts on residential amenity during construction	7
7. Impacts on residential amenity due to design	8
8. Impacts on visual amenity/heritage	10
9. Incorrect wave data	11
10. Ecology	15
11. Access post-completion	17
12. Drainage/Overtopping	18
13. Flagstones in Frontage 5	18
14. Flood risk during construction	19
15. Flood gate operation	19
16. Traffic Impacts of design	Error! Bookmark not defined.
17. Increasing flood risk elsewhere	20
18. Other	21

1. Footpath closures & diversions during construction

Please only put diversions in place when absolutely necessary and not throughout the whole two-year period. The footpaths and the Billy Line are important routes for many people.
Please provide a circular walk at the bottom of the fields that are to be used for plant/material storage. This would be easy to achieve with a bit of imagination. Dog walkers use the three fields on a daily basis; sometimes twice per day.
Please consider clearing the bank above the railway sleepers around the beach so that walkers can get from Wade Lane to Warblington Church when the tide is in.
In the documents there is a temporary diversion plan. It shows the intention to use Footpath No 49 Havant. This path has been severely eroded through the failure to remedy the breach in Footpath No 45 Havant and the route is the subject of a temporary closure order currently until 19 January 2026. Hampshire County Council have also made a decision to make a diversion order to re-route the path following close to the boundary of the industrial estate which will involve significant works of path construction. Depending on the timing of the proposed works in this application the diversion will have to follow the same route as the temporary closure order or the new route. The plan needs revising as there is no likelihood of the current Definitive Route ever being restored.
However, given the proposal is presented fully including delivery infrastructure I am forced to object to this significant and overly disruptive nature of the works to many residents and visitors who use this area. Specifically, I object to the use of "Langstone Meadows" (HCC owned fields north of the Royal Oak) as the main compound for the works, and the extra disruption this will bring to residents, dog walkers and visitors who will be already (Justifiably) suffering the loss of access to the coastal path. Langston Meadows are part of the Chichester AONB and used by 100's of people daily for exercise and recreation. They provide a safe and communal space for exercising pets and bring the community together. The council I believe should consider the land to the south of The Mallards for the compound. Access would be simpler either from the Mallards or directly from Langstone road. The site is significantly larger than the proposed compound, so any noisy elements could be kept to in areas away from residents, and I believe overall more separation could be achieved here.
Southmere Field is not suitable for storing construction vehicles, as it is Grade One agricultural land and used for hay production. The legal public access in Langstone Meadows is confined to the footpath between the gates and there are plenty of other footpaths, including the Billy Line., where people can walk their dogs. In the long term what matters is that the flood defences are erected without delay, and the meadows are protected from flooding.
We also object to the various footpath closures in an area much used by locals and visitors alike and access to the fields is also another way of escape for us.

Some footpaths will need to be temporarily closed, with diversions put in place, during the construction works. This is for safety reasons and will only be done when absolutely necessary. Individual footpaths will be re-opened as soon as it is safe to do so. The currently proposed closures and diversions are set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and Plan FD1RevA (Footpath Temporary Diversion Plan - Highways Diversion Plans). It is anticipated that a final version of this document will be secured by planning condition and assessed by the Local Planning Authority and the Highways Authority. The most appropriate diversions will be put forward, following discussions with the Highway Authority, but the suggestions from local residents will all be considered in this process. In addition to planning permission, all other necessary consents for closures and diversions will be sought from Hampshire County Council.

The area chosen for the main compound was given careful consideration. Other nearby sites were also considered but issues such as access, space, ecological constraints and landownership have been key considerations in determining the proposed location. It is anticipated that a final Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be secured via planning condition and the

contractor, once appointed, will feed into this directly. The current plans show the maximum extent of the compound space required but this is likely to be refined once a contractor is on board. The contractor will need to demonstrate that the impact on the community has been minimised in the design of the compound areas.

2. Impact on Sailing Club

The proposed compound shown on the "Access and Compound Plan AC1" is adjacent to the Sailing Club but is separated from it by an earth embankment (bund) which is part of the Sailing Club's own sea defences. Access to the satellite compound would necessitate the removal of a section of the bund, leaving the Sailing Club vulnerable to flooding. There is no mention in the proposal of the removal and reinstatement of the bund.
The "Site Clearance Plan" shows "general site clearance for compound in sailing club" of approximately 40m x 40m of club land. This area is used for boat storage in summer and winter. Moving the boats elsewhere would adversely affect Club activities. It should be noted that the only "empty" piece of land is soft grass, and not suitable for the storage of cruisers.
Access to the proposed compound via the entrance to the Sailing Club would use a strip of land used in the summers by members for car parking. Parking elsewhere would adversely affect Club activities and could result in members using the public car park to the south of the Ship Inn.
Use of the Club land for parking by customers of the Ship Inn. The yard is behind barriers which prevent public access. This is essential if we are to maintain a safe environment to conduct club activities. These include: (1) Sailing activities including the launch and recovery of small boats, and their storage on land. (2) Hoist operations to enable the launch and recovery of larger boats (cruisers), weighing up to 10 tonnes. (3) Junior and disabled sailing requiring an advanced degree of supervision and separation of vehicles and boats. (4) Club open-days and regattas when parking space is at a premium. (5) Long- and short-term parking for members cars.
The use of the sailing club yard would entail considerable rearrangement on our part as the whole yard is used year-round. We would have to make plans on where to store boats, rearrange our parking, and possibly change our events calendar. Not only will this be a cost to the club. We would also lose revenue if our storage capacity is reduced. Previously, when we allowed part of the yard to be used in connection with the laying of electricity cables to Hayling Island, sailing was significantly affected resulting in members leaving due to the disruption and joining neighbouring clubs, not to return on completion of the works.

Two satellite compounds - one north of the Sailing Club and one on the Quay adjacent to the Ship Inn Public House - have been proposed for consideration within the submitted planning documents as potential locations for contractor use. Once a contractor is appointed, they will assess whether they require the use of either of these areas.

Access to the satellite compound north of the sailing club via sailing club land is subject to further discussions with the club and the securing of any necessary permissions.

Further discussions have taken place with the Sailing Club to discuss the outline proposals and potential impact on their operations. As a result of these discussions, the plans and documents have been amended accordingly. This includes revising the proposed access route through the sailing club to a 5m easement. The Sailing Club has confirmed to us that these amendments make the proposals more acceptable to them but the final details will be subject to ongoing discussions once the requirements are fully understood.

3. Impacts on parking during construction

I am concerned about the serious impacts of the construction work on car parking and traffic movement in Langstone High Street. These impacts do not appear to have been adequately identified or addressed in the planning application documentation. It is particularly disappointing that the Environmental Statement (Chapter 3) includes no reference to traffic or parking issues in the High Street.

Most of the houses in the High Street have no off-street parking at all, and residents can already suffer significant difficulty in finding a parking place. It is especially difficult in the summer months when the 25 available spaces have to be shared with high numbers of walkers and pub users and staff.

The non-availability of the Ship car park and the proposed closure of spaces in the High Street to allow the overtaking of construction vehicles will significantly exacerbate this problem.

The Construction Traffic Management Plan states that the workforce will access frontages 4 and 5 via the High Street but appears not to recognise that many of the workers are likely to park their vehicles in the street and block the few available spaces throughout the working day. The estimated average movement of only one HGV and one car/van per day using the High Street would appear to be a serious underestimate.

The Traffic Management Plan suggests that the impact of the traffic and reduced parking in the street will be "moderate adverse without mitigation".

In order to avoid or mitigate the risk of these problems, I believe that urgent consideration should be given to either :

(a) the provision of alternative car parking during the period of construction. The use of any additional spaces should be reserved for affected residents without off-street provision. Possible areas for such parking could include the lay-by on Langstone Road, the Southmere hay field, or the grounds of Langstone Lodge. The latter two options would of course need to be by agreement with the owners.

and/or :

(b) the application of "residents only" restrictions to all parking spaces in Langstone High Street and the two adjoining cul-de-sacs.

Whichever approach is taken to ensure that residents' parking needs are met, there will inevitably be significant additional vehicle congestion in the street caused by pub-goers trying to find a place to park to visit both the Royal Oak and the Ship. This will result in vehicles being illegally parked as well as being left on grass verges and blocking access to properties.

The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and associated plans set out the current proposals for the temporary parking restrictions. This is based on the worst-case scenario and will be refined once a contractor is appointed and the precise construction phasing and methods are known. Any parking impacts will be minimised as much as possible and the full details of parking (and general highway) impacts and mitigation will be set out in a final CTMP, anticipated to be secured by planning condition. This will include (but not be limited to); control on access routes, timings of vehicular movements, parking areas, pedestrian walkways and diversions, access to the foreshore, storage and compound areas, interfaces with busy areas. The Contractor is to provide adequate parking for site-based personnel within the site boundary. No parking is allowed outside these areas, such as in nearby residential streets or public car parks, unless the Contractor enters into specific agreements with landowners and/or Authorities.

The Contractor shall adhere to the approved final CTMP throughout the duration of the construction period.

Emergency access to the foreshore is to be maintained throughout the works. The Contractor is to minimise impact to the community and businesses, especially the frontline residents and the two Public Houses. During the works there will be periods where vehicular access to the foreshore along Frontage 5 will not be available (i.e. during the replacement of the slipway at the end of Langstone High Street) however the Contractor is required to minimise this disturbance and liaise directly with affected residents. There may be some limitations to recreational use of slipways where works are taking place adjacent to these, and it is not possible to allow access due to safety reasons. The programme and detail for any closures or restrictions will be confirmed by the Contractor and advertised to the public in advance. These details will also be contained within the final CTMP.

The works at the Ship Inn will necessitate temporary closure of an area of the quay whilst the flood defences are being constructed, according to the programme defined by the contractor, and the area will be re-opened for public use as soon as it is safe to do so. Parking is not formalised on the Quay at the Ship Inn at present; however, we recognise that it is used for this purpose and that there will be displacement of parked vehicles during the period the area is closed.

Prior notice of closures in relation to the proposed works will be advertised and any necessary consents gained.

4. Impacts on parking post-construction

The slight reduction in the length of the High Street at its seaward end will bring parked cars back closer to the entrance drives 5 residential properties. Although this area and most of the south side of the road is covered by parking restrictions this is not enforced and therefore is constantly ignored. Both car and lorries often block access to properties and sometimes the foreshore. There is no turning circle. The combination of these factors and poor skill of some drivers cause not merely a nuisance but also danger. The danger will be increased as pedestrians will be funnelled by the barriers to a route that will often put them in conflict with these vehicles. This issue needs to be addressed by consideration of access and parking restrictions properly enforced and minor changes in road design.

I am in full support of the proposed scheme and am grateful for all the work of Coastal Partners have put in. However, My concern is the adequate provision of parking and access for local residents and visitors to the area post construction of the scheme. I understand that Fullers Brewery would like to take on the management of parking on the quay and area surrounding the Ship Inn. Although neighbouring residents have been reassured that there will be provision for a number of spaces for personal use I would like to highlight the following points: Currently this car parking area provides parking for number of different users: Patrons of The Ship Inn & The Royal Oak. Both these public houses are an intrinsic part of the local community and the cultural fabric of Langstone Village. Many people park here and walk along the coast path to visit the Royal Oak. In particular, loss of parking will have a detrimental effect on The Royal Oak Pub, the 'historic flagship' of the local borough and wider local community. Havant Youth Sail Training Scheme. Parents and volunteers use the car park to access the sailing centre, dropping off and collecting children using this facility and volunteers providing sailing instruction and support. removal of parking will greatly impede this. Access to the private parking areas for 3,4 & 5 Coastguard Cottages. Parking for local residents who don't have private parking provision. 1,2,6,7,& 8 Coastguard Cottages & The Lookout. Access for vehicles with trailers to launch small sailing craft from the public slipways. Local residents and visitors parking to access the coastal paths in both directions but who don't make use the Pubs. Although reassurances have been given verbally by the current management that there will be provision of parking allocation for local residents, my concern is if Fullers Brewery takes over the control of the parking surrounding The Ship Inn many of the above stakeholders will be excluded at some point in time when the current management changes. At

present there are some vehicles left there for longer periods, with evidence of car sharing by trades people and overnight camper vans staying on the quay but this has gone on for many years and has never caused a particular issue. In our experience the car park is only full at peak times, usually weekend lunchtime for a few hours and there is always movement of vehicles coming and going and spaces quickly come available.

It is not envisaged that the location of the new flood gate will affect parking provision, as it will be situated within the area already covered by existing double yellow line restrictions.

We do not have jurisdiction over the enforcement of existing parking restrictions for all highway/street issues as this falls under the control of Hampshire County Council. Any issue regarding enforcement of existing parking restrictions to the seaward end of Langstone High Street can be directed to the parking team at Hampshire County Council website www.hants.gov.uk, email parking.services@hants.gov.uk.

5. Impacts on integrity of buildings

the applicant should also be encouraged to submit its proposal for using proven alternative methods of construction, known to be both minimally invasive and substantially less risky to the setting and safety of heritage assets.

Our properties are early 15th century and have no foundations and we fear they would be at risk from the construction techniques specified. The Royal Oak is listed in the planning application as being at risk from vibrations but there is no reference to numbers 16, 17 and 18 Langstone High Street (Grade 2 listed) or number 15. We would like to know what pre- and post-construction surveys will be undertaken on individual properties; what mitigations will be in place to ensure no damage is done to the properties; and what, if any, insurance against damage will be offered pre- and post-construction. We would like assurances that if any damage emerges during construction, work will cease immediately and damage rectified. We would also like to understand what the implications would be for any damage pre- or post-construction should the construction company or any insurer cease trading.

Unacceptable high levels of disruption, damage & risk to safety of and curtilages from proposed sheet-piling methods

Planning application includes pile driving (either vibration or pressure) less than 2 meters from above properties which both have foundations that are unknown. Residents should not be exposed to a construction site that is likely to cause extreme stress. A risk assessment and action plan has not been put in place.

It is anticipated that there will be robust planning conditions on any approval requiring detailed method statements and associated mitigation measures for all buildings and structures, with particular emphasis on the historic properties. The contractor will be required to adopt the most appropriate construction methods, including those that will have the least impact on adjacent structures, to ensure these sensitivities are fully addressed.

Appropriate RICS pre-and post- works Schedule of Conditions surveys will be undertaken for properties that are within 10m of the works involving sheet piling, or Grade II listed and within 20m of the works (subject to landowner agreement). Properties which are to expect pre- and post- works Schedule of Conditions surveys will be contacted directly in due course.

Vibration and noise levels will be strictly controlled throughout the works. A Vibration and Noise Management Plan will be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval, and real-time on-site

monitoring with defined trigger levels will be in place during the works. If trigger levels are reached, all works will cease and the works methodology will be reviewed by the contractor before works are allowed to continue.

If in the unlikely event that any damage occurs, HBC will instruct the contractor to reinstate the affected area to its pre-works condition. This will be a contractual requirement between HBC and the construction contractor. Should the contractor fail to undertake the necessary remedial works, HBC can undertake the works directly and recover the associated costs. HBC will remain responsible for the contractors actions while construction works are being carried out.

Intervention in the form of this flood and erosion risk management scheme will serve to protect heritage assets in Langstone more than doing nothing – a scenario where heritage features would be adversely affected or lost to erosion and flooding. Historic buildings and structures were often built to last but are unlikely to have considered rising sea levels and ability to withstand more frequent wetting and drying (especially of timber structures). A flood risk reduction scheme will help to preserve and extend the life of these features.

6. Impacts on residential amenity during construction

I am concerned about the main compound being situated in Langstone meadows. The new access road through the meadows will disrupt and potentially damage this important social space for residents and visitors. It will also significantly intrude on the properties that border the meadows. There will be noise, privacy and security issues. Can you please advise how close the access road and main compound will be to the nearest properties? Will the internal workings of the compound be completely blocked/boarded from sight? Will working hours be limited to minimise noise disruption for residents and work only take place on week days? Will the access road be fenced/boarded for privacy to adjoining properties? What will be the purpose for the main compound i.e. machinery/supplies storage?

Unacceptably high levels of disruption caused by excessive & protracted exposure to noise & vibration at F4.

No security & safeguarding planning at F4

The currently submitted Outline CEMP proposes the purpose of the main compound and sets out the maximum extent of the area to be used. This will be refined once a contractor is on board and they will feed into the final CEMP with their precise requirements. They will be required to design the compound layout and access road to minimise any impact on adjacent properties. Any proposed compound buildings will be sited and designed to protect privacy and hoarding will be placed in appropriate locations. It is anticipated that a final CEMP will be secured by planning condition and submitted for approval by the LPA and relevant consultees.

The Contractor shall not compromise the privacy of nearby residential properties during the works and will seek to minimise all impacts on amenity. Good public and stakeholder communication, and a focus on limiting disruption to local residents and businesses will remain a key ethos throughout delivery of the project. Any issues and enquiries in relation to the construction works can be reported to the Contractor's Public Liaison Officer who will provide and publish their contact details (email, phone) when appointed. Coastal Partners staff will also have a presence on site during the works. The Contractor will lead on management of any issues or complaints which may arise during

construction, as raised by the public (residents, businesses, visitors etc.) and will be responsible for arranging meetings as necessary to resolve issues, ideally at a mutually convenient and appropriate location.

A noise assessment has been submitted with the application and deemed acceptable by Environmental Health in terms of the process followed. Restricted working hours will also be in place. A final CEMP is anticipated to be secured by planning condition, to include a Vibration and Noise Management Plan, and this will set out the final construction methods, phasing and mitigation proposed. No works will commence until the LPA, in conjunction with the relevant consultees, is satisfied. All construction will be carried out in accordance the final CEMP. The final CEMP will also cover in detail how the site will be secured.

7. Impacts on residential amenity due to design

1. The flood gates at Langstone High Street will be some metres west of the present barrier with each gate secured when open against the barrier wall. This will be their position except when a flood is anticipated. The wall, unless designed to prevent it, will become a perch for people to sit or stand on. Currently people congregate around the current barrier, sit on the quay and stand on the posts. Under the new scheme such activity will become more focussed as the area of opportunity will be reduced and closer to some of the homes., more visible and more intrusive.. The distance can be less than 2 metres from residents windows and at window height. Although, some may feel that this is no more than a minor irritant, and visitors pleasure should be tolerated it is to be born in mind that its impact for the residents is 24/7 365 days a year.

The shaping of the top of the wall could readily prevent or at least reduce it to an acceptable level.

At present the quay edge becomes a seating area but this will not be possible as the planned glazed barrier will prevent this. It is not likely that peoples desire to sit in this vicinity will cease when the defences are complete. It will almost certainly be displaced to the wall, if its design permits it.

2. The slight reduction in the length of the High Street at its seaward end will bring parked cars back closer to the entrance drives 5 residential properties. Although this area and most of the south side of the road is covered by parking restrictions this is not enforced and therefore is constantly ignored. Both car and lorries often block access to properties and sometimes the foreshore. There is no turning circle. The combination of these factors and poor skill of some drivers cause not merely a nuisance but also danger. The danger will be increased as pedestrians will be funnelled by the barriers to a route that will often put them in conflict with these vehicles. This issue needs to be addressed by consideration of access and parking restrictions properly enforced and minor changes in road design.

3. Some of the vehicles and often the largest service the Royal Oak public house are far to large and cannot manoeuvre safely in the road reversing for an excessive distance. It is understood that at some point it was considered that the pub should be serviced from gates inserted on the quay opposite the pub. This proposal appears been dropped. Vehicles will presently stop in Langstone High Street unload onto the pavement whence their load will be transported to the pub. This will cause excessive noise, block access drives and possibly damage the quay surface. Whilst the idea of the gates opposite the pub remains the best option, the northern gate is approximately twice as close to the pub as those to the west with next to no nuisance to residents or road users.

We have concerns about the flood wall against which the flood gates will open, at the end of the High Street. This wall will not be glass topped and will extend some 10 feet up the High Street; we have concerns that it could / will provide a seating area for people (who, pre-construction, would sit on the quay wall). Not only would this mean people sitting directly outside the kitchen window of the property adjacent to this section of the wall, it would also imply safety issues. We would like assurances that steps will be taken to deter people from sitting on top of this section of the wall.

The planning application does not appear to take account of deliveries to the Royal Oak pub which are currently made by lorries parking in front of the pub on the foreshore. It appears that deliveries post-wall construction will have to be made on trolleys from vehicles parked at the foreshore end of the High Street. We have concerns that this would cause significant and frequent vibrations and noise, due to the uneven surface of the flagstones, which could affect the properties from 15-18 Langstone High Street and the Royal Oak. We would like assurances that mitigations to reduce vibrations will be considered and implemented or consideration given to a new gate to be inserted where the wall ends by the Mill, so that deliveries can be unloaded there, causing no vibrations to properties.

No additional seating proposed as part of the flood defences. The Royal Oak public house provides seating adjacent to the pub, which under the proposals would benefit from flood defences, and a reduction in occurrence of flooding. Views across the harbour are preserved through integration of a glass top in the proposed flood and erosion defences at the request of local residents and businesses during the pre-app engagement process.

With reference to concerns about sitting on the wall around the Royal Oak where the wall is not topped with flood glass, please refer to drawing LANG-ACM-ZZ-F5-DR-ZZ-051504 (FRONTAGE 5 TYPICAL DETAILS SHEET 1 HIGH STREET AND ROYAL OAK). Cross section J shows the typical detail of the wall between chainage 10- 14 AND 58-94 (i.e. the sections of concern), to include cobbles bedded into concrete on the top surface of the wall, which we hope will discourage sitting on top of the wall along frontage 5.

The surface of the quay pavement from Langstone High Street, along Frontage 5 around the Royal Oak is currently surfaced with flagstones and provides a relatively uneven but level surface. The clearance plans for this frontage show an area of this pavement to be broken out to enable the construction of the flood defences, and to be reinstated upon completion. The landscaping plan for this frontage states that existing footpath paving slabs will be used for reinstatement, supplemented with additional 'marshals silver limestone paving slabs or similar approved' to be agreed on site (i.e. is dependent on the condition of slabs removed which are suitable for reinstatement). New paving slabs provide the opportunity for a more even and level surface which should reduce noise disruption from deliveries. This detail will be discussed and proposed as part of the discharge of conditions stage where we anticipate a condition requiring details of all materials.

We understand that deliveries to the pub already occur and have understood residents' concerns that these are at times disruptive. Complaints about deliveries to the public house will need to be forwarded directly to the business as we do not have control over this.

For all highway/street issues, including enforcement of existing parking restrictions to the seaward end of Langstone High Street, please refer any enquiry onto the Parking Team at Hampshire County Council website www.hants.gov.uk email parking.services@hants.gov.uk who will be in a position to assist, as required. We recognise that there are double yellow lines which extend to the location of the proposed flood gates which will remain unchanged under the plans. Gates will only be closed in anticipation of flood events.

Based on assessment of topographic data the reduction in flood gate height is relatively minimal. The assessment also considered impact on adjacent properties and buried services within the design footprint.

We feel the proposed position is the best design considering the constraints. Whilst the gate height needs to remain as proposed, the gates will typically be stored in the open position reducing visual impact of the closed gates which, when closed, will prevent tidal flooding of the High Street. When the gates are open there will not be an impact on vehicular use of the foreshore.

8. Impacts on visual amenity/heritage

While I can appreciate some work needs to be completed for cycleways and for sea defence, this should be adjacent to the field by the end of Wade Court footpath, it seems this has gone completely overboard with railings and clear panel frontage. This will completely spoil an unspoilt historic area. The Royal Oak has a beautiful view out to sea and many enjoy sitting on the wall with feet dangling at high tide. The clear panelling will get dirty and age very quickly giving it a terrible look. The railings are totally unnecessary and just spoil the open aspect of a lovely walkway. I also see steps that are going to be a hazard for dog walkers, elderly and disabled.

The disruption to the area will be enormous and for this and reasons above I strongly object to this desecration of a naturally beautiful iconic part of Havant.

The applicant is proposing putting ugly glass screens across the front of the Royal Oak Pub in Langstone, Havant. These will destroy a historic view. People often sit on the sea wall to drink. The glass screens will become dirty and may be prone to vandalism. It would only take one mischief maker to smash a screen at night with a sledge hammer, during a storm tide, and mass flooding would occur. The information about the glass screens seems to be as hidden as possible and was only highlighted in the Hayling Herald. Coastal Partners seem to be sheepish about revealing this. This may well devalue the properties in the area.

Minimising (and/or enhancing) impact to existing setting of listed buildings at F4

In addition the new sea wall proposed was agreed on condition that it would be exactly the same height as the existing historic wall and that there would be no ledge. Both of these agreements have now been ignored by CP and add to Historic England's comments that the walls look too industrial

The scheme's objective is to protect buildings and infrastructure from coastal flooding and erosion and the design has evolved to take full account of the character and appearance of the setting. The flood walls and glazed screens will reduce flood risk to the local public houses whilst maintaining the existing views out to the harbour. At present both businesses are susceptible to tidal flooding.

Future maintenance of newly constructed structures will be arranged as necessary by Havant Borough Council. Maintenance has been a key design consideration, with materials selected in liaison with asset owners, showing preference for readily available materials which will make repairs easier, and also materials which are resilient to the marine environment.

The flood glass manufacturer and supplier will be identified through tendering for a Contractor to build the Scheme. Once identified, we can confirm what the flood glass will look and feel like alongside any maintenance requirements, but the principle will be that the toughened flood glass panel frames are likely to be supported by stainless steel frames. Havant Borough Council will be responsible for organising maintenance of the flood defences once constructed.

The steps mentioned here appear to refer to the emergency access/egress steps adjacent to the Royal Oak pub garden which have been incorporated into the design as an alternative escape route for adjacent residents in the event of an emergency at high tide. Situated adjacent to the emergency steps is a pedestrian flood gate which is designed to be accessible i.e. use of the steps is only required during a significant flood event. Flood gates will only be closed in anticipation of a flood event.

The railings are a requirement under current safety guidelines and will remove the hazardous drop to the foreshore and demark the edge of the footpath during a flood.

The height of the flint wall along Frontage 4 has been amended on the plans to show it to match the height of the existing wall and the technical feasibility of this additional height is being considered.

The design has evolved taking full account of the heritage features present and detailed discussions have been held with the Conservation officer and Historic England, neither of whom have raised any objection to the proposal. Material choices have been provided but it is anticipated that the final materials will be secured via planning condition, in consultation with the relevant consultees.

9. Incorrect wave data

1. The Wave Risk to Langstone has been incorrectly assessed.

The choice of Southerly Wave direction representing the greatest risk to wave height in Langstone is based on information contained in:

Langstone FCERM Scheme Environmental Scoping Report - Appendix G EL Coastal Processes Study January 2019 Revision 4.0

"The North Portsea Island CFERM Scheme included some modelling to establish wave conditions under a 1 in 200 year event in Langstone Harbour (RHDHV, 2014). The results show that the worst-case waves for the Langstone Scheme are under a southerly wind direction and are shown below (Figure 3.2). The maximum significant wave heights at the site of the scheme are in the range of 0.5-0.75m high. It should be noted that the study shows wave heights within the north of the harbour reaching up to 0.9m in height."

The source data for wave direction was the wave rose diagrams in Figure 3.1 of the report "East Solent SMP (HR Wallingford, 1997)" ESR Revision 4.0 has based the risk on the wave rose on location 10 (adjacent to Kendal Wharf / Tudor Sailing Club). The risk should have been assessed based on wave rose location 9 at North Lake which shows the waves are from a South-westerly direction.

As the modelled data has been produced using the incorrect wave direction, it shows that in Southerly conditions, Langstone is sheltered by the North of Hayling, and this creates the impression that waves do not represent a major risk. THIS IS WRONG!

Langstone Harbour, in a South Westerly direction, has the third longest fetch of any harbour on the South coast (only Poole and Plymouth have longer). The 3.2 mile fetch provides the opportunity for waves to attain a damaging significant wave height and means that overtopping is a very real possibility, this risk will increase as the spit at Langstone erodes.

Objection point 1 IN SUMMARY

THE RISK TO LANGSTONE HAS BEEN BASED ON REHASHED DATA FROM 2014 THAT WAS GENERATED TO ASSESS THE RISK FOR PORTSMOUTH. THE REPORT HAS FAILED TO CORRECTLY IDENTIFY THE REAL RISK TO LANGSTONE AND THE A2032

The objection refers mainly to the Coastal Processes Study (2019) which was included as an appendix to the Environmental Scoping Report (Appendix G). This is also submitted as Appendix J1 to the Environmental Statement as part of this planning application. At the time of this study the project was at outline design.

Further relevant documentation has since been developed, and is also submitted as Appendix J2, J3, and J5 to the Environmental statement as part of the planning application:

- J2 - Technical Note on Extremes & SLR (August 2020)
- J3 - Modelling Narrative Note (December 2020)
- J5 - Langstone Overtopping Assessment (June 2022)

"The North Portsea Island CFERM Scheme included some modelling to establish wave conditions under a 1 in 200 year event in Langstone Harbour (RHDHV, 2014). The results show that the worst-case waves for the Langstone Scheme are under a southerly wind direction and are shown below (Figure 3.2). The maximum significant wave heights at the site of the scheme are in the range of 0.5-0.75m high. It should be noted that the study shows wave heights within the north of the harbour reaching up to 0.9m in height."

The source data for wave direction was the wave rose diagrams in Figure 3.1 of the report "East Solent SMP (HR Wallingford, 1997)" ESR Revision 4.0 has based the risk on the wave rose on location 10 (adjacent to Kendal Wharf / Tudor Sailing Club). The risk should have been assessed based on wave rose location 9 at North Lake which shows the waves are from a South-westerly direction.

Section 3.1.1 of the Coastal Processes Report discusses two sets of data available at the time of writing. It references one data set (1997) acknowledging that the predominant wind (at West Langstone) is from the south-west/west. It also references another data set (2014) which show that the worst-case waves for the Langstone Scheme are under a southerly wind direction (i.e. not that this is the dominant wind/wave fetch location for Langstone). This is because southerly waves are able to penetrate relatively unhindered through the mouth of Langstone Harbour and could potentially therefore reach a higher wave height in Langstone Harbour at the west side of Langstone (compared SW waves which have a limited fetch within the harbour).

Section 3.1.1 also confirms that it can be assumed that wave heights and energy are low due to the extremely sheltered nature: the narrow harbour entrances restrict waves and the fetch is limited. A shallow harbour means that waves are depth limited near the shore. The main threat of flooding in this area is from still water level overtopping rather than wave overtopping.

The source data for wave direction was the wave rose diagrams in Figure 3.1 of the report "East Solent SMP (HR Wallingford, 1997)" ESR Revision 4.0 has based the risk on the wave rose on location 10 (adjacent to Kendal Wharf / Tudor Sailing Club). The risk should have been assessed based on wave rose location 9 at North Lake which shows the waves are from a South-westerly direction.

The source data is in fact based on wave rose location 9 which is indeed confirmed to have a dominance of south-westerly fetch at Langstone. It does not suggest that the dominant fetch is from the south or any assessment of location 10.

Section 2.4 of Appendix J5 (Overtopping Assessment) also acknowledges the longest fetch length influencing the west side of Langstone to be South West, and the longest fetch length influencing the east side of Langstone to be the East.

As the modelled data has been produced using the incorrect wave direction, it shows that in Southerly conditions, Langstone is sheltered by the North of Hayling, and this creates the impression that waves do not represent a major risk. THIS IS WRONG! Langstone Harbour, in a South Westerly direction, has the third longest fetch of any harbour on the South coast (only Poole and Plymouth have longer). The 3.2 mile fetch provides the opportunity for waves to attain a damaging significant wave height and means that overtopping is a very real possibility, this risk will increase as the spit at Langstone erodes.

Section 3.4.2 of Appendix J3 - Modelling Narrative Note (December 2020) helps to illustrate the approach taken by the designer to the influence of waves:

Anecdotal evidence from historic flood events suggests that the western side of the frontage (i.e. the side to the west of Langstone Spit) experiences larger waves during flood events than the eastern side (the side to the east of Langstone Spit). This can be explained by the wind and wave climate at the site. Generally, the peak of a storm surge occurs as the lowest atmospheric pressure is overhead or close by. During historic flood events, to produce larger waves on the western side of the frontage the peak of the surge would have coincided with a wind direction from the south-west / west. As outlined in the Coastal Processes Report (ESCP, 2018), this is the predominant wind direction for the study area and therefore would be expected.

For the leading defence alignment(s), the proposed defences on the western side of the frontage are setback, located at the top of the beach and along the public footpath. Being setback, these defences would be more sheltered than a frontline solution and depth limiting factors, and wave breaking over the foreshore would be expected to reduce the incoming wave height impacting on these structures. With winds coming from the southwest / west, the defences on the eastern side of the frontage would be sheltered by Langstone Spit.

Whilst the predominant wind direction at the site is from the south-west / west, there remains a possibility that a more modest surge event could coincide with winds from the south east. This could expose the defences on the eastern side of the frontage to more significant wave action. However, given the south-west / west predominant wind direction, this situation is likely to occur less frequently. Furthermore, due to the coastline position of Hayling Island to the south of the study site, there is less fetch distance available in Chichester Harbour to the east of the study site for waves to be generated.

Although strong winds from the south-east could lead to some visible wave overtopping, it is the flooding arising from tidal inundation which has the potential to impact a greater number of properties and bring deeper flooding to a wider area in Langstone. Therefore, it is this risk from tidal inundation which underpins the case for investment in new flood defences in the study area.

A freeboard (or uncertainty allowance) was added to the design water level to determine the design crest level of the defences. For frontline defences, a freeboard of 0.3m was applied, whereas for setback defences a freeboard of 0.1m was applied. The freeboard was applied to help mitigate uncertainty in still water levels and to a limited extent the potential wave action that may occur in extreme events.

The residual risk of the overtopping remains even with the freeboard in place. Therefore, the overtopping risk was assessed at the detailed design stage (Appendix J5) to inform the drainage design

for the scheme. It should be noted that there is no intention nor appetite from the residents to further increase the flood defence level due to landscape and visual impacts i.e. to fully reduce overtopping risk the defences would need to be constructed to a level which is unacceptably and obstructively high and therefore unlikely to obtain the relevant consents.

Risk will increase as the spit at Langstone erodes.

Erosion of Langstone Spit is explored within the Coastal Processes Report (Appendix J1, 2019) using data available at the time of writing. It concludes that over the next 100 years, it is likely that a substantial portion of the Langstone Spit will erode (with highest rates of erosion noted at the distal tip of the spit). This may leave the Langstone Sailing Club and the northern section of the Langstone Road bridge vulnerable to the effects of the waves and rising sea levels across Langstone Harbour.

It must be noted that in acknowledgement of this erosion risk, detailed designs have been prepared for erosion protection to the distal tip of the spit, to target the area of erosion. Due to the current rules in place which determine how much Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA) funding a project can be eligible for, we have not been able to make an affordable case to proceed to the next stage of licencing and consenting or to construction for this frontage (F6 – Langstone Spit), without securing further investment and private contributions. Therefore, it does not form part of this proposal.

The leading design solution for Langstone Spit remains unchanged from rock armouring for the 50m section at the end of the spit, proposed to reduce erosion of the end of the Spit, helping with stabilisation. Granite rock was specified given its higher density and therefore lower required rock-armour size which in turn reduces the amount of encroachment into the designated foreshore. This proposal will need further consideration in terms of whether it is likely to gain the necessary consents and will require environmental impact assessment. Detailed designs are prepared in the event that funding and consents can be secured in the future.

THE RISK TO LANGSTONE HAS BEEN BASED ON REHASHED DATA FROM 2014 THAT WAS GENERATED TO ASSESS THE RISK FOR PORTSMOUTH. THE REPORT HAS FAILED TO CORRECTLY IDENTIFY THE REAL RISK TO LANGSTONE AND THE A2032.

Please refer to the response which confirm this is not the case.

10. Ecology

2. Undervaluation of Ecological Significance

Under valuation of ecological significance

The saltmarsh located in the creek between Langstone Spit and the sailing club has been significantly undervalued in the planning application. This area is designated as a "Priority Habitat Inventory - Coastal Saltmarsh (England)" by DEFRA, highlighting its national importance. The application fails to recognize the vital ecological functions this habitat provides, including carbon sequestration, water filtration, and serving as a nursery for marine life.

3. Missed Opportunity for Proactive Habitat Protection

The planning application overlooks the cost-effectiveness of proactive habitat protection. Investing in the preservation of existing saltmarshes is more economical than addressing the consequences of their loss, which can include increased flood risk and the need for costly restoration projects. The application should prioritize measures that protect and enhance this habitat, aligning with sustainable coastal management practices.

4. Vulnerability of Langstone Spit

Over the past 50 years, the crest of Langstone Spit, particularly to the west of the Ship Inn, has narrowed to less than 1 meter in width. With rising sea levels, there is a significant risk that these narrow points could breach within the next decade. Such breaches would allow shingle from the beach to wash into the creek, leading to the irreversible loss of the saltmarsh habitat.

5. Inaccurate Assessment in Environmental Scoping

The Langstone Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) Scheme Environmental Scoping Report has failed to accurately assess the extent and ecological value of the saltmarsh within the creek. Digitization of the area reveals approximately 2,768 square meters of saltmarsh, constituting 16.5% of the total remaining saltmarsh in the study area. Despite an overall 92% decline in saltmarsh area between 1946 and 2016, the saltmarsh in the creek has increased and remains the healthiest in Langstone Harbour.

6. Keystone Habitat Role

The creek saltmarsh serves as a keystone habitat due to its high quality and biodiversity. It supports a variety of plant species and provides critical resources for numerous invertebrates and bird species. Protecting this area is essential for maintaining the ecological integrity of Langstone Harbour and ensuring the survival of its diverse wildlife.

7. Legal and Policy Considerations

Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, public authorities are required to conserve biodiversity. The planning application does not adequately demonstrate that the proposed development will conserve this valuable saltmarsh habitat. The application should be reconsidered to prioritize habitat protection.

The submitted Environmental Statement, specifically Chapter 8 (Marine Ecology) sets out the baseline ecological conditions, including those related to saltmarsh. This acknowledges the importance of saltmarsh and its status as a Priority habitat. A full intertidal survey was also carried out in 2021 – see Appendix L2 of the ES.

During the design evolution of the scheme, several design changes were implemented to reduce the impact on the saltmarsh in Frontage 2, including the proposed realignment of the footpath, resulting in further reduction in foreshore encroachment (to zero so complete avoidance of this impact on this frontage with the revised design). This realignment now allows for future rollback and potential for increased saltmarsh colonisation.

As per other chapters, Chapter 8 (Marine Ecology) assesses the impact of the scheme (during construction and post-construction) on the saltmarsh habitat and states that

Direct disturbance of the intertidal habitats within the Scheme works area will occur during the construction works as a result of activities such as heavy plant movements on the foreshore, excavation of sediments for foundation preparation, breaking out of the existing defences, piling and installation of the new defence structures. This impact will occur on the Chichester Harbour side of the proposed Scheme area, in Frontages 3, 4 and 5 (Ship Inn to No.21 High Street) where marine works are proposed. There will be no disturbance impacts on intertidal habitats in Langstone Harbour during the construction of Frontages 1A and 2, or in Chichester Harbour during the construction of the landward sections of Frontage 5, as these works are either set back from the foreshore or can all be completed from the landward side of the works area.

Any impact of disturbance on the intertidal habitat (within Chichester Harbour) will be temporary and confined to the immediate area of construction.

Whilst the scheme has avoided any direct impacts on saltmarsh, alongside the flood defence scheme we are exploring potential saltmarsh restoration. This is separate to the planning application currently being considered and the necessary funding is being sought. More information can be found here: <https://coastalpartners.org.uk/project/intertidal-surveys-adjacent-to-langstone-village/>

The Scoping Report referred to has been submitted for completeness, but the submitted Environmental Statement, that builds on this report, supports the proposal and planning application.

Regarding the vulnerability of Langstone Spit, erosion is explored within the Coastal Processes Report (Appendix J1, 2019) using data available at the time of writing. It concludes that over the next 100 years, it is likely that a substantial portion of the Langstone Spit will erode (with highest rates of erosion noted at the distal tip of the spit). This may leave the Langstone Sailing Club and the northern section of the Langstone Road bridge vulnerable to the effects of the waves and rising sea levels across Langstone Harbour.

It must be noted that in acknowledgement of this erosion risk, detailed designs have been prepared for erosion protection to the distal tip of the spit, to target the area of erosion. Due to the current rules in place which determine how much Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA) funding a project can be eligible for, we have not been able to make an affordable case to proceed to the next stage of licencing and consenting or to construction for this frontage (F6 – Langstone Spit), without securing further investment and private contributions. Therefore, it does not form part of this proposal.

11. Access post-completion

I would also like reassurance on access to these cottages during the building work as the quay is the only means of access.
The planning application suggests that the footpath from the end of the High Street to the Mill will be closed for a number of months during construction; this would imply restricted access to our properties, which open directly onto the footpath, and we would like assurances we will have uninterrupted access to our homes during this period. Works to the footpath adjacent to numbers 16, 17, 18 and the Royal Oak:
We have constantly reminded Coastal Partners that we require access at low tides along the foreshore by car and at high tides along the quay 24/7 to allow escape in the event of a fire. The proposed gate at the end the High Street must NOT be closed until cars have been moved
The scheme will also restrict/reduce rather than enhance (versus existing) water/beach access for water-based activities, instead introducing 'choke' points for launching and recovery. Users will likely be 'discouraged' versus 'encouraged' to participate in these activities. Furthermore, rescue services' access will be substantially restricted/denied when called upon to effect (particularly) rescue of casualties often immobilised by the dangerous mud conditions within the Harbour

Access to properties is a key consideration in the construction of this scheme, and once a contractor is appointed, they will feed directly into the production of the final CEMP and CTMP documents. We will minimise impact to the community and businesses as much as is practically possible, especially the frontline residents and the two Public Houses who will be most directly affected. During the works there will be periods where temporary, short-term vehicle access restrictions to the foreshore will be unavoidable along Frontage 5 (i.e. during the replacement of the slipway at the end of Langstone High Street) however the Contractor is required to minimise this disturbance and liaise directly with affected residents. Pedestrian access will be made available at all times.

The proposals include for two vehicular access and four pedestrian flood gates, as well as two locations where flood boards are proposed. These will all remain open during normal tides (i.e. the majority of the time) and require deployment prior to a significant flood event.

Coastal Partners manage the operation of a network of flood gates and other structures through a duty coastal incident officer (CIO) role (24/7). In the Havant Borough, Coastal Partners work with Norse to operate emergency flood defences. Once we have a preferred gate supplier, an operational manual will be prepared in consultation with our Contractor, Langstone Flood Watch/Flood Advice Langstone and individual landowners affected so that all parties understand roles and responsibilities. This will set out the trigger and procedure for closing the gates, alerting the community and emergency action planning.

The gates would be shut prior to an extreme high tide event (not every high tide event would require closure of the gates). Vehicular and pedestrian access will not be possible until the tide drops, and the gates are re-opened.

The scheme is not considered to result in restrictions to water-based activities and will not affect the rescuing of casualties on the foreshore.

Coastal Partners work closely with the Environment Agency who are responsible for issuing any flood alerts. You can sign up to receive flood alerts from the Environment Agency here:

<https://www.gov.uk/sign-up-for-flood-warnings>

12. Drainage/Overtopping

Overtopping: We concur with comments from Hampshire County Council Flood and Water Management dated 30 May and the Environment Agency dated 8 April regarding the risk from surface water trapped behind the flood defences in the event of overtopping. The pathway between the flood barrier and our properties is our only entry point and trapped water could reduce or prevent access. Trapped water could also present an additional flood risk to our properties.

I have regard concerns over the drainage proposals should the barrier be overtopped to ensure water is not trapped in the quay/paving/house foundations and ensuring that the piling and other construction work does not cause any damage to the historic cottages at 16-18 Langstone High Street.

This Flood and Coastal Erosion risk management scheme predominately focuses on reducing tidal flooding and erosion risk which is the most significant source of risk impacting these properties.

It proposes a sufficient drainage network to ensure any water landward of the defences continues to drain at low tide.

There will be a remaining residual risk from surface water, spray overtopping, and significant events which exceed the standard of protection.

Frontage 5 (including Properties 15-19 Langstone High Street)

With no defences, there is no protection from tidal flooding to these properties, and as such access is restricted during normal flood events.

With the proposed defences, improved protection from tidal flooding will be provided, improving pedestrian access to properties on Frontage 5 through creation of a dry walkway.

In addition to the protection provided by the scheme, it is recommended that when high rainfall coincides with extreme tidal events, or when potential residual risk from wave overtopping is expected under the most extreme events, landowners will need to continue to manage their own flood risk through property-level protection such as flood boards. In these circumstance, access to properties would be just as limited as it would be without flood defences to prevent tidal flood risk, and would remain limited until the tide has lowered sufficiently for the non-return valves to reopen.

13. Flagstones in Frontage 5

will the footpath be dismantled or dug up; will current flagstones be removed and if so will they be put back in place or replaced with new flagstones? We would like assurances that there will be a pre- and post-construction survey of the footpath and the potential impact of building works on adjacent properties

A structural survey of the existing quay and adjacent properties was undertaken to inform the design of the proposal. Pre- and post-works condition surveys will be undertaken for any property/assets impacted by the works. Impacted residents will be notified.

The surface of the quay pavement from Langstone High Street, along Frontage 5 around the Royal Oak is currently surfaced with flagstones and provide a relatively uneven but level surface. The clearance

plans for this frontage show an area of this pavement to be broken out to enable the construction of the flood defences, and to be reinstated upon completion. The landscaping plan for this frontage states that existing footpath paving slabs should be used for reinstatement, supplemented with additional 'marshals sylvern limestone paving slabs or similar approved' to be agreed on site (i.e. is dependent on the condition of slabs removed which are suitable for reinstatement). Any voids discovered will be repaired.

14. Flood risk during construction

We would like assurances that during the building process there will be no increased risk of flooding or water ingress into the properties; for example, if the building of the wall and associated work on the footpath between the High Street and the Mill exposed the underside of the properties to high water or if during works the wall was overtopped by seawater at high tide

The existing structures generally provide flood protection to Langstone and surrounding roads during storm events. The Contractor shall ensure through management of the works that Langstone and roadways are not placed at an increased risk of flooding or erosion risk from the sea during the works. The Contractor shall provide temporary works to stabilise existing structures during the execution of the works. This detail will be set in within the final CEMP, to be submitted for approval to the LPA at the discharge of conditions stage. There are various methods for ensuring that existing flood protection levels remain in place.

15. Flood gate operation

Responsibility for the footpath, cleaning the glass and opening the flood gate: We would like to better understand whose responsibility it will be to maintain the surface of the newly-built footpath between the High Street and the Mill; who will have responsibility for maintaining the glass; and who will be opening and closing the flood gates when necessary.

The proposals include for two vehicular access and four pedestrian flood gates, as well as two locations where flood boards are proposed. These will all remain open during normal tides (i.e. the majority of the time) and require deployment prior to a flood event.

Coastal Partners manage the operation of a network of flood gates and other structures through a duty coastal incident officer (CIO) role (24/7). In the Havant Borough, Coastal Partners work with Norse to operate emergency flood defences. Once we have a preferred gate supplier, an operational manual will be prepared in consultation with our Contractor, Langstone Flood Watch/Flood Advice Langstone and individual landowners affected so that all parties understand roles and responsibilities. This will set out the trigger and procedure for closing the gates, alerting the community and emergency action planning.

The gates would be shut prior to an extreme high tide event (not every high tide event would require closure of the gates). Vehicular and pedestrian access will not be possible until the tide drops, and

the gates are re-opened. The closures are likely to only be in place approximately an hour either side of these extreme high tides.

Coastal Partners work closely with the Environment Agency who are responsible for issuing any flood alerts. You can sign up to receive flood alerts from the Environment Agency here:

<https://www.gov.uk/sign-up-for-flood-warnings>

16. Other highway improvements

While I can appreciate some work needs to be completed for cycleways and for sea defence, this should be Moreso adjacent to the field by the end of Wade Court footpath,

The Billy Trail is a designated footpath and cycle path. The proposed scheme design, following requirements from Hampshire County Council, widens the southern part (between Mill lane and the Sailing Club) to adopted standards. Other traffic improvements, including additional crossings etc are outside of the control of this scheme. The Flood Grant in Aid funding can only be used for the flood defence scheme, and the highway is managed by HCC.

17. Increasing flood risk elsewhere

Another factor that they fail to take into account is that if they remove the flood plains there is nowhere for the floodwater to go. As they seal off one part of the harbour the surge simple floods another area. They list about 68 people in their website. If this number of people descended on the area, they could quickly flood proof every property

Floodplains is a fluvial term and coastal flooding acts in a different way. There are no coastal floodplains or designated areas for coastal floodwater storage. The purpose of this coastal and erosion defence scheme is to prevent coastal tidal inundation from the harbour moving inland. At present, this flood route passes through properties and along the highway infrastructure throughout the village.

The scheme will reduce the risk of coastal flooding and erosion to 53 residential properties and 4 business properties. A further 6 residential properties, which are not currently at risk but are expected to become at risk by 2040 due to climate change, will also be better protected within the lifetime of the scheme. The scheme additionally reduces the risk of coastal flooding and erosion to the A3023, the only vehicular road onto Hayling Island.

Defending one section of the harbour will not increase flooding in other areas, as local tidal levels will not change, and existing flood defence protection provided by local structures and natural topography will continue to function as they do now.

Private Landowners have ultimate responsibility for protecting their own property from flooding and erosion but must act within statutory planning regulations and other applicable legislation e.g., Coast Protection Consent.

Private asset owners can reduce the impact of flooding through the installation of Property Flood Resilience (PFR) measures either on a building, to reduce the risk of floodwater entering the property or inside a building to minimise damage if water gets into the property.

Coastal Partners have compiled practical advice about management of flood risk here:
<https://coastalpartners.org.uk/protecting-against-flooding>.

Havant Borough Council (HBC) is a Risk Management Authority (RMA) and has permissive powers to undertake works (where there is a wider public benefit, clear economic benefit and an achievable solution) under The Coast Protection Act 1949 and Land Drainage Act 1991. These are permissive powers and not a legal obligation or responsibility on the Council to undertake any works (maintenance or new defences) to protect property from flooding or erosion. Coastal Partners provide the coastal engineering service to HBC, acting on behalf of the RMA.

18. Other

Insufficient evidence:

It is the opinion of [Redacted] that currently the applicant has failed to provide sufficient and/or credible detail regarding the planning and execution of the proposed scheme at F4. Accordingly, any granting of consent permitting the applicant to progress construction of the scheme, should, at this stage, be viewed as being premature.

Proposed Course of Action:

The applicant be required to: (i) voluntarily submit/agree to the adding of 'planning conditions' to its application. Including, proposing how these are to be rigorously monitored & enforced throughout the construction period, using measurable, data-driven methods, and a stated commitment to rapidly applying financial and/or legal penalty in the case of non-compliance. (ii) should the applicant require further time to identify/submit such 'planning conditions', the applicant be encouraged to temporarily pause its request for granting of planning permission to such time as it can wholly evidence and deliver a more equitably considered, viable and sufficiently detailed application at F4.

In particular, the applicant should also be encouraged to submit its proposal for using proven alternative methods of construction, known to be both minimally invasive and substantially less risky to the setting and safety of heritage assets.

It is anticipated that the LPA will impose appropriate robust planning conditions to seek further details, including those for construction methods and mitigation measures. We are committed to providing the necessary details to satisfy these planning conditions.

Please consider clearing the bank above the railway sleepers around the beach so that walkers can get from Wade Lane to Warblington Church when the tide is in.

This sits outside the scope of these proposals but the information can be shared with the relevant Council department.

No consideration of reciprocity has been offered by the scheme to offset these permanently blighting, financially & personally intrusive, devastating works

The main aim of the proposals is to provide flood and erosion risk reduction to the community of Langstone and the A3023m the only vehicular route to Hayling Island.

Discussions with all directly affected landowners have been taking place and this is now being taken forward more formally by a Land Agent. The appropriate mitigation is set out on the submitted documents, but further discussions will continue outside of the planning process.

Weak synergy between 'accessibility for all' with 'safe enjoyment' at F4 - introducing a mixed traffic scheme appears counter to improving accessibility, or meeting the spirit/requirements under the Equalities Act. Frail, young, or those of restricted mobility will actually/potentially suffer harm & anxiety as a result of introducing mechanised/ powered traffic within this restricted environment and so cannot be said to either in spirit or actually align with the intent of upgrading this path to improve 'accessibility for all'

The adopted footpath and PRow at F4 (and other frontages) is being widened to current day adoptable standards, following discussions with the Highways Authority. The current path is extremely narrow which hinders the use of it by those in wheelchairs or with buggies etc. It is particularly narrow when trying to pass by others. The new footpath is not intended to increase visitor numbers to the area or result in the use of mechanised/powered traffic but to improve the existing access for all. A handrail is proposed as a safety requirement, which will remove the hazardous drop to the foreshore and demark the edge of the footpath during a flood.

Age of Green Cottage

The heritage statement is based on the available publicly available data, including the National Heritage List for England (NHLE), which is the only official, up to date register of all nationally protected historic buildings and sites in England. The NHLE describes the date of the property to be "of C18 origin". If the property owner wishes to share any privately held surveys or reports then will examine these but the design of the scheme and construction methods are based on the physical features themselves rather than being precisely based on the year of construction.

It is SOP where the design life of infrastructure is fixed (in this case 50 years) for the applicant to outline their intention/requirement to decommission/rebuild etc at end of useful life. No such plan has been brought forward (or discussed) in this application, leading to greater uncertainty to regarding future impact to setting/character of, and the possibility of a further need to call upon additional privately owned land in the future

There are no proposals to decommission the defences. The footpath improvements, sea walls and embankments that form the scheme will remain in place. The Standard of Protection can only be provided for a 50yr period, after which time the situation will be reconsidered based on available funding and policy circumstances at that time.

The sea does not flood this side. The tidal flood is via Chichester harbour. Evidenced April 2024. No flooding in WEST beach at all. The force came from the EAST. Langstone west beach is in the lee. It accrues stones, they are not eroded FACT

The Modelling Narrative Report (Appendix J5 of the Environmental Statement) demonstrates the process undertaken to determine the design crest level for the scheme during the outline design stage. This is confirmed as 3.8mODN (6.5mCD) for structures on the water edge, inclusive of a 0.3m freeboard allowance to account for potential wave exposure and other uncertainty. The defence constructed to these elevations provides a present day 0.5% AEP (1:200 year) SoP against still water level flood risk from Langstone and Chichester Harbours. We then further considered how sea level rise would affect the design. With a rise in sea levels anticipated in the future, the standard of protection provided by the scheme is expected to reduce over time. Based on future projections of sea level rise (which are uncertain), by year 20 the scheme is expected to provide a 1% AEP (1:100 year) SoP (still water level flooding only).

The Coastal Processes Report investigates the erosion of Langstone Spit further.

Land collapse resulting from likely structural failure of existing quay wall at F4 within the scheme's lifetime.
--

Our design consultants have considered the existing structures in evolving the design for the scheme there is no expectation that any element will fail. The 50yr life of the scheme relates to the Standard of Protection rather than the physical fabric of the defences.