

Universal Services
The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD

Telephone 0300 555 1375
Fax 01962 847055
www.hants.gov.uk

Havant Borough Council
Civic Offices
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX

Enquiries to	Holly Drury	My reference	059474
Direct Line	N/A	Your reference	APP/25/00162
Date	19 March 2026	Email	havantdc@hants.gov.uk

For attention of Ms Miszevska

Dear Sirs

**Re: APP/25/00162 At Land and coast adjacent to, Langstone Road,
Havant**

Flood and coastal erosion risk management scheme comprising a combination of raised earth embankments, raised footpaths/cycleways, sheet piled sea/flood defence walls with cladding and flood glass, provision of flood gates, associated landscaping and landscaping improvements (including street furniture), tree works and tree removals, realigned sections of cycleway/walkway, highway alterations and improvements, ecological improvements and temporary compounds and access, and all associated works. The proposal constitutes EIA development.

Thank you for the consultation on the above application. The Highway Authority previously responded on 14 July 2025 and required additional information on a number of matters. The Highway Authority have reviewed the revised submitted information by the applicant and have the following comments.

Design and Access Statement

The design and access statement still refers to two new crossings on the A3023 but the scope of this has been reduced to one and the case officer should note this error in the documents.

EIA Considerations

Director of Universal Services
Patrick Blogg

Chapter 6 – Legislative Framework

Previously no reference was made within this EIA chapter to the requirement to comply with the Highways Act 1980. This has now been added and considered appropriate.

In addition, it was requested that in relation to other consents and licences that S278 agreements and stopping up orders under the Town and Country Planning Act should be referenced. This has also now been reflected appropriately within the application and EIA chapter.

Chapter 13 – Traffic and Access

Previous concerns were raised over the data utilised from DfT sources. It was requested that the permanent count site was utilised to inform the traffic flow on the A3023. Data has been reviewed from the permanent counter on the A3023 as requested.

Data was also requested for Langstone High Street and Langstone Avenue however due to the limited works to be undertaken here has been considered to not be necessary by the applicant. The Highway Authority note this position and in order for this to be the case will ensure that through the detailed CTMP works traffic on these routes are insignificant in numbers.

Accident data has now been provided which identifies a total of 13 accidents between 2019-2025, 2 series and 11 slight. The accident level along the route is consistent and the applicant has not identified any additional risks as a result of the construction or operational phases of development. The Highway Authority is satisfied that the construction risks can be appropriately mitigated through the CTMP measures.

The mitigation strategy for the EIA considerations is through the provision of a CTMP. The principle of this is agreed however the fCTMP submitted was considered insufficient. A revised fCTMP has been submitted and this shall be covered further within this response. A suitable condition will be required to secure the full CTMP requirements and ensure impacts are mitigated as far as reasonably practicable.

The ES has appropriately considered the risks of the project. It has forecast on average 6 HGV's and 60 vehicle movements a day. The exact details of this however will be agreed through the CTMP. At present it is not possible to agree parameters as a programme has not been shared. This should however be available for agreement of the full CTMP. The overall daily increase as assumed by the smoother data assumptions would not give rise to increases in traffic volumes on the corridor which you would not expect within daily fluctuations.

The increase of HGV movements on Langstone High Street is low overall and the details of the access arrangement will be agreed through the CTMP.

The loss of parking during construction and how this is to be managed especially around the Ship Inn will need to be suitably addressed in engagement with the landowners. Consideration of the impacts in relation to the EIA assessment should be made by Havant Borough Council as the Parking Authority.

Reference was made to PRow diversions but there was no discussion around the diversion of pedestrians and cyclists on frontage 1a and 2. Reference is now made to the diversions of other key designated routes including the Hayling Billy. This does refer to shared use provision on the A3023 being utilised, but this is not for the full stretch and therefore some on carriageway cycling will be needed. It is noted however that this is for a short period. Access along the Hayling Billy Route should be maintained as much as possible during construction.

With the above amendments to the EIA evidence base the Highway Authority is satisfied that this suitably captures the EIA impacts of the development proposals, and the design has been altered to address this impact accordingly.

Overtopping

The previous EIA work included an overtopping report. This highlighted issues in terms of highway safety to routes 1a and 2. This has now been addressed through the provision of access control gates which will be managed alongside the other flood gates by Havant Borough Council. This should be secured as part of the agency arrangement for the maintenance and management of the proposed infrastructure. The provision of the access gates is shown so that during times of flood risk users will be required to divert along the A3023 and suitable signage will be provided alongside the flood gates to advise of the diversion route. The existing infrastructure requires cycling on carriageway which does increase the safety risk to users. Footways are present providing opportunity to dismount and walk this section, should the gates be shut during storm events.

Chapter 17 – Conclusions

With the alterations to the ES the Highway Authority are satisfied that suitable mitigation measures and design changes have overcome the concerns with the ES assessment.

Construction Details

The design life of the project is 50 years, whereas for structures on the highway the design life is 120 years. It is accepted that the proposals whilst forming a structure on the highway are not in themselves a highway structure and therefore the reduced design life is agreeable subject to appropriate maintenance requirements being put in place for the non-highway asset.

The Highway Authority has engaged with the applicant and there is agreement that this will be addressed through entering into an agency agreement between the authorities to ensure maintenance responsibility is appropriately transferred to what otherwise would be considered to be highway structures.

Frontage 1a and Frontage 2

The highway extents along this frontage will be required to change as a result of the works. This will require both the stopping up of existing highway and dedication of new with the extents of this to be agreed with the Highway Authority.

The stopping up order for this area is yet to be formally received by the Highway Authority. The principle of the proposals shown within the submitted Stopping Up and Diversion Plan for Frontage 2 is agreed however the detail will need to be formally secured through the Stopping Up Order itself. It is recommended that these formal plans are shared with the Highway Authority for review before submission to the Planning Inspectorate. The extents of dedication will be agreed through the s278 process but is expected to include the full made-up width of the cycle path and any supporting structure, which may then also be covered by the agency agreement if necessary.

The Hayling Billy route at this section will still be vulnerable to flooding events. However, measures have now been implemented to manage such occurrences. Whilst the Highway Authority is disappointed the scheme design cannot afford the same level of protection to this walking and cycling route as the rest of the scheme proposals, it is considered that the provision of management measures offers acceptable mitigation. The details of the gates are shown in drawing 2024_22-HBC-LRSLG-PL-09002 Rev A and are agreeable in principle. The details should be secured through the S278 process and associated agreements.

It is noted that all bee post provision has now been located outside the highway boundary.

Any benches that fall within the extents of the highway will be required to be suitably covered in terms of maintenance responsibilities by the agency agreement.

The landscaping plans provided now show all tree planting and landscaping to fall outside highway boundary. The adopted highway extents here are still to be agreed through the S278 process. As the new alignment is on an embankment it likely that this feature needs to form part of the adopted highway, although as part of the sea defence maintained via the secured agency agreement.

Frontage 3

The DDA compliance of the ramp remains an outstanding matter of concern for the County Council. Given that the car park connects the PRow network the noncompliance of the ramp creates a risk to users. The provision of a separate signed DDA compliant route (as shown on drawing 2024_22-HBC-LRCA-PL-09007A Rev A) may be considered to suitably address the issue from a highway's perspective; however, concern remains from a landowner perspective given the way the car park area operates and therefore the risk of slips, trips and falls from the gradient provided. The details of the ramp arrangement therefore need to be considered further between all landowners to ensure an arrangement is reached that both addresses the interests of the Highway Authority and the landowners. It is suggested therefore that a condition is placed on the application to agree the details of this area prior to commencement of any works within this phase of development.

The Planning Authority should be aware that the ramp details to provide access to the Ship Inn do not enable access from the southern area of the bund arrangement. With the gradients proposed access to this ramp location is not considered possible across the whole width of the ramp. From the northern side of the car park the ramp simply leads you to steps and therefore there is confusion over the purpose of this ramp and its interaction with the access provision from the land with County Council's highway land interest.

Alterations to the access area are proposed to reduce the width to improve the landing area and tie in arrangement for the bund to the highway access point. This is agreed in principle but should be supported by appropriate tracking at the detailed design stage. As the nature of the access remains open it is not foreseen that tracking will raise any concerns. Visibility splays have been shown for the revised access on drawing 2024_22-HBC-LRCA-PL-09003 Rev B however these have not been drawn correctly measured to the centre of the carriageway and at a non-compliant offset. Notwithstanding this, visibility to the north is not being altered. To the south there is opportunity through the detailed design to ensure visibility is not impacted through the design stages and this should be considered when discharging the proposed condition.

It is considered that the sheet pile wall sits partially within the highway as it runs along the A3023 boundary. The Highway Authority consider that this should form part of the highway and additional dedication may be required. This can be addressed through the S278 agreement and maintenance suitably covered via the Agency Agreement if necessary.

The area of grass landscaping to the south of the existing site access and within the proposed bund area is shown to be removed on the landscaping drawings and the replacement requirements in the GA drawings is unclear. The details of the landscaping requirements need to be agreed through the discharge of condition.

Planters and street furniture remain across the layout. The Highway Authority consider that these can be removed if necessary to accommodate the maintenance compound arrangements. The provision, management and

maintenance of these would need to be covered in any landowner contract arrangements put in place for the works. This would suitably address the concerns and interests of the Highway Authority.

Frontage 4

It is unclear from the drawings whether the street furniture locations are acceptable. These should be shown clearly on the S278 plans when submitted. Amendments to the locations are unlikely to constitute a material amendment and therefore the Highway Authority is content that this detail can be agreed at the S278 stage. All street furniture (excluding street lighting) in terms of maintenance if it falls within the adopted highway or PRow will need to be covered by the agency agreement.

The applicant is not proposing to provide any dropped kerb and tactile paving crossing point at the end of Langstone High Street to connection frontage 4 and 5 works. This is considered poor design and a lost opportunity to provide low-cost betterment to the infrastructure provision through the project. However, it does not constitute a reason for refusal. Should opportunity arise to include the provision as the design progresses the Highway Authority would welcome the scoping in of these works at the S278 stage.

The stopping up order for this area is yet to be formally received by the Highway Authority. The principle of the proposals shown within the submitted Stopping Up and Diversion Plan for Frontage 4 is agreed however the detail will need to be formally secured through the Stopping Up Order itself. It is recommended that these formal plans are shared with the Highway Authority for review before submission to the Planning Inspectorate. The existing highway may require further realignment than is currently shown on this frontage as the overlay plans show this to now fall outside the alignment of the path and areas accessible for the PRow to follow. This may be a mapping error, but confirmation will be needed on how the PRow and the constructed route align. This is shown on drawing LAN-ACM-LS-F4-DR-LA-011023.

Frontage 5

It remains unclear if the steps proposed meet the requirements of DDA. This can be considered a detailed matters to be dealt with at the S278 stage but if the Planning Authority consider that design changes to this feature may be more material to the consent then a condition should be placed for the details to be submitted prior to commencement of phase 3 and 5.

It is understood that there is now agreement with the applicant that the design will address the voids in the structure at this point, and the details will be agreed through the S278 process. This is supported.

It is understood that private water is no longer proposed to run through the highway drainage systems. This detail can be confirmed at the S278 stage.

Should this give rise to any issues it can be appropriately addressed through the agency agreement.

Overall, there is a general drainage concern given the forecast tied heights that have been assumed and therefore the effectiveness of the proposals for drainage across the scheme. The Planning Authority should be satisfied that appropriate assumptions have been made, and it is noted additional information has been submitted through the EIA work to consider this point as narrated within the response from the applicant.

Reference is made on the landscaping plans to the existing grass area to be removed. It is unclear why or what it is to be replaced with. This is another matter to be considered with the County Council as landowner and any implication to highway users in relation to the visibility splays for the access and interaction with the highway boundary.

King Charles III Coastal Path

The Planning Authority should liaise directly with the Countryside Service team on the interaction of the project with the dedicated coastal path as this is not a highway asset. Informal advice was provided previously in regard the interaction with this route needing to be appropriately considered.

Legal Requirements

Public Rights of Way Management

In relation to the temporary closures these requests will need to be made to the County Council by applying through the below link:

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/rightsofway/definitivemap/temporaryclosures>

The applicant should be aware that the lead in time for closures is 6-8 weeks.

There are also separate requirements for diversions both temporary and permanent of the King Charles III Coastal Path route and these consents will also need to be applied for.

Maintenance and Management Responsibilities

As discussed, the Highway Authority consider that due to the nature of the proposals and the provision of the scheme on highway land an appropriate agreement needs to be put in place to ensure management can be undertaken by the implementing body and the assets maintained appropriately. An Agency Agreement will therefore be required, and a suitable obligation has been requested.

Works on the Highway

In order to undertake any works to the highway whether that be a PRow or adopted highway the Highway Authority require appropriate S278 design checks to be undertaken.

Works to Hampshire County Council owned land will be subject to landowner consent and separate landowner agreements, but the County Council would utilise the S278 design check process to approve the engineering details of those works.

Private Apparatus in the Highway

In regard to Frontage 2 there is a need to consider the appropriate legal framework to be put in place to enable the sheet piled wall to sit within the highway. This again may be suitable to cover through the agency agreement or through an alternative licence provision.

Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan and Construction Environmental Management Plan

A revised Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Outline CTMP) V0.2 dated January 2026 and Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (outline CEMP) V0.2 dated December 2025 has been submitted. Generally, traffic and transport matters are covered within the Outline CTMP with the Outline CEMP referring to this document.

2.1.3 Main Compound Access:

The access track remains to be proposed to be made via stone with no reference made to tarmac surfacing for the first 20.0m to reduce mud and debris being spread onto the public highway. This will need to be agreed as part of the full CTMP.

The relocated refuge island to facilitate construction access into the main compound have now been referenced to be a permanent change as a result of the proposals. This aligns with narrative set out within the ES and the Outline Traffic Management Plan.

Amendments have been provided to accommodate the construction access to the turning head on Langstone Avenue. These have been tracked on drawings 2024_22-HBC-LRCA*PL-090005 Rev O for a 3.5t panel van and considered acceptable, with the changes not impacting the existing turning capabilities of the area.

Details on the lining, signing and fencing are shown on drawing 2024_22-HBC-LRCA*PL-12001 Rev A for the layout during construction. This includes provision of fencing the temporarily prevent divert pedestrians away from the

construction access. The details of this and the method of deterrent will need to be agreed through the details Chapter 8 complaint TM arrangements through the CTMP. The Highway Authority cannot legally fence off highway in this manner, but the access restriction requirements are recognised to be a consideration. Generally, the principle of what is shown on the drawing for lining and signage will be agreed through the detailed S278 process and may be subject to minor amendments.

2.1.4 Satellite Compound Access:

Access is to be taken via Langstone Road to both satellite compounds however no further details have been provided. For the Frontage 2 satellite compound, access is proposed either via the Sailing Club, subject to landowner agreement and/or via the Billy Line.

The outline CTMP reference that the remaining Ship Inn car park will be available for public use except for during construction of the flood defence in the car park. No measures have been suggested to manage any displaced parking associated with the Ship Inn particularly during the construction of the flood defences when the full car park will be closed. The full CTMP must show agreed measures to manage the displacement of parking and agreement with landowners on this point.

Reference is made to a designated one-way system to be in place to allow access and egress from the access points in forward gear. It is unclear if this is intended for both satellite compounds. Regardless, no tracking has been provided for either satellite compound access arrangement and it is therefore unclear whether access for required vehicles can be obtained in a safe and suitable manner and there is suitable turning to allow for a one-way system. For agreement for use of these areas for compound use within the full CTMP the tracking will need to be provided and evidenced that vehicles can enter and exit in a forward gear.

No further narrative is provided regarding parking arrangements for the satellite compounds. Section 2.1.3 of the outline CTMP notes that final details surrounding compound details can be submitted for the satellite compounds once a contractor is known through a full CEMP/CTMP at the condition discharge stage. The vehicle numbers to the satellite compounds provided within Table 3.1 outlines that movements will be occurring and therefore suitable parking provision within the compound would need to be provided.

2.1.5 Additional Works Access Points:

Access to frontage 5 is still being considered via Langstone High Street and a new access track. No further details have been provided aside from this needing to be suitable for use as well as trees and hedgerow clearance and dismantling of an existing brick wall. Materials to be delivered via the temporary access track will be supported by a Traffic Marshall.

It is unclear whether the access track proposed is suitable and fit for purpose. Carriageway widths have not been confirmed, nor has any swept path analysis been provided to confirm that vehicles can access, manoeuvre and egress in a forward gear in a safe and suitable manner. The Highway Authority remain concerned on the suitability of this route given the available carriageway widths and extensive on-carriageway parking. Parking controls will be necessary however the extents of these have not been confirmed.

It is also suggested that access could be achieved from the Ship Inn car park along the Foreshore, however no further details on this have been provided.

A condition will be necessary on any consent to include the details of the access proposals onto Langstone High Street and the proposed access track arrangements for agreement with the Highway Authority prior to any works commencing on frontage 5. Should these detailed measures not be agreed access will be required to be facilitated via the Ship Inn car park.

3. Estimated Movements of Traffic:

Table 3.1 provides estimated vehicle movements to each compound including trips associated from the main compound to the satellite compounds and the foreshore frontages. The table outlines that only vehicles associated with workers (vans/cars) will travel to the satellite compounds with infrequent plant movements to occur approximately once a month. The size of the plant has not been confirmed, and it is unclear whether this could access the compounds appropriately. The outline CEMP suggests the Ship Inn car park is intended to store non-bulk materials however no HGV movements have been accounted for within the proposed movements. Appropriate controls and consideration of these accesses and compound uses therefore cannot be given at this stage and this will need to be a matter considered in detail within the full CTMP. Early engagement by the contractor with the Highway Authority to agree the CTMP measures will be project critical.

The main compound still references the need to accommodate temporary resident parking (50 spaces) during the slip way construction. Aside from this, no further details have been provided on where the parking is to be displaced from or how this is to be controlled (TTRO/Parking Suspension). The Highway Authority will seek further clarity on this point at the full CTMP stage, utilising this compound area for displaced parking provides opportunity to manage the concerns on this point.

3.1 Changes in Pedestrian Movements:

The anticipated footpath/cycleway closures and diversions is summarised within Fig. 3.1 of the outline CTMP. These seem to be logical, and the final details of the PRow diversion and the King Charles III Coastal Path will need to be formally agreed, and the appropriate temporary legal orders made as part of the separate statutory consenting processes.

4.1.1 Road Surface Condition:

The scope of the pre-condition survey remains to be confirmed aside from referencing that this will be carried out on the highway and the works areas prior to commencement. The narrative is limited and it is unclear what the intended scope covers. This should ideally be set out within the outline document, so the parameters are fixed, however it can be covered by a condition, and this has been included in our proposed condition requirements. It is noted that permeant repairs are to be agreed with the Highway Authority which is supported.

4.1.2 Site Entrance at Compounds:

Details remain have been provided on how the main compound access will be managed during operation to protect users of the footway/cycle path. It is expected that this will be monitored by a banksman/traffic marshal and entrance for HGV's will be overseen by site staff. This will include management of footway and cycleway users as they cross the access frontage.

4.2.1 Delivery Restrictions:

Delivery restrictions have been set to avoid the peak periods, considering seasonal variations, however the specific timeframes remain to be defined. Given the location and the sensitive area of the network this should be set out more clearly within the full CTMP, with time restrictions in place for both the weekdays and Saturdays. It is likely to be appropriate to have varying time restrictions depending on the time of year as the summertime peak periods vary from those in the winter months.

4.2.3 Vehicle Washing:

The location of the mobile jet wash facility has not been shown on the compound drawing for each compound area. The outline CTMP suggests that the precise location will be secured in the final CTMP/CEMP. The applicant has not committed to a drive through wheel-wash facility. Given the scale of the construction and direct access onto a classified 'A' road, this will be a requirement of the full CTMP.

4.2.6 Parking Restrictions:

Parking restrictions are being referred to as necessary at the end of Langstone Avenue to enable HGV access. These are referenced as being limited where possible to restricting parking during working hours, taking into consideration delivery restrictions. Details are to be provided within a final CTMP once working hours are known and undertaken appropriately for example through a TTRO. The Highway Authority reiterate that Langstone Avenue is subject to a double yellow line system at the turning head, and it

may be a need to refresh these markings and ensure appropriate enforcement is undertaken should illegal parking occur.

4.2.8 Additional Traffic Management:

Separate traffic management is still being referred to as necessary at the Ship Inn car park access, Sailing Club access and Langstone High Street. The details of the type of traffic management required at the Ship Inn and Sailing Club access should be set out. The Highway Authority consider that any active traffic management on the A3023 to support construction access is unlikely to be supported given the traffic sensitivity of the road.

Outline Traffic Management Plan

A revised Outline Traffic Management Plan dated January 2026 (Rev 0.2) has been submitted. This does not set out any details or implications of 'Chapter 8' traffic management requirements as expected, and this information will be required to be agreed as part of the CTMP.

This document does outline the operational implications of the development and summarises the findings of the EIA works, however, does not set out as intended the TM requirements for the site. Ultimately these are set out elsewhere and therefore it isn't considered necessary to secure this as a control document. The need for closures and road space bookings given the scale can be controlled appropriately utilising existing statutory process.

Construction Access

The applicant has been engaging directly with the Highway Authority to derive a scheme which both limits work to the A3023, provides safe and suitable access to the compound area and improves the crossing provision for the Hayling Billy route. A revised scheme shown in principle in drawing 2024_22/HBC/LRCA/PL/11001 Rev A has been submitted by the applicant which has been reviewed and considered appropriate to facilitate both construction traffic and enable safe and suitable access to the Hayling Billy route.

There are requirements for reinstatement of the dropped kerb arrangements onto the A3023 on completion of the construction activity and this should be secured alongside the works through an appropriately worded s106 obligation. This has been shown on a drawing 2024_22/HBC/LRCA/PL/02002 Rev 0 and 2024_22/HBC/LRCA/PL/11002 Rev 0. It should be noted this also includes the removal of the vehicle crossover arrangement to the existing field which is not considered necessary and therefore can be omitted at the S278 stage.

Drawing 2024_22/HBC/LRCA/PL/09004 has been provided showing a temporary diversion route for the Hayling Billy Trail during the construction of the access arrangement. The principle of this is agreed with the TM arrangements to be approved through the S278 process.

Drawing 2024_22/HBC/LRCA/PL/02001 has been provided showing the site clearance. Again, the details of this are to be agreed through the S278 process however it should be noted that the loss of 2 highway trees will be subject to CAVAT payments in accordance with TG15.

A revised safety audit has not been provided however it is noted that the amendments made have sought to address the previous audit comments.

Recommendation

The Highway Authority raise no objection to the application subject to the following conditions and obligations:

Conditions

1. Prior to the commencement of any works in frontage 3 for the ramp design details to be submitted to the Planning Authority for approval along with associate landscaping, drainage, materials and visibility requirements for the revised access to the A3023.
2. No development shall start on site, until a full Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority, which shall include:
 - a. A programme of and phasing of demolition (if any) and construction work and the methods for phasing such works
 - b. Measures for managing displaced parking at the Ship Inn Car Park and Langstone High Street
 - c. The arrangements for all deliveries associated with all construction works including swept path analysis for the Satellite Compounds for vehicles to manoeuvre, access and egress in forward gear
 - d. All vehicle movements including HGV numbers and movements associated with all compounds
 - e. The provision of long-term facilities for contractor parking including parking requirements for the Satellite Compounds

- f. Location and access arrangements for the 50 residential parking spaces within the main site compound
 - g. Scope of the pre-commencement survey
 - h. Measures to manage interaction between highway users and construction traffic at the main compound access
 - i. Protection of pedestrian/cycle routes during construction
 - j. Hours of operation and working which should include delivery time frames avoiding the network peak periods
 - k. Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction which should details surrounding wheel washing facilities which should include provision of a drive through wheel-wash facility at the main site compound and a road sweeper
 - l. Details of any traffic management requirements
 - m. Access and egress for plant and machinery
 - n. Location of temporary site buildings, compounds, construction material, and plant storage areas
3. Prior to commencement of any works on Frontage 5, details surrounding the access arrangements onto Langstone High Street and the proposed access track should be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Highway Authority. For the avoidance of doubt this should include submission of carriageway widths, construction details and suitable swept path analysis to ensure that vehicles can access and egress in forward gear and details of parking controls along Langstone High Street. The approved details should be implemented in accordance with the approved plans hereafter.

Obligations

1. Prior to completion of any part of the development for an Agency Agreement under Section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972 or Section 9 EA of Part 1A of the Local Government Act 2000 must be entered into with the Highway Authority to cover matters relating to the following:
 - a. Management of the flood gate and access control provisions across the scheme
 - b. The maintenance responsibility, schedule and specification of the implemented assets including but not limited to any structures, street furniture and landscaping implemented on any part of the highway, and for the avoidance of doubt for this to include highway dedicated as a Public Right of Way.
 - c. Provision and consent for sheet pile wall structures to be within the highway in relation to frontage 2 alongside the required maintenance, inspection and management requirements.
2. Prior to the commencement of development for the construction access as shown on drawing 2024_22/HBC/LRCA/PL/11001 Rev A to be implemented to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority. No later than 6 months from completion of all construction activity in relation to the development for the reinstatement works as shown on drawing 2024_22/HBC/LRCA/PL/02002 Rev 0 and 2024_22/HBC/LRCA/PL/11002 Rev 0 to be completed.
3. Prior to the commencement of development on any phase for the applicant to have submitted for approval a s278 design check submission and to have obtained technical approval.
4. Prior to commencement of any works on any phase for a highway's agreement under S278 of the Highways Act 1980 to have been entered

into with the Highway Authority along with the provision of appropriate surety.

Yours faithfully,

Holly Drury
Principal Transport Planner - Highway Development Planning
Universal Services