Application No. WSCC/056/11/SU (Consultation no. AWDM/0690/11) **Recommendation – No objection**

Site: **Adur Footbridge, High Street, Shoreham-by-Sea**

Proposal: **Consultation by WSCC on Regulation 3 application WSCC/056/11/SU for proposed replacement of existing Shoreham Harbour footbridge with new bridge suitable for pedestrians and cyclists**

The Application

This application will be determined by West Sussex County Council as a 'County matter' and is referred to this Council for consultation purposes only. The application is submitted under regulation 3 of the Town & Country Planning General Regulations 1992. The County Council has only given this Council 21 days to make comments, which expires on 11 October 2011. In addition to planning permission, the proposal also requires separate consents including a marine licence under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 from the Marine Management Organisation, and consents from the Environment Agency, Natural England and Shoreham Port Authority (SPA).

The application proposes to demolish the existing footbridge, which dates from 1921, and replace it with a new bridge, widened to include a cycleway and on a different (oblique) alignment to the east. The proposal by WSCC is in partnership with Sustrans. The application site (red line) is shown as including a much larger area than the proposed bridge itself.

The existing 2m wide 13-span reinforced concrete bridge, crossing the 200m-wide river and mudflats, is supported on concrete trustles and has a central opening (on a hand-winched steel truss) to allow navigation by taller boats. It has a straight alignment and has a causeway at its southern end (to be removed). It is stated that it is in a poor state of repair and its design does not satisfy current loading and safety standards, being inadequate to withstand extreme wind loading. In addition, the concrete is in poor condition, with spalling, cracking and staining.

Owing to its age and design, repair of the existing bridge is not considered economically viable and a new bridge of modern design and construction, providing an improved route for cyclists, is stated to represent the best solution. It will form part of a larger project to deliver a pedestrian and cycle route that runs from Shoreham Beach to Shoreham railway station which, when completed, will form part of the South Coast Cycle Route - National Cycle Network Route 2 (NCN2). This is one of 79 Connect2 projects around England sponsored by Sustrans and the Big Lottery Fund to encourage more people to walk and cycle for everyday journeys.

The proposed new 4m-wide (average usable width) 8-span bridge will be in the same landfall position as now exists at its northern end (opposite East Street and east of Coronation Green) except that it will be widened by approximately 2m on its east side (entailing a 3m wide partial 'stopping-up' and alteration of Dolphin public hard). However, it will be aligned obliquely across the river on a NNW-SSE alignment, so that its southern landfall at Lower Beach Road will be opposite the public car park, 70m further east than the existing bridge. This section of Lower Beach Road is to be

raised by 1 metre in height as part of the development, plus sheet-piling of the stretch from the existing footbridge to the bend by the Waterside Inn, to provide the necessary flood defence in advance of the Environment Agency carrying out the rest of the Adur Tidal Walls project. A footpath/cycle way is then proposed ramping or graded down and then passing southwards through the Riverside public car park (although this may be changed dependent on negotiations with ADC and SPA as owners).

The new bridge will be 213m long including a proposed 14m long causeway at the northern end. Its overall external width will be mainly 4.8m but widening to 6.1m on the opening swing section. It is shown supported on 7 cylindrical piers (fair-faced reinforced concrete abutments on piled foundations). The central pier will act as a pivot for the central-opening swing span providing a 15m-wide opening (the same opening width as at present) for taller vessels to navigate. This electrically-operated opening section will be wider than the rest of the bridge and be a 52m-long all-steel box section supported on angled rigid cable stays from an 8m high mast. The operating machinery will be housed below deck in a circular shroud flush with the 4m diameter main support. The bridge deck will be concrete supported on steel plate girders and it will have an anti-slip surface, not segregated between cyclists and pedestrians. The height of the underside (soffit) of the bridge above the river, at its highest central part, will be the same as the existing bridge, with the highest finished surface level at 7.86mAOD (as compared to the 5.52mAOD surface level at the north end and a proposed 4.85mAOD at the south end), the maximum gradient being 5%.

The stainless steel side parapet top rail will be 1.6m high (increased from the 1.4m previously proposed) and LED lighting incorporated within a lower 1.2m high side rail. The slightly inward-inclined sides, up to the 1.6m rail, will be of toughened or laminated glass (amended from the inward curved perforated stainless steel previously proposed). The rails and glazing will be supported on 1.6m high stainless steel posts, slightly inward inclined.

The existing bridge will not be demolished until shortly after the new bridge becomes operational (intended to be in March 2013).

Temporary causeways at the northern and southern ends will be laid for vehicles, plant and equipment both to construct the new bridge and demolish the existing one.

To enable the existing footbridge to remain open during the construction period, it is proposed to provide a 2m wide oblique-angled temporary link, 17m long (plus 10m long section) at 1:20 gradient onto Coronation Green. If closure to the public has to occur, a temporary bus link is proposed.

The public car park at Riverside, Shoreham Beach, is proposed as a temporary compound for construction works (dependent on negotiations with ADC and SPA as tenant and freehold owners respectively).

The application is accompanied by a 136-page Non-Statutory Environmental Statement. A screening opinion by WSCC in May 2010 determined that a formal EIA was not required and the Marine Management Organisation determined similarly.

There is also a Design & Access Statement; a Road Safety Audit; a Feasibility Report; an Environmental Risk Assessment; a Site Waste Management Plan; a Flood Risk Statement; an Initial Hydromorphological Assessment; a Sustrans Route User Survey Report, a copy of the Robert West Report on a replacement footbridge for SEEDA (2001), and a Public Consultation Findings report (June 2011).

Consultation and Representations

Under the relevant Regulations, all consultations with statutory and other bodies and publicity are carried out by WSCC and replies including by the public are made direct to WSCC.

Adur & Worthing Councils: The ***Environmental Health officer*** has no objection provided a condition is imposed requiring a scheme to minimise noise to be submitted and approved.

Third Parties: *[NB. Representations from Third Parties are made direct to WSCC]*

The Public Consultation Findings Report states that public exhibitions of the proposals took place in Shoreham between 3-17 June 2011 and questionnaires were distributed. 240 questionnaires were returned the main results of which were:-

- *67% considered the proposed bridge more attractive than the existing one;*
- *63% thought it would improve the view of the harbour as compared to the existing bridge;*
- *54% liked the design;*
- *47% thought it would enhance the Conservation Area more than the existing bridge;*
- *44% considered it would feel safer than the existing bridge (NB. this was before the side rail height was increased from 1.4m to 1.6m, 16% commenting that 1.4m was too low);*
- *9% commented that cyclists and pedestrians should be segregated;*
- *9% commented that there was not enough weather protection;*
- *6% commented that the design is bland, not in keeping with its context or something more architecturally iconic is needed;*
- *6% commented that views for children and disabled persons should be improved, 5% commenting that glass parapets are preferred (NB. this was before the curved perforated steel sides were amended to glass);*
- *6% commented they were concerned about the colour and weathering (NB. there was a preference for a buff-coloured finish);*
- *4% commented that seating should not be included (will attract gangs and poor behaviour).*

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The South East Plan 2006-2026 (GOSE 2009): SCT1-2, SCT7, SP3-4, CC1, CC4, CC6-7, T1-2, NRM5, NRM8, C5-6, BE1, BE6, TC2
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AP9, AC1, AC4, AB1, AB4-5, AB11, AB13, AB15, AB16, AT10,
PPS1 ‘Delivering Sustainable Development’ (ODPM 2005)
PPS4 ‘Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth’ (DCLG 2009)
PPS5 ‘ Planning for the Historic Environment’ (DCLG 2010)
PPS9 ‘Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (ODPM 2005)
PPG13 ‘Transport’ (DTLR 2001)
PPS25 ‘Planning and Flood Risk’ (ODPM 2006)
Draft National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG 2011)
West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-2016 (WSCC 2011)
Shoreham-by-Sea Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy (ADC 2008)
‘A Strategy for Shoreham Renaissance’ (for ADC 2006)

Planning Assessment

Policies

In the Local Plan, the existing footbridge forms part of the boundary of the defined built-up area and also that of the 'strategic gap' separating the built-up areas. West of the bridge, being outside the built-up area boundary and in the strategic gap, policy AG1 states that development will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and AC4 requires compelling circumstances. Being to the east of this boundary, the site of the new bridge is within the built-up area so these policies do not apply but, even if this was not the case, it is considered that the present proposal involves exceptional and compelling circumstances.

The area to the west of the existing bridge constitutes the Adur Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), with the mudflats on the south side being an RSPB-owned reserve. The northern half of the existing and proposed bridges fall within the Shoreham-by-Sea Conservation Area.

Policy AB16 states *"In order to protect and enhance the important amenity value of the River Adur, development which adversely affects views along and across it between the Surry Hard and the A27 will not be permitted."* Other Local Plan policies encourage access and environmental improvements in Shoreham town centre but there are also policies to safeguard the character of the Conservation Area, the setting of listed buildings (which includes the Grade 1 St Mary's church) and archaeological remains. AP9 seeks to ensure that the level of lighting not only provides the minimum for public safety but is also energy efficient and designed to illuminate downwards only.

As part of the Sussex Coast, Shoreham is identified as a key location for regeneration in the South East Plan. The 2006 document 'A Strategy for Shoreham Renaissance' aims to "*regenerate Shoreham town centre as a sustainable community possessing economic, social and environmental diversity*". It states that the overall aims include to "*Improve visual and physical access to the waterfront"* and "*Ensure highest quality design for public realm improvements whilst being sympathetic to the character of the town"*.

Under the Strategy for Shoreham Renaissance, the replacement of the Shoreham Footbridge is included as one of the key areas for improvement of the public realm and of the link to Shoreham Beach. It states that it should provide both cycle and pedestrian links; improved shelter from the wind; and, at its southern end, realignment eastwards to improve its connectivity with Ferry Road.

It states that "*The link between Shoreham Beach and the town centre, whilst visually very strong, is let down physically by the condition and appearance of the footbridge linking the two. However, the axis from the pebble beach, along Ferry Road and across the river to the town centre and specifically St Mary's church is very strong and represents a significant asset of the town. The regenerative benefits of a new iconic footbridge cannot be underestimated, and coordinated efforts should be made in the long term to secure this high profile infrastructure improvement."*

Visual Impact including on character of Conservation Area and setting of listed buildings

There is a photomontage showing the proposed bridge from the south east looking towards the town centre dominated by St Mary's church tower. The non-Statutory EIA submitted with the application describes in detail the Conservation Area, with its listed buildings and other heritage assets, and the pattern of land uses in the locality of the bridge. It looks at the new proposal in comparison with the adverse visual impact of the existing footbridge with its numerous concrete truss supports, solid concrete sides, and generally drab and outworn appearance. It also looks at the potential views from the proposed bridge, owing to its different alignment (NNW-SSE), as compared to those from the existing bridge.

The conclusion of the non-Statutory EIA is that the proposed new bridge will not have a direct impact on the listed buildings including the church with its 25m tower and that this has been accepted by English Heritage (from whom no consent is needed). As to the potential impact on the compact historic town core, characterised by small-scale buildings (except for the church), with the Downs in the distance, although concerns have been expressed by some local people, it concludes that the new bridge will contribute in a positive way and accord with the relevant Conservation Area policies. It states that appropriate consideration of height, form and colour is important to ensure it complements the existing characteristics of the Conservation Area.

Consideration of the visual impact of the architectural form of the new bridge is a largely subjective matter but there can be little doubt that it would be a vast improvement compared to the existing bridge.

The Design & Access Statement describes it as "*an elegant, visually discrete and contemporary structure that complements the open harbour setting"*. Whilst it is considered that falls short of being the 'iconic' structure envisaged in the Shoreham Renaissance strategy, it clearly has much to commend it in terms of the simplicity and 'lightweight' feel of its overall lines. The height of the main bridge deck is very similar to the existing bridge but the 8m high cable-stayed main opening span, although small in comparison with the overall length of the bridge, will be a visual feature seen from a greater distance than the existing bridge. It will affect views of St Mary's church tower and the Conservation Area from the south but, it is considered, because of its relatively negligible thickness, loosely akin to the mast of a boat, not of such dominance or inappropriate appearance as to warrant an objection.

The proposed glazed side parapets will give a 'lightweight' appearance, allowing maximum views from the bridge and through it, unlike the existing solid concrete parapets (or the stainless steel previously proposed). The glazing does give rise to concern that, over time, it will become more 'opaque' due to salt spray and weathering. In this context, from a visual aspect, the 1.4m height originally proposed for the parapets was considered preferable but it is not considered that the desire for a higher rail for safety reasons should be contested. Whether the gap between the 1.2m and 1.6m rails needs to be infilled with glass as proposed is more questionable but the argument expressed about the need for protection, from the strong winds which frequently occur, for pedestrians, especially those who are more vulnerable physically, is considered a sufficient reason. The NNW-SSE alignment of the proposed bridge makes its side more exposed to the direct angle of the prevailing south-west wind. The proposed LED lighting incorporated on the inner side of the 1.2m rails seems an appropriately discrete solution that minimises its effect beyond the bridge itself.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed bridge design is worthy of support in terms of its appearance and relationship to the Conservation Area. The detailing of the finishes is important, including the colour. It is considered that the glazing should not

be tinted and that light neutral tones are preferable. The Design & Access Statement states that the design philosophy is to have all materials naturally finished and left self-coloured, preferring to articulate surfaces to create interplay of light and shade. Large flat surfaces of concrete will be broken up with vertical recessed features to reduce their apparent visual expanse, limit adverse weathering and deter graffiti. It states that items requiring protection such as the steel deck beams, tower and hangers will be coated or sheathed in systems of a light neutral colour (yet to be decided).

It is also very important that the extensive 'landward' works carried out at either end of the bridge are to a high quality visually as well as functionally, and appropriately landscaped. For example, it is considered that the materials used for paving at the northern approach to the bridge, which will be more extensive than currently, need to be the same as those used for the recent pedestrianisation of East Street to which the bridge is directly connected by the recently-relocated Toucan crossing. There needs to be a consistent treatment of surfacing, landscaping, street furniture, etc to help ensure the pedestrian/cycle route is legible visually as an entity in its own right but also ensuring that the statutory requirement for having regard to the desirability enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is met.

Access

The provision of a new, wider footbridge that includes provision for riding cycles over the bridge as part of the long-distance cycle route is clearly a highly sustainable development. It should help to make cycling more attractive to a wider range of people, as well as continuing to provide for pedestrians. According to the Sustrans User Report, the existing bridge already caters for approx 760,000 movements each year of which 84,000 are by cyclists, so there is clearly scope to increase the number of cycle users. There is clearly a wider need, however, for works to create a much improved cycle route beyond the extent of this particular project.

The replacement bridge has been designed to Sustrans standards with a clear deck width of 4m. Current guidance for a bridge of this type is not to segregate pedestrians and cyclists, 4m width being considered adequate for the safety of all users. Apart from being economic, non-segregation encourages cyclists to go slower. 4m width is wide enough to enable access by emergency vehicles.

It is stated that the design, having regard to current best practice, does not include any restrictions or barriers to discourage inappropriate use (eg. by motorcycles) because such barriers would exclude legitimate users (cyclists and those with pushchairs and wheelchairs).

Impact on Ecology and Nature Conservation

Although the site comprises an uncommon and nationally-important assemblage of high-value habitats and their dependant species, the conclusion of the non-Statutory EIA is that the development, with the proposed mitigation, should result in no significant residual negative effects. It is proposed that areas damaged during the construction and demolition phases (eg. by temporary causeways) will be reinstated with native saltmarsh plants of local provenance (including sea lavender) to ensure no net loss of habitat, including planting of areas on the east side of the existing bridge already harmed by human activity, rubbish and dog fouling, and also planting the currently unvegetated areas shaded by the existing bridge. A 5-year monitoring period is considered necessary to ensure the saltmarsh plants establish successfully.

The report describes the provisions of the relevant legislation (Wildlife and Countryside Act, Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations), the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) and PPS9. Using recognised assessment techniques, it looks at the the construction and demolition phases of the new development, which are the areas of greatest concern, plus the operational of the new bridge once built. Construction activity effects included assessing habitat loss, direct harm to protected species or species of conservation value, and disturbance deterring species from using existing habitats. Operational effects assessed are habitat loss or modification due to new structure, neglect or inappropriate management of retained habitats, and opportunities for ecological enhancement.

The habitats within the area of the proposal include *intertidal mudflats* (which are a UK BAP priority habitat) and are considered to be of high ecological value both within the SSSI to the west and outside it to the east; *saltmarsh* (a UK BAP habitat) also considered to be of high value both within and outside the SSSI; *open river water* (not a BAP habitat but considered to be of high value due to its association with the above); *semi-improved and amenity grassland* (both negligible in ecological value).

It is highly likely that the bird population using the study area is of regional or national importance. The intertidal mudflats are renowned for their wintering populations of wading birds and those particularly supported by the Adur estuary are Ringed Plover, Redshank and Dunlin. The ecological value for fish is concluded to be medium but for reptiles it is low, and for other protected species negligible (although botanical species were not surveyed in detail or at the optimum season).

Mitigation measures stated as necessary to meet BAP objectives and ensure neutral/negative ecological impact, to avoid contamination of tidal sediment, include placing a geotextile layer between the existing ground level and imported material. The report states that, apart from laying the material for the raised causeways (and the bridge structure itself), the existing ground level must not be altered, scraped away or disturbed and vegetation not pulled up, and precautions must be taken using recognised best practice measures to prevent dispersal of foreign material (including that of the causeway) into the estuary and to prevent pollution.

The Assessment states that, although breeding birds are considered unlikely to be affected, a nesting bird inspection should be undertaken before works commence and, if active nests are found, works should be delayed until the birds have fledged. No mitigation is recommended for wintering and passage birds but noisy activity in the winter is an issue mentioned by the RSPB. To ensure a neutral/negligible effect on reptiles, any vegetation removal should be above a temperature of 5 degrees and in a progressive/methodical manner to allow any reptiles to escape. As for fish, January/February are the preferred months for piling in order to avoid the vibration affecting the key migratory season for locally-important fish(eg. brown trout and eel) – however, this is the period that most affects wintering birds in passage (the main reason for the SSSI designation of the estuary). Staggering construction across the river, starting at one side not both, would also maintain sufficient movement of fish along the river – it is stated that the Environment Agency will be further consulted on suitable mitigation of works.

Hydrological impact

The non-Statutory EIA concludes that, overall, despite the hydrological and hydrogeological sensitivity of the site, with the mudflats relying on flow and sediment dynamics within the estuary to ensure their continued existence as an important habitat, the impacts of the proposed development should be negligible. This is

provided suitable mitigation, pollution prevention and control measures are taken, using construction best practices. It concludes there would be no impact upon completion, as the position and number of supporting piers has only a very limited localised effect on river flow and sedimentation.

The assessment of potential impacts concentrates on those arising from construction of the 2 temporary causeways (10m wide with the northern one 30m long and the southern one 65m long) and also piling activity. These include the suspension of sediment in the water caused by construction disturbance and changes in flow rates. The mitigation measures include use of 150mm stone for temporary causeways to increase permeability to tidal flows, preventing any damming effect from these structures, and use of barges. The effects of sedimentation or scouring are predicted to be negligible/minor. The effects of run-off, dust and hydrocarbons from construction vehicles are assessed as negligible.

The chalk underlying the site is principal aquifer but it lies outside the boundary of the groundwater protection zone.

Clearly, the site is also within the flood risk area but the development proposed, being within the category of 'essential infrastructure', is exempt from the need for a Flood Risk Assessment subject to satisfying the 'exceptions test' in PPS25. It meets the exceptions test because the sustainable benefits of the bridge outweigh the flood risk, it will be safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere and there is no reasonable alternative site less at risk of flooding. The fewer supporting piers (7 as compared to 12), their cylindrical design and the reduced causeway length will help reduce obstruction of the flow of water and therefore help to lessen the risk of flooding of land.

The Environment Agency is embarking on a programme of flood defence improvements on this part of the river Adur, plans being relatively well advanced for the south side of the river where new defence works are proposed to give protection to a level of 4.83mAOD (50 year) and 5.53mAOD (100 year). Lower Beach Road is currently only 3.91mAOD and it is proposed as part of the bridge development to raise its height by 1 metre on this stretch. On the north side, where the footbridge meets the A259, the pavement height is currently 5.52m AOD.

Noise and Vibration

The non-Statutory EIA recognises that it will be necessary to mitigate the impacts of construction and demolition noise on sensitive receptors (such as residents and wildlife) as much as possible and as much as feasible without extending the development time. The main noise source is piling installation plus temporary causeway construction and demolition of the existing bridge. The construction period is stated to be 14 months (starting January 2012) which would include approximately 4 weeks to construct two temporary causeways and 15 weeks to install piles, piers and abutments, with intended opening of the new bridge in March 2013, followed by demolition of the old bridge in March-May 2013.

It states that, overall, the successful mitigation of noise will be achieved by use of the BS 5228 Code of Practice for noise on construction sites, and best practical means, with the prior consent (under section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974) of construction practices, hours, noise thresholds, and monitoring with the District Council's Environmental Health officers. It lists the following measures:-

- the hours of work will be planned and account taken of work duration and consequences of lengthening of work periods due to the tidal cycle of the estuary;
- quiet working methods will be employed as far as practicable;
- noise should be controlled at source and noise spread limited;
- on-site noise levels should be monitored at the start of noisy operations using an agreed appropriate method of measurement;
- consult the District Council on noise prevention measures and monitoring;
- consider the use of non-metallic 'dolly' between the hammer and the pile driving helmet and/or an acoustic shroud to enclose the pile-driving system;
- use rubber linings on chutes and dumpers to reduce impact noise;
- minimise drop heights of materials;
- avoid unnecessary engine revving and switch off equipment when not required.

It is stated in the D&A Statement that 2 types of piling will be involved - sheet piling at the end abutments and bored/driven piles for the 7 piers. The former are intended to be driven with a track-mounted high frequency hydraulic vibratory hammer producing approx 75dBA at 15m. The steel monopiles for the 7 piers will be installed either by auger boring and vibrating the casings, or by pre-augering and driving the casings. A combination of land-based plant (from the causeways) and marine-based plant from jack-leg barges will be used. Intended working hours are 8am-8pm but the barges may be moved outside these hours (dependant on tides). The deck beams and opening span sections will be installed by crane working either from the causeways or the barges (and the sections welded together on-site). Concrete will be delivered by ready-mix lorries and pumped into position.

Background noise surveys were undertaken on 7 April 2011 (between 7.30am and 6pm) at the nearest dwellings in Lower Beach Road and the High Street. Local and distant road traffic and occasional aircraft formed the general noise climate with average background noise levels respectively of 47dB/48.5dB LA90 10.5hrs.

As stated by the Council's Environmental Health section, it is not considered that there is any justifiable objection to the proposal on noise grounds. However, as there is no obligation for the contractor to obtain a consent under section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act, it is considered necessary that a condition is imposed on any planning permission requiring a scheme to minimise noise to be submitted and approved.

Air Quality

The non-Statutory EIA states that the assessment carried out focusses mainly on emissions, notably nitrogen dioxide, caused by the additional road traffic generated by the construction phase. The Highways Agency's DMRB Model has been used to assess the additional traffic impact and the outcome is that, at a worst case scenario, there would be an extremely small increase in nitrogen dioxide at a nearby point within the designated Shoreham High Street Air Quality Management Area.

Recommendation

That West Sussex County Council be informed that the District Council supports the replacement of the footbridge as proposed subject to conditions being imposed which include requirements for the submission and approval of:-

1. Details of a scheme to minimise noise from construction activity (on which the Council's Environmental Health section should be consulted);

2. Details of external finishes including colours, with a view expressed that tones should be neutral and glazing non-tinted;
3. Details of the hard and soft landscaping of the landward areas at the northern and southern ends of the bridge (including provision to replace any planting that fails), with a view expressed that these works need to be high quality and consistent with the East Street Pedestrianisation scheme;
4. Details of the precautions to be taken to minimise the impact on the SSSI and other saltmarsh and mudflat habitats and on birds, reptiles, fish and plants, including the associated saltmarsh planting of damaged areas and provision for the monitoring of such planting, with re-planting if necessary;
5. Details of the measures to be taken to safeguard the hydrology of the river;
6. Details of the measures to be taken to safeguard to protect against flood risk.

plus a condition requiring the existing bridge to be demolished and causeway removed, all associated debris removed and the saltmarsh habitat replanted where damaged, within a period not exceeding 6 months from the date of the opening of the new bridge to public use (NB. the demolition of the existing bridge is to be the subject of a separate application for conservation area consent because its northern half is within the Conservation Area).

……..