



# PAPER I

Purpose: For Decision

## Committee report

Committee	<b>CABINET</b>
Date	<b>TUESDAY 30 MARCH 2010</b>
Title	<b>MILITARY ROAD (A3055) - OPTIONS</b>
Report of	<b>CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT</b>

---

### PURPOSE

1. This paper sets out the background to coastal erosion on the south west coast of the Island and informs a decision on the implications to the highway network.

### OUTCOMES

2. To establish the councils approach to maintaining public access and addressing impacts on the local highway network and settlements in the area.

### BACKGROUND

#### History of the road

3. The A3055 Military Road is situated on the south western coast of the Island and links Freshwater Bay in the west with Chale in the east. The original road was constructed as part of a defence network in about 1860 and remained as a private gated road for about 70 years. It served as a link between forts and barracks and fluctuated between private and military use with private rights vested in the Seely family.
4. In 1930 or thereabouts, the landowner Sir Charles Seely donated what was then a narrow track to the Highways authority for public use. The track was vulnerable to erosion and a new road was constructed further inland. Some vestiges of the original alignment are still visible to the along the coast from Shippards Chine to the north west of the slumped area. The construction of the new road took place in the early 1930 with the formal opening of the last section in March 1936.
5. This area of coastline is constantly changing. The sedimentary nature of the rocks and effects of the sea, have had a dramatic impact on the land and man made features in this area. A number of coastal properties, together with hectares of farmland and amenities have been lost over time and the Blackgang

Chine pleasure park has been undergoing a lengthy and planned retreat over a number of years.

6. The ongoing erosion has also had an impact on roads in the area and the road constructed in 1936 was unable to follow the original route and had to be moved generally further inland and at a higher level due to land loss and ongoing erosion and landslip.
7. The council has been aware of these issues for some while and in the mid 1980s sought to divert the road inland at Afton Down so as to avoid an area of deep seated cracking and potential slippage. The planning application submitted in 1985 involved the excavation of a new cutting further up-slope through the downland owned by the National Trust.
8. The land in the area is of international environmental significance and the National Trust was not prepared to sell their land and opposed the scheme at the public inquiry. The Inspector considered the proposal and recommended that planning permission for the realignment should not be granted.
9. The council subsequently commissioned engineering / geological consultants to review the situation and their report dated January 2000 identified three areas of immediate concern. These are indicated on a map included as Appendix A to this report. They are:
  - a) Two sections on the elevated section east of Freshwater Bay, between the bay and Compton Chine. One approximately 100 metres long whilst the lower section to the east was approximately 150 metres in length.
  - b) The section at Shippards Chine, just north of the National Trust car park.
  - c) Adjacent to Brook Bay between the National Trust car park and Hanover Point.
10. The council acted on the recommendations of that report and submitted a planning application to stabilise the elevated section and reconstruct the road on the original alignment (a) above, plus realign the road just north of Shippards Chine (b) above.
11. The planning application was approved in December 2002 subject to 23 detailed conditions, on the basis that the piled elevated section shall be “dismantled and removed” following its failure or after 50 years from the completion of the works, which ever occurs first.
12. It was this factor that swayed the decision which was only considered acceptable in that that “it would have a relatively short-term impact on the candidate Special Area of Conservation, thereby not being contrary to the conservation objectives of the designated area and in accordance with Policy C9 of the IW Unitary Development Plan”.
13. The works were carried out in 2003 at a cost of some £3m. This approval was given subject to a legal agreement between the council and National Trust which requires that, even if still intact and open to traffic, at the end of 50 years from approval the road will have to be closed and the piles removed at a cost to the council. It would be unlikely that the council would be able to successfully

challenge this condition, in effect bringing about the closure of the Military Road as a through route.

### Ongoing erosion

14. Recent surveys have indicated that erosion is a growing problem at locations all along the western end of the military road, to such an extent that several key sections are now of real concern. Council engineers are now regularly inspecting a number of deep longitudinal fissures which run alongside the high level section of the road at Afton Down. Considerable sums were spent underpinning this section of the road and whilst the planning consent ultimately limits its life to another 43 years, premature failure here would effectively close the road and serves to highlight the fragility and uncertainty of the whole route.
15. The coastline at Shippards Chine (b) above is also under threat and despite comparatively recent works to realign the road and drain the area as part of the above project. The drainage system which was constructed to take away excess water has dramatically failed, the land in the area continues to slump with the result that the road here is under threat again, albeit in the slightly longer term.
16. The cliff edge between Brook Bay and Hanover Point location (c) above is of most immediate concern and has receded dramatically during the last few weeks. Once seen to be relatively stable, the distance between the cliff edge and the lay-by at this point was 12.3 metres in December 2009 and following ongoing cliff falls and slides is now (5 March 2010) under 1 metre (900mm).
17. Single lane working was introduced here on Monday 22 February so as to move traffic away from the encroaching cliff edge. The distance here continues to recede and it is considered that at the current rate of loss and with the prospect of more wet and cold spells this section of the road may be further compromised in the near future leading to its closure. The council has been monitoring this area daily for some while and the information included in Appendix C illustrates the rate of loss in this particular area.
18. Sections of the National Trust car park at Shippards Chine have recently slumped and it is clear that the council needs to consider what options are available and what could be done should the road be lost.

### STRATEGIC CONTEXT

19. Much of the Military Road, including the three areas in question is subject to a number of important national local environmental designations. The entire area falls within the Area of Outstanding Natural beauty (AONB) and Heritage Coast. The coastal strip is designated a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) a European designation under the Habitats Directive. Land at c) plus some sections north of the road are also designated a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). There are also a number of individual Sites of Importance Nature Conservation (SINC) in the area. A map illustrating these designations is included as Appendix D.
20. The future of the Island coast is considered in the Island's Shoreline Management Plan (SMP). This document provides a broad assessment of the long-term risks associated with coastal processes. It offers guidance to coastal

engineers and managers to identify and recommend strategic and sustainable coastal defence policy options for particular lengths of coast to reduce these risks to people, the developed and natural environments.

21. The SMP is an important part of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) strategy for flood and coastal defence. It has taken account of existing planning initiatives and legislative requirements and uses the best present knowledge on the possible effects of climate change and sea level rise. The plan informs and is supported by the statutory planning process.
22. The Islands first SMP was completed in 1997 and is now being reviewed by the council in line with guidance issued by Defra. Under this guidance the next plan will take a longer term view and instead of 50 years will look at one hundred years, over three time periods: 0-20 years, 20-50 years and 50-100 years
23. The SMP is a 'living' document and as well as being used by us as a decision making tool it is also used by a range of other organisations such as Environment Agency and Natural England to consider the planning and implementation of sea defences and other maritime works. It is also used by Defra when considering applications from the operating authorities to fund various coastal defence works.
24. Under the SMP the coastline of the Island has been subdivided into discrete "policy units", which are based on natural sediment movements and coastal processes as opposed to administrative or other boundaries. For each policy unit four coastal defence options are considered. These are set out below:

Policy	Comment
Hold the line	Maintain or upgrade level of protection by defences
Advance the line	Build new defences seaward of existing defences
Manage realignment	Allowing retreat of shoreline with management to control or limit movement
No active intervention	Not to invest in providing or maintaining defences

25. The south west coast of the Island falls under three policy units: Compton Chine to Freshwater Bay, Brook Chine to Compton Chine and St Catherine's Chine to Brook Chine. In each of these locations the SMP takes into consideration the location and use of the Military Road, proximity to the cliff edge and the effects of erosion, impact on the road and areas of nature conservation interest. It acknowledges the possibility of relocating the road inland, but recognises that the impact on the SAC, SSSI and other nature conservation / habitats would be "environmentally unacceptable". The SMP strategy for this area is therefore to do nothing – no active intervention. An extract from the current SMP is included in Annex E.
26. Reference is made to the route in a number of local policy documents including the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) adopted in May 2001 which makes reference to the poor condition of many of our local roads and the problems associated with the coastal erosion. UDP policy TR12 paragraph 14.33 states that "A number of problem areas exist on the Island, where roads pass either close to areas of coastal erosion or through land where unstable geological conditions exist. The resulting instability and land slippage continues to cause

problems in terms of carriageway maintenance and in some extreme instances, the actual long term future of some lengths of road. One such problem area is at the western end of the A3055 "Military Road" where a combination of coastal erosion and geological instability threatens to sever the roadway in several places".

27. Paragraph 14.34 of the UDP makes reference to the efforts made to secure the high level section by diverting the line inland and the failure to achieve approval for this at a Public Inquiry. Paragraph 14.34 is clear that "The council is now concentrating its efforts on maintaining the existing road for as long as possible". It concludes that "it is thought that the level of funding required to keep the road open in the longer term would be beyond the council's budget and whilst some work is available for road schemes and coastal sea defence work, this is normally only in those circumstances where a road is heavily used or where residential properties are under threat". The paragraph finishes "The council are continuing to monitor this situation and will examine all options available including the closure of the road re-routing traffic".

## CONSULTATION

28. The council has sought advice and comment from a range of organisations including Brighstone Parish Council, Isle of Wight Chamber of Commerce Tourism and Industry, National Trust, Environment Agency (EA), Natural England (NE) and the Isle of Wight Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Partnership (IOWAONBP).
29. Brighstone Parish Council was invited to comment on the situation, they felt that:
- The road is vital to the economy – it is one of the most spectacular roads in the country and is a tourist attraction in its own right and must be retained for that reason alone.
  - It is a vital link between the West Wight (Freshwater Bay) and South Wight (Niton and Ventnor)
  - Doing nothing is not an option and rerouting traffic through the quiet village of Brook would be totally unacceptable, particularly in terms of road width and junction layout.
  - The minimum necessary would be a Brook bypass, which was considered to be more costly than re-routing the road itself.
  - The Parish Council felt that it would be "absurd to have spent a small fortune" maintaining the Afton Down section to allow it to disappear in a location where re routing is possible.
  - The group felt that the scheme should be included in the Roads Maintenance PFI and were concerned about the longer term implications of erosion on residential properties and businesses.
30. Similar comments have been received from the Isle of Wight Chamber of Commerce, Tourism and Industry, who in their letter to the Portfolio Holder dated 11 March stated: "We have made a commitment to lobby the relevant organisations to keep this route open by any means necessary, as we all feel that it is vital tourist link road to the West Wight and we cannot afford to lose this route. We know that the council will also want to keep this road open and it might mean a rerouting of the existing highway. We would support this action

and would like to make sure that the business case is firmly put forward in support of this.”

31. The Parish Council was also concerned regarding the longer term implications for residential properties and businesses and suggested a number of possible solutions including:
  - Including a bypass funded as part of the roads Maintenance PFI project.
  - Protecting the cliff through the placing of rock armour and back filling behind.
  - Reinforcing the existing carriageway using sheet piling or similar.
32. The Environment Agency expressed concern that any works in this area has the potential to affect a number of protected areas including the South Wight Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which is a site of European importance for nature conservation, Compton Chine to Steephill Cove designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Compton Grange and Brook Field a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
33. They also identified that if seeking to construct a new route inland any works in excess of 1 hectare would require a Flood Risk Assessment and, if culverting watercourses, would require specific Environment Agency consent. They would also wish to ensure that any scheme seeks to avoid damage to protected species and their habitat.
34. Works to construct a bypass, reinforce the road or stabilise the cliff through rock armour would require a planning application to which Natural England would be a statutory consultee. They are highly likely to object to any proposal which affected a protected site, in particular the SAC which covers that area of beach and cliff currently under immediate threat
35. Natural England are also liable to object to any proposal which would affect the designated areas and was of the opinion that the truncation of the route and diversion of traffic via the existing road network, would provide a good opportunity for natural processes to govern the landscape and provide a long term sustainable solution.
36. Isle of Wight Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Partnership has concerns over the potential impact of a re-alignment project on the local landscape and habitats. They also question how long a re-alignment would survive before further works required. The partnership prefer the traffic re-direction approach but are aware this may raise a number of other local issues particularly in respect of the suitability and possible adjustment of the network to accommodate additional traffic.
37. National Trust (NT) own areas of land in the area stretching from just east of Freshwater Bay through to Brookgreen. This includes East Afton Down, Compton Down a coastal strip south of the road and two key sections both to the north and south of the road in the vicinity of the Coastguard Cottages, to the south west of Brook. A map indicating NT ownership in this area is included in Annex B.

38. The land here is “inalienable” and as such has special protection afforded to it by Parliament implemented by virtue of section 18 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981. The Trust views this status as being essential protection for the assets it holds for charitable purposes "for the benefit of the nation". Indeed land is often given by donors precisely because of these powers. It is likely that any inland diversion would pass to the south of the coastguard cottages thereby crossing an area of inalienable NT land.
39. The Special Parliamentary Procedure under the Statutory Orders (Special Procedure) Act 1945 makes provision for the acquisition of inalienable land, but whatever the case this could only happen by use of a Compulsory Purchase Order.
40. The National Trust is clearly aware of the broader issues surrounding coastal erosion and is facing similar issues at a number of sites across the country. They have said that they would have to take a view with regards to land in this area and any view would take into consideration its protected status.

#### FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

41. It is anticipated that the cost of constructing a bypass round the affected area to include areas (b) and (c) would be in the region of £8m including environmental mitigation and land acquisition costs. It is estimated that a scheme to protect the existing road with sheet piling and rock armour would be of a similar magnitude. Brighstone Parish Council has previously suggested the construction of a bypass to the east of Brook. This has a separate raft of environmental implications and will be of a similar magnitude of cost. Schemes of this cost are outside the scope of council funding and money would have to be achieved from other sources. Consideration has been given to a number of alternatives including PFI, Government funding and European sources.

#### Private Finance Initiative

42. Consideration has been given to the possibility of including the works within the PFI road maintenance bid. Discussions have concluded that it would not be possible to accommodate these works as part of this funding mechanism which is solely for the maintenance of existing roads and not for new road construction.

#### Government funding

43. The council has previously been successful in achieving funding for major bids (£5m+) from the government. Some while ago the government devolved its transport funding to a Regional level and any bid would now have to be submitted to the South East of England Partnership Board (SEEPB) - formerly SEERA, for detailed consideration.
44. The national assessment criteria under which any bid would be assessed was established under the Government New Approach to Appraisal process (NATA). Under this process the benefits of any works would be set against the disadvantages and a resulting figure - Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) be identified. It is essential that the benefits must outweigh the disadvantages

45. Factors for consideration would include the cost of the works and how it will benefit the local area, including supporting the release of land for housing, new business use, tackling congestion and improve travel by public transport, walking and cycling. The process would balance any positive benefits against the impact on the local environment, including the sites of nature conservation, in particular European designations, AONB and Heritage Coast etc.
46. Consideration of the policies contained in the Shoreline Management Plan would be critical here, as would be how long the funded works would be in place. The normal period required would be 50 years, so as to ensure the appropriate use of government money and ensure value for money. This period would be difficult to guarantee in this location especially bearing in mind the unstable nature of the area, history of subsidence and most crucially an existing planning approval which limits the life of the road to 43 years from now. The time remaining would actually be less than that taking into consideration the funding process, design and construction period which together could total in the order of 5 years, thereby reducing the time that the route would be available to 37 years.
47. Any such bid would be in competition with other schemes from within the South East area including those supporting major regeneration projects such as Thames Gateway, airport enhancements, road schemes and other major transport initiatives. The preparation of a comprehensive bid is estimated to cost in the region of £500,000 - £750,000, although this would need to be tested through a competitive tendering process and could take 3 to 4 years.
48. It is considered that given the specific circumstances which exist here, including the low traffic flows on Military Road alternative options to divert traffic via the middle road, absence of any supporting economic development potential or housing and impact on the environment, such a proposal would not achieve a positive BCR or stack up well against the competing regional priorities. It is therefore considered highly unlikely that we would be able to achieve funding to retain the existing route or divert the road inland through this process.

#### European funding

49. The council has investigated the possibility of achieving funding from the European Union and understands that it is also unlikely that any funding could be achieved from these sources. Consideration would be given to a range factors similar to those set out in the NATA process. Of particular relevance would be the impact on a site protected by a European designation.
50. The council has looked at what other options may be available and it is considered that whilst it may not be possible to achieve funding to divert or retain the road, support may be available to help provide a coastal path / cycle route or upgrade the existing network in this area. These options will be investigated further if appropriate. It is thought that the National Trust, Natural England and AONBP and would be supportive of such an idea.

#### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

51. For as long as the vulnerable sections of Military Road remain in existence the council will need to carry out highway maintenance in accordance with its

statutory duties as highway authority. This will include repair and maintenance to the extent that this can be carried out within the physical limits of the highway and any supporting structures. However, this would not include works necessary to stabilise the surrounding land which forms part of the landslip geological complex or works to resolve the underlying movement problems attributable to groundwater seepage through the landslip area.

52. Over time the road will become progressively less safe for use by vehicular and non-vehicular users as the carriageway becomes distorted and/or further sections collapse. The council will need therefore to consider in the future of the route and how to manage this risk.
53. Should a section or sections of the road be lost the council will need to close the road to prevent hazard to users and others.
54. Clearly the loss or severance of the road will cause some inconvenience to properties which depend upon it for access, but sooner or later the point will come when it is not feasible to maintain the existing road.
55. Any move to re-route the road inland through land within National Trust ownership would require an approach under the Special Parliamentary Procedure under the Statutory Orders (Special Procedure) Act 1945. This would no doubt involve additional legal expense and may not be successful.

#### EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY

56. Full consideration of the Equality and Diversity issues will given and a Equality Impact Assessment carried out to look at what impacts any decision may have on the diverse community of the Island.

#### OPTIONS

57. A number of options exist these are as follows:
  - Option a) To protect / maintain the current road by the construction of sea defences or piling within the existing carriageway.
  - Option b) To realign the road further inland.
  - Option c) When the road is no longer safe to use, truncate the road either side of point (c) and install turning point and improve car parking as necessary.

#### EVALUATION

58. Although classified as an A road the Military Road does not link any major settlements and even by Island standards is lightly trafficked. We regularly monitor traffic use across our road network and our surveys show that the number of vehicles using the road between Niton and Freshwater Bay is in the region of 3000 vehicles per day in the winter, this figure rises to 5000 per day in the summer.

59. The distribution size and demographic make up of the settlements in the West Wight is such that traffic flows are generally lower than those experienced elsewhere on the Island. The main road between Newport and Yarmouth (A3054) with its cross Solent ferry port carries on average 6000 vehicles per day while the B3399, which links Chale to Chessell and then onto Freshwater, carries in the region of 3000 vehicles per day on the Newport Road section, near Tapnell Cottages. The “middle road” B3401 which links Carisbrooke and Newport to Chessell carries in the region of 4,500 vehicles per day.
60. By comparison during the same period the number of vehicles using Medina Way, is in the region of 30,000 vehicles per day and Fairlee Road 19,500 vehicles per day.
61. There is a belief therefore that the majority of the traffic using the Military Road does so because it is there – for the views or access to the coast and beaches, rather than as a strategic link between settlements. This idea is underlined by the comments received from Brighstone Parish Council and recorded in the local press and elsewhere. Our traffic data reinforces the seasonal nature of this and shows an increase in weekend flows and large seasonal variations, something which our strategic network does not experience elsewhere.
62. Option A – would involve the protection of the existing carriageway through sea defence works, on-line sheet piling and or drainage works.
63. It may at one stage to have been possible to protect the existing carriageway in the areas currently under immediate threat, however the speed of regression has been such that very little of the cliff edge now remains in this area with the result that the carriageway is now right alongside the beach. The situation is further complicated in that chines are also forming either side of the area under threat, with the result that any protection or piling works would have to cover a larger area to include all of these emerging chines, plus be of sufficient length to ensure that any protected areas are not undercut at the ends as a result of adjoining erosion.
64. Works of this nature would require planning consent and it is likely that objections would be received from a number of statutory bodies and the landowner National Trust on the basis that the works would be contrary to the Shoreline Management Plan and the impact on the areas of nature conservation and designated sites. (See option B below)
65. Option B – The realignment of the route to the required standard would require land outside of the existing highway and as a consequence there would need to be a planning application to authorise the scheme. The National Trust own part of the land required and English Nature and the Environment Agency would be just two of the statutory consultees.
66. It is likely that any planning application will be challenged by the Environment Agency, Natural England, AONB partnership and others and that the planning application would be called in for a Public Inquiry. This whole process would not take less than 3 years, would be likely to cost the council in the region of £500,000 - £750,000 and is highly likely to result in the proposal being rejected.

67. Subject to any necessary planning approval we would need to find funding for the new road, which taking into consideration the cost associated with construction, land acquisition and mitigation is thought to be in the region of £8m. Even if the scheme received planning approval the cost would take it beyond the scope of our existing budget and as a new construction it would not be possible to fund it through the PFI process,
68. We would therefore need to bid for government funding to the SEEPB. The scheme would be assessed under the government's appraisal process It is highly unlikely that this would favour a scheme which looks to improve a lightly trafficked rural road within a landscape which is so heavily protected by national and European designations.
69. The government would also wish to be assured that any investment would last at least 50 years and an important consideration here would be the limited lifespan imposed by the planning approval and the potential risks to construction within such a high risk area of ongoing instability and coastal erosion.
70. Even if we were able to overcome all of these hurdles, this realignment of the route would only be a temporary solution bearing in mind the ongoing problem of coastal erosion. Looking at the erosion rate which we have seen in this area unless we re-route the road well inland we would still be facing the same sorts of issues within the next 7-10 years. And in any event the planning approval for higher section ultimately limits the use of this road making a strategy to continually realign the road further inland unsustainable.
71. Option C - It is considered that in view of the issues relating to funding, land designation / protection and ownership the pragmatic alternative is to terminate the existing road at a appropriate points on either side of point (c) and create turning point and improve car parking as required. The creation of an alternative cycleway / footpath through the upgrading of the remaining verge or improvements to the existing rights of way network would help to maintain the coastal path and cycle route.
72. The signing of cross-Island traffic would be revised so as to divert traffic away from this area onto alternative roads such as the A3054, Newport to West Wight road and B3401 "middle road" Newport to West Wight route. Any remaining local traffic would be diverted inland and onto the middle road from junctions at Chale, Brighstone, Brook and Freshwater Bay.
73. Traffic figures would indicate that the possible inland diversion route through Brook is operating at a fraction of its capacity and is more than sufficient to carry the additional traffic flows which would result from a diversion of the Military Road traffic, if that was to be the decision.
74. It is considered that in view of this there would be no need for parking restrictions to ensure adequate capacity, although occasionally people would have to give way to those travelling in the opposite direction if parked vehicles were encountered.
75. In terms of the safety and traffic speed on the inland route, the council has no reason to assume that there would be any greater risk of accidents on this route

than on any of the island's other roads. It is considered that speed limits already in place are appropriate and the council has no reason to assume that those would not be respected by motorists. As with any planned change to traffic routes, the council would monitor speeds, traffic flows and accident rates carefully in Brook village and along the whole route and make whatever interventions are thought necessary to ensure that the route continued to operate safely.

## RISK MANAGEMENT

76. The council should consider a number of risks when considering this issue.
77. Options A and B represents the highest risk to the council both in time and environmental costs, we could also potentially lose £750,000 in terms of wasted development costs. In addition some reputational damage may occur with our partners in the Environment Agency English Heritage, SEEPB and AONB by a proposal that would have a significant impact on the landscape for what may be only a short term solution.
78. Option C is of a lower risk; however consideration must be given to any impact on tourism and residential properties from the closure of the road to through traffic. Consideration must also be given to residents who live along the existing inland routes and who believe that roads in their area may experience additional traffic. These concerns may however be offset by others including locals who may welcome the comparative tranquilly brought about by the absence of traffic along this section of the coast and be happy to access the area on foot and or cycle.
79. When the road becomes unsafe, the redirection of unnecessary traffic away from the Military Road would present fewer risks to the remainder of the road and may help prolong its life. However there may be opposition from those who believe that they will be affected by rerouted traffic.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

80. That when the road becomes unsafe, the council truncates the road both side of the breach at point (c) and install turning heads and improve car parking as necessary. (Option c above)

## BACKGROUND PAPERS

81. Unitary Development Plan [www.iwight.com](http://www.iwight.com)
82. Isle of Wight Local Transport Plan 2001-2006 [www.iwight.com/transport](http://www.iwight.com/transport)
83. Isle of Wight Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 [www.iwight.com/transport](http://www.iwight.com/transport)
84. Shoreline Management Plan.

## APPENDICES ATTACHED

85. [Appendix A](#) - Location map.
86. [Appendix B](#) - Map illustrating land within the ownership of National Trust.
87. [Appendix C](#) - Record or erosion ant point (c).
88. [Appendix D](#) - Local Nature conservation and protection designations.
89. [Appendix E](#) - Extract from the Shoreline Management Plan.
90. [Appendix F](#) - Photographs showing recent cliff falls.
91. [Appendix G](#) - Signing strategy and map

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Contact Point: Chris Wells Transport Policy Manager  
Tel (01983) 821000 email - [chris.wells@iow.gov.uk](mailto:chris.wells@iow.gov.uk)

STUART LOVE  
*Director of Environment and  
Neighbourhoods*

COUNCILLOR EDWARD GILES  
*Cabinet Member for Environment and  
Transport*