

England Coast Path Stretch: Eastbourne to Camber

Report EBC 2: Bay View Caravan Park, Pevensey Bay to Herbrand Walk, Cooden

Part 2.1: Introduction

Start Point:	Bay View Caravan Park, Pevensey Bay (Grid reference 564876 102546)
End Point:	Herbrand Walk, Cooden (Grid reference 569786 106115)
Relevant Maps:	EBC 2a to EBC 2d

2.1.1 This is one of a series of linked but legally separate reports published by Natural England under section 51 of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, which make proposals to the Secretary of State for improved public access along and to this stretch of coast between Eastbourne and Camber.

2.1.2 This report covers length EBC 2 of the stretch, which is the coast between Bay View Caravan Park, Pevensey Bay and Herbrand Walk, Cooden. It makes free-standing statutory proposals for this part of the stretch, and seeks approval for them by the Secretary of State in their own right under section 52 of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949.

2.1.3 The report explains how we propose to implement the England Coast Path (“the trail”) on this part of the stretch, and details the likely consequences in terms of the wider ‘Coastal Margin’ that will be created if our proposals are approved by the Secretary of State. Our report also sets out:

- any proposals we think are necessary for restricting or excluding coastal access rights to address particular issues, in line with the powers in the legislation; and
- any proposed powers for the trail to be capable of being relocated on particular sections (“roll-back”), if this proves necessary in the future because of coastal change.

2.1.4 There is also a single Overview document for the whole of this stretch of coast, explaining common principles and background. **This and the other individual reports relating to the stretch should be read in conjunction with the Overview. The Overview explains, among other things, how we have considered any potential environmental impacts of improving public access to this part of the coast, and this report, and other separately published assessments we refer to, then provides more detail on these aspects where appropriate.**

Part 2.2: Proposals Narrative

The trail:

2.2.1 Follows existing walked routes along all of this length.

2.2.2 Mainly follows the coastline quite closely and has excellent views of the sea in places.

2.2.3 Is aligned on the beach or foreshore between Pevensey Bay Sailing Club and Bay Avenue, for a short section seaward of Normans Bay Camping and Caravanning Club Site and from the east of Normans Bay to Herbrand Walk.

2.2.4 Is aligned in places on 'unadopted roads' adjacent to the beach at Pevensey Bay to provide rest bite from walking on the shingle beach.

2.2.5 Is aligned a short distance inland on the pavement along Bay Avenue and Coast Road between EBC-2-S054 and EBC-2-S074 and is mainly aligned on the road through Normans Bay.

2.2.6 Is aligned along the landward side of a flood bank for a short section at Normans Bay between EBC-2-S084 and EBC-2-S089.

Protection of the environment:

In this part of the report, we explain how we have taken account of environmental protection objectives in developing our proposals for improved coastal access.

2.2.7 The following designated sites affect this length of coast:

- Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SPA
- Pevensey Levels SAC
- Pevensey Levels Ramsar
- Pevensey Levels SSSI
- Beachy Head East Marine Conservation Zone
- Martello tower no 55, 500m south west of Normans' Bay Station Scheduled Monument
- Shingle Beach at Normans Bay Local Wildlife Site

Map C in the Overview shows the extent of designated areas listed.

The following table brings together design features included in our access proposals to help to protect the environment along this length of the coast.

2.2.8 Measures to protect the environment

Map(s)	Route section number(s)	Design features of the access proposals	Reason included
EBC 2b	EBC-2-S040	We will install: <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ A replacement interpretive panel south of Sea Road Car Park.	■ To highlight the presence and potential vulnerability of vegetated shingle.
EBC 2c	EBC-2-S077	We will install: <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ A new interpretive panel on the shingle bank at Normans Bay.	■ To highlight the presence and potential vulnerability of vegetated shingle.

2.2.9 Natural England is satisfied that the proposals for coastal access in this report are made in accordance with relevant environmental protection legislation. In respect of cultural heritage, we have taken advice from Historic England and others before confirming this conclusion. For more information about how we came to this conclusion, see the following assessments of the access proposals that we have published separately:

- A Habitats Regulations Assessment relating to any potential impact on the conservation objectives of European sites.
- Our Nature Conservation Assessment, in which we document our conclusions in relation to other potential impacts on nature conservation.

Accessibility:

2.2.10 There are few artificial barriers to accessibility on the proposed route. However, the coastal terrain is often challenging for people with reduced mobility and this is the case on sections of our proposed route because:

- The trail would follow an uneven and unconsolidated shingle beach in places;
- The trail follows a section of path that is narrow in places landward of the coastal defence bank at sections EBC-2-S084 to EBC-2-S086;
- There is a narrow existing gap in the fence entering Pevensy Bay Sailing Club, we have looked for options to create more accessible opening, but this is not currently possible;
- The optional alternative route in Pevensy Bay is narrow and uneven in places.

2.2.11 At section EBC-2-S084 the fence will be moved in order to create a wider path alongside the coastal defence bank. We envisage this happening as part of the establishment works described below.

See part 6a of the Overview - 'Recreational issues' - for more information.

Where we have proposed exercising statutory discretions:

2.2.12 Landward boundary of the coastal margin: We have used our discretion on some sections of the route to map the landward extent of the coastal margin to an adjacent physical boundary such as a fence line, pavement or track to make the extent of the new access rights clearer. See Table 2.3.1 below.

2.2.13 Seaward of Normans Bay Caravan and Camping Club Site we have used this discretion to limit the landward extent of the coastal margin to the landward top edge of the track that runs atop the extensive coastal bank. This has had the effect of reducing the amount of coastal margin that would have otherwise been available by default. This option provides the most clarity (a) because of the sprawling nature of the bank we are unable to locate its landward extent and (b) because behind the bank there are areas of shingle interspersed with scrub and grass. The shingle would ordinarily be included in the coastal margin by default because it forms part of the beach, however it is so patchy that walkers would find it difficult to identify the extent of their coastal access rights.

2.2.14 The Proposals Tables show where we are proposing to alter the default landward boundary of the coastal margin. These proposals are set out in columns 5b and 5c of table 2.3.1. Where these columns are left blank, we are making no such proposals, so the default landward boundary applies. See the note relating to Columns 5b & 5c [above Table 2.3.1] explaining what this means in practice.

See also part 3 of the Overview - ‘Understanding the proposals and accompanying maps’, for a more detailed explanation of the default extent of the coastal margin and how we may use our discretion to adjust the margin, either to add land or to provide clarity.

2.2.15 Optional alternative routes: An optional alternative route is to operate as an optional diversion from the ordinary route between EBC-2-S019 and EBC-2-S024 when it is subject to exceptionally high tides. The optional alternative route is to be at the centre of the line shown as EBC-2-OA001 to EBC-2-OA005 on map EBC 2a. It would not have the effect of creating any additional spreading room on either the seaward or the landward side.

2.2.16 By default, an optional alternative route covers the land two metres either side of the approved line. However, by virtue of s55D(2) of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, where the optional alternative route follows an existing path corridor, we may propose that the trail should adopt a variable width as dictated by the existing physical features on either side. Columns 5a and 5b of this table describe the boundaries of the alternative route strips on any route sections where we have proposed use of this discretion in order to clarify the extent of the access strip.

2.2.17 Other factors affecting access: At route sections EBC-2-S006 and EBC-2-S017 seaward of Grey Towers Caravan Park, EBC-2-S029 and EBC-2-S033 between Leyland Road and Western Road, EBC-2-S041 and EBC-2-S047 between the car park and Seaville Drive, EBC-2-S097 and EBC-2-S104 to the east of Normans Bay between the car park and Herbrand Walk, public access may be interrupted from time-to-time for short periods due to exceptionally high tides. In these areas advisory signs will be installed to inform people that on these occasions the route may not be accessible for a short period of time until the tide subsides. We did not consider it necessary to install optional alternative routes as the exceptionally high tides rarely occur (normally only in winter during periods of strong wind) and walkers would not normally have to wait long before they are able to pass.

2.2.18 Coastal erosion: Natural England is able to propose that the route of the trail would be able to change in the future, without further approval from the Secretary of State, in response to coastal change. This would happen in accordance with the criteria and procedures for ‘roll-back’ set out in part 7 of the Overview.

Natural England may only propose the use of this roll-back power:

4 England Coast Path | Eastbourne to Camber | EBC 2: Bay View Caravan Park, Pevensey Bay to Hebrand Walk, Cooden

- as a result of coastal erosion or other geomorphological processes or encroachment by the sea, or
- in order to link with other parts of the route that need to roll back in direct response to such changes.

2.2.19 Column 4 of tables 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 indicates where roll-back has been proposed in relation to a route section. Where this is the case, the route, as initially determined at the time the report was prepared, is to be at the centre of the line shown on maps EBC 2a to EBC 2d as the proposed route of the trail.

2.2.20 If at any time in the future any part of a route section upon which roll-back has been specified needs, in Natural England's view, to change in order for the overall route to remain viable, the new route for the part in question will be determined by Natural England without further reference to the Secretary of State. This will be done in accordance with the criteria and procedures described under the title 'Roll-back' in part 7 of the Overview and section 4.10 of the Coastal Access Scheme. If this happens, the new route will become the approved route for that section for the purposes of the Order which determines where coastal access rights apply.

2.2.21 On sections for which roll-back is not proposed in table 2.3.2, the route is to be at the centre of the line shown on map EBC 2b and 2c as the proposed route of the trail.

Other future change:

2.2.22 At this point we do not foresee any other need for future changes to the access provisions that we have proposed within this report. However, on the coast road in Normans Bay (route sections EBC-2-S084 to EBC-2-S087, maps 2c and 2d) the development of a new Sustrans Cycle Route is imminent. Whilst this is not expected to affect the proposed route alignment in this area, it may result in improvements to the walking surface and widening of the walking route in areas where it is currently narrow.

See parts 7 - 'Future changes' of the Overview for more information.

Establishment of the trail:

2.2.23 Below we summarise how our proposed route for the trail would be physically established to make it ready for public use before any new rights come into force.

Establishment works will only start on this length of coast once these proposals have been approved by the Secretary of State. The works may therefore either precede or follow the start of establishment works on other lengths of coast within the stretch, and detailed in their separate reports.

2.2.24 Our estimate of the capital costs for physical establishment of the trail on the proposed route is £24,955.00 and is informed by:

- information already held by the access authority, East Sussex County Council, in relation to the management of the existing public rights of way;
- the conclusions of our deliberations in relation to potential impacts on the environment; and
- information gathered while visiting affected land and talking to the people who own and manage it about the options for the route.

2.2.25 There are six main elements to the overall cost:

- A significant number of new signs would be needed to waymark the main and optional alternative routes.

- New and replacement interpretation panels would be installed at various locations to inform people about vegetated shingle habitat.
- New advisory signs will be installed in specific locations to inform people that access may be interrupted from time-to-time for short periods due to exceptionally high tides.
- New advisory signs will be installed where the route uses the road between EBC-2-S082 and EBC-2-S083 to alert drivers to the potential for pedestrians to be in the road ahead.
- The existing fence will be moved slightly landward at EBC-2-S084, to widen the route at an existing narrow pinch point.
- The surfaces and access furniture of the existing paths and footways on the proposed route are generally of a suitable standard for the trail, but there is one place where a dropped kerb would enhance the convenience of the trail. More significant items of establishment works are shown on the relevant maps accompanying this report.

Table 1 shows our estimate of the capital cost for each of the main elements of physical establishment described above.

Table 1: Estimate of capital costs

Item	Cost
Signs	£13,900.00
Interpretation panels	£5,000.00
Dropped kerb	£2,000.00
Fence relocation	£800.00
Project management	£3255.00
Total	£24,955.00 (Exclusive of any VAT payable)

2.2.26 The shingle beach between Pevensey Bay and Cooden is maintained by the Environment Agency. We have taken advice about where to locate any structures such as waymarking signs so that they do not impede beach replenishment works.

2.2.27 Once the Secretary of State's decision on our report has been notified, and further to our conversations with land managers during the route planning stage, East Sussex County Council will liaise with affected land owners and occupiers about relevant aspects of the design, installation and maintenance of the new signs and infrastructure that are needed on their land. Prior to works being carried out on the ground, all necessary permissions, authorisations and consents will be obtained. All such works would conform to the published standards for National Trails and the other criteria described in our Coastal Access Scheme.

Maintenance of the trail:

2.2.28 Because the trail on this length of coast will form part of the National Trail being created around the whole coast of England called the England Coast Path, we envisage that it will be maintained to the same high quality standards as other National Trails in England (see The New Deal; Management of National Trails in England from April 2013: details at Annex A of the Overview).

2.2.29 We estimate that the annual cost to maintain the trail will be £3,388.53 (exclusive of any VAT payable). In developing this estimate we have taken account of the formula used to calculate Natural England's contribution to the maintenance of other National Trails.

Part 2.3: Proposals Tables

See Part 3 of Overview for guidance on reading and understanding the tables below.

2.3.1 Section Details: Maps EBC 2a to EBC 2d - Bay View Caravan Park, Pevensey Bay to Herbrand Walk, Cooden

Key notes on table:

1. Column 2 – an asterisk (*) against the route section number means see also table 2.3.3: Other options considered.
2. Column 4 – ‘No’ means no roll-back is proposed for this route section. ‘Yes – normal’ means roll-back is proposed and is likely to follow the current feature (e.g. cliff edge/beach) for the foreseeable future as any coastal change occurs.
3. Column 4 – ‘Yes – see table 2.3.4’ means roll-back is proposed, but refer to that table below about our likely approach to implementing it for this route section. This is because a more complex situation exists in this case and consideration must be given to how roll-back may happen in relation to excepted land, a protected site etc.
4. Column 5a - Certain coastal land types are included automatically in the coastal margin where they fall landward of the trail if they touch it at some point. The relevant land type (foreshore, cliff, bank, barrier, dune, beach, flat or section 15 land – see Glossary) is shown in this column where appropriate. “No” means none present on this route section.
5. Columns 5b and 5c – Any entry in these columns means we are proposing to align the landward boundary of the coastal margin on this route section with the physical feature(s) shown in 5b, for the reason in 5c. No text here means that for this route section the landward edge of the margin would be that of the trail itself - or if any default coastal land type is shown in 5a, that would be its landward boundary instead.

1	2	3	4	5a	5b	5c	6
Map(s)	Route section number(s)	Current status of route section(s)	Roll-back proposed? (See Part 7 of Overview)	Landward margin contains coastal land type?	Proposal to specify landward boundary of margin (See maps)	Reason for landward boundary proposal	Explanatory notes
EBC 2a	EBC-2-S001*	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Edge of track	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2a	EBC-2-S002 to EBC-2-S023*	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 2.3.4	Yes - beach			
EBC 2a to	EBC-2-S024 to	Public highway	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Landward edge of road	Clarity and cohesion	

1	2	3	4	5a	5b	5c	6
Map(s)	Route section number(s)	Current status of route section(s)	Roll-back proposed? (See Part 7 of Overview)	Landward margin contains coastal land type?	Proposal to specify landward boundary of margin (See maps)	Reason for landward boundary proposal	Explanatory notes
EBC 2b	EBC-2-S028*						
EBC 2b	EBC-2-S029 to EBC-2-S032*	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 2.3.4	Yes - beach			
EBC 2b	EBC-2-S033*	Public highway	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Landward edge of road	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2b	EBC-2-S034*	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Fence line	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2b	EBC-2-S035 to EBC-2-S048*	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 2.3.4	Yes - beach			
EBC 2b	EBC-2-S049*	Public highway	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Landward edge of road	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2b	EBC-2-S050 to EBC-2-S052*	Public highway	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Landward edge of road	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2b	EBC-2-S053*	Public highway	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No			
EBC 2b	EBC-2-S054*	Public footway (pavement)	Yes – See table 2.3.4	No	Pavement edge	Clarity and cohesion	

1	2	3	4	5a	5b	5c	6
Map(s)	Route section number(s)	Current status of route section(s)	Roll-back proposed? (See Part 7 of Overview)	Landward margin contains coastal land type?	Proposal to specify landward boundary of margin (See maps)	Reason for landward boundary proposal	Explanatory notes
EBC 2b to EBC 2c	EBC-2-S055 to EBC-2-S067*	Public footway (pavement)	No	No	Various	Clarity and cohesion	Various means pavement edge and default width (2m) in places where the trail crosses the road.
EBC 2c	EBC-2-S068*	Public highway	No	No			
EBC 2c	EBC-2-S069 to EBC-2-S073*	Public footway (pavement)	No	No	Pavement edge	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2c	EBC-2-S074*	Other existing walked route	No	No	Landward edge of road	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2c	EBC-2-S075*	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No			
EBC 2c	EBC-2-S076 to EBC-2-S080*	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 2.3.4	Yes - bank	Landward edge of bank	Clarity and cohesion	See paragraph 2.2.13
EBC 2c	EBC-2-S081	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 2.3.4	Yes - bank	Landward edge of bank	Clarity and cohesion	See paragraph 2.2.13

1	2	3	4	5a	5b	5c	6
Map(s)	Route section number(s)	Current status of route section(s)	Roll-back proposed? (See Part 7 of Overview)	Landward margin contains coastal land type?	Proposal to specify landward boundary of margin (See maps)	Reason for landward boundary proposal	Explanatory notes
EBC 2c	EBC-2-S082 and EBC-2-S083	Public highway	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Landward edge of road	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2c to EBC 2d	EBC-2-S084 to EBC-2-S088	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Fence line	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2d	EBC-2-S089	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Fence line	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2d	EBC-2-S090 and EBC-2-S091*	Public highway	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Landward edge of road	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2d	EBC-2-S092*	Public footpath	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Landward edge of road	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2d	EBC-2-S093*	Public highway	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Landward edge of road	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2d	EBC-2-S094*	Public highway	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Landward edge of road	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2d	EBC-2-S095*	Public highway	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Landward edge of road	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2d	EBC-2-S096 to EBC-2-S102*	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Fence line	Clarity and cohesion	

1	2	3	4	5a	5b	5c	6
Map(s)	Route section number(s)	Current status of route section(s)	Roll-back proposed? (See Part 7 of Overview)	Landward margin contains coastal land type?	Proposal to specify landward boundary of margin (See maps)	Reason for landward boundary proposal	Explanatory notes
EBC 2d	EBC-2-S103*	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 2.3.4	No	Fence line	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 2d	EBC-2-S104	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 2.3.4	Yes - barrier			

2.3.2 Optional alternative route details: Map EBC 2a - Bay View Caravan Park, Pevensey Bay to Rosetti Road

Notes on table:

1. Column 2 – an asterisk (*) against the route section number means see also table 2.3.3: Other options considered.
2. Column 4 – ‘No’ means no roll-back is proposed for this route section. ‘Yes – normal’ means roll-back is proposed and is likely to follow the current feature (e.g. cliff edge/beach) for the foreseeable future as any coastal change occurs.
3. Column 4 – ‘Yes – see table 2.3.4’ means roll-back is proposed, but refer to that table below about our likely approach to implementing it for this route section. This is because a more complex situation exists and consideration must be given to how roll-back may happen in relation to excepted land, a protected site etc.
4. Columns 5a and 5b – An entry in either or both of these columns denotes a proposal to align the seaward or landward boundary (as the case may be) of this section of the alternative route strip with the physical feature(s) shown. No text in the column means no such proposal, meaning that the edge of the alternative route strip would be at the default width of 2 metres on the relevant side of the route’s centre line.

1	2	3	4	5a	5b	6
Map(s)	Route section number(s)	Current status of route section(s)	Roll-back proposed? (See Part 7 of Overview)	Proposal to specify seaward boundary of alternative route strip	Proposal to specify landward boundary of alternative route strip	Explanatory notes
EBC 2a	EBC-2-OA001	Other existing walked route	No	Various	Various	Various for the seaward boundary means wall and fence. Various for the landward boundary means 2m default width and fence.
EBC 2a	EBC-2-OA002	Public footpath	No	Various	Various	Various for the seaward boundary means wall and fence. Various for the landward boundary means wall, fence and edge of path.
EBC 2a	EBC-2-OA003	Public footpath	No	Edge of path	Edge of path	
EBC 2a	EBC-2-OA004 and EBC-2-OA005	Public footway (pavement)	No	Pavement edge	Pavement edge	

2.3.3 Other options considered: Map(s) EBC 2a to EBC 2d - Bay View Caravan Park, Pevensey Bay to Herbrand Walk, Cooden

Map(s)	Route section numbers(s)	Other option(s) considered	Reasons for not proposing this option
EBC 2a	EBC-2-S003 to EBC-2-S005	We considered aligning the trail along an access track/desire line through Pevensey Bay Sailing Club. The path would skirt around the rear of the property before returning to the beach to join up with EBC-2-S005	<p>We opted for the proposed route because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ It is closer to the sea than any of the other options and would afford better sea views. ■ It avoids impacting upon the land management of the Pevensey Sailing Club, the golf club and caravan park. ■ It would be difficult to find a viable route through the caravan park. ■ We concluded that overall the proposed route struck the best balance in terms of the criteria described in chapter 4 of the Coastal Access Scheme
EBC 2a	EBC-2-S003 to EBC-2-S0011	We considered aligning the trail along the bank between Pevensey Bay Sailing Club and Bay View Golf Club and then back to the beach via the Grey Tower Caravan Park	
EBC 2a	EBC-2-S003 to EBC-2-S011	We considered aligning the trail through Pevensey Bay Sailing Club, across the shingle and through Grey Tower Caravan Park and then back onto the beach.	
EBC 2a	EBC-2-S001 to EBC-2-S011	We considered creating an optional alternative route along the A259 between Bay View Caravan Park and Grey Tower Caravan Park.	<p>We opted for the proposed route because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ If we were to create an optional alternative route here, it would have to be aligned up to and along the A259, then along the access tracks through Grey Tower Caravan Park. The optional alternative route would be approximately 1.4km in length, which we consider a disproportionate and impractical solution compared to waiting a short while for an occasional extreme high tide to subside. ■ It would be difficult to find a viable route through the caravan park.

Map(s)	Route section numbers(s)	Other option(s) considered	Reasons for not proposing this option
EBC 2a to EBC 2c	EBC- 2-SO22 to EBC-2-SO54	We considered aligning the trail entirely along the shingle beach between Norman Road and Bay Avenue.	<p>We opted for the proposed route because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Shingle can be difficult to walk on for any distance. The proposed use of Normans Bay Road, The Promenade and The Parade provides people with periods of walking on a more consolidated surface, whilst still maintaining views of the sea. ■ Under our proposals the beach would remain available for use by walkers as part of the coastal margin. ■ We concluded that overall the proposed route struck the best balance in terms of the criteria described in chapter 4 of the Coastal Access Scheme
EBC 2a to EBC 2c	EBC- 2-SO24 to EBC-2-SO75	We also considered aligning the trail along Val Prinseps Road on to Eastbourne Road and then along Coast Road.	<p>We opted for the proposed route because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ It is closer to the sea and would afford sea views. ■ We concluded that overall the proposed route struck the best balance in terms of the criteria described in chapter 4 of the Coastal Access Scheme
2b	EBC-2-S029 to EBC-2-S033	We considered creating an optional alternative route along Leyland Road, Eastbourne Road and Western Road.	<p>We opted for the proposed route because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ It is generally possible to walk above mean high water here. Waves come up to the fence line of the properties at least once per year. On these rare occasions' walkers could wait a short time for the tide to subside or informally use the surrounding roads to walk around this pinch point. It is therefore proposed this situation is best managed with advisory signage (see 2.2.17).

Map(s)	Route section numbers(s)	Other option(s) considered	Reasons for not proposing this option
2b	EBC-2-S041 and EBC-2-S047	We considered creating an optional alternative route along the Coast Road between the car park and Seaville Drive.	<p>We opted for the proposed route because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ It is generally possible to walk above mean high water here. Waves have come up to the fence line of the properties east of the car park on a few occasions in the last 17 years. On these rare occasions walkers could wait a short time for the tide to subside or informally use the nearby roads to walk around this pinch point. It is therefore proposed this situation is best managed with advisory signage (see 2.2.17).
EBC 2b to EBC 2c	EBC-2-S054 to EBC-2-S076	We also considered aligning the trail along the beach between Bay Avenue and the beach in front of Normans Bay Camping and Caravan Site	<p>We opted for the proposed route because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Shingle can be difficult to walk on for any distance. The proposed use of the pavement provides people with periods of rest bite by providing a better walking surface. ■ Under our proposals the beach would remain available for use by walkers as part of the coastal margin. ■ We concluded that overall the proposed route struck the best balance in terms of the criteria described in chapter 4 of the Coastal Access Scheme.
EBC 2d	EBC-2-S095 to EBC-2-S103	We considered aligning the trail along the ballast hole area to the north of the proposed route of the trail and then either through the Environment Agency depot or back on to the beach.	<p>We opted for the proposed route because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ It is closer to the sea and would afford better sea views. ■ We would have needed to move a fence to allow walkers to pass over an area of vegetated shingle. ■ The Environment Agency had concerns in relation to damage to vegetated shingle, the costs outweighing the benefits and the operational future of the site. ■ This proposal is made with the support of the landowners of the Ballast Hole and the depot. ■ We concluded that overall the proposed route struck the best balance in terms of

Map(s)	Route section numbers(s)	Other option(s) considered	Reasons for not proposing this option
			the criteria described in chapter 4 of the Coastal Access Scheme
EBC 2d	EBC-2-S095 to EBC-2-S103	We considered creating an optional alternative route along the ballast hole area to the north of the proposed route of the trail and then either through the Environment Agency depot or back on to the beach.	<p>We opted for the proposed route because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ It is generally possible to walk above mean high water here. There are points along this route that occasionally wash out in winter and on these occasions' walkers could wait a short time for the tide to subside. It is therefore proposed this situation can be managed with advisory signage (see 2.2.17). ■ This proposal is made with the support of the landowners of the Ballast Hole and the depot. ■ We concluded that overall the proposed route struck the best balance in terms of the criteria described in chapter 4 of the Coastal Access Scheme
EBC 2d	EBC-2-S090 to EBC-2-S103	We considered aligning the route either (a) along the PRow from Normans Bay or (b) along the Coast Road. The trail would then continue along Sluice Lane before re-joining the beach at Herbrand Walk	<p>We opted for the proposed route because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ It is closer to the sea and would afford better sea views. ■ It avoids crossing the railway line in two locations. ■ Concerns were raised by Network Rail in relation to the safety of taking the England Coast Path over the railway crossings on the PRow and at Herbrand Walk. ■ Network Rail advised the railway crossing at Herbrand Walk was likely to require improvements to take the England Coast Path across it which were likely to involve significant costs. ■ It avoids taking walkers along busy roads.

Map(s)	Route section numbers(s)	Other option(s) considered	Reasons for not proposing this option
EBC 2d	EBC-2-S090 to EBC-2-S103	We considered creating an optional alternative route along the PRow from Normans Bay or along the Coast Road and then along Sluice Lane before re-joining the beach at Herbrand Walk	<p>We opted for the proposed route because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ It is generally possible to walk above mean high water here. There are points along this route that occasionally wash out in winter and on these occasions' walkers could wait a short time for the tide to subside. It is therefore proposed this situation can be managed with advisory signage (see 2.2.17). ■ It avoids crossing the railway line in two locations. ■ Concerns were raised by Network Rail in relation to the safety of taking the England Coast Path over the railway crossings on the PRow and at Herbrand Walk. ■ Network Rail advised the railway crossing at Herbrand Walk was likely to require improvements to take the England Coast Path across it which were likely to involve significant costs. ■ It avoids taking walkers along busy roads.

Note: Any public rights of way not forming part of the proposed trail would remain available for people to

2.3.4 Roll-back implementation – more complex situations: Maps EBC 2a to EBC 2d Bay View Caravan Park, Pevensey Bay to Herbrand Walk, Cooden

Map(s)	Route section number(s)	Feature(s) or site(s) potentially affected	Our likely approach to roll-back
2a	EBC-2-S001 to EBC-2-S017	Bay View Caravan Park, Pevensey Bay Sailing Club, Bay View Golf Club, Grey Towers Caravan Park or Pevensey Bay Holiday Park	If it is no longer possible to find a viable route seaward of the specified Caravan Parks, Golf Course or Sailing Club, we will choose a new route after detailed discussions with all relevant interests, either (a) to pass through the site/sailing club or course, or (b) if this is not practicable, to pass somewhere on the landward side of it. In reaching this judgement we will have full regard to the need to seek a fair balance between the interests of potentially affected owners and occupiers and those of the public.

Map(s)	Route section number(s)	Feature(s) or site(s) potentially affected	Our likely approach to roll-back
2a,2b	EBC-2-S018 to EBC-2-S054,	Buildings	If it is no longer possible to find a viable route seaward of the specified excepted land (e.g. buildings, curtilage, gardens etc), we will choose a route landward of it, following discussions with owners and occupiers.
2c	EBC-2-S083	Buildings, SSSI, SPA, Ramsar	If it is no longer possible to find a viable route seaward of the specified excepted land (e.g. buildings, curtilage, gardens etc), we will choose a route landward of it, following discussions with owners and occupiers.
			If it is no longer possible to find a viable route seaward of a designated site (e.g. SSSI, SAC, SPA, SAM) whose designated features are sensitive to public access, or where the existing route already passing through such a site must be altered, we will choose a new route after detailed discussions with the relevant experts and with any potentially affected owners or occupiers, which will either (a) continue to pass through the site, if appropriate or (b) if necessary, be routed landward of it.
2c	EBC-2-S075 to EBC-2-S082	Normans Bay Camping and Caravanning site, railway Line, SSSI, SPA, Ramsar	If it is no longer possible to find a viable route seaward of the specified Caravan Park, we will choose a new route after detailed discussions with all relevant interests, either (a) to pass through the site, or (b) if this is not practicable, to pass somewhere on the landward side of it. In reaching this judgement we will have full regard to the need to seek a fair balance between the interests of potentially affected owners and occupiers and those of the public.
			If it is no longer possible to find a viable route seaward of the specified excepted land (e.g. buildings, curtilage, gardens, land used for the purposes of a railway etc), we will choose a route landward of it, following discussions with owners and occupiers.
			If it is no longer possible to find a viable route seaward of a designated site (e.g. SSSI, SAC, SPA, SAM) whose designated features are sensitive to public access, or where the existing route already passing through such a site must be altered, we will choose a new route after detailed discussions with the relevant experts and with any potentially affected owners or occupiers, which will either (a) continue to

Map(s)	Route section number(s)	Feature(s) or site(s) potentially affected	Our likely approach to roll-back
			pass through the site, if appropriate or (b) if necessary, be routed landward of it.
2c to 2d	EBC-2-S084 to EBC-2-S089	Railway line, SPA, Ramsar, SSSI	If it is no longer possible to find a viable route seaward of the specified excepted land (e.g. buildings, curtilage, gardens, land used for the purposes of a railway etc), we will choose a route landward of it, following discussions with owners and occupiers.
			If it is no longer possible to find a viable route seaward of a designated site (e.g. SSSI, SAC, SPA, SAM) whose designated features are sensitive to public access, or where the existing route already passing through such a site must be altered, we will choose a new route after detailed discussions with the relevant experts and with any potentially affected owners or occupiers, which will either (a) continue to pass through the site, if appropriate or (b) if necessary, be routed landward of it.
2d	EBC-2-S090 to EBC-2-S093	Normans Bay Caravan Park, buildings, railway line, SPA, Ramsar, SSSI	If it is no longer possible to find a viable route seaward of the specified excepted land (e.g. buildings, curtilage, gardens, land used for the purposes of a railway etc), we will choose a route landward of it, following discussions with owners and occupiers.
			If it is no longer possible to find a viable route seaward of the specified Caravan Park, we will choose a new route after detailed discussions with all relevant interests, either (a) to pass through the site, or (b) if this is not practicable, to pass somewhere on the landward side of it. In reaching this judgement we will have full regard to the need to seek a fair balance between the interests of potentially affected owners and occupiers and those of the public.
2d	EBC-2-S094 to EBC-2-S103	Buildings, railway Line, EA Depot, SPA, Ramsar, SSSI	If it is no longer possible to find a viable route seaward of the specified excepted land (e.g. buildings, curtilage, gardens, land used for the purposes of a railway etc.), we will choose a route landward of it, following discussions with owners and occupiers.
			If it is no longer possible to find a viable route seaward of a designated site (e.g. SSSI, SAC, SPA, SAM) whose designated features are sensitive to

Map(s)	Route section number(s)	Feature(s) or site(s) potentially affected	Our likely approach to roll-back
			public access, or where the existing route already passing through such a site must be altered, we will choose a new route after detailed discussions with the relevant experts and with any potentially affected owners or occupiers, which will either (a) continue to pass through the site, if appropriate or (b) if necessary, be routed landward of it.
2d	EBC-2-S104	Railway Line, SPA, Ramsar, SSSI	If it is no longer possible to find a viable route seaward of the specified excepted land (e.g. buildings, curtilage, gardens, land used for the purposes of a railway etc), we will choose a route landward of it, following discussions with owners and occupiers.
			If it is no longer possible to find a viable route seaward of a designated site (e.g. SSSI, SAC, SPA, SAM) whose designated features are sensitive to public access, or where the existing route already passing through such a site must be altered, we will choose a new route after detailed discussions with the relevant experts and with any potentially affected owners or occupiers, which will either (a) continue to pass through the site, if appropriate or (b) if necessary, be routed landward of it.

In relation to all other sections where roll-back has been proposed, any later adjustment of the trail is likely to follow the current feature (e.g. cliff edge/beach) for the foreseeable future as any coastal change occurs.

Part 2.4 Proposals Maps

2.4.1 Map Index



Map reference	Map title
EBC 2a	Bay View Caravan Park, Pevensey Bay to Rosetti Road
EBC 2b	Rosetti Road to Marine Avenue
EBC 2c	Marine Avenue to Normans Bay East
EBC 2d	Normans Bay East to Herbrand Walk, Cooden

PROPOSALS

Trail Sections

-  Trail using existing public right of way or highway
-  Trail using other existing walked route
-  Trail not using existing walked route
-  Alternative route
-  Trail shown on other maps
-  Approved or open England Coast Path

Maps that show sections of the trail that follow the existing South West Coast Path as currently walked and managed use the following trail categories. Information on the existing status and infrastructure is not shown.

-  Trail using existing South West Coast Path
-  Alternative or optional alternative route using existing South West Coast Path



Trail sections which follow existing public rights of way or highways are indicated by a suffix:

- BW** - Public bridleway
- BY** - Public byway
- CP** - Cycletrack (pedestrian)
- CT** - Cycletrack (cycles only)
- FP** - Public footpath
- FW** - Public footway (Pavement)
- RB** - Restricted byway
- RD** - Public road

Coastal Margin

Explanatory note

Part 3 of the Overview to the report explains where the landward boundary of the coastal margin falls by default. Our proposals include any suggested variation of this default boundary. The purple wash on the map indicates where as a result of our proposals the coastal margin would extend significantly to the landward side of the proposed route of the trail. The coastal margin may include some areas where coastal access rights do not apply, either seaward or landward of the proposed route of the trail: the Overview explains more about this. The landward boundary of the coastal margin may in due course move inland, if the trail rolls back under proposals in this report to respond to coastal change.

-  Coastal margin landward of the trail
-  Coastal margin landward of the trail which is existing access land



































Other Information

Other access rights and routes

-  Public bridleways
-  Public byways
-  Public footpaths
-  Restricted byways
-  South West Coast Path
-  Sustrans national routes
-  Existing access land




Infrastructure types

For status of each, where shown on map, see colour codes below

- | Bridges: | Stiles: | Gates: |
|---|---|--|
|  Clapper bridge |  Ladder stile |  Bristol gate |
|  Footbridge |  Lift-up stile |  Field gate |
|  Quad bike bridge |  Squeeze stile |  Gateway with no gate |
|  Sleeper bridge |  Step stile |  Kissing gate |
|  Vehicle bridge |  Stone stile |  Pedestrian gate |
| | |  Wheelchair gate |
| Miscellaneous: | | |
|  Barrier |  Cycle chicane |  Interpretation panel |
|  Boardwalk |  Drainage |  Ramp |
|  Bollard |  Drop-kerb |  Revetment |
|  Cattle grid |  Gap in fence |  Stepping stones |
|  Culvert |  Hurdle |  Steps |
|  Motorbike barrier |  Roadside sign |  Advisory sign |

Infrastructure status

Each symbol shown on the map is colour coded as appropriate, as in this example for a set of steps:

-  Existing steps to be retained
-  New steps required
-  Existing steps to be removed

* Please note that the items in this legend may not all be present on an individual map or report.

