

England Coast Path Stretch: Eastbourne to Camber

Report EBC 1: Eastbourne Pier to Bay View Caravan Park, Pevensey Bay

Part 1.1: Introduction

Start Point:	Eastbourne Pier (Grid reference 561780 098916)
End Point:	Bay View Caravan Park, Pevensey Bay (Grid reference 564876 102546)
Relevant Maps:	EBC 1a to EBC 1c

1.1.1 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.

1.1.2 This report covers length EBC 1 of the stretch, which is the coast between Eastbourne Pier and Bay View Caravan Park, Pevensey Bay. 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.

1.1.3 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.

1.1.4 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 1.2: Proposals Narrative

The trail:

1.2.1 Follows existing walked routes, including promenades and pavements.

1.2.2 Follows the coastline quite closely and maintains good views of the sea.

1.2.3 Is aligned on the beach at Langney Point, as well as for a short distance as it approaches Bay View Caravan Park.

1.2.4 Diverts inland for a short distance at Sovereign Harbour to cross the lock gates.

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.

1.2.5 The following designated sites affect this length of coast:

- Beachy Head East Marine Conservation Zone
- Eastbourne Redoubt Scheduled Monument
- Martello tower no 66, 320m north east of Langney Point Scheduled Monument
- Martello tower no 64 at the Crumbles, 1.3km north east of Langney Point Scheduled Monument
- Prince William Parade Local Wildlife Site
- Sovereign Harbour Beach Local Wildlife Site

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

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

1.2.6 Measures to protect the environment

Map(s)	Route section number(s)	Design features of the access proposals	Reason included
EBC 1b	EBC-1-S011	We will install: <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Two replacement interpretive panels on the promenade south of Sovereign Park.	■ To highlight the presence and potential vulnerability of vegetated shingle.

1.2.7 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 in respect of the natural environment; 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.

Part 6b of the Overview includes some contextual information about protecting the environment along this length of coast.

Accessibility:

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

- There are short distances where it would follow an uneven track across shingle.
- It would be necessary to ascend/descend existing steps in some locations as shown on maps EBC 1b and EBC 1c.
- It would be necessary to pass through existing bollards as shown on map EBC 1c.

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

Where we have proposed exercising statutory discretions:

1.2.9 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 1.3.1 below.

1.2.10 In several places we have used this discretion to limit the landward extent of the coastal margin to the landward edge of the promenade. 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 because it is not clear where the landward extent of the coastal defence barrier is, but the edge of the promenade provides an easily identifiable boundary for access users.

1.2.11 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 1.3.1. 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 1.3.1] 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.

1.2.12 Alternative routes: An alternative route is to operate as a diversion from the ordinary route between EBC-1-S022 and EBC-1-S029 when both lock gates are open and pedestrian access is inhibited. This occurs an hour after every high tide to allow water back into the harbour. It occurs twice a day and can last for up to 20 minutes. The alternative route is to be at the centre of the line shown as EBC-1-A001 and EBC-1-A015 on map EBC 1c. It would not have the effect of creating any additional spreading room on either the seaward or the landward side.

1.2.13 By default, an 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 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.

1.2.14 Other factors affecting access: The Environment Agency periodically undertake beach regeneration works that would affect route sections EBC-1-S015 and EBC-1-S018. Works typically last in this location for 1-2 weeks and normally take place three times a year during the winter. During this time, access to the beach is interrupted and the contractors working on behalf of the Environment Agency sign an informal route for walkers through a nearby housing estate. Following the introduction of the England Coast Path along the beach, this arrangement would continue without any local restriction on the new rights to give effect to it formally. The access authority will work with the Environment Agency if required to monitor the effectiveness of this approach.

1.2.15 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:

- 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.

1.2.16 Column 4 of tables 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 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 map EBC 1c as the proposed route of the trail.

1.2.17 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.

On sections for which roll-back is not proposed in tables 1.3.1 or 1.3.2, the route is to be at the centre of the line shown on maps EBC 1a to EBC 1c as the proposed route of the trail.

1.2.18 At this point we do not foresee any need for future changes to the access provisions that we have proposed within this report.

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

Other future change:

1.2.19 Eastbourne Borough Council is considering developing a Seafront Strategy that could result in some changes to the seafront east of Eastbourne Pier. It is possible the trail alignment may be affected as these plans emerge in the future, and that a separate variation report to the Secretary of State may be required.

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

Establishment of the trail:

1.2.20 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.

1.2.21 Our estimate of the capital costs for physical establishment of the trail on the proposed route is £15,295.00 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.

1.1.22 There are two main elements to the overall cost:

- A significant number of new signs would be needed on the trail to waymark the main and alternative routes.
- Two interpretative panel on the promenade, south of Sovereign Park (see map EBC 1b) to highlight the presence and potential vulnerability of vegetated shingle.

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
Way markers	£8,300.00
Interpretation panels	£5,000.00
Project management	£1,995.00

Total **£15,295.00 (Exclusive of any VAT payable)**

1.2.23 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:

1.2.24 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).

1.2.25 We estimate that the annual cost to maintain the trail will be £817.43 (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 1.3: Proposals Tables

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

1.3.1 Section Details: Maps EBC 1a to EBC 1c - Eastbourne Pier to Bay View Caravan Park, Pevensey Bay

Key notes on table:

1. Column 2 – an asterisk (*) against the route section number means see also table 1.3.3: 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 1.3.4’ 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 1a	EBC-1-S001 to EBC-1-S003	Other existing walked route	No	Yes - barrier	Promenade edge	Clarity and cohesion	See 1.2.10
EBC 1a	EBC-1-S004	Cycle track (pedestrian)	No	No	Landward edge of path	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 1b	EBC-1-S005	Other existing	No	No	Landward edge of path	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
		walked route					
EBC 1b	EBC-1-S006 and EBC-1-S007	Cycle track (pedestrian)	No	Yes - barrier			
EBC 1b	EBC-1-S008 and EBC-1-S009	Cycle track (pedestrian)	No	Yes - barrier	Promenade edge	Clarity and cohesion	See 1.2.10
EBC 1b	EBC-1-S010	Cycle track (pedestrian)	No	No Yes - barrier	Promenade edge	Clarity and cohesion	See 1.2.10
EBC 1b	EBC-1-S011	Cycle track (pedestrian)	No	Yes – barrier	Promenade edge	Clarity and cohesion	See 1.2.10
EBC 1b to EBC 1c	EBC-1-S012 to EBC-1-S014	Cycle track (pedestrian)	No	Yes-barrier	Promenade edge	Clarity and cohesion	See 1.2.10
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S015	Other existing walked route	No	No			
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S016*	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 1.3.4	Yes - beach			

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 1c	EBC-1-S017*	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 1.3.4	Yes - beach			
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S018*	Other existing walked route	Yes - See table 1.3.4	Yes - barrier			
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S019 to EBC-1-S020	Other existing walked route	No	Yes - barrier			
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S021	Other existing walked route	No	Yes - barrier			
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S022*	Other existing walked route	No	No			
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S023*	Other existing walked route	No	No	Fence line	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S024 to EBC-1-S025*	Other existing walked route	No	No			
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S026*	Other existing	No	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
		walked route					
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S027*	Other existing walked route	No	No			
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S028*	Other existing walked route	No	No	Promenade edge	Clarity and cohesion	
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S029 to EBC-1-S038*	Other existing walked route	No	No	Promenade edge	Clarity and cohesion	

1.3.2 Alternative routes details: Map EBC 1c - Langney Point to Bay View Caravan park, Pevensey Bay

Notes on table:

1. Column 2 – an asterisk (*) against the route section number means see also table 1.3.3: 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 1.3.4’ 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 1c	EBC-1-A001 and EBC-1-A002	Other existing walked route	No	Fence line	Bank	
EBC 1c	EBC-1-A003	Other existing walked route	No	Fence line	Various	Various means edge of pavement, fence line, wall and edge of path
EBC 1c	EBC-1-A004	Other existing walked route	No	Fence line	Edge of path	
EBC 1c	EBC-1-A005 to EBC-1-A007	Other existing walked route	No	Fence line	Wall	
EBC 1c	EBC-1-A008	Other existing walked route	No	Fence line	Fence line	
EBC 1c	EBC-1-A009 and EBC-1-A010	Other existing walked route	No	Various	Wall	Various means fence line and top edge of steps
EBC 1c	EBC-1-A011	Other existing walked route	No	Edge of path	Edge of path	
EBC 1c	EBC-1-A012	Other existing walked route	No	Fence line	Wall	

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 1c	EBC-1-A013	Other existing walked route	No	Wall	Wall	
EBC 1c	EBC-1-A014	Public highway	No			
EBC 1c	EBC-1-A015	Other existing walked route	No	Edge of path	Edge of path	

1.3.3 Other options considered: Map EBC 1c - Langney Point to Bay View Caravan park, Pevensey Bay

Map(s)	Route section numbers(s)	Other option(s) considered	Reasons for not proposing this option
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S016 to EBC-1-S018	We considered aligning the main route along the pavement along Martinique Way and then along a path between the properties to join up with EBC-1-S019.	<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. ■ It avoids a housing estate which would not give walkers a sense of being by the sea.
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S016 to EBC-1-S018	We considered an alternative route along the pavement through Martinique Way and then through a path between the properties to join up with EBC-1-S019	<p>We opted for the proposed arrangement because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Whilst access to the beach is interrupted during beach regeneration works. The Environment Agency currently sign an informal route for walkers through a nearby housing estate. It was therefore concluded that following the introduction of the England Coast Path along the beach, this arrangement would continue without the need for an alternative route.

Map(s)	Route section numbers(s)	Other option(s) considered	Reasons for not proposing this option
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S022 to EBC-1-S027	We considered aligning the main route or the alternative route of the trail along the landward lock gate.	<p>We opted for the proposed route because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ It is closer to the sea. ■ When one lock gate is open, the lock keeper already effectively manages public access over the lock, for the most part ensuring that the public can cross the lock using the other set of gates. This arrangement would continue without the need for any further proposals to give effect to it formally. ■ Both sets of lock gates are simultaneously closed for pedestrian access for 20 minutes twice a day. This prevents the landward lock gate functioning as an alternative route during this time. ■ this proposal is made with the support of the landowner ■ 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 1c	EBC-1-S028 to EBC-1-S034	We considered aligning the main route of the trail along the pavement on the south side of Pacific Drive, with the trail joining the beach along the road by the Martello Tower.	<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. ■ it passes along an already well used promenade.

Note: Any public rights of way not forming part of the proposed trail would remain available for people to use under their pre-existing rights.

1.3.4 Roll-back implementation – more complex situations: Map EBC 1c - Langney Point to Bay View Caravan park, Pevensey Bay

Map(s)	Route section number(s)	Feature(s) or site(s) potentially affected	Our likely approach to roll-back
EBC 1c	EBC-1-S016 to EBC-1-S018	Houses	In the event that it is not possible to find a viable route seaward of any excepted land (e.g. buildings) we will choose a route that passes landward of it, following discussions with owners and occupiers and relevant experts.

Map(s)	Route section number(s)	Feature(s) or site(s) potentially affected	Our likely approach to roll-back
			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.

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 1.4: Proposals Maps

1.4.1 Map Index



Map reference	Map title
EBC 1a	Eastbourne Pier to Channel View Road
EBC 1b	Channel View Road to Langney Point
EBC 1c	Langney Point to Bay View Caravan park, Pevensey Bay

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.



