

**COMMITTEE****CABINET****DATE****19 March 2014****SUBJECT****Priority Cycle Routes****REPORT OF****Senior Head of Development**

---

**Ward(s)**

All

**Purpose**

To inform Members of the results of the consultation undertaken by East Sussex County Council on six cycle routes identified in the adopted Cycling Strategy.

To seek approval for the routes to be taken forward to detailed design and construction.

To seek approval to amend the seafront byelaw to allow both unsegregated cycling as well as cycling in lanes on appropriate sections of the promenade .

**Contact**

Lisa Rawlinson, Senior Specialist Advisor,  
1 Grove Road, Eastbourne  
Tel no: (01323) 415250  
E-mail: lisa.rawlinson@eastbourne.gov.uk

**Recommendations**

1. That Cabinet approve the following cycle routes to be taken forward to detailed design and construction as part of the County Council's 2014/15 capital programme for local transport improvement initiatives:
    - a. University to Town Centre and Seafront
    - b. Town Centre to Seafront
    - c. Horsey Way Section 1
  2. That Cabinet agree in principle, and subject to agreement by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government that the byelaw can be amended, that the Seafront cycle route along the promenade between the Wish Tower and Fisherman's Green be taken forward by the County Council to detailed design with construction taking place as part of a future year's capital programme beyond 2014/15.
  3. That Cabinet recommend Full Council to authorise the officers to take all necessary steps to seek and obtain approval from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to an amendment to the current
-

byelaw to enable the Council to allow, where appropriate, both unsegregated as well as segregated shared use of the seafront promenade by cyclists and pedestrians.

4. That Cabinet agree the Horsey Sewer Route Section 3 be taken forward by the County Council to detailed design with construction taking place as part of a future year's capital programme beyond 2014/15.
5. That in view of the comments received during the consultation on the Town Centre to Hospital route that delegated authority is given to the Senior Head of Development in consultation with the Cabinet Portfolio Holder to agree to an adjusted route.

---

## **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 In February 2012, Cabinet approved the Cycling Strategy for Eastbourne. The principal objective of the Strategy is to identify a Borough-wide network of potential cycle routes which can then be provided as funding becomes available. This proposed network builds on both the existing cycle routes within the Borough as well as the new routes between the railway station and the eastern side of the town (the Horsey Cycle Route) and the western Seafront Cycle Route (along King Edwards Parade).
- 1.2 The network of proposed cycle routes will provide linkages between principal employment, housing, recreational and tourist locations. The routes are prioritised in order to ensure those with the greatest potential to be delivered and those that would benefit the greatest number of people are taken forward at the earliest opportunity.
- 1.3 The Strategy identified the following priority routes:
  - University to Town Centre and Seafront
  - Town Centre to Seafront
  - Seafront (between the Wish Tower and Fisherman's Green)
  - Langney to Sovereign Harbour and Sovereign Centre
  - Willingdon Drove
  - Town Centre to Hospital
- 1.4 Of these routes the following were taken forward to preliminary design and formed the major part of the public consultation:-
  - University to Town Centre and Seafront
  - Town Centre to Seafront
  - Seafront (along the promenade between the Wish Tower and Fisherman's Green)

- Town Centre to Hospital.

In addition further detailed work was undertaken on the Horsey Way Section 1 route (Railway Station to Ringwood Road) and the Horsey Way Section 3 route (Lottbridge Drove to Langney roundabout, including the Tollgate School link). These routes also formed part of the public consultation.

All these routes were also identified as a priority by Bespoke, the local cycle campaign group.

Feasibility work on providing additional cycle routes in the town, for example in Eastbourne Park will be looked as part of a future year's capital programme.

## **2.0 Details of the Routes**

### **2.1 University to Town Centre and Seafrost**

This route is mainly a signed road route and consists of the following two sections:

#### Section A – University to Town Centre

Carlisle Road, Meads Road, Saffrons Road, Old Orchard Road (northbound), Grove Road (southbound), Upperton Road, The Avenue and St Leonard's Road.

A cycle lane is proposed around Terminus Road/Upperton Road roundabout and an advanced stop line for cyclists at the Upperton Road/The Avenue junction.

#### Section B – University to Seafrost

Carlisle Road, Wilmington Square and Kings Edwards Parade.

In order to connect to the proposed Seafrost route, a shared footway for pedestrians and cyclists is proposed on the western side of King Edwards Parade leading to the existing zebra crossings. The footway would also be widened by the zebra crossing.

### **2.2 Town Centre to Seafrost**

This route would be from the Town Centre to the Seafrost along Terminus Road, Cornfield Road and Devonshire Place.

A cycle lane would be provided around the Memorial roundabout. The route would connect to the proposed Seafrost route via the existing zebra crossing. A limited number of parking bays would need to be removed.

### 2.3 **Seafront – Wish Tower to Fisherman’s Green**

This route would extend along the promenade from the Wish Tower to Fisherman’s Green. The key aspects of the route are:

- Cyclists would be allowed to cycle along sections of the promenade and will share the space with pedestrians (i.e. there would not be a dedicated cycle track reserved for cyclists).
- At the Wish Tower, cyclists and pedestrians will share the middle promenade which is over 6 metres wide.
- At the Pier, a widened footway area would be provided to increase the space available for both pedestrians and cyclists.

Before cyclists are allowed to use the promenade the provisions in the existing seafront byelaws concerning cycling on the promenade will need to be updated and amended. Further details relating to this matter are provided below in Section 4 of this report.

The timescale for this process means that although it is recommended that detailed design for this route is progressed, it could not be constructed before the March 2015 deadline for spending of the Local Sustainable Transport Funding (LSTF). Therefore construction of this route would take place as part of a future year’s capital programme beyond 2014/15, pending successful revision of the byelaw.

### 2.4 **Town Centre to Hospital**

The route from the Town Centre would be via Commercial Road, Upper Avenue, Bedfordwell Road, Mayfield Place, Gorringe Road, Tutts Barn Lane and Kings Drive. The key aspects of the route are:

- A mix of on-road and shared footway/cycleway.
- The introduction of parking restrictions and an advisory cycle lane along Kings Drive. Parking bays are proposed near Prideaux Road on the east and west side of Kings Drive.

In the event that the route via Mayfield Place cannot be delivered an alternative via Upper Avenue and Gorringe Road could be provided.

### 2.5 **Horseway Section 1**

This section of the cycle route extends from Eastbourne Railway Station to Ringwood Road (where it meets Section 2 and would run mostly along existing footways which would become shared cycleway/footway. The key aspects of the route are:

- Additional cycle racks will be provided outside the Railway Station.
- Raised platforms would be provided in the highway at a number

of junctions along the route to provide additional priority for cyclists.

- Existing footways will be widened at a number of points along the route to enable a shared surface for both pedestrians and cyclists to be created.
- The existing parking bays on the southern side of Ashford Road would need to be adjusted although no parking spaces will be lost.
- Toucan crossings will be installed at the junction of Ashford Road and Cavendish Place to enable cyclists and pedestrians to cross the road.
- Raised platforms would be provided at a number of junctions along the route.
- A new Toucan crossing will be constructed across Whitley Road.

It is recognised that the construction of the part of the cycleway near the Railway Station will need to be co-ordinated with the works associated with the proposed extension to the Arndale Centre and the proposed improvements to Terminus Road.

## 2.6 **Horseway Section 3**

This section of the cycle route extends from Lottbridge Drove to Langney roundabout and is entirely off-road except for the crossing over Lottbridge Drove and Birch Road. The key aspects of the route are as follows:

- A new staggered Toucan crossing will be constructed across Lottbridge Drove with local footway widening on the corner of Hammonds Drive.
- The cycleway will join the existing footways at Langney roundabout which will be widened to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists.
- The existing footway between the Crumbles Sewer and the local shops will be widened to enable cyclists (mainly school children) to reach the entrance to Tollgate School.
- A stock proof fence will be constructed between the cycleway and the open fields to prevent animals from escaping.
- At the Langney roundabout end of the route a gate system will be installed to allow the local farmer to move sheep between the two fields across the cycleway.

## 3.0 **Consultation**

- 3.1 In January 2014 consultation took place on the proposed cycle routes. A staffed exhibition was held in the Town Hall on Friday 10th January and Saturday 11th January 2014. The proposals were made available for viewing on both the County Council's and Borough Council's websites

between 2 and 31 January 2014. A consultation questionnaire was available at the exhibition and on the County Council website. Copies of the consultation questionnaire and an overview plan of the proposals are included in Appendix 1 and 2 respectively. In addition, a list of those stakeholders that were invited to participate in the consultation is attached at Appendix 5.

3.2 A total of 784 responses were received to the consultation. An analysis of the results of the consultation, a summary of the comments received and responses to them are set out in Appendix 3. The responses received from the following stakeholders are set out in Appendix 4:

- Bespoke
- Campaign for Better Transport – East Sussex
- Eastbourne’s Hackney Carriage Trade

Officers from both East Sussex County Council and Eastbourne Borough Council will be working closely with these stakeholders in developing the detailed design of the proposed cycle routes.

3.3 The results of the comments analysis in Appendix 3 show that the majority of respondents supported the introduction of each of the six schemes:

- University to Town Centre and Seafront - 75% supported or strongly supported the proposals
- Town Centre to Seafront - 77% supported or strongly supported the proposals
- Seafront - 73% supported or strongly supported the proposals
- Town Centre to Hospital – 77% supported or strongly supported the proposals
- Horsey Way Section 1 - 74% supported or strongly supported the proposals
- Horsey Way Section 3 - 79% supported or strongly supported the proposals.

3.4 Concerns were expressed in the consultation responses about key aspects of the Town Centre to Hospital route. These included the impact of the parking restrictions along Kings Drive, the nature of the route along Kings Drive (i.e. off-road or on-road) and the route between Upper Avenue and Lewes Road. In view of this it is recommended that more feasibility work should be undertaken to look at possible alternative options for this route. Officers will work with key stakeholders such as Bespoke to seek a consensus on the final route before implementation.

#### **4.0 Details of the Promenade Byelaws and the Process to Amend**

4.1 The promenade byelaws currently state, among other things:

“Vehicles

(1) No person shall, without reasonable excuse, ride or drive a cycle, motor cycle, motor vehicle or any other mechanically propelled vehicle on the promenade, or bring or cause to be brought onto the promenade a motor cycle, motor vehicle, trailer or any other mechanically propelled vehicle (other than a cycle), except on any part of the promenade where there is a right of way for that class of vehicle or in the pursuance of a statutory provision or lawful agreement with the Council.

(2) If the Council has set apart a space on the promenade for use by vehicles of any class, this byelaw shall not prevent the riding or driving of those vehicles in the space so set apart, or on a route, indicated by signs placed in conspicuous positions, between it and the entrance to the promenade.

(3) This byelaw shall not extend to:

- (a) invalid carriages; or
- (b) the Dotto Train.

(4) In this byelaw:

"cycle" means a bicycle, a tricycle, or a cycle having four or more wheels, not being in any case a motor cycle or motor vehicle;

"the Dotto Train" means a vehicle towing carriages carrying passengers on routes on the promenade specified by the Council;

"invalid carriage" means a vehicle, whether mechanically propelled or not, the unladen weight of which does not exceed 150 kilograms, the width of which does not exceed 0.85 metres and which has been constructed or adapted for use for the carriage of one person, being a person suffering from some physical defect or disability and is used solely by such a person;

"motor cycle" means a mechanically propelled vehicle, not being an invalid carriage, with less than four wheels and the weight of which unladen does not exceed 410 kilograms;

"motor vehicles" means a mechanically propelled vehicle, not being an invalid carriage, intended or adapted for use on roads;

"trailer" means a vehicle drawn by a motor vehicle and includes a caravan.

4.2 The Council will wish to amend and update the byelaw appropriately. This will enable it to permit and control cycling, where appropriate, along the whole length of the promenade within the borough, either in an exclusive cycle-lane or on an unsegregated, shared-use basis. As with other authorities, it would then be possible for the Council to decide to have, as circumstances from time to time dictate, some stretches of the promenade where cycling remains banned, some where it is

permitted in a lane and others where pedestrians and cyclists mingle together. The function of making and amending byelaws is reserved to Full Council. It is not delegable.

- 4.3 The Council, in either making a new byelaw or amending an existing one, is dealing with a piece of local legislation, a breach of which is prosecutable as a criminal offence. The process requires the involvement and approval of the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (CLG) and can be quite lengthy.
- 4.4 The CLG always starts by asking Councils that are considering amending their byelaws, even if only in a comparatively limited way, to consider whether it would be more appropriate to undertake a complete overhaul and updating exercise. They do however acknowledge that this can be an extremely lengthy process and they are in theory not wholly unsympathetic to the predicament of a Council wanting to amend something that is hopefully fairly straightforward on a reasonable timescale. If the process goes smoothly, it should be possible to have the CLG confirm and give an effective date for the amendment that is within 9 months of the date of this report.
- 4.5 In outline, summarised below, there is a multi-step prescribed process that the Council would need to follow, leading up to the amendment coming into effect.  
  
The first stage, that the CLG will be at pains to assure themselves has taken place, is considering the amendment and consulting with all interested parties including disability groups.
- 4.6 The amendment is then drafted that would enable the Council to permit, from time to time, what it considers would be appropriate cycling on the promenade. Provisional approval for a draft amendment to the byelaw is then sought from the CLG by providing a draft along with a completed, detailed application form, the contents of which are designed by the CLG to demonstrate the reasoning behind and the thoroughness of the process the Council has gone through. If satisfied, the CLG grant provisional approval.
- 4.7 Approval of the making of the amended byelaw in the form provisionally approved by the CLG is then sought from Full Council and authority is sought for the application of the seal.
- 4.8 The Council advertises the making of the byelaw amendment and notifies the public of its intention to apply to the CLG for confirmation of the amendment, but also states that the byelaw amendment is held on deposit for inspection and that the public have a month to make representations to the Secretary of State, at the given address, prior to the CLG confirming it.
- 4.9 The CLG notifies the Council of any representations made to them and asks the Council for its comments on those representations. The Council may have decided to delegate the making of any comments on such



representations to a senior officer. After this, the Council can apply to the CLG for confirmation of the amendment. The CLG will consider any objections and the Council's responses to them. If satisfied, they will confirm the byelaw, attest their confirmation on it and give a commencement date, which is normally a calendar month after the date of confirmation. This period gives the Council time to publicise the coming into force date and to erect signs.

- 4.10 This fairly exhaustive process is designed to make sure that the need for a byelaw amendment has been carefully thought through, all relevant people have been consulted and their views have been taken into account.

## **5.0 Financial Implications**

- 5.1 The total estimated cost of the construction of the schemes that are being recommended to be taken forward to detailed design for 2014/15 would be £1,040,000. The two Horsey Way schemes would be funded from developer contributions associated with the Sovereign Harbour development. The remaining schemes (except the Seafront Promenade route) would be funded from the funding awarded to East Sussex County Council in July 2012, from the Government's Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF). This funding has to be spent by March 2015.
- 5.2 The construction of the Seafront cycle route (along the promenade between the Wish Tower and Fisherman's Green) would take place as part of a future year's capital programme beyond 2014/15 and would be subject to a separate bid pending the outcome of the amendment to the byelaw.
- 5.3 Consequently all costs are funded externally with the exception of the work on the byelaw. The costs associated with amending the promenade byelaw will be met from within existing service budgets.

## **6.0 Conclusion**

- 6.1 The results of the recent consultation on the proposed cycle routes show that the majority of those who responded supported the introduction of the six schemes included in the consultation. It is therefore recommended that the University to Town Centre and Seafront, Town Centre to Seafront and Horsey Way Section 1 routes be taken forward to detailed design and construction as part of the County Council's 2014/15 capital programme for Local Transport Improvements. It is also recommended that the Seafront Route (along the promenade between Wish Tower and Fisherman's Green) and the Horsey Way Section 3 should be taken forward by the County Council to detailed design with construction as part of a future years capital programme beyond 2014/15, subject to the availability of funding. In view of the comments received about the Town Centre to Hospital route, it is recommended that further feasibility work is needed on this route to identify possible alternative options for the route.

6.2 The delivery of these schemes will help to develop a network of cycle routes across the town, which is key to increasing the number of cycle trips made. This will contribute towards the Council's objectives of becoming a low carbon town, reducing congestion and improving air quality and accessibility. It will also assist the wider health agenda.

6.3 Cabinet is asked to agree the recommendations above.

---

Background Papers:

Cabinet Report dated 14 July 2010

Cabinet Report dated 15 December 2010

Cabinet Report dated 13 July 2011

A Healthy Cycling Plan for Eastbourne (Sustrans – 1994)

East Sussex County Council - Cycling Strategy (2009)

Cabinet Report dated 8 February 2012

Eastbourne Cycling Strategy (2012)

East Sussex County Council's Report to Lead Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment 18 March 2014

To inspect or obtain copies of the background paper, please refer to the contact officer listed above.

---

**CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE**



## **EASTBOURNE CYCLING IMPROVEMENTS**

### **Your views about our proposals**

We would like to hear your views on our proposals to introduce a number of new routes for cyclists in Eastbourne.

An online version of this survey is available on our website along with plans showing the proposals: [www.eastsussex.gov.uk/haveyoursay](http://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/haveyoursay)

Please return your completed survey by **31 January 2014** to:  
East Sussex County Council, Eastbourne Cycling, Communities, Economy and Transport Department, FREEPOST (LW43), Lewes, BN7 1BR.

If you would like a copy of this survey in a different format such as large print, Braille or in a different language, please contact us:

Email: [alan.cook@eastsussex.gov.uk](mailto:alan.cook@eastsussex.gov.uk), or telephone: 01273 482500.

All responses received will be treated in the strictest confidence. The Council will use the collective responses from this survey for research purposes only.

---

### **Your Status**

We are asking these questions as we want to make sure that we have a representative view of the proposals from residents, businesses and stakeholder groups.

**Q1 Are you**     An individual     A business     Other

If you ticked 'A business' or 'other' please provide details

**Q2** Are you a  Resident of Eastbourne  Other

**Q3** If you are a resident of another town or village or a commuter where did you travel from?

**Q4** Please provide your postcode as this is required for analysis purposes. It will not be used to identify you.

### **Route 1 – University (Meads) to Seafront and Town Centre**

This would mainly be an on-road route with signing and carriageway markings along Denton Road, Carlisle Road, Meads Road, Saffrons Road, Old Orchard Road to the roundabout adjacent to the station. There would be a cycle lane marked in red around the Terminus Road roundabout to make drivers aware of cyclists. Cyclists could either use the roundabout to get to the railway station or travel west along Upperton Road onto The Avenue and Commercial Road where they would link up with the proposed route to the District General Hospital.

The route would also run the length of Carlisle Road and Wilmington Square (on-road) to the seafront where it links up with the proposed route along the promenade

**Q5** Do you support the proposed cycle route from the University to the Seafront and Town Centre?

Strongly Support

Support

No Opinion

Oppose

Strongly Oppose

Don't Know

**Q6** Are there any comments that you would like to make about your response to Q5 or about how the proposal may affect you?

## Route 2 – Town Centre to Seafront via Cornfield Road

This would be an on-road route and cyclists would be directed along Terminus Road and Cornfield Road to the Memorial roundabout and from there to the seafront via Devonshire Place. A cycle lane would be provided on the roundabout to make drivers aware of cyclists.

**Q7 Do you support the proposed cycle route from the Town Centre to the Seafront?**

- |   |  |                                     |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Support         | <input type="checkbox"/> No Opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose           | <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know |

**Q8 Are there any comments that you would like to make about your response to Q7 or about how the proposals may affect you?**

## Route 3 – Along the Promenade from Wish Tower to Fishermans Green

We are planning to allow cyclists to share parts of the promenade with pedestrians. Cyclists would be allowed on the Upper Promenade, from the Wish Tower to the Pier, and on the Promenade from the Pier to Fisherman's Green both on an unsegregated footway/cycleway.

**Q9 Do you support the proposals for cyclists to share sections of the promenade with pedestrians?**

- |   |  |                                     |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Support         | <input type="checkbox"/> No Opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose           | <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know |

**Q10 Are there any comments that you would like to make about your response to Q9 or about how the proposal may affect you?**

## **Route 4 – Town Centre to Eastbourne DGH, via Commercial Road**

This would be mainly an on-road route which would direct cyclists from Eastbourne Railway Station to Eastbourne Hospital from the rear of the station car park onto Commercial Road and then northbound via Upper Avenue.

The route would then be either via Bedfordwell Road and Mayfield Place or Gorringe Road (subject to detailed design) leading to Tutts Barn Lane and Kings Drive.

### **Q11 Do you support the proposed cycle route ?**

- |   |  |                                     |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Support         | <input type="checkbox"/> No Opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose           | <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know |

### **Q12 Are there any comments that you would like to make about your response to Q11 or about how the proposals may affect you?**

## **Route 5 – Horsey Way Section 1**

A continuous route would be provided for cyclists from Eastbourne Railway Station to Ringwood Road (where the existing cycleway starts). The route would follow existing roads and would include some on-road sections and some sections of shared footway/cycleway that would be provided on the pavements where they are wide enough.

### **Q13 Do you support the proposals for Section 1 of the Horsey Way?**

- |   |  |                                     |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Support         | <input type="checkbox"/> No Opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose           | <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Oppose | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know |

### **Q14 Are there any comments that you would like to make about your response to Q13 or about how the proposals may affect you?**

## Route 6 – Horsey Way Section 3

This route would allow cyclists to travel from the end of the existing cycleway at Hammonds Drive, across Lottbridge Drove (via a Toucan crossing) and then alongside Horsey Sewer to Langney roundabout via Willingdon Levels.

**Q15 Do you support the proposals for Section 3 of the Horsey Way?**

Strongly Support  
 Oppose

Support  
 Strongly Oppose

No Opinion  
 Don't Know

**Q16 Are there any comments that you would like to make about your response to Q15 or about how the proposals may affect you?**

## Tollgate School link between Horsey Sewer and Winston Crescent

A link to Tollgate School is being proposed as part of Horsey Way Section 3

**Q17 Do you support the proposals for the Tollgate School link as part of Horsey Way Section 3?**

Strongly Support  
 Oppose

Support  
 Strongly Oppose

No Opinion  
 Don't Know

**Q18 Are there any comments that you would like to make about your response to Q17 or about how the proposals may affect you?**

## About you...

### Q19 Are you....?

- Female  Male  Prefer not to say

### Q20 Which of these age groups do you belong to?

- Under 18  18-24  25-34  35-44  45-54  
 55-59  60-64  65-74  75+  Prefer not to say

### Q21 To which of these ethnic groups do you feel you belong? (Source:2011 census) Please select one answer:

- White British  Mixed White & Asian  Black or Black British Caribbean  
 White Gypsy/Roma  Asian or Asian British  Black or Black British African  
 White other\*  Asian or Asian British Pakistani  Black other\*  
 Mixed White & Black Caribbean  Asian Other\*  Arab  
 Mixed White & Black African  Chinese  Prefer not to say  
 Other ethnic group\*

\*If your ethnic group was not specified in the list please describe your ethnic group.

### Q22 Do you consider yourself to be disabled as set out in the Equality Act 2010?

- Yes  No  Prefer not to say

The Equality Act 2010 describes a person disabled if they have a longstanding physical or mental condition that has lasted or is likely to last at least 12 months; and this condition has a substantial adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day to day activities. People with some conditions (cancer, multiple sclerosis and HIV/AIDS, for example) are considered to be disabled from the point that they are diagnosed.



**Q23 If you answered yes to Q22, please tell us the type of impairment that applies to you.**

You may have more than one type of impairment, so please select all that apply. If none of these apply to you please select other and write in the type of impairment you have.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Physical Impairment  | <input type="checkbox"/> Mental Health Condition |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sensory Impairment (hearing or sight   | <input type="checkbox"/> Learning disability     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Long standing illness or health condition<br>Such as cancer, HIV, heart disease,<br>Diabetes or epilepsy | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say       |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> Other*                  |

\*If you ticked other please specify

**Q24 How did you hear about this consultation? Please select all that apply.**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> In a newspaper               | <input type="checkbox"/> On the radio                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Via Social Media             | <input type="checkbox"/> A poster                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> A leaflet through your door  | <input type="checkbox"/> An invitation or personal letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> The County Council website   | <input type="checkbox"/> The Borough Council website      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other website                | <input type="checkbox"/> Back of bus advert               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bus stop advertising         | <input type="checkbox"/> Another person                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify below) |   |

**Thank you for taking part, your views are important to us.**

**OVERVIEW PLAN OF PROPOSALS**



**Overview of proposals**

Proposals for the following six schemes are included in this exhibition and are shown on the map opposite:

- 1** University (Meads) to Seafront and Town Centre
- 2** Town Centre to Seafront
- 3** Seafront – Wish Tower to Fisherman’s Green
- 4** Town Centre to Hospital
- 5** Horsey Way Section 1 – Railway Station to Ringwood Road
- 6** Horsey Way Section 3 – Lottbridge Drove to Langney roundabout



**Results of the public consultation exercise on Eastbourne Cycling Proposals**

**1. Details of the public consultation exercise**

In January 2014 a public consultation exercise was held to inform the public about proposals for six cycle routes in Eastbourne.

A public exhibition was held in the Court Room of Eastbourne Town Hall on Friday 10 and Saturday 11 January 2014 where plans were exhibited showing the proposals. Copies of the proposals were also made available on the County Council's website. The consultation period ended on Friday 31 January 2014.

**2. Publicity**

In order to advertise the consultation, 5,000 flyers were delivered to addresses within the vicinity of each of the six proposed cycle routes, with posters advertising the consultation being placed in Eastbourne library and local cycle shops in Eastbourne.

A press release was issued on 20 December and a full page advertisement was placed in the Eastbourne Herald on Friday Dec 20 and Friday January 3 2014 and also in the Eastbourne Gazette on Wednesday January 8. These promoted the date and time of the exhibitions and the online consultation.

In addition, advertisements were placed at seven bus stops across Eastbourne, namely Terminus Road (4), District General Hospital (1), Langney Rise (1) and Seaside (1). Advertisements were also placed on the outside of selected buses.

Details of the consultation were sent to local Members of East Sussex County Council and Eastbourne Borough Council. A total of 44 key stakeholders were sent details about the consultation exercise these included Eastbourne Residents Associations, Community Interest Groups, Neighbourhood Management Groups, Eastbourne Can and other representative residents groups in Eastbourne.

Details of the consultation were available on the County and Borough Council websites from 2 January 2014.

**3. Public Feedback on Cycleway Proposals**

The public were asked to complete a questionnaire either at the exhibition event or on-line. There was a good response from the public with an estimated 296 people attending the exhibition with many more visiting the website. A total of 784 questionnaires have been completed.

The analysis of the feedback has been undertaken and the results are presented below.

**Question 1 – Are you an individual, a business or other?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage of responses</b>
An individual	776	96%
A business	13	2%
Other	16	2%

As shown in the Table above, the majority of respondents were individuals.

**Question 5 – Do you support the proposed cycle route from the University to the Seafront and Town Centre?**

There were 784 responses to this question and as shown in the table below, 75 percent of respondents either strongly supported or supported the proposed route.

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage of responses</b>
-----------------	---------------	--------------------------------

Strongly Support	416	53%
Support	169	22%
No opinion	105	13%
Oppose	38	5%
Strongly Oppose	49	6%
Don't know	7	1%
TOTAL	784	100%

**Question 6 – Are there any comments that you would like to make about your response to Q5 or about how the proposal may affect you?**

A total of 256 comments were received. The comments have been reviewed and categorised into themes with the main themes are presented in the table below.

	Theme	Number of respondents making this comment	Comments
1	Good route/Excellent proposal/long overdue	26	-
2	The roundabout lanes could cause conflicting interpretation of right of way. Not in the highway code.	25	The proposal to provide a marked cycle lane around the roundabout is being reviewed.
3	Will make cycling safer as roads are too dangerous	16	-
4	Would encourage more cycling	15	-
5	How are you going to stop parking in the cycle lanes?	11	The proposals for this route do not include cycle lanes. Cyclists will use the road as they do now but the route will be signed.
6	Not enough room for a designated cycle path (Orchard Road?)	10	There is no cycle path because of the limited width of the existing carriageway and the impact on parking. Cyclists will use the road as they do now.
7	Would prefer an off-road cycle route	10	There are many reasons why an off-road route is not being considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The creation of a an off road route along the footway would require widening which would be expensive.</li> <li>- There would be many road crossings which would greatly increase the cost of the scheme and make the route unattractive to cyclists.</li> </ul>

			- Parking restrictions may need to be considered which would displace on street parking.
8	Waste of money for a minority of cyclists/not needed	10	The funding that is being provided by the Department for Transport is specifically for cycling and walking improvements and cannot be used for any other purpose. This funding has been made available by the Government to local transport authorities sustainable transport initiatives, which support economic development and reduce carbon emissions.
9	Will promote a more active lifestyle	7	-
10	Need to have dedicated lanes on the road to reduce potential conflict with cars	6	There is insufficient carriageway width to consider dedicated cycle lanes. These lanes would also likely involve parking restrictions which may be unacceptable.
11	Welcome the proposals as they would improve health and the environment	5	-
12	Road is not wide enough for cycle lanes.	5	Cycle lanes are not being provided as there is not enough carriageway width.
13	Too much street signage would cause confusion	3	Signage is necessary in order to provide clear guidance for cyclists and other road users.
14	Too much traffic and dangerous for cyclists	3	The majority of roads that will form part of the cycle route are lightly trafficked.
15	Where cycle lanes are proposed the roads should be subject to a 20mph speed limit	3	Cycle lanes are not being provided on this route. All the roads covered by the route are covered by a 30mph limit and the introduction of a 20mph limit would only be appropriate if speeding was identified as a problem causing danger to cyclists, pedestrians and other road users.
16	Cyclists will not use the routes	3	The routes proposed are lightly trafficked and will provide those unfamiliar with Eastbourne and less confident cyclists with signed routes between a number of key destinations in the town.
17	Need to keep to national guidelines for	3	The County Council is fully aware

	cycling infrastructure		of the guidelines for designing cycling infrastructure. On occasions constraints on the space available mean we may not be able to meet the guidance in full.
--	------------------------	--	---

**Question 7 – Do you support the proposed cycle route from the Town Centre to the Seafront?**

A total of 784 comments were received. The comments have been reviewed and categorised into themes with the main themes are presented in the table below.

Response	Number	Percentage of responses
Strongly Support	420	54%
Support	180	23%
No opinion	87	11%
Oppose	43	5%
Strongly Oppose	48	6%
Don't know	6	1%
TOTAL	784	100%

**Question 8 – Are there any comments that you would like to make about your response to Q7 or how the proposal may affect you?**

A total of 238 comments were received. The comments have been reviewed and categorised into themes with the main themes are presented in the table below.

No.	Theme	Number of respondents raising this issue	Comments
1	The roundabout lanes could cause conflicting interpretation of right of way. Not in the highway code.	31	The proposal to provide a marked cycle lane around the roundabout is being reviewed.
2	Good route/excellent proposal	29	-
3	Would prefer an off-road cycle route	17	There are three main reasons why an off-road route has not been considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is insufficient space available to be able to create an off road route which would be sufficiently continuous to be attractive to cyclists.</li> <li>- There would be many road crossings which would greatly increase the cost of the scheme and present cyclists with a difficult route.</li> <li>- Parking restrictions may need to be considered</li> </ul>

			which would result in a loss of on street parking space.
4	Could cyclists use the whole of Terminus Road to the seafront?	12	The County Council did consider the route along the entire length of Terminus Road but have not pursued this because the pedestrianised section of the road is heavily used by pedestrians criss-crossing from the shops on one side of the street to the other which means there is a high risk of collisions between pedestrians and cyclists. In addition the lower end of Terminus Road towards the seafront is one-way and the introduction of contraflow cycling next to the parking areas would have been difficult to achieve. For this reason we opted for a route along Devonshire Place.
5	Waste of money/cycle lanes not required	9	The additional funding is being provided by the Department for Transport specifically for cycling improvements and cannot be used for any other purpose.
6	Would encourage more cycling	9	-
7	Would prefer cycle lanes to be provided	8	The width of the carriageway is insufficient for the introduction of cycle lanes.
8	Road is not wide enough	6	Dedicated cycle lanes have not been proposed and cyclists will use the road.
9	The cycle lane around the roundabout is a good idea	6	The use of cycle lanes around the roundabout will be reviewed.
10	Need more cycle parking	5	Could be introduced if suitable sites could be identified.
11	Issues with cycling along bus area of Terminus Road	5	The Terminus Road proposals provide a direct cycle route to the seafront. Cars are banned from this area and as such the mix of cyclists and buses is not deemed high risk in what will become a shared space environment.
12	Concern about cyclists in Terminus Road	4	Cyclists will share the space with buses and pedestrians in what will become a shared space environment. Other shared pedestrian/cycling facilities have

			worked well in other parts of the country.
13	Where cycle lanes/routes are proposed the roads should be subject to a 20mph speed limit	4	Cycle lanes are not being provided on this route. All the roads covered by the route are covered by a 30mph limit and the introduction of a 20mph limit would only be appropriate if speeding was identified as a problem causing danger to cyclists, pedestrians and other road users.
14	Cyclists should use the road	4	The aim of the proposals is to encourage more cycling as this is not only sustainable but leads to a more active, healthy lifestyle. To achieve this we need to provide a safe network of routes for cyclists avoiding busy/congested roads.
15	The cycle routes needs policing to ensure that cyclists follow the highway code	4	The opening of the routes will be accompanied by a publicity campaign with one of the messages being that cyclists must comply with the highway code.
16	Will encourage a more healthy lifestyle	4	-
17	Need to keep to national guidelines for cycling infrastructure	4	The County Council is fully conversant with the guidelines for designing cycling infrastructure. On occasions constraints on the space available mean we may not be able to meet the guidance in full.
18	Concern about causing congestion	3	Congestion should decrease if the new routes encourage more people to cycle rather than use their cars.
19	Cycle lanes are of no use, car drivers take no notice	3	-
20	Will make cycling safer as roads are too dangerous	3	-
21	Pedestrians and cyclists don't mix, someone will get injured	3	There is clear evidence both nationally and locally that shared cycling/pedestrian facilities work well.

**Question 9** – Do you support the proposals for cyclists to share sections of the promenade with pedestrians?



There were 784 responses to this question and as shown in the table below, 73 percent of respondents either strongly supported or supported the proposed route.

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage of responses</b>
Strongly Support	505	64%
Support	74	9%
No opinion	27	3%
Oppose	18	2%
Strongly Oppose	160	20%
Don't know	0	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>784</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Question 10 – Are there any comments that you would like to make about your response to Q9 or how the proposal may affect you?**

A total of 460 comments were received. The comments have been reviewed and categorised into themes with the main themes are presented in the table below.

No.	Theme	Number of respondents	Comments
1	Good route/excellent proposal/long overdue	141	-
2	The proposals will result in more accidents between pedestrians and cyclists (pedestrians and cyclists do not mix)	81	Shared cycling/pedestrian facilities work well locally and in other parts of the country. The opening of the route would be accompanied by a publicity campaign aimed at ensuring safe cycling along the promenade.
3	The prom is too narrow in places/not enough room in places	59	Further design work will be carried out on the “pinch points” to determine how best to accommodate a shared cycling and walking facility.
4	Should be a segregated cycleway	54	There is insufficient width to be able to provide a segregated cycle way along the promenade. A segregated cycleway may result in cyclists travelling at inappropriate speeds with the risk that pedestrians will stray into the area reserved for cyclists.
5	The promenade should be for pedestrians	49	The objective of the proposals is to encourage more people to cycle by creating a network of routes across the town. The introduction of a cycle facility along the seafront is a critical link in that network. An increase in cycle based tourism would provide a boost to the local

			economy.
6	Cycling on the road is dangerous	45	-
7	The existing By-law is not enforced, more cyclists will make matters worse	21	Evidence from elsewhere in the County (Hastings and Bexhill) clearly demonstrates that pedestrians and cyclists can successfully share seafront environments.
8	Cyclists should use the road	18	The aim of the proposals is to encourage more cycling as this is not only sustainable but leads to a more active, healthy lifestyle. To achieve this we need to provide a safe network of routes for cyclists avoiding busy/congested roads.
9	Good signing is essential (pedestrian priority?)	18	Suitable signage will be used to inform all users about their responsibilities.
10	Consider timed use of the prom (e.g. no cycling during major pedestrian activity)	14	A timed facility would be extremely difficult to operate. Obviously cycling will not be possible during times of heavy demand such as the Airbourne Festival. At other busy times cyclists may choose to use alternative routes.
11	Education for all on shared routes needed (and enforcement)	13	A publicity campaign would be mounted to coincide with the opening of the route to help ensure the safety of all those using it.
12	Who will police the cyclists?	13	The introduction of a shared surface will in the main be 'self policing' as cyclists will have to moderate their speeds to take account of the volume of pedestrians. A publicity campaign would be mounted to coincide with the opening of the route to reinforce the message about safe cycling.
13	Speed restriction for cyclists should be considered	12	Evidence from similar shared surface schemes demonstrates that in the main cyclists moderate their speed to take account of the volume of pedestrians.
14	Eastbourne should be inclusive by considering families not just the elderly/make the promenade accessible for all	12	-

15	There is a greater risk to toddlers and young children	10	There is no evidence to suggest that shared space schemes present a particular risk to pedestrians.
16	Will damage the tourist industry	10	An increase in cycle based tourism would provide a boost to the local economy.
17	Shared routes for cyclists and pedestrians works O/K	8	-
18	Will improve health and wellbeing	8	-
19	Would encourage more cycling	7	-
20	Create a route along the seafront with speed restrictions for cars (remove parking?)	6	An on road route along the seafront will require the removal of parking. This will be very controversial. Such a route would not be as attractive to less confident cyclists.
21	The route will attract tourism to the town	4	-
22	Will provide the "missing link" along the seafront	3	-

**Question 11 – Do you support the proposed cycle route from the Town Centre to Eastbourne DGH?**

There were 784 responses to this question and as shown in the table below, 77 percent of respondents either strongly supported or supported the proposed route.

Response	Number	Percentage of responses
Strongly Support	422	54%
Support	178	23%
No opinion	102	13%
Oppose	25	3%
Strongly Oppose	47	6%
Don't know	10	1%
TOTAL	784	100%

**Question 12 – Are there any comments that you would like to make about your response to Q11 or about how the proposals may affect you?**

A total of 235 comments were received. The comments have been reviewed and categorised into themes with the main themes are presented in the table below.

No.	Theme	Number of respondents	Comments
1	Good route/excellent proposal/long	45	-

	overdue		
2	Cycle route should be off-road/parked cars are a problem	31	<p>There are many reasons why an off-road route is not being considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some of the roads that the route would follow have low traffic volume/speed and are suitable for use by cyclists.</li> <li>- Parking restrictions may need to be considered as widening of the footway to accommodate cyclists would leave no space for parking.</li> <li>- It has not been possible to identify a suitable off road route that could be designed and constructed within the timescale and budget available.</li> </ul>
3	The loss of parking along Kings Drive will greatly affect the residents	19	The County Council is fully aware of this issue and will be carrying out further feasibility work to assess other route options.
4	Kings Drive is too narrow to accommodate the cyclists	12	See response to items (2) and (3) above.
5	The southern part of the route needs to be reconsidered, there are several points of concern along this route	10	The County Council will carry out further feasibility work to assess other route options.
6	Dangerous to cycle on the road	9	-
7	Cyclists may not use this route, it is not direct.	8	See response to item (5) above.
8	Use a different route to Kings Drive (e.g. via the allotments)	7	See response to item (5) above.
9	Introduce 20mph speed limits where on-road cycle routes	6	All the roads covered by the route are covered by a 30mph limit and the introduction of a 20mph limit would only be appropriate if speeding was identified as a problem causing danger to cyclists, pedestrians and other road users.
10	A waste of money/not needed	6	The additional funding that is being provided by the Department for Transport specifically for walking and cycling improvements and cannot be used for any other purposes.

11	Need a Toucan crossing on Kings Drive to get cyclists across to the underpass	5	See response to item (5) above.
12	Do not want narrow cycle lanes, they are useless (drivers ignore them)	4	See response to item (5) above.

**Question 13 – Do you support the proposals for Section 1 of the Horsey Way?**

There were 784 responses to this question and as shown in the table below, 74 percent of respondents either strongly supported or supported the proposed route.

Response	Number	Percentage of responses
Strongly Support	417	53%
Support	165	21%
No opinion	118	15%
Oppose	31	4%
Strongly Oppose	39	5%
Don't know	14	2%
TOTAL	784	100%

**Question 14 – Are there any comments that you would like to make about your response to Q13 or about how the proposals may affect you?**

A total of 186 comments were received. The comments have been reviewed and categorised into themes with the main themes are presented in the table below.

No.	Theme	Number of respondents	Comments
1	Good route/excellent proposal/long overdue	41	-
2	Shared footways not a good idea	31	Shared cycling/pedestrian facilities have been shown to work well both in other parts of the county and nationally.
3	Better route via Junction Road, Dursley, Firlie Road and Courtlands Road	16	The County Council will review parts of the route in view of the feedback received.
4	On-road sections not good, parked cars, etc.	12	See response to Item (3).
5	Route is not direct/too many road	7	See response to Item (3).

	crossings		
6	Footways not wide enough/bins a problem	5	The existing footway will be widened to 3.8m which is wide enough for shared use by pedestrians and cyclists.
7	Would prefer an off-road route along St.Philip's Avenue and Ringwood Road	4	See response to Item (3).
8	Waste of money/not needed	4	The additional funding that is being provided by the Department for Transport specifically for cycling improvements and cannot be used for any other purpose.
9	Will encourage a healthy lifestyle	4	-
10	Introduce 20mph speed limits where on-road cycle routes	3	All the roads covered by the route are covered by a 30mph limit and the introduction of a 20mph limit would only be appropriate if speeding was identified as a problem causing danger to cyclists, pedestrians and other road users.

**Question 15 – Do you support the proposals for Section 3 of the Horsey Way?**

There were 784 responses to this question and as shown in the table below, 79 percent of respondents either strongly supported or supported the proposed route.

Response	Number	Percentage of responses
Strongly Support	456	58%
Support	166	21%
No opinion	125	16%
Oppose	14	2%
Strongly Oppose	23	3%
Don't know	0	0%
TOTAL	784	100%

**Question 16 – Are there any comments that you would like to make about your response to Q15 or how the proposals may affect you?**

A total of 146 comments were received. The comments have been reviewed and categorised into themes with the main themes are presented in the table below.

No.	Theme	Number of respondents	Comments
1	Good route/excellent proposal/long overdue	70	-

2	Why not extend to Pevensey Bay/Langney	4	Outside the scope of the project. Could be considered in the future should funding be available.
3	Will encourage more cycling	4	-
4	Waste of money/not needed	3	There is a strong demand for improving cycling facilities as this would not only improve sustainability but also enable a more healthy lifestyle. The additional funding that is being provided by the Department for Transport is specifically for walking and cycling improvements and cannot be used for any other purpose.
5	Shared routes are not safe	3	Shared cycling/pedestrian facilities work well in other parts of the county and across the country.
6	Safety risk of route beside ditches	3	The independent safety audit carried out on the proposals requires a minimum of 2m separation between the cycleway and any waterways. This has been achieved in the current design.

**Question 17 – Do you support the proposals for the Tollgate School link as part of Horsey Way?**

There were 784 responses to this question and as shown in the table below, 74 percent of respondents either strongly supported or supported the proposed route.

Response	Number	Percentage of responses
Strongly Support	434	55%
Support	152	19%
No opinion	154	20%
Oppose	8	1%
Strongly Oppose	22	3%
Don't know	14	2%
TOTAL	784	100%

**Question 18 – Are there any comments that you would like to make about your response to Q17 or how the proposals may affect you?**

There were 109 responses to this question. The comments submitted have been categorised into themes for simplicity. The table below lists those themes together with the number of people making similar comments shown.

No.	Theme	Number of respondents	Comments
-----	-------	-----------------------	----------

1	Good route/excellent proposal/long overdue	39	-
2	May encourage more parents/children to walk/cycle to school	19	-
3	Shared routes are not safe	6	Shared cycling/pedestrian facilities work well in other parts of the country.
4	Cycling proficiency needed for school children	3	Cycling proficiency will be arranged for school children before the cycle route is opened.
5	Inconsiderate parking outside schools is a major problem	3	-
6	Could a route into the rear of the school be provided	3	This has been considered but rejected for the following reasons. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- security at the school requires access be achieved from the southern entrance only.</li> <li>- land is a premium and a cycleway would reduce available land for the playground.</li> </ul>



**RESPONSES FROM STAKEHOLDERS**

## 1. Response from Bespoke

**Bespoke response to the consultation on cycle routes 22 Jan 2014**

Bespoke welcome the opportunity to comment on the proposed cycle routes within Eastbourne. We want to encourage cycling and we accept that improvements to cycle infrastructure are an endorsement, by the Council, of this aim.

Before we comment on each route we wanted to provide some helpful comments on the overall process for this and future reviews.

- For each route it would be useful where more than one option was examined that some details of these other options are provided along with the reasons for their rejection. This might be cost, practicality, access to land, pedestrian densities at peak times or safety. It became apparent at the Town Hall consultation that residents would be submitting alternative routes to you but they are unaware that you have already examined them.
- There are a number of organisations that provide standards for building cycle routes. These include Department for Transport, Transport for London and Sustrans. By adopting at least one of these, and stating it in the review, then certain minimum levels can be expected and also research guidance becomes available. So for example, cycle lanes on large roundabouts are generally not considered good design (Ref 1, 2). Where they are being proposed there should be a reason provided in the documentation.
- The Department of Transport classifies cyclists into 4 categories :
  - fast commuter
  - utility cyclist
  - inexperienced and/or leisure cyclist
  - children

This also suggests what type of solution is suitable for each (Ref 3). With this in mind we would like for each route to identify the type of cyclists it is intended to support. DfT state that children "require segregated, direct largely off-road routes from residential areas to schools" whereas utility cyclists would manage with "some segregation" such as the Advisory Cycle Lanes that are being proposed. We are pleased to see that in the new draft Hastings Walking and Cycling Strategy, ESCC and Hastings Borough agree to adopt the DfT guidance and standards. This is excellent. DfT standards include continuing cycle lanes across side streets, not having short sections of Advisory Cycle Lanes, etc.

- We were delighted to help ESCC with the original bid for LSTF funding, and we agreed which 4 links were the priority for new cycle routes. As part of Cycle East Sussex, we encourage as much collaboration as possible at all stages between ESCC and local cycling groups when new infrastructure is planned. We understand the pressure of time and that LSTF money has to be spent by March 2015, so there are limits on what can be achieved in this time. We are keen to be involved in future bids for funding and building development in Eastbourne around which cycle routes could be planned.

**Bespoke position on the routes consulted on:**

- We presented a petition in 2011 with over 3000 signatures requesting better facilities for cycling in Eastbourne and a seafront cycle route. The current lack of cycling on the seafront is the commonest thing that non-cyclists ask us about.
- The plans include some excellent features, such as Advanced Stop Lines at some signalised junctions. These improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians.
- All routes need good signage.
- The plans include two roundabouts with proposed integral cycle lanes, at the memorial roundabout and the Eastbourne station roundabout. Our view is that these may be more dangerous for cyclists with planned cycle lanes.

**Summary of Bespoke's response:**

No.	Route	Bespoke rating (5 stars = excellent)	Comments
1	University (Meads) to town and seafront	**	This route involves signage and is very cheap. The level of infrastructure proposed may not be sufficient to encourage further uptake of cycling. The junction between Carlisle Road and Meads Road is currently very dangerous, and this section may need more than just new markings. The novel cycle lane on the roundabout near the station may be dangerous.
2	Town centre to Seafront	*	It may be better to wait for a better route along Terminus Road. The plan for a cycle lane on memorial roundabout may be dangerous. Devonshire Place may contain too many parked cars to be a good cycle route.
3	Seafront	****	The seafront has always been the no. 1 priority for Bespoke. This route will work for the groups likely to use it: commuters and for fitness most of the time; children or recreational users on sunny days when the promenade is busy with other users. These groups will share nicely. It will not be suitable for high speed cycling but is not intended for this. Some extra consideration needs to occur around the 4 pinch points between the Pier and the Redoubt. The byelaw may not be an issue.
4	Town centre to Hospital	***	Removing parking will improve this as a commuter route on King's Drive, which is very busy. We suggest semi-segregation to make this safer. The link to the railway station could be tidier.
5	Horseway section 1 – Railway station to Ringwood Road	***	Half of this (dual flow on the pavement in Ashford Road) could work well. The further half is very awkward for cyclists, and we have made other suggestions to use a route with less traffic.
6	Horseway Section 3 – Lottbridge Drove to Langney roundabout	*****	Looks great! Genuine off-road route linking several schools.

Weblink for the consultation, including maps: <https://consultation.eastsussex.gov.uk/economy-transport-environment/eastbourne-cycling-improvements>

**Re: Provision for cyclists on roundabouts:**

We are concerned to see proposals for painted cycle lanes on the two busy roundabouts in the town centre. The DfT Cycle Infrastructure Design guidance states '*Cycle lanes on roundabouts must be very carefully considered. There is little evidence to suggest that they offer any safety benefit to cyclists, and they may introduce additional hazards. Some cycle lanes on roundabouts have been removed because they led to a deterioration in the accident rate*'. This is particularly known to be the case where roundabouts have 2-lane entries. Department for Transport has specific guidance summarising features that make roundabouts safer for cyclists, including single lane entry (Ref 2)

Having two major roundabouts in Eastbourne changed in a way that might make them less safe may spoil how the acceptable the whole cycle network design appears.

**Bespoke detailed response about each route:**

**Route 1: University (Meads) to town and seafront**

1. There are a number of students who might use this route
2. Please note that there are a number of schools on this route as well
3. We love the Advanced Stop Lane on Upperton Road (by the Avenue). This is really good. It allows the cyclists to be ahead of the traffic at junctions (where most injuries occur). Can we have more of these?
4. We are very concerned about cycle lanes on the roundabout by the railway station, which we understand have been removed from roundabouts in other towns.
5. Bespoke do not feel the level of infrastructure proposed would be sufficient to encourage further uptake of cycling. This is largely because it consists of little more than signage on routes that existing cyclists would already use
6. We worry about cyclists using Old Orchard Road, by the library -- with large numbers of taxis turning at the junction with Arlington Road. It may be useful to move the taxis elsewhere.
7. Our preferred option would be using Grove Road in both directions, with a contraflow cycle lane for returning cyclists.
8. The Carlisle Road – to Meads Road junction is already dangerous. Road markings may be insufficient to be safe. It may also need some traffic calming.
9. This is a fairly cheap route.
10. We should be supportive of a route here if it was properly done
11. More signs would be needed to reinforce this as a route

**Route 2: Town centre to Seafront**

12. We are very concerned about cycle lanes on the memorial roundabout, which we understand have been removed from roundabouts in other towns.
13. We also are concerned about using Devonshire Place which has parking down both sides and in the centre. This leaves cyclists vulnerable to doors being opened and cars moving, which can lead to collisions or late swerving manoeuvres to avoid the opening door. This might be better if the cycle lanes were inside the rows of parked cars, as is seen in Copenhagen and elsewhere (Ref 4, Ref 5)
14. We welcome cyclists being allowed on the first part of Terminus Road, but would request that cyclists can continue down Terminus road to the Seafront. If the station end of Terminus Road really is to be a "shared space", why not extend that concept through to the seafront? This is by far the superior route for locals and visitors.
15. We would prefer a route down Terminus Road. We realise that the funding for this is attached to the Arndale centre redevelopment. We want to state again that the current plan for Terminus Road includes the same number of buses using this road, so cyclists may be squeezed out.

### Route 3: Seafront

16. A continuous cycle route along the seafront has always been a top priority for Bespoke. We have consulted and researched widely on this issue.
17. Our understanding of the byelaws is that they are not difficult to change (see below). All that is needed is the erection of signs allowing cycling.
18. There has been a long debate about the benefits and risks of segregation and cyclists sharing space (Ref 6). The activity on the promenade varies massively by time, season and sunniness. The cyclists using the seafront will be: workers travelling in the early morning, those wishing to exercise (eg cycling rather than jogging for people with hip or knee problems), children, older people and less confident people. It should work well. Those wanting to cycle fast will not use it.
19. Bespoke has pointed out that the 1km of cycle path installed last year from Bede's school to the wishtower is still confusing and needs more signs. This made us cautious about shared use unless there is adequate signage. We have recommended improved signage in this area.
20. We recommend sufficient signs making the routes clear, including cycles painted on the tarmac and different colour tarmac. Most of Eastbourne's promenade is very wide. The sections from Bede's school to the wishtower (already installed) and from the wishtower to the Pier (planned) have 2 or 3 promenades and a pavement, with cycling only permitted on one level as shared use. It may be that walkers use one of the other levels.
21. The signs may need to say "cyclists please use your bell to warn others of your presence" as they do in Brighton, on the Undercliff path.
22. There are some days when volumes of people are too high for comfortable cycling, especially in the section between the Pier and the Redoubt fortress. We expect this to be self-policing, in that children will still cycle and others will either push their bikes or cycle on the road.
23. We would request:
  - a. Some provision needs to be made for when the Bandstand section is closed (for example opening up the pavement to cycling on that section)
  - b. Urgent attention to signage and painting cycles on the tarmac for the section already completed (Bede's to wishtower). This needs bigger signs and far more of them as it is still confusing. The Traffic Signs Manual states that the blue shared pedestrian / cycle sign to indicate a shared use footway should be located where the shared route begins and must be used as a repeater at regular intervals to remind cyclists and pedestrians that pedal cycles can legally be ridden on the pavement. Existing signage is not adequate and should be improved, particularly around the areas where access points lead to and from the ramps to the seafront.
  - c. Attention to the 4 pinch points between the pier and the Pavilion tea rooms. A Boardwalk was considered in 2010. Could this be re-explored please? Please note that the current 'Netpave' surface between Glynde and Hastings is currently closed for repair. Any similar option for Eastbourne would need to be maintained.
  - d. The path by the Natural fitness centre and Redoubt should be opened up for cyclists. The Dotto train currently uses this as access from royal Parade.
  - e. A better corner at the Natural fitness centre/Redoubt, perhaps using the wasteland there.

#### Route 4: Town centre to Hospital

24. We are delighted that this is a priority route – thousands of people work at the hospital and this would allow many to make the modal shift to cycling. Cycling by hospital staff and by students and staff at South Downs' College will be a huge benefit to residents and car drivers in reducing congestion and parking in local streets.
25. Our preferred route for the future is off-road behind the houses. We realise there are constraints around a landownership and funding at this time.
26. Advisory cycle lanes are difficult on a busy road, especially for children or less confident cyclists. Advisory cycle lanes must be 2 metres wide wherever possible and no less than 1.5 metres even at pinch points. There is plenty of room to achieve this on Kings Drive and if the facility is built to a high standard then this could be a very valuable addition to the cycle network, despite Kings Drive being a relatively busy road.
27. We recommend some aspects of semi-segregation, such as "armadillos" or "circular semi-separators" at intervals (Ref 7, Ref 8, Ref 9). Because King's Drive is such a busy and dangerous road (large number of KSIs – Killed or Seriously Injured) which links several schools, we want to see semi segregation such as armadillos to deter people from driving or parking in the cycle lane.
28. From the hospital to Prideaux Road, removing parking, with double yellow lines and an advisory cycle lane will make section this far better by allowing visibility.
29. We realise that at Prideaux Road there is insufficient width for any separate provision on the area. Solutions include:
  - a. double yellow lines all along this section to prevent cars parking half on the road, half on the verge as at present.
  - b. the width of the pavement on at least one side of the road could be widened to 2.5m to accommodate a shared pedestrian / cycle path.
  - c. at this point cyclists (e.g. school children) should be permitted to use the pavement
30. Accessing the station via the car park is a good idea. Currently the car park signs and tarmac arrow painting suggest this is not possible. We would prefer a designated 2-way cycle route through the station car park.
31. Red surfacing is needed to continue the cycle lane across junctions to give cyclists priority.
32. At other parts of King's Drive (further North and not part of this consultation):
  - a. Some of the cycle lanes are too narrow
  - b. There are junctions where no provision has been made for cyclists, with their lane just stopping
  - c. A review of this section would be useful to see where improvements could be made. This would then link the route to key education facilities and further increase usage.
33. Upper Avenue might be a better route than having a dog-leg (down Mayfield Place)
34. It may be easier to use Bedfordwell Road, coming from Gorrington Road, and sticking to Upper Avenue, rather than cyclists having to keep crossing. A contraflow may be useful for cyclists here where it is one-way.

#### Route 5: Horsey way section 1: Railway station

35. This section is desperately needed. On these plans the section joining the recently opened Horsey Way route is far too convoluted and indirect to be used by cyclists. The constant changing of one side of the road to another is not conducive to cycling. Also, the suggestion to use St Phillips Avenue is worrying given the speed and volume of traffic on this route.
36. The first section is dual-carriageway on the widened pavement, as far as Cavendish Place. This section should work well. There are bins in this area and people with doorways straight onto the cycle path, but we hope this has been considered.



37. Consideration should be given to using the alternative quiet route from Ashford Road via Junction Road (rear of JCP car park), Ashford Road, Dursley Road, Winchcombe Road and then exiting on to Firle Road. The money saved from not building the proposed shared route along Ashford Road / Cavendish Road could then be used to redesign the Firle Road / Whitley Road traffic light junction and would enable the introduction of Advanced Stop Lines. This route could then continue via Stansted Road, Waterworks Road, Moy Avenue and then via Courtlands Road before linking in to Ringwood Road near the start of the off-road Horsey Way section that has already been built. There is sufficient width to widen the footway and provide shared ped / cycle facilities on Waterworks Road, Moy Ave and Courtlands Ave.
38. The ideal would be using the land by the railway, installing a high fence and just running along the east of the railway line, traffic-free. We hope that East Sussex County Council's negotiations with Southern railway are proceeding.
39. We dislike the crossing over at Cavendish Place. This is very bitty for cyclists, having to get up press a button, and then cross to the other side of the road. It would be better to keep the cycle path on the North of the road the whole way along. If we can't use the north side, ideally the shared space route on the south side should have the same priority of as the rest of Cavendish Avenue where it crosses Belmore Road and Bourne Street.
40. The plans have a cyclist crossing the road again to a path on the other carriageway on Crawbrook Road (by the fire station). This seems awkward, particularly since the bends on both sides of the road reduce their visibility to cars.
41. The blind corner off St Phillip's Avenue would be difficult for cyclists.
42. The section changing to Havelock Road is poor. The cycle route would be better either:
  - a. Staying on Firle Road
  - b. Using Dursley Road which is quieter. There are two roads: Winchcombe Road going East, Dursley Road going Westwards. This means a short section of one-way street (Dursley Road) would need to be 2-way for cyclists. This would need a "no entry except cyclists" and other signage. No parking would have to be removed. A specific cycle lane is not needed.
43. Advanced Stop Lines at the traffic lights Firle Road to Whitley Road would be very useful.
44. There is a development occurring at the old BT site, with 37 houses. It would be better to take the cycle route over there for the final part of this route. The pavement outside the diary on Waterworks Road could be shared space.
45. For the final part, St Philip's Avenue is sub-optimal for cyclists. Similarly Ringwood Road is very busy with cars, as is the junction between these 2 roads. Our preferred alternatives are:
  - a. Along Horsey sewer
  - b. Moy Avenue
46. Taking the Firle Road / Stanstead Road route brings the Horsey route very close to the hospital route, making it a more joined up solution

#### 6: Horsey way Section 3 – Lottbridge Drove to Langney roundabout

47. Looks great!
48. This is a genuine off-road route linking several schools
49. It ends at the Langney roundabout, so excellent for linking large numbers of people
50. We suggest traffic calming is needed on Birch Road as this is a fast junction.
51. The toucan crossing over the very busy Lottbridge Drove needs to be as close as possible to Hammonds Drive

#### Regarding the byelaw currently preventing cycling on Eastbourne promenade:

Bespoke have had advice that the current byelaw does not require changing, because it states that cycling is not permitted except where the council has placed signs allowing it. The planned route would clearly sign that cycling was permitted.

*Byelaws relating to promenades Eastbourne Borough Council 19 April 1995 (Extracts)*

- *No person shall, without reasonable excuse, ride or drive a cycle, motor cycle, motor vehicle or any other mechanically propelled vehicle on the promenade...except on any part of the promenade where there is a right of way for that class of vehicle or in pursuance of a statutory provision or lawful agreement with the council.*

- *If the council has set apart a space on the promenade for use by vehicles of any class, this byelaw shall not prevent the riding or driving of those vehicles in the space so set apart, or on a route, indicated by signs placed in conspicuous positions, between it and the entrance to the promenade.*

In May 2002 the byelaws were extended to also include the Eastern Parade and the access road at Fisherman's Green. These two routes have signage allowing cycling so the precedent is in place to carry this on for the seafront route being proposed.

Between the Pier and the Healy Shelter opposite Cambridge Road is pavement and not covered under the byelaws. ESCC would need to convert this to allow cycling, something that can be done without a change in the byelaws, in a matter of weeks.

Keeping the byelaw would give the Council flexibility at peak times, such as Airbourne, to reintroduce signs to limit cycling where required.

#### References:

1. Cycle Infrastructure Design, Department for Transport 2008 Local Transport Note 2/08 Section 9.10.1 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-transport-notes>
2. TAL 9/97 Cyclists at Roundabouts, Continental Design Geometry [http://web.archive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090505152230/http://www.dft.gov.uk/adobe/pdf/165240/244921/244924/TAL\\_9-97](http://web.archive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090505152230/http://www.dft.gov.uk/adobe/pdf/165240/244921/244924/TAL_9-97)
3. Cycle Infrastructure Design, Department for Transport 2008 Local Transport Note 2/08 Section 1.3.8 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-transport-notes>
4. Re cycle lanes inside the row of parked cars: <http://2.bp.blogspot.com/-gRGLXVfGHNO/UAhPyM5rdri/AAAAAAAAABE0/wIP5WEjtzZo/s1600/NYC+buffered+bike+lane+in+action.jpg>
5. CTC 18.6.2012. Brighton's Old Shoreham Road: the cycle-ways to the future. <http://www.ctc.org.uk/news/2012-06-18/brightons-old-shoreham-road-cycle-ways-to-future>
6. Shared Use Routes for Pedestrians and Cyclists, Department for Transport 2008 Local Transport note 2/08 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/shared-use>
7. Notes on "armadillos" and semi-segregation <http://www.camdencyclists.org.uk/newsitems/ccc/royal-college-street-cycle-track>
8. The Guardian 6.11.13. London expands protected cycle lane scheme <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2013/nov/06/london-protected-cycle-lanes-scheme>
9. Separated cycle lane suggestions: <https://www.bicyclenetwork.com.au/general/bike-futures/11522/>

## 2. Response from Campaign for Better Transport



Derrick Coffee  
County Officer  
**Campaign for Better Transport – East Sussex**  
9 Mayfield Place  
Eastbourne, East Sussex BN22 8XJ  
01323 646866 [derrick.coffee@talk21.com](mailto:derrick.coffee@talk21.com).  
29 1 14  
**Eastbourne Cycling Strategy – Comments**

Dear Alan  
Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the proposed cycle routes in Eastbourne.

To a great extent, we support the suggestions you have received from 'Bespoke'.

### **Suggestions/Comments - general:**

Branding of the range of measures in the whole LSTF strategy could help to create a positive perception of the range of integrated, sustainable and healthy alternatives to the car. Together these could reduce car traffic and improve background conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users.

In promoting the proposed work and garnering support for it, it would be useful to emphasise the proportion of short car trips making up the total of journeys to work. These are the easiest to transfer to sustainable modes of transport. Health benefits should also be emphasized.

20mph default speed limit on residential streets would encourage potential cyclists to seriously consider – for themselves and their children to set out by bike, town wide. Older people, especially those who have cycled at some time in their lives, may also be encouraged to persuaded to 'get back in the saddle and wheel back the years'!

Removal of on-street parking where this would make a route viable, and a robustly applied policy to discourage pavement parking would help to position cycling high up in the transport hierarchy. High value for money will largely be dependent upon parking policy and enforcement.

### **Route 2 Town Centre – Seafrost**

20mph limit should be applied to Southfields Road where currently town centre bound traffic often approaches at speeds which can alarm pedestrians and discourage cyclists.

### **Route 4 Town Centre – Hospital**

Suggest that all opportunities should be explored to link the route across Whitley Road railway bridge through provision of a combined footway/cycleway to the entrance to Stansted Road. Can S 106 arising from the Bedfordwell housing development be used to fund this?

\*(see our response to the planning application attached: there are suggestions regarding the two roundabouts between the development and the town centre and comments on the nature of the difficulties and also opportunities for better bus/pedestrian/cycle access.)

Sincerely,

Derrick Coffee  
(County Officer, Campaign for Better Transport – East Sussex)

[Type text]

[Type text]

[Type text]



### 3. Response from Eastbourne Hackney Carriage trade

**Alan Cook**

---

**From:** Kevin Jeffries <ticjeffries@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** 29 January 2014 23:01  
**To:** Alan Cook  
**Subject:** Eastbourne Cycle routes

Dear Alan,

Please be advised that on behalf of the Eastbourne Hackney Carriage trade I would like to object in the strongest terms about the moving of the taxi rank from pier head to further back behind the bus stops near the Queens Hotel. The very nature of our trade requires us to have ranks where there is most footfall and to be in sight of potential customers. We would ask you to reinstate them as originally laid out.

Regards

Kevin Jeffries, Secretary of the Hackney Carriage Branch of Unite the Union

Sent from Windows Mail

## STAKEHOLDER DISTRIBUTION LIST

Organisation
Bespoke
Bexhill Wheelers
Brighton & Hove Buses
British Cycling South East
Campaign for Better Transport
Cycle Seahaven
Cyclist Touring Club (CTC) Wealden & South Downs
Devonshire West Big Local
Eastbourne Area Panel Groups
Eastbourne Can
Eastbourne Chamber of Commerce
Eastbourne Community Environment Partnership (CEPE)
Eastbourne Community Interest Groups
Eastbourne Disability Involvement Group
Eastbourne Hospitality Association
Eastbourne Neighbourhood Management Operation Groups
Eastbourne Neighbourhood Panels
Eastbourne Society
Eastbourne Strategic Partnership
Eastbourne Town Centre Management Initiative
Eastbourne Youth Forum
East Sussex Disability Association
East Sussex Downs and Weald NHS PCT
East Sussex Fire & Rescue (ESFRS)
ESCC Rights of Way
Healthy Eastbourne
Highways Agency
Meads Community Association
Network Rail
Places for People
Queens Estate Residents Association
Rodmill Residents Association
South Downs National Park
South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECAMBS)
Southern Railways
Sovereign Harbour Residents Association
Stagecoach
Sunbury Farm Residents Association
Sussex Downs College
Sussex Police
Sustrans
University of Brighton
Wealden District Council