



Intro

1: Introduction

138 responses

Response counts

Section	Count
Comments received	9
Question 1: How could the redevelopment of Shoreham Cement Works contribute to the purposes and duty of the National Park?	129

Comments received

(R16/session 60851; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

Allowing the site to continue undeveloped should permit scientific study of natural regeneration; to me this is the only viable option and steps to protect wildlife and habitat must be taken. This should be taken as an opportunity to do something more significant to redress the decimation of our wildlife and habitat.

(R2/session 60855; Adur and Worthing District Council)

Created August 2nd 2022

Sustainability Appraisal Chapter 1 - Introduction: No comments Chapter 2 - Scope of the SA: No comments Chapter 3 - AAP Issues & Options Document: Para 3.19 states that the water drainage and flooding theme highlights that the riverside area is likely to be suitable for housing. This is surprising given that this area is at risk of surface water flooding and the southern section is also identified as being at a high risk of tidal flooding in the future with climate change. It is unclear how this accords with the sequential approach set out in the NPPF of directing most vulnerable development to areas of lowest flood risk. Although the option of directing development to undeveloped or previously developed parts of the site was tested, it is surprising that directing residential development to each of the site areas was not tested as an option as part of the SA, as was done for which areas should the focus be for biodiversity. This would have enabled the justification for and potential impacts of directing residential development to the areas identified to be understood. As well as some of the competing demands for areas of the site. Chapter 4 - The SA Findings at This Stage: No comments Chapter 5 - Way Forward: No comments Habitat Regulations Assessment Chapter 1 - Introduction: HRA is linked to the North Sussex water supply neutrality issue so no comments. Chapter 2 - Likely Significant Effects: No comments Chapter 3 - Conclusion: No comments

(R25/session 60865; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

Please accept this email as my formal response to your consultation on the future plans for this site. Firstly having reviewed the video, your response to the Habitats and Species Regulations screening and considered the overall tone of your consultation, I am extremely surprised at your presumption in favour of development for this site, especially given your role as custodians, the nationally important wildlife and landscape features of the area and the potential for the site to transform the area into a truly sustainable, future proofed, holistic nature based solution to the blight that this industry has made here.

(R28/session 60868; Horsham District Council)

Created August 2nd 2022

Historically, Shoreham Cement Works was allocated in the Horsham District Core Strategy (2007) and the Site Specific Allocations of Land (2007) for restoration, including employment, leisure and / or tourism uses. We, therefore, supports the principle of the redevelopment of the site. We welcome the preparation of an AAP for the purposes of guiding development of this exceptional site and help deliver an exemplar mixed use development of regional or indeed national importance. It understands that the AAP will form part of the Development Plan along with the South Downs Local Plan, the Upper Beeding Neighbourhood Plan, and the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan and Waste Local Plan. We acknowledge that in the preparation of the AAP, the SDNPA has made use of evidence base prepared by Horsham District Council, and other Local Authorities. This includes the Economic Growth Assessment (2020) which suggests the need for a balance of housing and jobs as a key objective for the Council. With regards to the housing evidence, it is understood that this comprises of the SDNPA Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2015), the SDNPA Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (2017), the Adur and Worthing SHMA (2020) and the Upper Beeding Housing Needs Survey (2014); and that no separate evidence was collected on housing need for the AAP. Water Neutrality is a significant issue for Horsham District, at present, following the issue of a Position Statement from Natural England in September 2021 requiring any new development within the Sussex North Water Resource (Supply) Zone to demonstrate water neutrality. Reference to this, and the joint work the SDNPA along with Horsham District, Crawley Borough and Chichester District are undertaking to achieve a strategic solution for development on this matter, is acknowledged and welcomed. The impact of any redevelopment at this site on Water Neutrality will need to be considered as part of this work as relevant.

(R37/session 60878; Mid Sussex District Council)

Created August 2nd 2022

Overall, the Council is concerned that draft AAP is lacking in detail on the four potential development options, making it very difficult to comment on their acceptability. There is no indication of how the site could accommodate any of the options; what layout is proposed, what scale the buildings are likely to be for each option; or how dense the development would be within each element of the site. The Council would therefore urge the SDNPA to publish a Regulation 19 version of the AAP which clearly articulates the Preferred Option and includes a concept masterplan(s) for the site, with clearly defined parameters, along with diagrams indicating scale, massing and layout. This level of detail is required in order for key stakeholders and interested parties to be able to understand how the SDNP envisage the site's redevelopment and therefore be able to actively engage with the evolution of the AAP. The quantum and mix/ types of commercial uses needs to be fully explained and justified by the evidence base, particularly as the AAP appears to suggest that this is driving some key decisions on the location and scale of residential development. The Council does not agree with taking an approach that is too rigid about

segregation of the commercial / employment uses and residential. Not all employment uses are incompatible in residential areas and a well-designed scheme could see a successful mix of uses across the development. It is noted that only Scenario 4, includes E(g)(ii) and the AAP suggests this is driven by construction costs. The Viability Study includes some caveats regarding the appraisal of office space, largely owing to lack of information on the proposals (para 4.26); the Council would therefore request that the SDNPA continue to explore and fully justify the proposed mix of commercial uses on the site. The draft AAP should seek to provide opportunities for imaginative proposals which offer flexibility and reliance to the scheme with the potential to integrate a range of uses, without being too restrictive. The Council is concerned that without fully exploring the potential to have a greater mix of residential and commercial uses, particularly on the Cement Works/ Bowl area, the AAP could adversely limit the quantum of residential development. The Council considers that the SDNPA should challenge views regarding the compatibility of residential and more industrial/ logistics based uses and should be imaginative on the use of different buffer spaces to protect the housing from any potential environmental impacts. The Council objects to the potentially segregated approach where housing is predominantly/ solely proposed on the Riverside as this risks missing the opportunity to create a mixed community which can provide mutual benefits between the residential and commercial elements. Achieving successful placemaking needs to be at the heart of the AAP, providing a scale of development which can support a balanced community which provides housing, employment, day to day services, education and leisure opportunities as a single development; the current options appear too modest to achieve this goal.

(R56/session 60899; Sussex Wildlife Trust)
Created August 2nd 2022

An alternative future for the Shoreham Cement Works SWT recognise that the South Downs Local Plan, adopted in 2018 includes a strategic policy for Shoreham Cement Works and within that, there are clear aspirations to restore the site. However, it appears that this aspiration for restoration is currently only explored when considered alongside commercial and residential development. Since the adoption of the Local Plan, the ambition for the restoration of our natural environment to address the biodiversity and climate crises have increased at pace. Therefore we feel that the SDNPA needs to consider if the commercial and residential aspects of developing the site, which has such potential for the restoration of nature, sits in line with the Governments environmental ambitions and subsequent direction for National Parks from the Glover Review. We note that the consultation references that the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has tested various options and demonstrated that 'doing nothing' is not a viable option for the site. While we note that section 3.13 of the SA states that this is because the other options will better meet the strategic objectives for the AAP, we do not believe that these are the only parameters the site's future should be considered against. SWT highlights that the SA does highlight that the strategic objectives for the redevelopment of the Shoreham Cement works included: The Biodiversity Emergency to be addressed through landscape-led nature recovery, which conserves and enhances existing on-site biodiversity. In light of the site's history as a mineral site, we believe that there is a responsibility to enable nature to restore itself. SWT do not have confidence in the statement made in section 4.30 of the SA which states; Do Nothing (Scenario 5) 4.30 The Do Nothing scenario is considered to be the least sustainable option as it offers little in terms of positive impact when appraised against the sustainability objectives. It effectively means the site will remain as it is. When assessed against cultural heritage objectives – there may be some benefit, but in all other cases, it will have a negative impact. We question whether this 'do nothing option' would really have a negative impact against the biodiversity and climate change objectives? So while SWT understands that 'do nothing is not an option' and has been considered as explored by SDNPA, SWT do not agree. We do not feel that the potential of the site for delivering Natures Recovery has been fully considered by the SDNPA separate to commercial and residential units. Delivering for Nature's recovery is not a do nothing option, it is an active and positive choice for biodiversity and people and therefore should be actively explored

as a future option for this site. In conclusion SWT urge the SDNPA to consider an alternative approach to the future of the Shoreham Cement Works that has nature's recovery as the driver. At a time of climate and ecological emergency, recognising the site's location within the landscape and the emerging nature recovery network is needed to ensure the potential of the site for biodiversity is fulfilled. We want the SDNPA to be positive in its approach that delivering for nature's recovery is not a do nothing option, it is an active and positive choice for biodiversity, people and the climate and therefore should be actively explored as a future option for this Shoreham Cement Works.

(R55/session 60898; Sussex Ornithological Society)
Created August 2nd 2022

Instead of any of the four options that are being considered we believe it would be much better for wildlife and for views of the landscape, for expenditure to be minimised to clearing some of the buildings on the site, and for the site to then be closed to the public and left to rewild naturally. Such a course of action we feel would be best for nature and it could provide some wonderful views to members of the public at very little cost. Such a solution, would, we feel be more in keeping with the purpose of a National Park. Summary We wish to respond to the above consultation, because, as the published document recognises, Shoreham Cement Works is an excellent site for birds and for other wildlife. We are concerned that the extent of development outlined in the AAP seems to be driven by the huge sum of money needed to make the site habitable, yet because of the £26m cost of this, the most financially viable option, option 2, only shows a 0.4% surplus. These facts suggest an outcome in which none of these options are likely to go forward unless still more housing/industrial units are built on the site. This being the case, we challenge the assumption underlying the published draft of the AAP that "doing nothing is not an option", and that development of some kind is inevitable. We also question whether the options listed are the best way to improve the landscape (see 2 below) and we are also concerned that introducing a new population of residents plus day visitors to this site would significantly disturb wildlife, including birds.

(R69/session 60913; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

I start from the position I took in the s19 soundness consultation on the local plan for the Park and that was that the authority has to provide a local plan (and then an AAP) that is economically and environmentally viable. That goes back to the two purposes and the duty. I still am not convinced that it has been delivered. I do agree that any particular scheme has to be proved viable by its developer. The site is very complex and may need an unconventional approach to resolve. There is precedent (in Worthing and other places) of taking complex sites into public ownership with things like Public Works Loans Board or regeneration money and then getting a return once they get developed. You may need to map some of my comments to the consultation questions. I don't see a single use for the whole site as likely or desirable. I have no allegiance to any scheme that is being promoted and due to past Partnership membership, have declined to be lobbied before we get to the alternatives for consultation, noting they are local plan options, not planning applications, I set out the key principles that guide my thinking • the cement works in its current state is a liability and we need site that is free from asbestos and other risks to community safety (above ground and then below) - that is an imperative and it has been in that state for too long - urgent action is required and CPO powers should be considered – a clean site will be more attractive to developers - the method for doing this will be complex and carefully planned and executed - I do not see the building as heritage that needs preservation. Outcome 7 takes precedence • we can't undo history and lack of action by previous planning authorities, but we need action now, not more delay - • proper consultation is essential • i agree that resolving the site is a "major development", doing nothing is not an

option as set out above

(R38/session 60879; member of public)

Created **August 2nd 2022**

The term "Strategic Development Site" - Not sure what that covers - 400 homes - on chalk?
Does that work?

Question 1: How could the redevelopment of Shoreham Cement Works contribute to the purposes and duty of the National Park?

(R73/session 53538; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

The option for housing 200 and employment

(R213/session 53535; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

It wouldn't I would suggest rewilding it

(R214/session 53542; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

It could provide an excellently placed educational hub for a wide range of interests and disciplines.

(R120/session 53593; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Nature based recovery stewarded by community led self build housing could increase biodiversity and community learning of these approaches.

(R190/session 53662; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

It could be an integral aspect of protecting the National Park and all of the amazing wildlife within it by not only offering further area for protection and wildlife but also raising awareness and funds through sustainable tourism. This is such an important site and has so much potential to really be something special for the park and the local area, people would love to see it be turned into something that enhances the park and allows them to enjoy it as local residents. The Knepp estate has done such fantastic work and this site has the potential to really build on that and align with the purpose of the National Park.

(R197/session 53690; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

It could not be another terrible looking housing estate and actually support your aims and objectives properly. It could work with the local ecosystem to provide a space that actually benefits people, not just landowners and seeks to build a better, richer community.

(R208/session 53703; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

It could provide a greater natural environment for wildlife

(R154/session 53708; member of public)
Created June 8th 2022

Provide more affordable housing and better cycling links so so that people can actually enjoy the park.

(R144/session 53798; member of public)
Created June 9th 2022

This is a terrible site for homes - it will lock in car use and create additional pollution within the national park. The site should be prioritised as an area for nature and recreation, creating links to the Downs Link and creating a safe crossing of the road for the South Downs Way to the north, and new pedestrian and cycling links to it. Principle should be to create wetlands , re-wild the riverside section and allow for safe and easy recreation opportunities with minimal development (100 homes absolute maximum).

(R203/session 53949; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

The development must be truly carbon zero, and it should be connected to Shoreham by a tramlink. This is probably the only opportunity to provide a substantial indoor leisure complex sorely needed by the adjacent resorts (Guildford's Spectrum Centre is a good example). What we don't want is the usual dormitory car based housing development with some sheds for industry, sadly it looks like this is already in the plan.

(R153/session 53964; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

With a sustainable usage of good infrastructure and awareness of the natural habitat.

(R181/session 54012; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

by maintaining some of the industrial heritage.

(R90/session 54020; member of public)
Created June 10th 2022

It must meet sustainability targets, and economic-wise should become a visitor attraction and destination in its own right.

(R112/session 54076; member of public)
Created June 11th 2022

Easy..rewild this site as the SDNP is so wildlife depleted. No housing, no shops, just wildlife.

(R164/session 54096; member of public)
Created June 11th 2022

Developing the site for nature and public viewing and leave old works as they are but made safe. . Sadly the works should have been demolished at the expense of the company making the cement there before being allowed to sell it, for almost nothing to the current owners. That has left an almost insurmountable problem to find the huge cost of demolition.

(R94/session 54186; member of public)
Created June 13th 2022

Developing the leisure and biodiversity of the area would attract visitors and having both visitor information and centre?, food and drink etc it could provide a focal point for both local people and visitors from further afield.

(R142/session 54348; member of public)
Created June 14th 2022

By providing better footpaths

(R125/session 54365; member of public)
Created June 15th 2022

Hi This might be a possible solution. It would provide jobs and scope to protect the local environment. https://www.thewave.com/?utm_source=fb&utm_medium=cpc&utm_content=Retargeting&utm_campaign=TheWave%7CSurfing2021%7CBookings&fbclid=IwAR2d27o1rSUV6h98l7mMQHmnlMFIAPFxLDmygsFh0sZzIfKucilJytYExJg

(R78/session 54414; member of public)
Created June 15th 2022

This is predominantly a brownfield site. The primary focus for this redevelopment should be housing to relieve the pressure of housing developments on other areas of East and West Sussex, many of which are on greenfield sites.

(R135/session 54443; member of public)
Created June 16th 2022

Has the potential to lead to large scale improvement in visitor levels to the park, while removing an ugly scar on the landscape.

(R119/session 54505; member of public)
Created June 17th 2022

Supporting local businesses and increasing understanding of, and engagement with, the National Park.

(R209/session 54553; member of public)
Created June 19th 2022

considerate minimal development would further the environmental aspirations of SDNP

(R145/session 54557; member of public)
Created June 19th 2022

If suitably developed, the cement works could be a convenient and lucrative visitor portal to the SDNP and a platform for local development.

(R134/session 54643; member of public)
Created June 21st 2022

I'm not sure that the redevelopment of Shoreham Cement works can contribute to the NP.

Perhaps the Cement works, whilst developing the site beautifully, should be considered to be outside of the NP. A 'buffer zone' or 'ecology corridor' could exist around the perimeter of the site to enable the redeveloped site to be visually less apparent to the NP so that the middle section can become its own village. The village should only be visible and accessible from the existing road. Access to the NP from the new village should be on foot only. The redevelopment should function as a village too and be predominantly mixed use so that is self sustaining with shops, industry, education and industry. The new village should remain invisible from the national park. This can be done by restricting the height of any new buildings being no higher than the cliff face. On the subject of the NP Transport and Viability Modelling; option 3 sound most viable: a leisure led scheme with 200 new homes. I would add to this a 'self sustaining community with recreation, education - i.e. schools, industry (including houses where people can work from home) and leisure. Within your presentation the NP have suggested the 'moonscape' could be open public land. My view is that the central space - 'the bowl' should be where there is perhaps a 'village green' type central space which the community is centered around.

(R122/session 54780; member of public)
Created June 23rd 2022

The current cement works is an eyesore that does not sit well in the outstanding beauty of the SDNP My favoured option would be

(R129/session 54811; member of public)
Created June 23rd 2022

Bringing jobs and housing whilst not ruining the landscape

(R180/session 54868; member of public)
Created June 23rd 2022

It is thriving with wildlife and has a lot of history to it. I have grown up with it there, if it was to be redeveloped I would hope that it keeps the original outside structure. It needs to be a safe green space for the wildlife. I would be surprised if bats and owls aren't nesting in the structure.

(R139/session 54943; member of public)
Created June 24th 2022

Redevelopment will remove an eyesore and make the national park a more attractive place

(R173/session 54989; member of public)
Created June 25th 2022

This site seems to be the ideal opportunity to create an environment similar to that of the Eden Project in Cornwall. It would greatly enhance the aims of the National Park and provide a popular and educational attraction to be enjoyed by locals and visitors alike. If it was necessary to provide homes on the site maybe the area on the other side of the road away from the main site could be utilised.

(R186/session 55093; member of public)
Created June 28th 2022

It would help enliven a prominent area which has been derelict for 30 years, bringing it back into public use and helping to grow the local economy.

(R93/session 55114; member of public)
Created **June 28th 2022**

If people were able to access it better and view around it would be better.

(R108/session 55212; member of public)
Created **July 1st 2022**

mixed scheme 240 houses and tourism with eden project

(R172/session 55230; member of public)
Created **July 2nd 2022**

with development sympathetic to the landscape and its users

(R117/session 55250; member of public)
Created **July 3rd 2022**

It should prioritise conservation of the natural habitat

(R205/session 55260; member of public)
Created **July 3rd 2022**

The primary objective must be the protection and increase of biodiversity within the National Park. The "no development" option is stated to be non-viable but little evidence is given for this. Any redevelopment could have a negative impact on biodiversity and so a scheme that increases biodiversity is of paramount importance. e.g. the use/adaptation of the chimney as a Swift nesting site.

(R188/session 55268; member of public)
Created **July 4th 2022**

By removing the hazardous eyesore of the cement works building and providing an environmentally responsible re-development including a substantial proportion of community-owned housing.

(R123/session 55271; member of public)
Created **July 4th 2022**

This document is difficult to use. My overall response is that development should be limited and that affordable housing should be a major part of the scheme as this is almost never provided in local developments

(R179/session 55304; member of public)
Created **July 5th 2022**

An imaginative redevelopment would make more people aware of the park and bring more people to the area, not just for work and to live, but also for leisure. I'm surprised how few people use the area now.

(R150/session 55319; member of public)
Created **July 5th 2022**

I support the building of new homes however I would like any scheme to contribute a

proportion of new well built and environmentally sustainable council homes for families. for example Camden LA has been building more council houses and using the profits of private sales to fund future development. housing security for all should be a priority rather than home ownership for some. This would be a beautiful area for families to live and work. Also in developing new houses with integrated renewable technologies this would provide energy security for vulnerable families.

(R111/session 55328; member of public)

Created July 5th 2022

Why would this site be turned into hundreds of houses and or leisure/commercial uses. This redevelopment should not proceed, the site would be better left as is or cleared and not redeveloped

(R215/session 55329; member of public)

Created July 6th 2022

Opportunity for visitors to enjoy nature

(R201/session 55338; member of public)

Created July 6th 2022

Please do not build more houses

(R201/session 55338; member of public)

Created July 6th 2022

Allow it to be a completely natural environment and habitat.

(R171/session 55391; member of public)

Created July 7th 2022

Appropriate redevelopment would recognise that it is a historic downland employment site with unique environmental characteristics and build on that legacy.

(R171/session 55391; member of public)

Created July 7th 2022

By recognising the historic use of the site as a quarry ie a workplace, sensitive redevelopment focusing on providing employment space (but removing the eyesore chimney and asbestos sheet buildings) would ensure the duty whilst allowing the more remote areas to continue rewilding would meet the purpose.

(R169/session 55398; member of public)

Created July 7th 2022

I think it would be a massive mistake to build yet more houses in the South East area, especially in or near the South Downs National Park. This would encourage encroachment into this wonderful green space by setting a precedent for housing, especially with little or no infrastructure which is already in very short supply. I would very much like to see a superb project such as the Eden Project in Cornwall - the similarities of the Shoreham works to the redundant chalk pits are obvious. The Eden Project draws huge interest and revenue. It encourages bio-diversity and 'green thinking' so vital to our planet, especially now with climate change and all its accompanying problems.

(R175/session 55405; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

It should clear up the mess which spoils the Downs

(R5/session 55408; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

I suggest doing none of the proposed options. Why not do landfill and landscape it back to what it was originally, similar to the scheme to the east of the A26 south of Lewes which is returning to its original state. If you put any sort of developments in there you will hugely increase the human intrusion into the park. I would be totally opposed to that. Brian Davies
FoSD member

(R193/session 55462; member of public)
Created July 8th 2022

I would like to see this redeveloped as an outdoor activity centre, with e.g. MTB course for cyclists (linking to the Downslink), lakes for walking, an outdoor ski slope, climbing on the cliffs (if stabilised), a zip wire etc etc. Special provision required for disabled. NO HOMES!

(R104/session 55482; member of public)
Created July 9th 2022

An education centre on the local area would be perfect.

(R113/session 55940; member of public)
Created July 12th 2022

Conservation areas, encourage nesting of rare birds through rewinding.

(R114/session 56363; member of public)
Created July 15th 2022

Better developed as an industrial site for employment

(R176/session 56372; member of public)
Created July 16th 2022

By being "invisible " and not encroaching on current natural walks. Don't displace any protected species of plants and or wildlife

(R140/session 55534; member of public)
Created July 17th 2022

By protecting both the environment and cultural heritage.

(R136/session 56490; member of public)
Created July 18th 2022

- Providing more natural 'break points' on the South Downs Way (i.e. cafe, toilets, hotels, etc.); - Providing 'destination' facilities to attract visitors to South Downs National Park (leisure facilities, cement works 'museum', cafe, and supporting local employment).

(R107/session 56637; member of public)
Created July 19th 2022

While there is a need to support some development in appropriate areas within the SDNP, with particular pressure on availability of residential property, this AAP also allows for key areas of environment to be protected and nurtured, albeit that they were created through industrial use of the site.

(R187/session 56735; member of public)
Created July 20th 2022

By providing easily accessible leisure facilities and some low density affordable homes. By returning as much of the site as possible to a wild and natural state. By limiting motorised vehicles and providing safe access to the site from the main road. I would choose Scenario 3 which is a mix of leisure and 200 homes. The homes should respect and complement vernacular architecture. Developments in Shoreham by Sea have been ugly and in my view have destroyed the waterfront and the skyline. Aerial overviews would be important.

(R75/session 56810; member of public)
Created July 21st 2022

Irrelevant. There are very important issues of major public importance and the NP might just have to take second place.

(R207/session 56817; member of public)
Created July 21st 2022

Build (using existing building where appropriate & create an entire leisure centre, with all facilities (and more!). A centre with indoor & outdoor leisure activities, with a hotel on site for short or long stays. The building to represent a Pirates Ship as its close by Shoreham harbour and history with Pirates sailing the Shoreham Sea's an attraction for all, this would be a magnificent edifice for this location. I want to create an excellent source of outdoor activities, like cycling, but at the heart of it to reserve a wildlife paradise. Nature and exercise goes hand in hand with mental stimulation.

(R141/session 56885; member of public)
Created July 22nd 2022

Any National Park is a monument to the best possible accommodation between people, agriculture and nature in the worst of all worlds. SCW has been a blot on the Park and the Sussex landscape, even before its closure. Since 1991 it has been decaying even with on-site activity. Its saving grace is the natural infestation of all kinds of wildlife, and much less effluent. The site will be a significant location for housing in a NP, and should not be seen as a case for allowing such housing numbers in other sites. The potential for both leisure and nature fit fully within the realms of what a NP should be for.

(R168/session 56899; member of public)
Created July 23rd 2022

By improving the appearance of the site, helping to enhance the natural beauty and conserve the cultural (industrial in this case) heritage of the area. Also by opening the site to public use it helps to promote understanding and enjoyment of the National Park

(R159/session 56908; member of public)
Created July 23rd 2022

it's unique heritage, landscape and biodiversity should be preserved as much as possible for people now and in the future. housing and commercial development are not needed here and may destroy what is special about the place

(R152/session 56938; member of public)
Created July 24th 2022

By providing leisure activities

(R79/session 56961; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

By being sympathetically developed and not being over developed

(R195/session 56984; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

By removing an eyesore and using the site to the benefit of the community. Some of the land would need to be accessible to the public in perpetuity, or in public ownership.

(R174/session 56998; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

By improving the look of the site, creating a sustainable alternative and encouraging visitors to the South Downs

(R101/session 56990; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

provide a unique opportunity to both habitat, recreation opportunities and housing allocation

(R212/session 57028; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

By explaining and preserving the contribution of this site to employment and vital manufacturing in the South Downs

(R184/session 57024; member of public)
Created July 25th 2022

It won't. This is a quarry, well past its sell-by date. The landscape needs to be restored, in keeping with the protected area status, not turned into a "new town" in the heart of the SDNP. Purpose 1 needs to be adhered to and the SDNPA should show leadership, not offering development opportunities to predatory developers to exploit this site. Initiate a campaign to save this narrowest and most vulnerable part of the South Downs, otherwise, incremental development and associated infrastructure will shrink this slim green bridge, irrevocable loss of this open downland, long-term, the inevitable cutting of the SDNP into two. With the South Downs Trust and supporting organisations + lottery and other grant opportunities, it would not be difficult to raise the funds and restore this land, creating a chalk grassland coombe, as exemplified by the neighbouring Anchor Bottom. There should

at the very least have been a 5. To restore or re-create the South Downs landscape.

(R182/session 57984; Kingsley Parish Council, Hampshire)
Created July 25th 2022

1) Greatly improving the beauty of the area whilst providing housing, employment and leisure opportunities for all. 2) Increase visitors to this specific site and to the wide area of the Park around Shoreham, the South Downs and the River Adur.

(R103/session 56917; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

I was an apprentice draughtsman at the Shoreham Cement Works at a time when, as stated in the Action Plan, it employed 250 - 300 local people and made a major contribution to the local and national economy. For the last 30 years the site has been an eyesore, a 'blot on the landscape', and any development would be better than now. The buildings have little 'cultural heritage' and that heritage could be maintained in a small photographic exhibition on site. Improvements could be made to improve the 'natural beauty' but quarries are not attractive in themselves. The 'social and economic wellbeing' of the local community would be supported by the provision of housing and employment whilst engaging modern power creation technology to minimise the use of fossil fuel whilst capturing rainwater runoff from the site for reuse. The green environment could be developed in parallel with any development.

(R221/session 57159; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

It should turn it into a valuable asset for the community and the National Park

(R124/session 57177; member of public)
Created July 26th 2022

By removing the unsightly buildings and landscaping the site there will be a positive contribution to the surrounding landscape and local views

(R177/session 57237; member of public)
Created July 27th 2022

Protect existing wildlife & biodiversity & encouraging active travel whilst bringing on revenue - hotel/ leisure facilities eg swimming pool / sports club & business units.

(R211/session 57853; member of public)
Created July 27th 2022

The Upper Beeding Neighbourhood Plan identified opportunities for development and employment at the site as part of a regeneration and restoration package for the Cement Works. Any proposal for development must deliver the principal objective of securing the satisfactory restoration of the site with major environmental and landscape improvements compatible with the site's sensitive location within the National Park. The adopted South Downs Local Plan identifies the Cement Works as a strategic development site (Strategic Site Policy SD56) which the Upper Beeding Parish Council (UBPC) supports. The UBPC on behalf of the parish community encourages sustainable development that is carbon neutral. The UBPC also supports a development that respects the character of the existing site and the National Park.

(R156/session 57287; member of public)
Created July 27th 2022

Preserving biodiversity of the site, whilst allowing some new housing and some access for leisure activities

(R192/session 57319; member of public)
Created July 28th 2022

I think the site should remain industrial so that nearby communities can utilise brown sites that attract traffic and congestion and provide housing in more sustainable locations than this site .Examples Huffwood estate ,Partridge Green,Petrol station ,Upper Beeding,Mackleys ,Small Dole.Lorry parking facility.These would benefit local communities

(R157/session 57333; member of public)
Created July 28th 2022

Redevelopment would remove the eyesore of the current abandoned workss

(R191/session 57390; member of public)
Created July 28th 2022

Enhance the natural beauty of the surroundings by ameliorating the very significant eyesore of a semi-derelict industrial site, while retaining less-visually damaging aspects of the cultural heritage, e.g., through a well-designed and sensitive visitor centre.

(R84/session 57491; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

I would extend the national park and I would create a big car park for visitors a turist info point a bike hire point and a caffe.Keeping the area wild as possible but with some facilities for families to encourage babies and families to enjoy the nature and the beauty of the downs

(R128/session 57501; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Create leisure possibilities as well as maintaining ecosystems for nature.

(R138/session 57515; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Currently it is an eyesore and dangerous for both people and animals. It would be great to see the land used sustainably to provide better leisure facilities to the area as the population grows. Whilst also protecting the natural habitats and enhancing the National park working with the local community.

(R165/session 57543; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

Biodiversity is a given with 10% BNG a minimal over current condition. The basin and the cliffs must be retained and enhanced for biodiversity purposes. Including provision for the cliffs subsidence in the future. Employment and culture, the cement works building is notable and a landmark within the area. In consideration of minimising waste and net zero

construction principles this building must be retained. Contamination is a key consideration. I'd urge you to look at Duisburg Nord in Germany as an amazing case study of mixing historical industrial use with recreation offer to give an amazing regional destinations space. Aspects like climbing walls and rope walks and theatres within the existing built form would be original and stand out. Key is connections to the river to prevent severance. A small footbridge similar to that at Southeast Station over the river would be feasible, better would be a larger green bridge for ecology also. The site must be bedded in verdant greenery. It must promote sustainable transport modes and demote vehicle usage. Electrical charging points for bikes and micromobility with connections to existing cycle and footway networks essential. The design should be place led i.e. an urban designer, landscape architect and ecologist lead for architecture to feed in. The proposals should be mixed use i.e. option 3 with minimal new buildings that will affect existing ecology. SuDS and flooding a key concern, the site should be operable under flooding. In addition to industrial heritage the site offers key potential to link into recreation and activity as an activity hub to promote the Downs Way.

(R99/session 57553; Findon Parish Council)
Created July 29th 2022

1. Currently it is an eyesore in the National Park. Sympathetic development of each area of the site could create an attractive landscape to the benefit of wildlife, the natural environment and people alike. An ethos similar to that of Knepp Castle Estate is one option.

(R132/session 57586; member of public)
Created July 29th 2022

In many ways; aesthetically, educationally and from a conservation and accessibility perspective. The needs of the current owners needs to be balanced against the long term needs of the community. Its existing presentation puts people off from visiting this area and seeking new homes within the area. The biodiversity can be better protected by having an agreed plan.

(R110/session 57734; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

By the removal of all the unsightly concrete - and asbestos filled - buildings, creating potentially cleaner air and a wonderful site full of potential for future sensitive development, with some areas left undeveloped.

(R204/session 57743; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Make it look better.

(R137/session 57747; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

The Shoreham Cement Works have been an historic landmark throughout my life living in Shoreham by Sea, since 1976 and, although considered by some as being an eyesore, I'm sure public opinion for its sympathetic development is utmost. I therefore feel that the National Park has a duty to retain as much of the biodiversity as absolutely possible and any development should also pay tribute to the historic memory of the Cement Works.

(R77/session 57764; member of public)

Created July 30th 2022
By providing an exemplar sustainable site

(R82/session 57785; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Restoring the visual continuity while preserving and creating new wildlife habitats

(R76/session 57798; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

Whatever redevelopment you decide to do it is essential that the environment, re-wilding & climate change mitigation are your primary focus. You must develop in a future proof manner - no fossil fuels, wild gardens, solar panels, water preservation etc. as a National Park you have a duty to be a climate protector and a leader in sustainable & imaginative development. If you fill this with little homogeneous boxes & destroy the abundance of wildlife (ravens, peregrines & red kites to name some of the big ones) then you will have failed.

(R76/session 57798; member of public)
Created July 30th 2022

It won't, you should be looking at ways to protect the nature that has made this unique site home. Managed decline & a rewording program would be better than the plans here.

(R222/session 57864; member of public)
Created July 31st 2022

Currently it looks a bit of an eyesore. Redevelopment would make use of the site and create some more much-needed housing in the area (although there are limited facilities nearby). Acknowledging the industrial heritage is important. Preserving the biodiversity as part of the SDNP is a must, as is any redevelopment being carbon neutral. Leisure/tourist facilities would generate income.

(R220/session 57858; member of public)
Created July 31st 2022

More access to nature walks and cycle paths.

(R200/session 57897; member of public)
Created July 31st 2022

It won't, it will drive away the wildlife and create yet more pollution to an already busy road. The noise from the road is horrendous

(R126/session 57939; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

The site as significant biodiversity value and this should be enhanced.

(R96/session 57924; member of public)
Created August 1st 2022

This is the largest chalk habitat restoration in the national Park. the priority must be

focused on the habitat creation and enhanced opportunity for understanding and enjoyment, two purposes of a National Park. We are in a biodiversity crisis, and if we do not seize the opportunity for a landscape-scale visionary project to restore habitats and increase public enjoyment then there is no hope!

(R126/session 57939; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

None of the proposals contribute to the primary purposes and duty of the National Park. 1. It does not improve the landscape or natural beauty of the Park,. 2. It does not promote public access, understanding or enjoyment of the Park This statement is taken from the NP website "At the moment, 25% of the National Park is managed for nature. Our goal is to increase that to 33% by 2030." Shoreham cement works provides an opportunity to help achieve this goal, the proposals suggested lack ambition and are contrary to this objective.

(R217/session 57940; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Surely this is an ideal opportunity to do something positive for our environment, please think about all the development that is happening in the shoreham area. Do we need any more building ?. Why not let the whole site rewild , wouldn't that be the best solution for this site.

(R130/session 57941; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

By visually enhancing the area in question, making use of the industrial area with aesthetically pleasing and sympathetic designed building. Make the best use of other areas to retain where possible its natural landscape and celebrate in some form, the history of the cement industry.

(R87/session 57957; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Increase business for locals and increase public enjoyment and engagement in the Park. Also a good opportunity to enhance any nature and wildlife already at the site

(R102/session 57990; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Definitely best option would be: "Mixed use leisure led scheme with and 200 new homes." By repurposing the site to prioritise development and preservation of the natural environment and so facilitate additional human leisure activity.

(R163/session 57979; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

The redevelopment could introduce a controlled, but natural public recreational environment on to the doorstep of the South Downs. It could host people and businesses who are sympathetic to the nature around them and promote respect and education for our local community.

(R143/session 57986; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

1. It will finally remove the eyesore that has blighted the South Downs for generations. 2. It will remove the significant asbestos risk that is clearly escalating as the existing building deteriorate. 3. it provides the South Downs National Park with the perfect site and opportunity in which to showcase environmentally-sustainable, beautifully architecturally designed buildings to compliment the National Park, whilst providing housing, employment and leisure activities as income-generators.

(R162/session 57996; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Re naturalise it

(R9/session 60920; Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex)

Created **August 2nd 2022**

The Cement Works with its graceless industrial buildings, creates a huge and very visible scar in the Downs and the National Park. It is bisected by the A283 road connecting the A27 and A24 which also challenges people crossing on the South Downs Way. It encroaches into the hillside only yards away from Mill Hill, a metalled bridle way constituting a major access point for walkers, cyclists, riders, dog walkers, taxis and cars approaching Five Ways and Truleigh Hill and its youth hostel as well as serving homes and farms. Currently, the need to cross the busy A283 prevents safe access for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders onto the South Downs Way or from those on the Downs Link riverside path wishing to join the Downs eastwards. The Adur river valley provides several areas where roads and vehicular traffic threaten walkers and riders seeking to follow traditional bye ways and through routes. While rewilding the cement works site, restoring poisoned ground and removing the worst examples of industrial heritage will be welcomed as closely relating to the authority's duties and purposes, contributing significant development of housing, business or leisure may only be seen as supporting those who only seek to monetise precious countryside for those with little other interest in the SDNP.

(R1 /session 60844; Adur Collective Community Land Trust)

Created **August 2nd 2022**

One of the SDNPA's strategic objectives is to create new jobs and homes - with affordable housing being a priority. SDNPA is aware that providing affordable homes will be challenging to deliver. There is a small section of the brownfield area of the site designated for housing that falls within the Adur District Council (ADC) boundary. Adur Collective Community Land Trust (ACCLT) proposes that this area is ringfenced for the development of affordable housing delivered and managed by the Community Land Trust as part of the final housing mix. Community Land Trusts are a way for people to come together to help solve local housing challenges. ACCLT is uniquely positioned to use its solid community support and a combination of community and commercial fund raising to provide truly affordable rental homes for the residents of Adur. Our business model as a not-for-profit landlord constituted as a community benefit society allows us to both work in partnership with local authorities, housing associations and commercial developers whilst maintaining our independence. Any homes that ACCLT creates will be available for rent at rates linked to local wages which means that they will be truly affordable now and in the future. Because the homes would be owned by ACCLT they could never be sold off for personal profit or be subject to Right to Buy. For us, "building back much better" means creating homes rooted in community ownership with affordable rents which can be sustained in the long term. The high cost of buying or renting in Adur is deeply problematic and can impact anyone at any stage of their life. ACCLT was established in response to these housing needs. To create affordable homes for people living and working in Adur on low to middle incomes and for whom purchasing and renting homes is economically challenging. For further details please see our responses to Q. 20/21/22/26/27/28.

(R2/session 60855; Adur and Worthing District Council)
Created August 2nd 2022

Adur District Council (ADC) supports the principle of an AAP being progressed for Shoreham Cement Works and welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Issues and Options consultation document. ADC is supportive of the aspiration for an exemplar mixed use development of this site that will conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the South Downs National Park as well as conserving the cultural heritage / legacy of Shoreham Cement Works. Adur District Council has a particular interest in the area labelled as 'Riverside' as this falls within the jurisdiction of Adur District Council although ADC is not the responsible Planning Authority for this area.

(R21/session 60857; Greening Steyning)
Created August 2nd 2022

It could become a model for how to reclaim brownfield industrial sites, turning them from a blot on the National Park's landscape, to a real asset.

(R25/session 60865; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

Secondly, there is no mention of the wider biodiversity crisis, the climate crisis and the pollution crisis which faces the UK, Europe and the planet and humanity. This is a gross oversight by the Authority and should be corrected in future proposals. If the South Downs National Park Authority as one of the leading biodiversity and landscape organisations in the UK cannot address these issues within this proposal, it is likely that any decision based on the options that you propose currently, will be called in for the SoS's determination and or, subject to a judicial review.

(R33/session 60874; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

Please consider the following points for part of the preferred option on the action undertaken at Beeding Cement Works. The cost involved to render the site safe enough to start development of housing, light industrial and tourism use is excessive, upwards of £20 million, so in order to recover these costs the development would need to be on a large scale, The lower Adur valley is already under considerable development putting strain on water use, roads and infrastructure. Therefore we need to halt any further degradation at this point in time when we face unprecedented loss biodiversity. We now have a once in a lifetime opportunity to restore and create a truly unique site for nature. A location that can use its iconic chimney as a flag for how to bequeath a former industrial site to future generations by allowing a rewilding project; a Sussex Eden.

(R34/session 60875; Lancing College)
Created August 2nd 2022

However, what I can say is that Lancing College is in favour of appropriate development at the Shoreham Cement Works. Appropriate development is that which fits in with the purposes of the park and which is sensitive to the ecology and the environment, and which does not cause transport issues in the local vicinity. Any solution needs to be financially viable and I see this as one of the greatest challenges to overcome - the decades long saga around Battersea Power Station comes to mind- given the ground contamination and size and state of the existing buildings and development area. We would need to assess any planning application on a case-by-case basis.

(R45/session 60887; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

Surely the profits made from these Works should be used to repair the damage done and return the site to nature. Having said that I understand that any changes need to be financially viable. Therefore I would like to see sensible and sympathetic housing development with a mix of commercial development, but this should be nature driven so as to maximise nature's opportunities to recover

(R51/session 60894; Shoreham District Ornithological Society)
Created August 2nd 2022

Such a strategy would seem to us to be in keeping with the purposes of the National Park: to conserve and enhance the natural wildlife and beauty whilst also promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the Park's special qualities.

(R55/session 60898; Sussex Ornithological Society)
Created August 2nd 2022

We realise that the SDNP Local Plan identifies the Shoreham Cement Works as a Strategic Development Site where the "landscape needs to be substantially enhanced" by removing the existing buildings. This, however, was a policy adopted three years ago in the SDNP Local Plan and we believe that, with the increasing recognition of the climate and biodiversity emergencies and the need for much greater action to allow nature to recover, circumstances have changed substantially since then. Moreover, it is a policy which appears to us to be directly in opposition to NPPF Policy 177: 177. When considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of: a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy; b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated. We do not understand what the special circumstances are that require the SDNP to build up to 400 homes plus light industrial units, and to add tourist-destination recreation facilities and footfall, whilst arguably NOT enhancing the landscape, at least where views from the west bank of the R Adur or from high points on the Downs are concerned, let alone harming nature in the way this development will. When the AAP says that £26m needs to be spent to allow development to go ahead, only £2.8m of that relates to the cost of demolishing the current buildings. Over £23m then needs to be spent to enable any development to occur – on costs to remediate the site so that it can be built upon, on building plant to treat the foul water from the developments that will be built on the site, and on changes to roads to handle extra traffic volumes and create a new entrance to the site. Were there to be no development and the site allowed to rewild it would appear to us that none of this £23m would need to be spent. We therefore would suggest that the SDNP develops a further option, which is to demolish the existing buildings, keep the site closed to visitors (but perhaps erect some viewing points of what will be an amazing view) and let the site rewild for the benefit of nature. In addition to these on-site development costs, off-site there are transport costs to create a new site access roundabout on the A283 and upgrade junctions with roads in the vicinity to handle the extra volumes of traffic that the development would generate. These are costed at £2,451,552 (ADL Traffic Report April 2022, page 120, para 14.9.3) bringing the total costs of making the site developable to about £27m, with apparently much more risk that this cost could be higher rather than lower. It can, therefore, be seen that the vast majority of the costs required to make the site developable relate to remediation costs (which are particularly uncertain), to installing new water treatment facilities to treat foul

water from any of the development options and to improving road links to handle the resulting increases in traffic. It appears that none of these expenditures would be needed if there was no development on the site. The actual cost of just demolishing the buildings on the site and doing nothing else would appear to be £2.8m. 6. Conclusion - the best solution for nature and the landscape is to tidy the Cement Works up and leave it to rewild. To conclude, we feel that this area remains fairly rural in atmosphere, is situated within the National Park, and we are doubtful if any of the current proposals will successfully enhance the landscape setting or prove financially viable to a developer. Any major tourist "honey pot" development, which would create major increases in traffic and recreational pressures in the immediate area, should be ruled out. Instead, we believe the most sensible thing for this brownfield site would be to pull down some of the existing buildings, keep the site closed to public access, and let it rewild into what should become a wonderful site for nature. A viewing platform along the A283 and perhaps somewhere near the cliff edge would enable the public to enjoy views of this wonderful area as it rewilds. We suggest that our proposals represent the best way to enhance the landscape views rather than to have views of a major development of up to 400 houses, light industrial units and recreational facilities blighting the National Park. We also feel that such a solution would be in keeping with the objectives of National Parks rather than building a major development which is the last thing we expect to see the SDNP promoting.

(R63/session 60907; Upper Beeding Parish Council)
Created August 2nd 2022

The Upper Beeding Neighbourhood Plan identified opportunities for development and employment at the site as part of a regeneration and restoration package for the Cement Works. • Thus any proposal for development must deliver the principal objective of securing the satisfactory restoration of the site with major environmental and landscape improvements compatible with the site's sensitive location within the National Park. • The adopted South Downs Local Plan identifies the Cement Works as a strategic development site (Strategic Site Policy SD56) which the Upper Beeding Parish Council (UBPC) supports. • UBPC, on behalf of the parish community, encourages sustainable development that is carbon neutral. • UBPC also supports a development that respects the character of the existing site and the National Park.

(R69/session 60913; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

covered above

(R50/session 60893; SDNPA Specialists Team)
Created August 2nd 2022

Through re-nature, retain industry-related cultural heritage, affordable housing, and public access and visitor attractions.

(R67/session 60911; Whaleback)
Created August 2nd 2022

Purpose 1: Conservation of existing wildlife, retention of buildings/artefacts on-site that are culturally significant, creation of new habitat (e.g along the river), removal of some of the more unsightly or derelict buildings and restoration of the land. Purpose 2: Provide non-intrusive tourism uses or educational facilities/accommodation, landscape restoration and public access. Duty: Provide affordable housing to meet local housing need, provide employment opportunities and community facilities to create a cohesive and balanced community.

(R72/session 60917; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

The CountrySide Act 1959 created the protection of National Parks for their beauty, national and cultural history and protection of our 'native wildlife.' Surely that it what must happen to this site. There are very successful 'rewilding projects' such as 'Wilder Blean' in Kent and The Knepp Estate in Sussex. These not only protect, sustain and improve the wildlife of the area they also provide work opportunities. They also provide community cohesion and involvement through volunteering as well as an educational resource for schools and local groups. They provide a resource for research for university students and other areas of research. I am not saying Wilder Blean or Knepp Estate is the right model for the 'Cement Works' but these projects illustrate their success.

(R23/session 60863; Hampshire County Council: Economy, Transport, Environment)
Created August 2nd 2022

Local Plan Policy and the draft AAP says the site offers a significant opportunity for 'an exemplar sustainable mixed use development' which we fully support as meeting the purposes and duty of the National Park. (Question 1: How could the redevelopment of Shoreham Cement Works contribute to the purposes and duty of the National Park?)

(R20/session 60856; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

The redevelopment of the cement works could provide a natural history exhibit.

(R10/session 60845; Cycling UK Brighton and Hove)
Created August 2nd 2022

Active travel (cycling, walking, wheeling) is a cheap and healthy option which enables contact with nature without destroying it. A car free development with good active travel and public transport provision would be a very economical use of space and would contribute to "opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the National Park by the public". Sustainable and active transport avoids the negative impacts on people, communities and biodiversity brought about by excessive roadbuilding, car dependence and the passage of motorised vehicles. In a car free development, residents on the site would radically slash their transport-based carbon emissions, as well as making a positive improvement to issues such as poor air quality, road traffic collisions, roadkill, loss of tranquillity, loss of land to road space, use of land for car parks etc. This supports the other purpose of the National Park, to "To conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area". "Fostering the economic and social well-being of the local communities" is also assisted by active travel. Uptake is known to prevent many serious mental and physical health issues due to physical inactivity. Facilities for active travel enable a wider range of people to explore their areas and make journeys. Cycling and walking/wheeling is open to all ages, including children and those who cannot or do not drive. These people are often neglected in transport assessments. Providing the infrastructure to enable more people of all ages and abilities to use active travel supports community connections and social coherence, and provision is much less expensive than road building with much greater benefits. Conventional car transport is unavailable to the poorest people due to the costs of running a privately owned motor vehicle, high fuel prices, and the rising cost of living.

(R199/session 58013; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

It will have a detrimental effect if homes are built, which will impact badly on traffic.

Potential for 400 plus cars each day on the Steyning Road.

(R72/session 60917; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

Any commercial development which involves any housing and leisure development will contribute absolute nothing to the National Park. In retrospect, any development cause devastating loss to wildlife, beauty and our cultural heritage due to the re landscaping and introduction of man made infrastructures which would include housing, road systems, the development of a new water and sewage disposal site. The National Parks Country Side Act enabled the creation of National Parks to conserve, enhance the natural beauty , wildlife and cultural heritage. This redevelopment will destroy what the NPCA was set out to protect.

(R91/session 55861; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

The redevelopment of the Shoreham Cement Works could be an opportunity to regenerate the area in a way that offers future generations a nature-positive and heritage-rich, place to live, work or visit. It presents a huge potential for innovative and forward thinking place design - from landscape-led green infrastructure, promoting biodiversity net gain, to heritage education and new business opportunities.

(R127/session 53652; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

I think it could be a real opportunity to contribute to people (who live or visit) the National Parks overall enjoyment. I think it's also important to remember to conserve special habitats, wildlife and biodiversity and retain this where possible.

(R224/session 58050; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

By re-connecting it back to the landscape of the South Downs, making what is an inaccessible site usable again for the community

(R223/session 58070; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

It could provide a hub for national park tourism with visitor centre, nature trails and outdoor education/leisure facilities while also showcasing the best eco technologies in affordable housing and work spaces.