

## Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

### Summary of Responses

#### Chapter 3: Re-imagining Shoreham Cement Works

There were a total of 484 responses to this chapter. These consisted of 5 general comments on the chapter and 479 responses to the questions.

There were a total of 5 general comments on this chapter. These are summarised below.

#### District, Borough, City and County Councils

**Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC)** supports the conclusions of the SNDPA's assessment of major development and the landscape-led approach to the redevelopment. The Council acknowledges the site's environmental sensitivities and their impacts on what can be developed, however the draft AAP does not articulate a clear vision to the redevelopment and the Council objects to some elements as they risk the redevelopment not being fully realised: it is key for the AAP to set out a clear vision and well-defined design principles for success of the redevelopment.

#### Individuals

There were responses objecting the proposals made, stating that chalk land and cultural landscapes should be retained, also objecting to another commercial, residential and leisure development. Instead, there is support for a wildlife focus to the site, with education, tourism, research and community opportunities. Another concern raised was the large scale of the development and its devastating effects in the area. Housing development would not do justice to the opportunity of the site.

A comment highlighted the need to conserve and enhance the natural beauty and cultural heritage as well as creating new jobs.

#### **Question 3: Should development be restricted to previously developed areas?**

There were a total of 88 responses to this question. These are summarised below.

#### District, Borough, City and County Councils

**Adur & Worthing District Council** supports the principle of using previously developed land within the Cement Works and Riverside areas, however it raises comments (responded in other questions) regarding flood risk and landscape. The Council notes that the Bowl could potentially have lightweight structures, and the Moonscape provide an opportunity for recreation and tourism hidden in the landscape. Any new structures should not be harmful to the setting of the National Park. The Council supports the Clifflands remaining undeveloped. Any education-related concept for these areas should be developed further, and clarification on associated development such as a visitor centre.

**SDNPA Design Team** supports the principle of development with previously developed areas only.

**Hampshire County Council** said that concentrating development of previously developed parts of the site is supported, enabling the restoration of most ecologically and visually sensitive areas.

#### Parish and Town Councils

**Upper Beeding Parish Council** said that development should be considered for the whole site.

## Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

### Summary of Responses

**Findon Parish Council** responded that development should be restricted to previously developed areas.

**Kingsley Parish Council** responded no, if a better use can be found for connected areas.

#### Other Organisations

**Brighton City Airport** raised no issues with future development outside of existing developed areas. Any development should be subject to an Aerodrome Safeguarding Assessment.

**Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex** objects to new housing or development unconnected to the National Park. This site would enable the creation of a hub for appreciation of challenges of climate change, nature recovery, etc. through education, leadership and example.

**Greening Steyning** supports the principle of redevelopment only within previously developed areas.

#### Individuals

49 individuals responded 'yes'. Comments raised that there is plenty of space for redevelopment within already developed areas and that this principle would limit impacts. There is an emphasis on re-wilding the site and leaving it as much natural as possible, other raised existing access and road constraints, and expected to maximise number of homes and avoiding the loss of existing housing near the site. Comments mentioned that the Moonscape and Clifflands should not be developed, others mentioned that some development in the Bowl could take place with sensitive design (non-residential). Riverside and Cement Works should be the focus of most of the development. There were comments raising concern about new development outside of the site's boundary.

26 individuals responded 'no'. Individuals mentioned that the aim should be a development that is suitable and is the best possible result, regardless of previously developed land. Some comments included: maximising number of homes, more development with river transport options to Shoreham, cliff safety and flooding should be considered. Someone suggested warehouses in the Moonscape and landscaping the Bowl for leisure, Cement Works for employment, Riverside for housing.

3 individuals commented that there should be no development at all.

1 person did not understand the question. 1 person said that the question is not compatible with the National Park purposes.

#### **Question 4: Would you like to see materials on site re-used or re-cycled for construction?**

There were a total of 92 responses to this question. These are summarised below.

#### District, Borough, City and County Councils

**Adur & Worthing District Council** declared the climate emergency and recognises the importance of circular economy in reducing embodied carbon impacts from development. The Council would support retaining and retrofitting existing buildings first, if possible. The Council is supportive of the principle of the re-use and recycle of existing materials, it understands that there are exceptional circumstances with contamination that need to be addressed therefore re-use and recycling may not be possible across the whole site.

## Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

### Summary of Responses

**Hampshire County Council** identifies substantial benefits to the landscape by concentrating development in repurposes buildings. Not only would sensitive parts of the wider site be protected from built development, allowing them to be conserved, but the retention of the buildings would give meaning to the extraordinary landscape of the Cement Works area. The option to convert and preserve buildings in some form has not yet been explored fully – there is insufficient evidence to conclude that it would not be viable to keep buildings. The Council suggests that the AAP should outline how embodied energy will be addressed going forward. Re-use and re-purposing of buildings and other structures on the site could have a profound effect on the form of development and consequently its impact on the local landscape.

#### Parish and Town Councils

**Upper Beeding Parish Council** is favourable to the re-use of materials where possible and where certain elements of significance contribute to the original character of the site.

#### Other Organisations

**Greening Steyning** would like to see as much material reused and recycled.

**Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex** is supportive of re-using and recycling materials in an attempt to decarbonise development.

**SDNPA Design Team** supports this principle.

#### Individuals

79 individual responses received in support of the principle of re-use and recycling of materials. Supporters commented that the reuse of materials should be done sympathetically, they identified examples in Germany of recycled materials, and they also claimed that the principle is supported if it doesn't impair or slow down the development. Some individuals mentioned that this principle should apply where viable and materials were not contaminated (including asbestos). Other comments referred to the need to keep some buildings, reduce new buildings to minimum, and the possibility for other developments in the area making use of these materials, reuse of foundation slabs, reuse of architectural details and materials for maintaining part of the original character too.

4 responses received in disagreement with the principle of reuse and recycling materials. Not necessarily as the purpose should be to lower costs of construction, there is no value from any of them and there is no industrial heritage value, no benefit also retaining structures,

A number of varied comments related to the unnecessary re-use of materials in the case of the industrial heritage being destroyed. Other suggested that the wording should not say 'where possible', but to make it mandatory. Others suggested the use of flint and chalk and the rewilding of the site.

One person said that the site should not be redeveloped.

### **Question 5: How far do you think the new buildings should reflect the height and massing of the existing buildings?**

There were a total of 99 responses to this question. These are summarised below.

#### District, Borough, City and County Councils

**Adur & Worthing District Council** suggests the use of design codes for this site that are sympathetic to the local character and cultural heritage of the site.

## Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

### Summary of Responses

**SDNPA Design Team** supports this principle, when buildings are of excellent quality and fit for purpose, supporting compact forms of development.

#### Parish and Town Councils

**Findon Parish Council** responded that new buildings should not exceed the height and massing of existing buildings.

**Upper Beeding Parish Council** suggests that all building should blend with the countryside, respecting the generally low-rise of development in the area.

#### Other Organisations

**Brighton City Airport** would not like to see new structures built at the height of the existing chimney and would encourage for new structures to be kept to the height of lower structures currently on site.

**Greening Steyning** suggested that a replicate of the chimney could be a haven for birds.

**Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex** is not supportive of this principle: the bulk and height deserve little account in any future buildings' design.

**Fittleworth and District Association** said that development should not be constrained by the need to respect existing domestic buildings.

#### Individuals

40 individuals preferred new buildings to not to necessarily reflect the height and mass of existing buildings.

18 people supported this principle, although most individuals don't support development beyond the height of the cliffs, existing buildings and the chimney.

There is a mix of views, some favouring vertical expansion, but not lateral expansion of buildings, as well as done sympathetically, others favour lower heights, others suggest that if the high buildings are being removed, then new development should not be visible, except in the Riverside, where commenters suggest that height of buildings could reflect existing. An individual suggested buildings slightly higher than existing. Other individual agreed with this principle where buildings sit within the footprint of existing buildings, but other new buildings elsewhere should be lower. Some said that new development in keeping with history of site, whilst others said that new buildings should look at the future, not the past. Individuals commented that buildings should not dominating the site, and these should be sensitively designed and located.

Others said: no development at all, or make use of all space, or buildings should be retained and repurposed where possible.

#### **Question 6: Would you prefer a contemporary or traditional approach to architectural design or a mixture of both?**

There were a total of 100 responses to this question. These are summarised below.

## Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

### Summary of Responses

#### Parish and Town Councils

**Upper Beeding Parish Council** supports a mixture of both traditional and contemporary as long as they are inclusive and of high quality with a clear understanding of the local, physical, social, economic, environmental and policy context.

#### Other Organisations

**Brighton City Airport** has no preference on architectural style but it reminds that it is important for the airport that buildings are not attractive to birds.

**Greening Steyning** doesn't have a preference as long as construction is energy efficient and use renewable energy and, where possible nature-based solutions.

**Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex** supports appropriate design sensitive to place and purpose.

**SDNPA Design Team** supports this principle, but with good quality materials and architecture. There is no support for a mix of styles.

#### Individuals

20 individuals favoured contemporary architecture.

13 individuals preferred traditional architecture.

The majority of individuals (28) favoured a mix approach: contemporary and traditional.

A number of comments raised that regardless of the architectural style, development should be of high quality, reflect history, follow a wild approach, complement the landscape, energy efficient, use sustainable methods and design, maximise the number of small homes, use local materials, use sensitive materials in the landscape, be carbon neutral, etc.

#### **Question 7: What type of public space, such as public squares, pocket parks and skateboard parks, would you like to see and why?**

There were a total of 100 responses to this question. These are summarised below.

#### District, Borough, City and County Councils

**Adur & Worthing District Council** encourages a variety of public open space typologies to meet needs of residents and visitors.

**West Sussex County Council** states that all public spaces should be linked by non-motorised routes that follow a multitude of users: pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians.

#### Parish and Town Councils

**Kingsley Parish Council** welcomes public spaces that support social meeting for adults and children, safe and vehicle free environments.

**Upper Beeding Parish Council** identifies the opportunity to provide leisure and tourism uses, including visitor centre, parks, campsite, etc. and sport facilities: gym, ice skating, ski slope, swimming pool, rock climbing, water sports, zip wires... but also creative spaces.

## Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

### Summary of Responses

#### Other Organisations

**Brighton City Airport** warns that the introduction of soft landscaping could attract birds and increase bird strike risk. They identify a number of plant species and the impact on bird population as well as recommend no areas of open water within the site.

**Greening Steyning** supports public spaces that promote inclusion, biodiversity and community.

**Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex** supports primarily to 'green' the site, with an emphasis on active rural leisure activities.

**Cycling UK Brighton & Hove** supports public spaces that are accessible for all and motor vehicles are not welcome. There should be adequate, secure, visible and easily accessible safe cycle parking, movement should be easy and logical for walking, cycling, wheeling, etc. Modes should be segregated. Active travel infrastructure should be provided and should be connected to an integrated in the wider network: fast, safe and accessible travel routes to nearby settlements, including support to intermodal journeys, with a shuttle to the train station in Shoreham. Bus stops should be accessible and sheltered. Non-motorised connections to PROW should be maximised. A car-free development should be explored, and if not possible, motor vehicle access and parking should be an absolute minimum. Highway improvements entail increasing road capacity, at the expense of biodiversity, community and active travel: highway changes would be more appropriate. The Downs Link should be improved, and be more in line with the old railway line. Improving the A283 underpass is welcomed for cyclists and walkers. There is support for lower speeds on the road, reducing highway accident risks, which could be increased if more people access the site (destination). The junctions should be signalised. It is not clear what the AAP meant by 'shared/communal multifunctional parking facilities. Cycle parking and store should be clarified. The distinction between vehicles and motor vehicles should be clear. Public transport such as frequent bus services will be essential to achieve modal change.

**SDNPA Design Team** supports a mix of public realm: integrated in nature, varied in terms of function and uses across the site, and characteristic in landscape terms and multifunctional.

#### Individuals

There is no clear majority of individuals supporting a particular typology of public realm or space. However, individuals put forward a number of public open spaces and other destinations, such as: free public access to the river, open spaces, café/restaurant, skate parks, creative spaces for performances (amphitheatre), public park in the Bowl area, nature trails, allotments, village halls, playing fields, bird hides, indoor ski and ice skating ring. Other spaces and facilities supported are benches, play areas, mini golf, a leisure park, mountain biking, squares, barbecues, pocket parks and information boards.

Some individuals highlighted key principles that in their view should drive public realm design: good for wildlife, dog friendly, for both visitors and non-visitors, ensure security, cleanliness, pleasant experience. Spaces should be children-friendly, for health and wellbeing, enjoyment of views, the river and not suffering noise from the road.

There were other comments suggesting that the open spaces should be natural, or at least that should be the focus, for rewilding. The majority of individuals favour natural and green environments. Others requested more trees. An individual suggested turning some buildings into botanical gardens or greenhouses.

There were also adverse comments to some particular spaces, such as skateboard parks and hard surfaces.

## **Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options**

### **Summary of Responses**

Supporting infrastructure such as bus stops and footpaths were seen favourable, as well as the integration of SuDS in the public realm and the idea of a sequential experience of the site.