



## 4: The Five Areas of Shoreham Cement Works

104 responses

### Response counts

Section	Count
Comments received	7
Question 8: Should the redevelopment hide, frame or reveal new views moving eastwards away from the main road or a combination of all three?	97

### Comments received

(R14/session 60849; Environment Agency Chichester)  
Created August 2nd 2022

Buffer zones between the river and any buildings will also need to be implemented as part of any riverside development. These will, ideally, need to be at least 10 metres from the top of the river bank (minimum 8 metres), and these should be free from any development, including any significant amounts of play equipment or lighting. If footpaths are to be incorporated into the buffer zone, they should be designed to have minimal impact and still have a gap between them and the top of the river bank to allow for riverside habitats and vegetation to be undisturbed. Buffer zones allow a river to be more resilient to pollutants from runoff and the impacts of climate change, as well as providing valuable habitats and ecological corridors. We would expect this to be a condition in any planning permission granted and for suitable plans to be submitted clearly identifying the buffer zones.

(R15/session 60850; Environment Agency Arun and Adur)  
Created August 2nd 2022

A few concerns or points I thought I should raise is that the riverside steel sheet piles are in poor condition which hold up and retain the bank. This above t also has the cycle/footpath that runs along above it. Our asset inspectors grade this and advise the 3rd party owner of its condition, (not sent this year as of yet) but a letter will be sent to the owner.)

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

2.3.1) In section 4.7, Design Principles, the AAP says 'High contextual density would be appropriate. Buildings should face the River, positively contributing to views into the site and out. High quality architectural solutions would be needed.' Even though 'Riverside' is considered brownfield, having been built on before, we question whether it is suitable for

anything other than low key development: 'Riverside' is low lying and part in the future will be within river floodplain. (We note the AAP refers to issues with drainage on this low-lying part of the site.) 'Riverside' may offer an opportunity to increase bio-diversity, as well as flood storage capacity. Rather than approaching this part of the site as an opportunity for built development (in particular the suggested 'high value' housing 4.5 in AAP) it may have greater value as greenspace used for informal recreation and possibly outdoor/sports activities in the context of the wider landscape for conservation and sustainability. 2.3,2) Following on from point above, the AAP could be extended to cover the role 'Riverside' plays potentially within the landscape of the Adur valley. It would seem to have potential to add to the biodiversity network. This might allow development of access to both waterside and the river itself as well as low key visitor/recreational facilities while greatly enhancing views from the west. This topic does not appear to be covered in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). 2.3.3) Built development on site A is at present set back from the river frontage. Pressure if used for housing would be to set the buildings close to the river which could be visually intrusive. Both banks of the river remain almost entirely undeveloped from Shoreham to Bramber. 2.5) Site C- 'the Bowl': The AAP includes a suggestion that site C might be developed. In section 4.14 it says: 'There is the potential to build lightweight commercial buildings that could be accommodated on the contaminated, made ground and would generate value for the site.' It goes on to refer to recreational facilities: 'They could both (site C and site D) accommodate active recreation with zip lines, mountain biking or toboggans whilst also adding value to the landscape and habitats.' Both statements seem at odds with the ecological value attached to site C. The Landscape Study identifies it as presenting opportunities for 'sensitive access and recreation.' It identifies it as having moderate to high sensitivity in terms of views and visual amenity. If other parts of the site are intensively developed it might be possible for site C to be used for informal, less intensive recreation and conserved. 2.6) Site D- 'the Moonscape': As with the 'Bowl', the suggestion that 'active recreation' use is appropriate in an area described elsewhere in the AAP as having 'high potential for habitat enhancement and creation' is perplexing. As well as the impact active use and consequent foot traffic will have on habitats it will affect views into that part of the site. The Landscape Study identifies it as presenting opportunities for 'nature enhancement'. It identifies it as having high sensitivity in terms of views and visual amenity. We concur with the AAP section on 'the Clifflands' which broadly follows the recommendations in the Landscape Study.

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

In particular SOS would be very strongly opposed to any plans for buildings along the river frontage (particularly three or four storey ones), and we would ideally want to see no built development between the river and the A283. Something like the Waterside development at Shoreham, with its "wall of glass" directly fronting the river should be ruled out and would be totally unacceptable. In any event we would very much hope to see the existing barrier of uncontrolled vegetation between the Downs Link path and the river being retained or enhanced. Besides creating a green screen for birds using the river and the river valley generally, the eastern bank of the river is used by Common Sandpipers (amber listed species), which use the mud underneath the overhanging vegetation as a high-tide roost. Also, the branches over-hanging the river are used as hunting perches by Kingfishers (amber listed and schedule 1 species).

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

Birds of the "Riverside" section The consultation document, Section 5E – Nature Recovery, paragraph 5.63 describes the "Riverside" site as the least valuable habitat and therefore most suitable for development. We suggest, however, that the immediate riverside habitat

is highly valuable for birds and somewhat unique in this area of Sussex. This section of the site is important bird habitat, especially for Common Sandpipers, Kingfishers, Grey Wagtails, and wintering thrushes such as Redwings and Fieldfares. It is important to recognise that the trees and shrubs lying on both sides of the Downslink path at the "Riverside" section provide a shelterbelt that screens the "Riverside" section of river and an adjacent area of floodplain from activity likely to disturb birds. Such activity originates from the Downslink Path and from within the "Riverside" site. The tree belt provides screening for Common Sandpipers, food for winter thrushes, plus nesting, perching and roosting sites for a variety of birds including Kingfishers. The "Riverside" section is the only section of this part of the lower Adur bordered by trees and shrubs. The "Riverside" section of riverbank is a low-lying cliff face and is an important roosting site for Common Sandpiper at high tide. We therefore suggest that the 'Riverside' section incorporates areas of valuable and sensitive bird habitat. We would also have concerns about any proposal to enhance water-based leisure access in this area as this would impact upon bird habitat, particularly the Common Sandpiper roost. Further information on the special birds and their habitats is include as Appendix 1.

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

The consultation considers the site in five separate areas with varying proposals for future development. The current consultation seems to present a consistent theme for the Riverside area to be deemed suitable for development. The consultation document, Section 5E – Nature Recovery, paragraph 5.63 describes the "Riverside" site as the least valuable habitat and therefore most suitable for development. Yet there seems disparity within the consultation as we can also see that there is scope for the consultation to recognise the value and future potential of this location for example in the SA section 3.21, it states: Nature Recovery Theme – options include consideration of how much of a priority nature recovery should be as part of the redevelopment of the site. The extent and intensity of development could have an adverse impact on sensitive habitats and protected species. The five areas of the site offer different opportunities for nature recovery, for example, the Riverside could be conserved and enhanced as a riparian corridor linking with other habitats down and up stream SWT are concerned that intense development in the Riverside location may be damaging to the site directly and the Lower Adur more broadly. This bend of the river is thickly vegetated and provides a location where Sussex Ornithological data shows that Common Sandpiper and King Fishers have been recorded. In addition, the consultation paints the idea of a riverside living where recreational water use would be part of the attraction. SWT highlight that the site falls within the impact risk zone of the Adur Estuary SSSI. The Adur Estuary SSSI which is down stream of the development has recently under gone a rapid condition assessment in 2021 and has been classified as the majority; unfavourable declining. Therefore, an increase in and encouraging more access on to the River could further contribute to the pressures this location is already dealing with. What consideration is there regarding the impacts on this SSSI features from future activity? Impacts to Mill Hill to New Timber SSSI and the Mill Hill LNR from activities would also require careful assessment. Further to this, the other areas within the AAP all highlight the current value and potential to deliver important areas for biodiversity from the Clifflands to the bare surfaces in the Moonscape, which present habitat opportunities for invertebrates and open mosaic habitat. The biodiversity information presented in the PEA highlights the plethora of further biodiversity information that should be gathered on the site to fully understand the impacts of any proposals. What does seem clear is that nature is looking to thrive at this site in the absence of the intense human activity.

(R26/session 60866; Henfield Parish Council)  
Created August 2nd 2022

The Committee had no strong views on the relative merits of the four proposals. The one piece of feedback the Committee would wish to make is that the members unanimously favoured keeping the riverside (ie to the south west of the road) for development of low rise leisure facilities so as to maintain the views from the road whilst believing the quarry-side (ie to the north east of the road) would be more suited for development of industrial and/or housing.

## Question 8: Should the redevelopment hide, frame or reveal new views moving eastwards away from the main road or a combination of all three?

(R206/session 53526; member of public)  
Created June 7th 2022

Frame

(R80/session 53547; member of public)  
Created June 7th 2022

Hide

(R196/session 53606; member of public)  
Created June 8th 2022

Thanks

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

Probably all three. Show the great bits and views, and hide the fugly stuff. Tricky to asses with the overhead view.

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

no comment

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

I don't understand this question. Hide from who? Views of what? I wouldn't want to see any more of the site than I do now. I also feel like this might be a question purposefully worded to skew the answers.

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

maximise views, but the Riverside should be set aside for no development - should be public access nature/wetland area with improved links to Downs Link and South Downs Way, and new walks up and around the full extent of the works (linear greenway)

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

Reveal

(R90/session 54020; member of public)

Created **June 10th 2022**

The route of the road could be moved to the riverside so it does not bisect the site, making it a single holistic site, but that would lose the valued river views from potential new homes.

(R112/session 54076; member of public)

Created **June 11th 2022**

There should be no redevelopment other than rewinding. Schedule 1 birds nest on those cliffs, and in the immediate environs of the site many rare species of bird and plant are thriving. Rewild this area.

(R164/session 54096; member of public)

Created **June 11th 2022**

combination of all 3

(R94/session 54186; member of public)

Created **June 13th 2022**

If the development is sympathetic to the area why not reveal it

(R142/session 54348; member of public)

Created **June 14th 2022**

No idea

(R166/session 54370; member of public)

Created **June 15th 2022**

A combination of all three

(R216/session 54416; member of public)

Created **June 15th 2022**

No stay below the cliff height

(R78/session 54414; member of public)

Created **June 15th 2022**

Whatever the architects feel is best to maximise the number of new houses built on the site.

(R135/session 54443; member of public)

Created **June 16th 2022**

Reveal

(R119/session 54505; member of public)

Created **June 17th 2022**

Reveal

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

hide

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

Redevelopment should reveal new eastward views

(R164/session 54096; member of public)  
Created **June 21st 2022**

reveal new views moving east

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

frame

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

Reveal new views to see more of the national park

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

Not sure

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

Ideally a combination of all three.

(R219/session 55134; Greening Steyning)  
Created **June 29th 2022**

We think that there may be opportunity to combine all three

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

This is a great opportunity to build something for the future with eco designed homes - we need to move away from the industrial monster created by Faber, and listen to the suggestions of the younger generation.

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

frame or reveal, not hide

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

hide road

(R205/session 55260; member of public)  
Created July 4th 2022

A combination

(R74/session 55269; member of public)  
Created July 4th 2022

Frame

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

I wouldn't want to see it opened up to views from the east. There are not many vantage points from the east that would benefit from this.

(R149/session 55308; member of public)  
Created July 5th 2022

Combination of all three

(R146/session 55327; member of public)  
Created July 5th 2022

All three

(R183/session 55368; member of public)  
Created July 7th 2022

Combination.

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

hide

(R133/session 55416; member of public)  
Created July 7th 2022

New views

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

I think it should probably frame what is already visible.

(R176/session 56372; member of public)



Created July 16th 2022

Hide

(R140/session 55534; member of public)

Created July 17th 2022

No opinion.

(R136/session 56490; member of public)

Created July 18th 2022

Hide.

(R107/session 56637; member of public)

Created July 19th 2022

A combination of all three. The past use of the site shouldn't be hidden away, but likely would be better to frame views to the cliffs and other areas left as open landscape. At the moment the view from the South Downs Way, travelling west to east, is not very inspiring, but I don't believe that the context of the site should be lost or obscured if and when the area is developed.

(R187/session 56735; member of public)

Created July 20th 2022

Combination, depending on the views.

(R207/session 56817; member of public)

Created July 21st 2022

I believe it should remain the same. (However, it would depend on the size and shape of the multi storey car park, I envision it to be on the east side of the main building)

(R148/session 56870; member of public)

Created July 22nd 2022

A Combination of all 3

(R141/session 56885; member of public)

Created July 22nd 2022

There seems little point - unless something quite different is envisaged, of seeking to fill in any of the site to enable views to the East and South East. Much better to all the site to grow itself naturally, encouraged with new planting, drainage, and habitat attractions, so that views from the extreme north-east corner become the sought after aspect as the site re-integrates into the landscape. There might be some need to 'flatten' off the edges of the site, to reduce the precipice of the surrounding cliff edge. Some footpath, bridle way connections might be made to existing footpaths to the north and east - maybe even a diversion of the South Downs way, south of Beeding and Henfield. It will be most important to reduce the height of buildings in the bowl so that views eastwards from the riverside simply see trees, the roofs of houses and beyond into the upper reaches of the north east site.

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

Redevelopment offers the opportunity to open new vistas as seen from the road and from the Botolphs / Coombes side of the valley

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

as i haven't been there i don't know?! but the area behind the buildings feeling 'secret or hidden' sounds magical and should be retained/enhanced. some artists and landscape garden designers should be employed to do this. it would be fantastic to get Peter Latz to do what he did at Landschaftspark

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

combination but with a leaning towards revealing and framing

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

Should not hide, frame & reveal may be best

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

combination of all 3

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

Frame and reveal

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

Redevelopment should do whatever it can to remove the current landscape scarring and open up the view of the South Downs and the river estuary.

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

Restoration should reveal the success of a bold SDNPA, championing NP Purposes, with the resulting chalk coombe, rich in wildlife and accessible for informal recreation. But the AAP's skewed consultation questions make it difficult to make constructive comments to provide such an innovative and imaginative answer. Within the descriptions of the various site sections there is a useful steer to coming up with a more adventurous AAP, fitting with the National Park status of this critical site in the South Downs: The Riverside "long views across the Adur Valley ... a flat (open, visually stark) area"; The Cement Works "iconic" or abnormal / anomalous / unnatural! "imposes a feeling of large-scale" industrial eyesore; The Bowl "a 'secret' or 'hidden' world ... a sense of tranquillity ... which is pitch black at night"; The Moonscape "the sense of human intervention is reduced ... numerous ecological niches ... the return of nature in this space is awe-inspiring ... highly tranquil and

remote"; The Clifflands "encircle the whole site ... and are visible from afar".

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

The redevelopment should be a natural progression from the main road moving east and with good design it should not be necessary to artificially hide, frame or reveal new views. Having worked on the site for many years the shading caused by the southern cliffs will necessitate that those areas be favoured for warehousing and light industrial use whereas where the light prevails even during the winter months the area should be focussed on housing, office space and landscape.

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

Reveal new views

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

Attractive views are to be encouraged to enhance the environment but not unsightly ones

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

Combination

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

hide

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

I'm not sure how this would look. I think probably frame or reveal.

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

Wholly dependent on considered and thoughtful proposals, cliffs should visible from west.

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

8. Redevelopment should frame and reveal new views moving eastwards rather than hide them.

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

Any redevelopment should maximise the natural beauty of the landscape, revealing the scars man has made during the excavation process, as per Bluewater.

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

Combination

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

In as far as I understand the question the way it is worded, I think the question is conceived back-to-front. The views criss-crossing the site are of paramount importance. The lan, and should be used creatively and sensitively to escape itself should as far as possible hide the development, but where this is not possible artfully frame it.

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

You should do as little as possible to change the footprint of this site

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

You have Peregrines nesting here, you have a duty to protect this site for them. Any development you undertake must be sensitive & non intrusive to the wildlife.

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

As little as possible must be done to maintain the footprint of the site & to protect that wildlife that lives there. Be imaginative and brave, consider re-wilding this site instead of redevelopment

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

You have said the key point in your description here, it is pitch black at night. We have so few areas of genuine darkness, be brave leave it.

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

Leave this place to re-wild. Please. Be brave.

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

I don't think you should be developing this site at all. Manage its decline & rewild.

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

Hide the views

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

Combination

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

Hide, horrible road noise will echo off the cliffs and be hell for any resident

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

The clifflands should be integrated into an overall habitat restoration plan for the area.

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

The river is important for birds which feed on the mud flats, additional recreational use of the river should not be allowed.

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

The premise is that the site should be redeveloped for economic purposes. Chalk grassland is a rare and declining habitat and this should be enhanced for the benefit of biodiversity.

(R130/session 57941; member of public)  
Created **August 1st 2022**

Mainly frame and reveal. Not hide

(R87/session 57957; member of public)  
Created **August 1st 2022**

Reveal

(R163/session 57979; member of public)  
Created **August 1st 2022**

As much should be done to repair the countryside of the damage caused by the industry. But to retain what can be usefully used.

(R158/session 57982; member of public)  
Created **August 1st 2022**

no preference

(R143/session 57986; member of public)  
Created **August 1st 2022**

I think it should reveal new views. "Hide" would suggest high buildings alongside the road,

blocking all views east - that's not ideal at all. "Frame" would suggest high on each side. "Reveal" .. ideally architecture that is sympathetic to the surrounding Downs. The site is dramatic but this does not mean the redevelopment should be tall & dramatic. Low rise. possible 3 levels max in the Bowl away from the river valley.

(R102/session 57990; member of public)  
Created August 1st 2022

Frame and reveal

(R162/session 57996; member of public)  
Created August 1st 2022

New views

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

If a design is submitted that provides additional buildings and amenities that offer artistic and innovative structures that need to be seen so as to appreciate them, then these could be revealed rather than hidden. • The façade of the main building could be maintained and buildings added to it to enhance the site. • Therefore, a new development should provide a combination of all three aspects (hide, frame and reveal).

(R9/session 60920; Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex)  
Created August 2nd 2022

The starkness, sometimes majesty of chalk cliffs is often seen on the Downs where chalk has been extracted, as well as at the coast; elsewhere the drama of the sea's retreat from the land adds spectacle to the entrance to the Culfail Tunnel at Lewes. The height of the chalk walls at the SCW should be visible from the road, with, perhaps, the chimney retained to help with visual scale.

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

We think that there may be opportunity to combine all three, however we would ask this this be done with considerable care to maintain and improve wildlife habitats and avoid the removal of trees wherever possible.

(R211/session 57853; member of public)  
Created August 2nd 2022

If a design is submitted that provides additional buildings and amenities that offer artistic and innovative structures that need to be seen so as to appreciate them, then these could be revealed rather than hidden. The façade of the main building could be maintained and buildings added to it to enhance the site. Therefore, a new development should provide a combination of all 3 (hide, frame and reveal)

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

new views would be good - see 5 above - this is an opportunity

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

I like the way that the site is currently hidden from the road. The riverside could be cleared (save for the iconic monkey puzzle tree) for better views.

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

The Council has reviewed the Shoreham Cement Works Local Landscape Character and Sensitivity Study (May 2022). It is recognised that the Shoreham Cement Works forms a prominent position within the South Downs, and is located at the narrowest point of the SDNP. The Council accepts that any new development is likely to generate a fairly widespread direct and indirect effect on the landscape including views, ecology, perceptual qualities for, for example increased traffic. However, this harm would have to be outweighed by demonstrating that redevelopment of the site is in the public interest in accordance with paragraph 177 of the NPPF. Of particular interest is the Local Landscape Character Area (LLAC) 1a. Shoreham Cement Works West of A283 (which is also the area referred to as 'The Riverside') as this falls within Adur District. LLAC 1.a is a topographically flat landscape, with areas that have been artificially raised in the site, adjacent to the River Adur and its meandering corridor. The Landscape Sensitivity Evaluation indicates that there is a sensitivity value scoring of moderate-high against the Views & Visual Amenity criteria. Buildings within the LLCA form middle-ground features within slightly elevated views across the valley from the west and within certain views from the quarry itself, from the east. They are also highly visible within shorter views from the A283 and users of the Downs Link and Public Rights of Way along the River Adur, between breaks in the surrounding vegetation. However, vegetation surrounding the area means intervisibility between the LLCA and the wider floodplain landscape is somewhat limited. The overall sensitivity for LLAC 1.a has been scored as Low-Moderate. It is understood that although the LLCA inhabits a prominent location along the course of the River Adur within the South Downs National Park, the poor condition of the landscape and its accompanying elements, and the evident highly developed and urban/ industrial character, means the area is afforded an overall low-moderate sensitivity. Therefore LLCA 1.a is of low-moderate sensitivity, to mixed used development. Despite that the Riverside (LLAC 1.a) has been identified as the most visually exposed part of Shoreham Cement Works, this area is considered most suitable for a residential use and this is the most viable land use but remains the least sensitive ecologically. The Council would want to ensure that redevelopment at this location (LLAC 1.a) is not visually intrusive particularly when viewed from the river) and thus does not significantly have any detrimental effect on the environment, landscape and recreational opportunities. The Council is particularly supportive of the following LLAC 1.a design principles as set out in the Landscape Report:

- Respond to both sensitive views and character (built form is uncharacteristic in the floodplain) to design unobtrusive buildings and rooflines. Variety in the built form and visual breaks in the roofscape would be appropriate. Any new development in the LLCA should be particularly cognisant of visibility into the LLCA and views across the River Adur Valley and sensitive skylines.
- The scale of any new development should not exceed the scale of existing development in the site, seen in views across the Adur Valley.
- Keep new development heights below the horizon line of Beeding Hill and no greater than existing.
- Design of buildings should be unobtrusive in views from the west, and work in partnership with other elements of landscape e.g. trees.

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

Views are important. The development should maximise the experience of views, create a procession of views.

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

This question sounds like the development is already a done deal! I would like to see it brought back to nature, with no homes, buildings or anything that will bring more and more traffic, and therefore, pollution.

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

There should no development of any kind to this site. The cliff lands provide habitat for peregrine falcons, ravens and other important protected wild life such as bats and plants. This site should be protected and further developed and enhanced so it sustainable and can become a habitat of principle importance.

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

There is a huge carbon cost in simply knocking down the factory building. Could it be design celebrate the building's iconic stature? Be wonderful to reveal the new views as long as this was done sensitively to maintain that sense of remoteness.

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

I think what suits the development best when the planning moves forward. I think new views would be great as it would really showcase the beauty of the National Park.

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

Combination of all three