



Viability

5A: Viability

5 responses

Response counts

Section	Count
Comments received	5

Comments received

(R16/session 60851; member of public)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

I really do not understand why you are considering and spending public funds on this when you will not have any notion of the financial commitment involved in making this site clean and safe. The constraints that you are trying obviate are overwhelming and you cannot demonstrate that any development of the site is sustainable. Yet another worrying factor is that faced with the unsurmountable difficulties of financing this project you resort to a suggestion of payment in kind arrangements with developers. Few developers, if any, have resources to take this on, especially with the risks involved, and the price exacted will be high; as I think you realise since you have asked about this, you will have to consent to significant development outside the site, doubtless along the waterfront and on the hills. You are well out of your depth here and in the interests of your statutory purposes you should bring this to a stop and avoid further wasted expenditure.

(R52/session 60895; Shoreham Society)
Created **August 2nd 2022**

I believe that is absolutely correct with the cost of controlled demolition and disposal allegedly running into many millions of pounds! It has long been said that this cost alone has put off many potential schemes in the past plus I believe the land that the current building are on would have to be segregated and capped for a number of years due to the asbestos contamination. Name redacted June 7, 2022 at 12:46 pm

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

4. Likelihood of development being financially viable The Viability Report by BPS Chartered Surveyors (March 2022) shows (Section 1.7, page 2) the overall profitability of the 4 options as varying between a surplus of £1,121,774 on option 2 which has a Gross Development Value of £315,280,000 (a 0.4% return) to a whopping deficit of £107,399,524 on option 3 which has a gross Development Value of £227,540,000. These are after making some best-case adjustments to assumptions (10% lower building costs and 10%

higher GDV values) which seems unlikely to occur in an inflationary period with higher interest rates. With the most favourable option only showing a 0.4% surplus our conclusion is that BPS are indicating that the financial viability of the best option is so marginal that the financial viability of development is questionable. On these assumptions and numbers our conclusion is that any development would only be viable if the development was densified i.e if there were more houses. We can therefore see no overriding financial reason why any development should take place.

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

In order to bring all five areas of the AAP forward for development the consultation has a current estimate for remediation of the site at around £26 million pounds. The majority of the costs required to make the site developable seem to relate to uncertain remediation cost including clearing up previous industry activities, new water treatment facilities to treat foul water from the development options and highways improvements to address the increased traffic in the area. It appears that none of these expenditures would be needed if the residential and commercial elements of the development were removed. If the site was establish as a location where biodiversity could be actively allowed to flourish surely this this would significant reduce the remediation spend and have positive impacts for the biodiversity and climate change. The exploration of green funding mechanisms to enable the delivery of high quality biodiversity is a credible option to explore. SDNPA could further compliment this by public access in a limited, sustainable and sensitive way to aid education in the natural environment for the local population.

(R64/session 60908; Henfield Birdwatch)
Created August 2nd 2022

We note the estimated expense of rendering the site safe for development. We also are aware that there is a major development already going ahead near Shoreham Airport, and further housing and industrial units here can only add to the disturbance to birds and other wildlife in the Cement Works quarry area and along the River Adur.