



Cultural heritage

5D: Cultural heritage

212 responses

Response counts

Section	Count
Comments received	6
Question 9: Should any of the buildings, such as the chimney, be retained on site?	106
Question 10: To what extent should the design of the redevelopment reflect the site's industrial past?	100

Comments received

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

2.2.1) Although it is helpful to divide the wider site into different areas, the buildings and industrial equipment they contain should be considered as a single group in terms of survey and assessment and, indeed, that approach is reflected in various reports within the supporting evidence to the AAP. Clearly they have heritage value as does their setting. Unfortunately the Industrial Archaeology Study had to be undertaken without access to the site and we can see no heritage assessment on the buildings and the machinery. We believe that both are needed going forward, and the methodology for undertaking them could be described in the AAP. In relation to heritage aspects of landscape Historic England's guidance, Good Practice Advice note 3 - The Setting of Heritage Assets (2nd Edition), is relevant here.

(R17/session 60852; Fittleworth and District Association)
Created August 2nd 2022

Any historically significant machinery could be offered to the Amberley Chalk Pits Museum. Any competition with the Museum should be avoided.

(R24/session 60864; Hampshire County Council Specialist Environmental Services)
Created August 2nd 2022

Thank you for your consultation. The site is located within a wider landscape of a high archaeological potential, largely covered by archaeological notification areas. In the immediate vicinity of the site (Anchor Bottom, Upper Beeding) the archaeological potential is defined by a series of cropmarks and earthworks indicative of later prehistoric activity.

The area now occupied by Shoreham Cement Works will have no below ground archaeological potential remaining. The extensive extraction and development (undertaken across the majority of the site) will have negatively impacted and completely removed any archaeological remains which might have been present, severely compromising the sites archaeological potential. Across the majority of the site, no below ground archaeological issues will be raised. However, fringes of the site (located within the area named as the 'Clifflands') retain what would be their natural topography, where development and extraction have not taken place. In these areas it is likely that some archaeological potential is retained. If any development works (or other forms of impact) are planned for these areas, below ground archaeological issues might be raised, however it is very unlikely that these would be an overriding concern and are unlikely to present a significant constraint to the scheme. I would therefore recommend that any planning application should be submitted with an Archaeological Heritage Statement. This document should consider the available archaeological evidence, past and present land use, the archaeological potential of the area and the impact of the development. The heritage statement should seek to set out what mitigation, if any, would be considered an appropriate response. With regards to the historic buildings and their link to the industrial archaeology of the site, I would defer to your conservation team. However, I was happy to see that an appropriate level of consideration has been given to the significance of the industrial archaeology of the site. Whilst there is no purely archaeological reason for the retention of the buildings associated to the cement works, their significance is such that thought should be given to some form of historic building recording of the standing structures, especially where demolition or significant change is proposed. The archaeological recording of the buildings, might be raised as an archaeological issue once more detailed plans are submitted for planning permission and, therefore, a detailed heritage statement, including a mitigation strategy, should be included within any application.

(R27/session 60867; Historic England)
Created August 2nd 2022

Although not formally designated, the former Shoreham Cement Works do have historic significance. When constructed they were considered an excellent example of a compact cement works and were visited by representatives of the cement industry from all over the world. We are pleased to see cultural heritage of the site is acknowledged in the draft AAP, with a particular focus in Section 5D. However, having identified and indicated the significance of the cement processing buildings and structures on the site the AAP is dismissive of their retention, largely because "...it is here where the new four arm roundabout is proposed. This would obviously require the demolition of most of the buildings". Only the chimney is considered worthy of retention, almost fortuitously because it is "just outside the footprint of the proposed roundabout". The WPS report that underpins the evidence of the heritage significance of the site, while undoubtedly as comprehensive and thorough as it could have been, is defective as a result of the (as admitted) unavailability of access to the site during the assessment process. We suggest, therefore, a review of the conclusion of the WSP assessment that the heritage value of the site is of "medium significance" should be undertaken. We would be happy to discuss with the SDNPA how this may be carried out. Although there are no designated assets on the site of the former works itself, there is a scheduled monument, viz. Cross dyke on Beeding Hill, 1100m north west of New Erringham Farm Cottages, on the very edge of the former workings. The AAP also fails to recognise the heritage significances of the wider area, and the connections to other local heritage assets e.g. the association with the cement workers cottages at Dacre Gardens, just outside the site, that may themselves be considered of heritage significance. We would welcome the inclusion of policies and proposals for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment in the area action plan. All the policies and proposals throughout all sections of the AAP should be tested against the potential effects they will have on the historic environment and the significance of heritage assets. This, also will be a key test of the soundness of the plan and the achievement of sustainable development as defined in the NPPF when it is subject

to examination.

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

The cement works is an important social, architectural and historical site to Sussex with its connection with the cement industry, with its iconic chimney structure.

(R71/session 60916; The Twentieth Century Society)
Created August 2nd 2022

Background The cement works in Shoreham was built for the British Portland Cement Manufacturers in the mid- to late-1940s to early-1950s and later extended. It was designed by the engineering staff of the Associated Portland Cement Manufacturers. Oscar Faber and Partners were the consultants for the civil engineering work and G.A. Jellicoe was consulting architect and architect for the office block. John Laing and Son were the contractors, Bierrum & Partners the sub-contractors of the reinforced concrete, and J.L. Keir & Co provided the structural steelwork. The cement works was published in the Architects' Journal. A 1952 article, 'New Cement Works at Shoreham' (14 Feb 1952), reported that: "With a capacity for 350,000 tons per year, it replaces a small works which has been in operation on the same site for 50 years [...] most of the new works has been built in the quarry of the old, so that the view of the surrounding countryside is interrupted as little as possible." An earlier Architects Journal article from 1951, 'New Works Producing Over 1,000 Tons Per Day' (2 Aug 1951), similarly observed how "The works are sited in the quarry from which came the chalk used by the old works, so that, from a distance, little can be seen but the tall chimneys." It was equipped with two 350-ft long cylindrical 'rotary' kilns. Also on the site (as recorded in the 1952 Architects' Journal article) were 12 cement storage silos, built from reinforced concrete, their construction joints "emphasised to produce a neat pattern." And there was Jellicoe's 3-storey, reinforced concrete office. The Shoreham works was also published in the Architect & Building News (23 Aug 1951) and Official Architect (Sept 1951) (but we have been unable to review these articles due to the Temporary closure of the RIBA library). Comments The publication of the cement works in the architectural press in the 1950s is an indicator of the site's significance. The new buildings also clearly responded to the landscape of the South Downs and we are interested in the involvement of Geoffrey Jellicoe in this. Jellicoe was an important architect and landscape designer in the inter- and post-war period: our 20th publication, 100 -Century Gardens and Landscapes (2020), includes a chapter by Alan Powers dedicated to him, 'Geoffrey Jellicoe and the Landscape Profession' which begins "Is 20th- it possible to tell the story of British century landscape and gardens through one individual? If so, that individual person would have to be Sir Geoffrey Jellicoe (1900-96), not only for his long life and career, but for his role in the history of ideas and the redefinition of the boundary lines of the professional practice." The site has cultural heritage significance and a considered relationship to the landscape. We would encourage SDNPA to explore this further, if not already examined in WSP's Industrial Archaeology Study. We would be grateful if we could please be sent a copy of this study to review. Thank you for your response. We have now reviewed the Industrial Archaeology Study. This notes that: "Care was taken in the design so it would have less of an impact on the natural landscape, and also likely from the main designer Oscar Faber who was an advocate for engineering and architecture to work together. This is also reflected in the landscaping design of the plant which was noticeably well-kept and presentable during its operational period." (p.49) However, the involvement of Geoffrey Jellicoe is not recorded or explored. We recommend that further research is carried out, as outlined in our attached letter. Jellicoe was also responsible for the landscaping of the Hope Cement Works in the Peak District in the 1940s, also for the British Portland Cement Manufacturers (which became Blue Circle in the 1970s). I've attached here an article on the landscaping of the Hope

Cement Works for your interest.

Question 9: Should any of the buildings, such as the chimney, be retained on site?

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

No

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

No. There is nothing great about the chimney or its industrial past. Remove and demolish everything.

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

The chimney is iconic, I think it should remain. Look at what they've done to places like Battersea. It informs the narrative and purpose of the space. I'd also love to see some of the buildings retained, they'd make really cool, contemporary live / work spaces. Think OneBrighton, but much better looking.

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

Yes, for heritage and historical reasons. It's important to continue the historical story of the site for future generations

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

The chimney should be retained.

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

Seems likely to prove impractical due to contamination

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

Save the iconic buildings

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

yes, absolutely the chimney should be retained. There are probably considerable difficulties with maintaining large parts, or all, of the other parts of the industrial buildings, but it would be important to retain as much as possible of these historically important buildings.

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

No

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

Anything that is used by wildlife, such as bats, should be left, and the rest of the site should be returned to Downland nature.

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

Only a very few as a reminder of the history

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

Whilst I'm not a greater lover of industrial heritage, others may well be - developing the site may well be able to incorporate elements of the area's industrial past. Repurposing such elements may be quite exciting for visitors.

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

Yes

(R166/session 54370; member of public)
Created **June 15th 2022**

Yes, as much as possible should be re-used, particularly the chimney

(R216/session 54416; member of public)
Created **June 15th 2022**

No

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

Not necessary. This site has been an eyesore for decades. Probably best and most cost-effective to demolish all the buildings and redevelop from scratch. Then the design of the redevelopment can be the most creative and not be restricted by any need to accommodate existing buildings.

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

No

(R119/session 54505; member of public)

Created June 17th 2022
Yes, especially the chimney

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

no

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

No need to retain existing buildings or industrial legacy

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

I think that looking at the 'cultural heritage' as a means to give guidance to a design is a 'red herring'. The existing building is not a building that local people look at lovingly. It is considered an eyesore and does not represent the area in the way that mills in Yorkshire or dockside buildings in our port cities represent the heritage of the area. Sussex, the coast and the NP are not culturally defined by the manufacture of cement and so I hope the NP disregard the existing building. It is neither culturally significant or beautiful as a building.

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

No chimney. Just a very small. aprt of the old buildings

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

yes - the site was beautifully maintained when operational - flowers etc

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

Yes the chimney should be saved

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

If the chimney is important architecturally it presumably should be retained if it isn't important and doesn't fit within the redevelopment then I see no reason to retain it. The other buildings don't appear particularly impressive architecturally and are in fact rather ugly and could be demolished.

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

Only if viable and safe. It's important this development works for the developer as well as the SDNP and if the chimney remaining causes safety and / or other issues I say get rid of it.

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

We believe that a reconstructed chimney could provide important habitat for birds but that there is no existing building that we would particularly wish to be retained, unless it could be incorporated as part of the design and reduce demolition costs.

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

NO

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

No

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

No

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

Most of the existing buildings are ugly and add little or nothing to a National Park. The chimney is a landmark however and also presents conservation opportunities. The height of the chimney means that it may be suitable as a breeding site for Swifts that are currently in decline and have recently been put on the red list. This decline is thought to be caused by the lack of suitable nesting sites for Swifts in modern buildings where there are no cavities at height. These birds, which have been a feature of downland walks are starting to become a rarity. Any tall buildings within the new development should include Swift Bricks and Swift nesting boxes or a suitable alternative could make the chimney a major Swift conservation project.

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

Yes to retain chimney. And would suggest large industrial building infrastructure and character are retained and repurposed through architectural redesign

(R83/session 55267; member of public)
Created **July 4th 2022**

Yes; as many as possible.

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

As far as we can see there is no architectural value in keeping these old buildings. They are not like the brick built cotton mills of the north. I would seek to maximise the area available and remove all these old buildings

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

As much as possible should be kept of the old buildings. It's past is so very interesting and it would be nice to retain some of this.

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

Yes, the chimney and the main building

(R201/session 55338; member of public)
Created July 6th 2022

None

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

No need. It would be a shame to see the chimney go in a way, and I quite like the architectural style of the cement works buildings, but that's a sentimental view. I don't think we're talking Battersea power station here and anyway, that's in central London so more appropriate to its surroundings. I think the cement works including all the iconic buildings that go with it can make way for something much more spectacular that fits with the Downland

(R171/session 55391; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

No, but leave the foundations (embedded carbon)

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

NO

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

Not necessarily, depends on their structural integrity and cost if keeping

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

Yes, I think it's important to show a link to what the area used to be.

(R98/session 56023; member of public)
Created July 15th 2022

Yes, I strongly feel that there should be some buildings left on the site. This site has a place in my heart, and I am sure many others, although I know quite a few see it as an eyesore. The architecture and design is somewhat unique and it would be a shame for this to go completely. I still remember the part of the building that used to go over the road!

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

Possibly the chimney so long as it is safe to do so and if it can be maintained for the life of the development

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

Definitely retain chimney. It is used by peregrines for perching. Other tall buildings used by ravens. The chimney is also a major landmark.

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

Only the chimney should be retained. The rest is utterly grotesque and should be razed to the ground.

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

It is difficult to see the cultural value of retaining much of the existing buildings, though reusing one or more of the low level buildings as a cultural centre would be worth considering. Retaining some of the machinery on site to provide context would be valuable. Could some artefacts be donated to Amberley Chalk Pits Museum to tie together two related local industries? Retention of the chimney stack introduces conflicting demands on the site as clearly for safety it would impact development within its immediate locality, and introduces a long-term maintenance demand. It would be an asset in terms of setting the context of the site and retaining a recognised landmark. However the cliffs are equally as significant and arguably even more visible and on balance I would not oppose the removal of the chimney.

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

Possibly the chimney, but a photo record, permanent exhibition and or scale model of the site could compensate. Also, the outline of the building could be marked on the floor with bricks (or I guess, cement!)

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

No no No.

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

Yes, definitely the chimney.. Other building I would like to utilise if possible. Like the building to the west side, near bottom of the slope, for use of a zip wire. I would like to maintain as much as possible.

(R148/session 56870; member of public)
Created July 22nd 2022

Chimney Should be retained

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

None whatsoever. This is not "Ironbridge". All the buildings are an eyesore, and would require wasteful and intensive re-construction. The current height of the buildings on site should not be considered in terms of need to retain - a whole new look of height perspective could developed from Riverside North and Eastward towards the Downs.

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

It would be appropriate to give some recognition to the history of the site. The chimney is an iconic landmark, but as observed in the document, its retention could restrict redevelopment options. There are also issues of the current structural stability and safety of the structure, plus its ongoing maintenance. It might be a better option to retain part of the cement kiln, which could be located somewhere on the site as part of an industrial heritage interpretation display. The former offices on the Riverside part, if structurally sound, could be redeveloped into flats. The retention of other buildings would possibly impact upon redevelopment options.

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

absolutely! as much of the industrial/cultural heritage should be retained. i can see the current buildings being artistically converted into a romantic 'ruined industrial castle' by careful editing (for safety and to bring out the beauty of the frameworks) so that they form a skeleton for planting and gardens with machinery and unique structures incorporated. there is no where else like this and to destroy this unique landscape would be such a waste. if it is all demolished leaving just the chimney it would seem sanitised and the chimney on it's own would i feel end up looking 'a bit sad' !

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

no

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

Chimney yes. Only buildings that can be sustainably reused should be retained, ie used for housing, leisure or business. I do not see great scope for it being a visitor attraction.

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

Yes

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

Some large buildings (and industrial artefacts) should be retained, so as to give an appreciation of the scale of the former works.

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

Not necessarily, and only if they blend in with any new buildings or development.

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

No, it's a redundant quarry needing to be restored back to downland.

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

None of the current industrial buildings, including the chimney, kilns etc. should be retained because they have low 'cultural' value. Their retention would greatly detract from the site and restrict the opportunity to incorporate groundbreaking design relevant to the future.

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

Keep the chimney

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

No

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

Possibly - it would depend on archaeological surveys and consultation

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

yes

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

Yes, if this can be done practically and economically

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

All should be retained for character and history and originality and net zero. We're facing a climate collapse just for context.

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

9. The chimney should be retained on site as it is a well-known landmark locally.

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

Only as part of a working museum which acts as a tourist attraction.

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

Yes, the chimney, no to all or most of the other buildings, tho' maybe one smallish one retained as an example and 'museum'.

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

The chimney is and has always been an historic landmark and I believe that some of the buildings do have some architectural significance. Their retention would depend on their safety, etc.

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

No.

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

All of the buildings should be retained

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

Chimney and part of the building to be useful as a visitor and information centre.

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

Chimney yes as it's a landmark. Perhaps the big round towers and main building be repurposed for leisure facilities/exhibition halls/visitor centre?

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

Only if there is a means of funding the ongoing liability of maintenance

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

no

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

Yes, and if feasible, make use of of elements of the main industrial works building, keeping

the exterior.

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

Retain specific buildings, particularly the chimney as it is iconic of the site to build in the cultural heritage. Could use some buildings as a big hall for stalls or office space perhaps.

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

I believe buildings should only be retained if they have a use and their use saves similar buildings been built from scratch. Given the example of the West Pier in Brighton, retaining buildings for the sake of cultural heritage only can lead to buildings being badly used or be unusable.

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

yes, the chimney

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

No. The chimney is just not an architectural gem like for example Battersea Power Station. I think most local residents would like to see it gone. As a comparison the old chimneys at Shoreham Harbour were blown up in the 1980s.

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

No - the buildings are ugly and dominate the space - start again! Too expensive to refurbish/redesign.

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

Yes

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

2.2.2) The existing buildings offer the opportunity, if re-purposed, to concentrate development rather than spreading across the site. Due to their sheer scale, conversion could go a long way towards producing sufficient floorspace to create a financially viable development. (We can see no analysis of existing floor/site areas which might be useful in evaluating this.) The benefits to the landscape of concentrating development in this way would be substantial. 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 site. 2.2.3) The option to convert and preserve the buildings in some form hasn't yet been fully explored it seems. Section 5D in the draft AAP suggests there really isn't sufficient evidence to rule out the option of retaining the most important buildings. In particular the statement in section 5.50 that 'retention of all of the historic buildings, much of which are in an extreme state of dilapidation, would increase the development costs and thus impact on viability' needs to

be supported by evidence. The Landscape Study says in chapter five, Summary and Design Principles: 'Where appropriate and fit for restoration, former industrial buildings could also be retained and re-purposed to provide important references to the industrial heritage of the site' and 'New development proposals should consider the retention, adaptation and reuse of existing buildings where feasible.' 2.2.4) The site's embodied energy is mentioned in the AAP. Para. 5.74 says: 'The buildings on site, being made predominantly of concrete contain significant amounts of embodied energy and should ideally be re-used.' That applies to both the buildings and to the developed site itself which contains extensive areas of hardstanding. Para. 5.74 goes on to say: 'This is unlikely to be practical' but without referring to supporting evidence. An assessment of embodied energy would allow the benefits of retention rather than demolition to be examined. The ICE has stated that: 'It is thought that in the UK, buildings account for around 50% of the total energy consumed. The UK construction industry is the largest consumer of resources, consuming more than 400 million tonnes of material a year (ref. Davis Langdon), and this consumption of materials in itself accounts for around 10% of UK carbon emissions (ref. ENVEST from ICE).' We suggest the AAP should outline how the topic of 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. 2.4.1) As noted above the Industrial Archaeology Study of 2022 was produced without access to the site. The Demolition Report of 2017 was not a condition survey although it contains useful observations including some on the state of the substantial steel framed building that houses the rotary kilns. 2.4.2) In particular the statement in section 5.50 of the AAP that 'retention of all of the historic buildings, much of which are in an extreme state of dilapidation, would increase the development costs and thus impact on viability' needs to be supported by evidence. The Landscape Study says in 'Opportunities and Constraints': '....where feasible, buildings, structures or internal mechanical features of interest should be retained and re-purposed.'

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

Retention of existing buildings must be determined by cost, safety and re-use. • A number of people regard the architectural features of the site as amazing and do not want them dismantled. • Other people would like to see the 'eyesores' knocked down. • Some designs produced for the site have made use of the chimney and main building façade which would be preferential if possible. • There should be an attempt to work out the optimal viable use of a heritage asset and re-use of redundant or disused buildings. • This could lead to enhancing the immediate setting and add to the innovative nature of the design of any new dwellings.

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

It is recognised that the chimney forms a cultural landmark signifying the historical land use context of the site. The Council does not have any specific policy comments regarding the possible retention of the chimney but would like to point out that the Council takes a positive approach towards the use of public art being incorporated within new major developments by way of improving the quality of the built environment and public realm. It is considered that perhaps the chimney could be treated as a form of public art to form a cultural link between the development and its industrial legacy.

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

The chimney should be retained with all other buildings removed.

(R11/session 60846; Cyrrus Brighton City Airport)
Created August 2nd 2022

Please see our response to question 5.

(R17/session 60852; Fittleworth and District Association)
Created August 2nd 2022

The site is probably the greatest eyesore in the National Park and that can only be cured by the total demolition of all the buildings. The negative impact on the landscape surely far outweighs any conservation value the works may have.

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

I would like to see the facade of the main building and the chimney kept.

(R22/session 60860; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

I write to express my interest in these iconic buildings. I note that in several instances I have heard the site described as an eyesore. Personally, and based on an active interest going back to 1986 when I first moved to Shoreham, I believe they offer immense development potential without any demolition. Compared to more industrialised parts of the country, the sheer size of the buildings make the cement works quite unique within the South Downs National Park.

(R27/session 60867; Historic England)
Created August 2nd 2022

In our view, the answer to Question 9: Should any of the buildings, such as the chimney, be retained on site of the draft AAP is that, subject to a more informed understanding of the significances of the archaeology, buildings and related structures of the site, the starting point should for any discussion of the future uses of the site should be the intention to seek the retention of all or as many as possible, of the extant cement working buildings, structures and machinery. The site is of almost unique importance in terms of telling the story of the South Downs landscape and of the social and economic history of the National Park and its communities. The loss of the buildings would be a missed opportunity to celebrate in physical form this distinctive part of the South Downs story, and to embrace a distinctive and special aspect of its varied heritage.

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

The cement works is an important cultural heritage site in terms of its link with the cement history and the chimney is an iconic part of that history. We need to retain our cultural history, it is part of Sussex's social and South Downs industrial history. This must be retained, once its gone, its gone for every.

(R43/session 60885; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

One last thing I would like to also say, is that the former packing plant that is on the West Side, should not be demolished. Aside from the cosmetic neglect of the cladding and windows, the enormous concrete structure is a remarkable industrial sight in the valley. I

can say that the views from the top floor are remarkable and would be a fantastic venue for a restaurant, you could also land a helicopter on the roof if you needed to. If it was torn down, I doubt anything as high would replace it - nor that would be as much as a nod to the industrial heritage of the site. I have attached a photo of the building in question behind our vehicles.

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

Having lived in Steyning since 1983 I have had to put up with the blanket of dust and pollution covering the local area giving the trees and landscape a ghostly appearance, I see nothing to celebrate and would therefore like to see all buildings and structures eradicated. I don't see anything to be proud of the way the downs has been systematically raped and scared for ever

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

Yes. Other structures and surfaces should be considered for retention. E.g. rail tracks.

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

We welcome the retention of culturally significant structures/buildings/artefacts where practical. See also answer to Question 4 regarding embodied carbon and the hierarchy of waste meaning retention and re-use, then recycling, should be considered before removal.

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

see above - I can see an argument for the chimney and a bit of heritage around it, as long as it is safe and there are funds to keep it safe

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

Retention of existing buildings must be determined by cost, safety and use of. A number of people regard the architectural features of the site as amazing and should not be dismantled, others would like to see the eyesores knocked down. Some designs produced for the site have made use of the chimney and main building façade which would be preferential if possible. Attempt to represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset and re-use redundant or disused buildings where possible. This could lead to enhancing the immediate setting and add to the innovative nature of the design of any new dwellings.

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

We believe that a reconstructed chimney could provide important habitat for birds but that there is no existing building that we would particularly wish to be retained, unless it could be incorporated as part of the design and reduce demolition costs, giving the site an opportunity to showcase the redevelopment potential, rather than complete rebuilding of sites like this.

(R199/session 58013; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

I have no objection to the chimney or buildings going, but only to make the area into a nature reserve type of space.

(R91/session 55861; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

The Chimney should try to be retained as its such an icon in the local area

(R127/session 53652; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

I personally love the chimney, it has this really grand feel and a sense of place. However, I am not local to the site, as in drive by it everyday. I can imagine it being a bit ugly, especially on a dark winter morning. However, I think if it can be retained, why not try.

(R223/session 58070; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

Retention of some aspects of the historic buildings would be ideal as they provide character and connection with the heritage.

(R224/session 58050; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

The main factory with its huge scale, could in the right hands be transformed into something amazing (see previous comment on housing botanical plants, or even something like Tate Modern in London). If that is not possible then I would agree with keeping something of the heritage such as the chimney

Question 10: To what extent should the design of the redevelopment reflect the site's industrial past?

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

Not really relevant

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

It shouldn't

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

It should maintain the architecturally interesting buildings to help explain the narrative of the space and it could look so cool. As mentioned before, what they've done in Germany with rewilding industrial spaces is also amazing.

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

An industrial style or theme would be appropriate in some areas but not all

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

To a very great extent, but the design should be empathetic by providing loads of natural light, terraces and balconies to each dwelling.

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

Reinstate the rail line, to show the superior transport of the past, and provide sustainable transport to the site

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

It should reflect its industrial past

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

Paying homage to the site's industrial part should be a priority for the scheme. The industrial buildings have a beauty to them that should be considered with any new development.

(R90/session 54020; member of public)

Created **June 10th 2022**

Given the massive impact of the industrial past on the landscape, the designs should reference how the site was created, but subtly rather than by retaining the current ugly buildings

(R112/session 54076; member of public)

Created **June 11th 2022**

The site should reflect the planet and regions unique natural history. Rewild now.

(R164/session 54096; member of public)

Created **June 11th 2022**

somewhat

(R94/session 54186; member of public)

Created **June 13th 2022**

Clearly there must be some indication of the site's previous function

(R142/session 54348; member of public)

Created **June 14th 2022**

It should

(R166/session 54370; member of public)

Created **June 15th 2022**

As much as possible

(R216/session 54416; member of public)

Created **June 15th 2022**

None

(R78/session 54414; member of public)

Created **June 15th 2022**

Not at all. The site has been an eyesore for decades and, as stated, is of little historic interest. It would be best to knock the whole thing down and redesign from scratch. That way as many houses as possible can be built on the site.

(R135/session 54443; member of public)

Created **June 16th 2022**

None

(R119/session 54505; member of public)

Created **June 17th 2022**

To some extent, but also like the idea of mixing contemporary architecture with heritage.

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

not at all

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

The redevelopment does not need to reflect the industrial provenance

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

Again, the industrial past, as a stimulant for creativity in the built environment, in this case is misplaced. My view is that the National Park should put an emphasis on ecology, zero emissions (which is possible in housing), should be the creative stimulus for the architecture of the site. As much green as possible to repair the damage done by the industrial past. We should not get gooey eyed over the industrial buildings - they are an eyesore.

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

To a very small extent only

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

it should pay homage to the past and also look forward with sustainable and carbon neutral reworking

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

There needs to be at least reference to the previous industrial use. An explanation of how and why this area came about

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

The industrial past should be recorded and influence any design but not to the extent of overwhelming new development

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

Its been derelict for 30 years. I'm not personally bothered if the redevelopment reflects the site's industrial past, but I think any future development should at least have a publicly accessible 'memories' gallery with photos of the history of the site.

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

We think that an area within the visitor area could showcase the industrial heritage - Teggs

Nose quarry in Macclesfield is an example where old equipment and notice boards allow visitors to engage with the historical legacy

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

NONE

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

In naming only, and in access to, and information on the origin of the cliffs. In terms of buildings, not at all. Something to commemorate railway history perhaps.

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

Warehouse style apartments might work well in the re-developed factory buildings.

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

It should absolutely reflect the sites past.

(R83/session 55267; member of public)
Created July 4th 2022

Totally

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

I have no firm views on this. I'm not sure how important this is the area.

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

A nice mix of old with new would look great. The newness alongside the sites industrial past would show them both off beautifully

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

Only to the extent that the existing buildings are retained

(R201/session 55338; member of public)
Created July 6th 2022

None. Demolis, leave to nature to reclaim.

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

No need - a museum is enough.

(R171/session 55391; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

Purely in the choice of colours

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

None - it should be returned to nature as much as possible

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

Depends if it would be more expensive to reflect this

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

For future generations, and for people to be able to understand the reasoning for site, I think it's important elements are retained to show the area's development.

(R98/session 56023; member of public)
Created July 15th 2022

Again, linked to my answer to q9, it would be a shame to completely ignore the history of the industrial past ... it was a huge site, with locals working there and it would be a shame for this not to be recognised. Could housing be "in keeping" with the design of the cement work, should housing be approved, and any buildings to have a specific design to be in keeping of what was there before.

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

Possibly, By the retention of the chimney

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

To some extent it should.

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

None, other than perhaps a small museum room to the site's origins if that would attract people to the site.

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

I don't see that the development itself needs to reflect the site's history in any direct way, other than perhaps in naming (roads, buildings etc.). Context can be provided more

effectively by having a site visitor centre or other facilities such as signboards, machinery exhibits etc.

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

Names could be retained, if positively associated, e.g. Store Street, Upper Sidings, Chimneystack Close. Commemorative plaques or historical notices. Not sure about anything else. However, it is highly significant that the owner denied access to the site for heritage evaluation purposes. This can only imply that they are not willing to honour or commit to preservation of heritage and must count against their plans.

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

Not at all. Anything built should not be influenced in this way. There is after all little if anything at all of any historical interest whatsoever.

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

Very important, it's part of our heritage and culture. The history of the building still holds a vital story. Something we need to cherish, not throw away!

(R148/session 56870; member of public)
Created July 22nd 2022

Maybe a visitor centre should be incorporated within the development explaining the history the site

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

One of the new features of the site might be a museum facility that would embrace both the cement works and the Port of Shoreham. This should be in a new building, purpose built in to any semi-commercial part of the development it is important to not forget that this site is a major act of "reclamation" - not re-development - there is no need to see the need for anything to remind us of the grim buildings that were once here, apart from a museum that celebrates the wider region. Maybe it could act as the eastern cedntre of the SDNP, as Midhurst does further west?

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

Perhaps in some way, but not as a major architectural theme.

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

as much as possible with exploration, educational elements and nature allowed to take over

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

just a nod

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

Limited. The extent of the industrial past as present is (I believe) limited to post 1950s. The Edwardian workers houses (?) on the A283 could be used as a basis for some development.

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

Design should be sympathetic and should try and maintain the unique feel of the site

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

The past must be reflected, but not to the detriment on new uses.

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

Little or none

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

Restore the site and interpret its past, from before the cement works to, hopefully, its full downland restoration, celebrating the landscape enhancement (NP Purpose 1), reversal in biodiversity decline and providing for informal recreation with open access, promoting understanding and enjoyment (NP Purpose 2)..

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

The redevelopment should not reflect the site's industrial past.

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

Only to a small extent

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

I think the site is in such a sensitive landscape area that the opportunity should be taken for a fresh start with no industrial characteristics

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

There should be some reflection of its history in the redevelopment

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

yes

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

Yes, definitely- but to bring greenery back into the industrial setting. Think about grassed roofs, nature trails, green park spaces.

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

Fully, inclusivity is a key to success though. a Development models such as battersea Power statio are not to be followed. Its exclusive, homogenous overlaying on working class history for predominantly wealthy.

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

10. Design of the redevelopment should reflect the cultural heritage of the site.

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

If there is a working museum then the design needs to be sympathetic to that. If there is no working museum, then there is no need to reflect the site's industrial past.

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

Only in some light industrial buildings if there is space/demand. Otherwise it is a real opportunity to develop a pleasant environment with good views both to and from the NP

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

Any development should COMPLETELY reflect the site's industrial past. This is part of the history of Shoreham by Sea and should be retained as such.

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

Not to any significant extent.

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

You shouldn't be redeveloping this site. Manage its decline & allow nature to reclaim the site. It would be beautiful & groundbreaking. be brave.

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

Should reflective a small amount.

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

Definitely the past should be referenced. it wouldn't exist if it hadn't been used for chalk excavation/cement manufacturing

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

This can be a great part of overall habitat and site restoration interpretation

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

it should.

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

The industrial works buildings should be a kind of feature but any new builds should blend in. Use the bowl and moonscape for activities that make use of its present visual condition as a kind of reminder its past.

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

There should be a significant reflection of the past - this way it can promote the previous and future special qualities of the site.

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

If any building would serve as being educational by being preserved whilst given it a new use then it should be preserved. Otherwise, reclaiming an environment more sympathetic to its surroundings should outweigh remembering the site's industrial past.

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

yes it should reflect the site's industrial past. As a local resident I'm extremely concerned about the risks of eg asbestos contamination to the local area during (de)construction

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

This should be limited to either a small number of buildings, or with a subtle reflection in the architecture or material choice.

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

A SDNP heritage centre could give good educational view of historical aspects of the site. No need to retain existing buildings at all - apart from recycling their materials for new building work.

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

Re wild it

(R61/session 60905; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

As a geographer who brought many students to the Cement Works in the '70's and who have taken students down redundant coalmine industries and to many archeological industrial sites I would be disappointed if this opportunity was missed. The Cement industry is and possibly always will be one of our most important industries.

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

UBPC Neighbourhood Plan recommended to reflect the site's history by building: • An artefacts/ Cement Works Museum & Heritage Centre. • A Wild Life Centre and sanctuary for birds, fish & plants. • An Education & Innovative Centre for arts, science & technology and to develop the skills required for the local area but realising and appreciating those of the past.

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

The Council would be supportive of a high quality design that sensitively characterises the site's unique industrial past. The NPPF is clear that the conservation and enhancement of cultural heritage are important considerations and should be given great weight in National Parks.

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

The SCW's past will always be hard to avoid and should be unnecessary in relation to architectural design. The industrial use of the Downs might be better reflected by resituating the Amberley Museum, or similar, with some additional artefacts and explanators on the site.

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

I think the main chimney and facade would adequately reflect the industrial past.

(R27/session 60867; Historic England)
Created August 2nd 2022

Question 10 asks: To what extent should the design of the redevelopment reflect the site's

industrial past? We would suggest that the site itself, including its buildings and open processing spaces, reflect its industrial past better than any replacement buildings could. Should redevelopment of the site be proposed as the preferred option replacement buildings are unlikely to reflect the heritage of the site in an adequate or meaningful way. There are numerous examples of the retention, reuse and adaptation of large-scale industrial buildings and sites to draw upon as models for reusing the cement works, some illustrated in the draft AAP itself, that have resulted in creative and vibrant futures for the respective sites. We would argue that a heritage-led scheme for retention, reuse, and adaptation of buildings and spaces, rather than redevelopment, should be the starting point for revitalisation of the site.

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

There should be "NO development of "redevelopment" absolute "NOT." The development of this site must be about sustaining the chalk land, wildlife, biodiversity. Chalkland has 40 species per one square metre; it's rarer than rainforest and home to all our native wildlife. Ecological surveys have shown how important this site is. Our cultural heritage is part

(R32/session 60873; Brighton & Hove Schools Wellbeing Service)
Created August 2nd 2022

Enhancing the natural beauty Comically we might recognise that the iconic eyesore of the old cement works has its own unique and well-established charm. So, some efforts to maintain its industrial feel, feels essential

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

Buildings, materials and hard landscaping (surfaces mainly) should reflect the industrial past.

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

The buildings are not listed or statutorily protected in any way, but aside from retention of culturally significant structures/buildings/artefacts, there is no need for its historic uses to overly influence future architecture or lead to creating a pastiche.

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

you can hide the past and shouldn't - need to use it as a platform for the future and a platform for learning

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

The UBPC NP recommended that we reflect the site's history by building an Artefacts/ Cement Works Museum & Heritage Centre. A Wild Life Centre and sanctuary for birds, fish & plants. An Education & Innovative Centre for arts, science & technology and to develop the skills required for the local area but realising and appreciating those of the past.

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

We think that an area within the visitor area could showcase the industrial heritage - Teggs Nose quarry in Macclesfield is an example where old equipment and notice boards allow visitors to engage with the historical legacy

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

Keep the general shape

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

It would be a fabulous opportunity as an educational centre for the relationship between industrial history and the outcomes of conservation work for biodiversity (as per 5.108) Any education centre could also showcase other carbon positive activities across the National Park such as local regenerative farming and rewilding projects.

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

I really like retaining some sense of the past in new development, especially on a site of this nature. If possible - some sort of remembrance of the past I think could really create sense of place and a link to the past. One thing I dislike about new developments (typically outside of the NP), is that the development could be anywhere. There is nothing special that reminds you where you are. So I would love to see this here.

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

The industrial past should be incorporated but without making it front and centre. The exception might be the main building if it were to be transformed into a new venue but retaining its structural characteristics