

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

Chapter 5D: Cultural Heritage

There were a total of 212 responses to this chapter. These consisted of 6 general comments on the chapter and 206 responses to the questions.

There were a total of 6 general comments on this chapter. These are summarised below.

National Agencies

Historic England:

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 significance 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.

District, Borough, City and County Councils

Hampshire County Council:

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

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

would be there 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.

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.

Other Organisations

The Twentieth Century Society:

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

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

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.

The Industrial Archaeology Study 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).

Fittleworth and District Association:

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

Individuals

1 individual commented that 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.

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

There were a total of 106 responses to this question. These are summarised below.

National Agencies

Historic England:

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.

District, Borough, City and County Councils

Adur and Worthing District Council:

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

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.

Hampshire County Council:

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. (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 '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.'

Parish and Town Councils

Upper Beeding Parish Council:

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

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.

Kingsley Parish Council:

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

Other Organisations

Greening Steyning:

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.

SDNPA Design Specialist:

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

CPRE Sussex:

The chimney should be retained with all other buildings removed.

Fittleworth and District Association:

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.

Individuals

57 individuals thought some buildings / the chimney should be retained, 32 thought everything should be demolished and 8 were undecided. Comments included:

- The buildings are an eyesore
- The buildings/chimney are iconic, a major landmark and should be retained as a reminder of the past use (like Battersea)
- The buildings would make really cool, contemporary live / work spaces
- Anything that is used by wildlife, such as bats, should be left
- The height of the chimney means that it may be suitable as a breeding site for Swifts
- Could be a visitor attraction.
- the design of the redevelopment should be the most creative and not be restricted by any need to accommodate existing buildings
- Only retain if viable and safe

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

- Site should be restored back to downland
- Sussex, the coast and the NP are not culturally defined by the manufacture of cement
- the site was beautifully maintained when operational - flowers etc
- retaining buildings / foundations important for embedded carbon - the waste hierarchy is retention and re-use, then recycling, these options should be considered before removal.
- reusing one or more of the low level buildings as a cultural centre / museum / visitor 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
- a photo record, permanent exhibition and or scale model of the site could compensate for loss. Also, the outline of the building could be marked on the floor with bricks (or cement!)
- building to the west side, near bottom of the slope, could be used for a zip wire
- could 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.
- current buildings could be 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.
- if it is all demolished leaving just the chimney it would seem sanitised and the chimney on its own would end up looking 'a bit sad'
- the former packing plant that is on the West Side, should not be demolished. The enormous concrete structure is a remarkable industrial sight in the valley. 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.
- The main factory with its huge scale, could in the right hands be transformed into something amazing such as housing botanical plants, or something like Tate Modern in London.

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

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

National Agencies

Historic England:

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 largescale 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.

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

District, Borough, City and County Councils

Adur and Worthing District Council:

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.

Parish and Town Councils

Upper Beeding Parish Council:

UBPC Neighbourhood Plan recommended to reflect the site's history by building: • An artefacts/ Cement Works Museum & Heritage Centre. • A Wildlife 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.

Findon Parish Council:

Design of the redevelopment should respect the cultural heritage of the site.

Other Organisations

Greening Steyning:

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.

Brighton & Hove Schools Wellbeing Service:

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.

CPRE Sussex:

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.

SDNPA Design Specialist:

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

Individuals

56 individuals thought that the design should reflect the site's past to varying degrees, 27 considered it shouldn't reflect it at all. 6 said that the site should not be redeveloped at all and be left to re-wild.

Comments included:

- An industrial style or theme would be appropriate in some areas but not all
- the design should be empathetic by providing loads if natural light, terraces and balconies to each dwelling
- Reinstate the rail line, to show the superior transport of the past, and provide sustainable transport to the site

Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues & Options

Summary of Responses

- The industrial buildings have a beauty to them that should be considered with any new development
- designs should reference how the site was created, but subtly rather than by retaining the current ugly buildings
- The site should reflect the planet and regions unique natural history
- best to knock the whole thing down and redesign from scratch. That way as many houses as possible can be built on the site
- like the idea of mixing contemporary architecture with heritage
- 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
- pay homage to the past and also look forward with sustainable and carbon neutral reworking
- any future development should at least have a publicly accessible 'memories' gallery with photos of the history of the site
- Warehouse style apartments might work well in the re-developed factory buildings
- Purely in the choice of colours
- Possibly, By the retention of the chimney
- Names could be retained, if positively associated, e.g. Store Street, Upper Sidings, Chimneystack Close. Commemorative plaques or historical notices.
- 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 centre of the SDNP, as Midhurst does further west?
- 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)
- inclusivity is a key to success, though a development models such as Battersea Power station should not be followed as it is exclusive, homogenous overlaying on working class history for predominantly wealthy.
- Use the bowl and moonscape for activities that make use of its present visual condition as a kind of reminder its past.
- no need for its historic uses to overly influence future architecture or lead to creating a pastiche
- As a geographer who brought many students to the Cement Works in he "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.
- Any education centre could also showcase other carbon positive activities across the National Park such as local regenerative farming and rewilding projects
- some sort of remembrance of the past could really create sense of place and a link to the past. New developments (typically outside of the NP), could be anywhere. There is nothing special that reminds you where you are.