Summary of Responses

Chapter 5J: A Place to Work

There were a total of 257 responses to this chapter. These consisted of 5 general comments on the chapter and 252 responses to the questions (85 responses, Question 23; 81 responses, Question 24; 86 responses, Question 25).

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

District, Borough, City and County Councils

Hampshire County Council (HCC) welcomed the statement in 5.128 (corrected from 5.1.8 in the response) of the Area Action Plan (AAP) regarding the delivery of employment land and jobs centred on a greener economy. Also, that the AAP would address the issue of how much land and how many jobs could be provided at the site. HCC stated the site seemed to offer an ideal location for industrial/commercial use because of the relative remoteness and the enclosed form of the Bowl area.

In relation to the options in 5.11, HCC stated there are significant advantages in focusing on future B2 and B8 uses as the site is remote from populated areas and relatively enclosed. The site is unsurprisingly ideally suited to those uses. Residential use raises issues of accessibility and sustainability. The result could be an inappropriate, car-dependent development. Employment use, perhaps with a few live-work units could meet the aspiration to create a greentech hub. HCC suggest a fourth option concentrated on employment. This would allow public access for informal recreational use of the Riverside, the Bowl and the Moonscape.

A Horsham District Councillor stated that their understanding was no separate evidence was collected on employment for the AAP. This was due to the substantial existing evidence on employment. Welcomed that development would include employment as part of mixed-use scheme in line with SDNPA Local Plan, Upper Beeding NDP and historic HDC aspirations. Noted the different levels of employment floorspace provision were tested through the transport study.

Other Organisations

The **Fittleworth and District Association** stated high-tech manufacturing would offer more quality employment than warehousing and distribution.

The **Shoreham Society** stated use of site for housing with shops and access to local nature walks would be good.

Individuals

An employee of one of the commercial transport operators on the site commented that the popularity with commercial transport operators of the site due to loss of similar premises locally. They stated the site has no restrictions on operating hours and the rural location avoids complaints from residents as access needed around the clock including at night. Proximity to A24 and A27 is also an advantage.

Summary of Responses

There was a total of 85 responses to this question. These are summarised below.

District, Borough, City and County Councils

A Horsham District Councillor considered that provision of employment space should be linked to local needs, with a mixture of tourism and "green economy" uses, to create high value/high skilled jobs.

Adur and Worthing District Council (AWDC) stated the site should be seen within the strategic context for employment including uses that may come forward at Shoreham Airport and the former IKEA within Adur. Evidence for employment needs within the local area will be provided by an Adur Employment Land Review Study as part of the emerging Adur Local Plan update.

AWDC suggested there is an opportunity to link to ongoing work around the Adur Estuary/Sussex Bay and to make provision for ecological, horticultural and/or green technologies.

Parish and Town Councils

Findon Parish Council suggested a mix of high wage, high tech clean industry and small independent units including arts and crafts.

Upper Beeding Parish Council (UBPC) suggested promoting the site to businesses that offer skilled and semi-skilled opportunities for the local community. UBPC suggested the site should be for businesses specialising in green energy, and research/manufacturing; along with provision for start-ups and pods for new businesses to network. Businesses in the hospitality sector, also vineyards and winery. Provision of an amphitheatre was also suggested.

Other Organisations

Greening Steyning would like to see local small businesses.

Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE), Sussex queried if the question meant only commercial businesses rather than public services, and if so, why that was the case. CPRE Sussex suggested the site could be used by health related, cultural and green focused organisations.

South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) Specialists Team stated businesses should be small scale, "clean" and not heavy in traffic. The businesses should be compatible with the special qualities (of the National Park), for example, tranquillity.

Individuals

There were responses from 78 individuals to this question. The majority of responses gave an answer with more than one type of specific use or category of business. Therefore, this summary considers the number of times a specific use or category of business appeared in the answers.

In total there were 163 uses or categories of business suggested for the site in response to the question. The answers can be classified into broad themes around the most common responses for use or category of business. The broad themes and categories of use along with the number of times they were suggested in an answer are as follows:

Small business/start-up/local business (33)
Leisure/Entertainment (25)
Employment – office, industrial, storage/distribution (24)
Environmental/Green Energy/Low Carbon (22)
Restaurant/café and food & drink (14)

Summary of Responses

The Small business/start-up/local business theme includes mentions of start-ups six times and small business space nine times. This theme also includes creative/artisan type businesses being mentioned II times. Also, the need for a local or community focus to the type of business on site was mentioned seven times.

The Leisure/Entertainment theme includes suggestions of an amphitheatre or outdoor events space, swimming pool, museum, dry ski slope and climbing or abseiling facility. Responses of either more broadly leisure or entertainment rather than a specific use were made 10 times.

The Employment theme had mentions in the answers of office use six times, manufacturing four times, light industry three times, high technology eight times, research once and warehousing twice. The comment was made there was a lack of energy-efficient industrial space in the area. Also, linking employment space to the National Park's priority sectors of farming, forestry and tourism was mentioned.

The Environmental/Green Energy/Low Carbon theme includes mention of four broad categories. These broad categories for the type of business and for each the number of mentions in the answers are Environmental seven times, Green Energy nine times, Low carbon once and Climate friendly five times. The comment was made that any suitable business would need to contribute to tackling climate change in the way they operate.

The restaurant/café and food & drink theme includes four mentions in answers for food & drink uses and 10 mentions for restaurant/café on the site. For the latter use for restaurant/café this was sometimes mentioned as being to support another main use on the site for example for nature conservation or rewilding, or to support leisure opportunities.

In addition to the above, answers covered a wide range of possible uses including managing the site for wildlife (mentioned five times), hotel (twice), bike hire/workshop (three times), and plant nursery, film studio, vineyard/winery all mentioned once. There were also single mentions of retain existing businesses and using the site as a regional waste facility. A mix of business uses was also mentioned several times and implied by some answers giving multiple uses for the site.

Question 24: What sort of business would you not like to see and why?

There were 81 responses to this question. These are summarised below.

District, Borough, City and County Councils

Adur & Worthing District Council stated no comment for this question.

Parish and Town Councils

Findon Parish Council stated low wage, low skill, large retail outlets, heavy industry, warehousing and waste recycling.

Upper Beeding Parish Council stated a retail park with popular high street stores, or a rubbish incinerator or waste transfer facility, as the latter two would not meet the needs of the community or the South Downs National Park.

Other Organisations

Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex suggested there are so many unattractive businesses, and specifically stated start with no estate agents, asset managers, financial services or security firms.

Summary of Responses

South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) Specialists Team stated the opposite of those businesses that were wanted in response to question 23. Implying large scale, "dirty", and creating heavy traffic use and therefore being incompatible with the special qualities of the National Park.

Greening Steyning would not want to see businesses that are inherently in conflict with the ethos of a green living community and nature focused site.

Individuals

There were responses from 75 individuals to this question. Similarly, to question 24 many of the responses gave multiple answers. Therefore, this summary considers the number of times a particular type of answer was given in the responses.

In total there were 96 answers to the question what sort of business uses respondents did not want to see at the site and why. Broadly four themes emerged accounting for 59 answers. There was also a range of answers appearing once or a small number of times outside the four themes. These accounted for 37 answers. The four themes and the number of times they appeared in the answers are as follows:

Industrial (20)
Retail including large shops (17)
Storage & Distribution (15)
Polluting/Environmentally damaging (7)

The Industrial theme includes single word answers such as "industrial" or "heavy industry" without further explanation. Comments as to why this use was inappropriate regarded the noise and smells that could result. Others commented that this use was inappropriate for the National Park. Some people specifically stated they did not want the motor trade, for example car repairs or workshops, on the site and these answers are grouped under this theme. Two answers stated waste disposal was inappropriate at the site and this was grouped under the industrial theme.

For retail, the comment was made that this use was inappropriate especially larger premises or attracting national chains due to increased traffic generation and the demand for larger areas of space on site for parking. The comment was also made that a retail park would not meet the needs of the local community or those of the National Park.

For storage and distribution, the answers included the comment that this use would result in an increase in heavy traffic. Also, the comment was made that large scale warehouses are ugly and contribute nothing to the built environment.

The polluting and environmentally damaging theme included broad answers referring to polluting or environmentally damaging businesses in general. Sometimes this was qualified as having a negative impact on, or being inappropriate in, the National Park.

In addition to the four themes outlined above answers for the sort of businesses respondents did not want to see included office (four times), large corporates (three times) and large commercial (two times). One person commented that the office market had plummeted and there was the risk of space being left unlet. Other answers include that non-carbon neutral businesses (two times) and non-National Park priority businesses (two times) would not want to be seen on the site. In four answers it was stated the site be for only nature.

Question 25: Do you think green tech companies should be encouraged to locate here?

Summary of Responses

There were 86 responses to this question. These are summarised below.

District, Borough, City and County Councils

Adur and Worthing District Council said yes in principle although reiterated the site needed to be seen in a strategic context along with employment uses that may come forward at Shoreham Airport and the former IKEA site. Green tech companies at the site would assist the Council's overall ambition of encouraging a green economy.

Parish and Town Councils

Findon Parish Council stated green technology companies should be encouraged as part of the on-site businesses.

Upper Beeding Parish Council stated yes, and the site should be marketed as a Carbon Free, Green, Eco site.

Other Organisations

Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Sussex said Green Tech companies should have an important role and representation at the site.

South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) Specialists Team answered yes to encouraging green tech companies on the site.

Greening Steyning also answered yes.

Individuals

There were 80 individual responses this question. The majority of responses were in favour of green technology companies being encouraged to locate at the site.

56 individuals responded yes to green technology companies being located at the site. Of these respondents, 34 answered yes only and 22 replied yes while adding further comment.

These further comments sometimes repeated the answer from question 23 and the types of business the person wanted to see at the site. For example, marketing the site as carbon free and eco, only small businesses, and encouraging start-ups. Others commented green technology companies would be more in line with the National Park and its objectives. Also, that the site could be a showcase for this type of business. One person answered yes but queried how these types of businesses could be encouraged to the site. Others suggested these types of business would be good for the local economy, would provide high quality jobs and could be part of a housing development to enable people to work at or close to home reducing car use.

There were 10 individuals who responded no to encouraging green technology companies to be located at the site. Four individuals responded no only, while six people replied no with further comment. These comments included that the site be only for wildlife, this was the wrong location for technology companies, indeed for any type of business use, that housing was a better use with other areas more suitable on the main coast road and that other empty premises elsewhere would be benefit from this type of business.

There were 14 individuals who gave a response other than yes or no, usually with a comment. Two individuals responded maybe, and one person stated no opinion. Others queried why green technology companies would want to locate at the site and were unsure how they could be encouraged to come to the area whilst stating it would be good if they did. Other responses included that the buildings themselves (in terms of their "green" standards) were more important

Summary of Responses

than the occupiers, that the preference would be for re-wilding although would mind this type of business less than others and that they didn't want to see a business park at this location as other less unique sites could be used.