

| sponse counts     |       |
|-------------------|-------|
| Section           | Count |
| Comments received | 8     |

## **Comments received**

(R18/session 60853; Friends of the South Downs) Created **August 2nd 2022** 

Our overriding concern is the impact of development upon the internal and external landscape of the National Park. Presently the site has a strong impact locally which we believe to be detrimental to the setting of the Park, although we acknowledge that many may feel otherwise. We also recognise that, apart from the Riverside, there are significant difficulties with landscaping within certain parts of the site; but equally we believe that where there are challenges there are also opportunities in the more different parts of the site, for example the Moonscape; there are opportunities for innovative landscaping and other visual improvements and urge that these be explored as and when the opportunity arises.

(R226 /session 60862; member of public) Created **August 2nd 2022** 

Finally, in any development the natural landscape of the Downs should be paramount. This should reduce car traffic to the site (perhaps with additional public transport and active travel options) and restore/retain natural habitats.

(R57/session 60900; The Aquifer Partnership (TAP)) Created **August 2nd 2022** 

There is a great opportunity here: - To adopt a landscape-led design principle as an attractive way to shape the design of the site for people, water and nature

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

Loss of habitat, loss of wildlife, loss of tranquility, damage to views, lighting pollution, contamination, flooding, contamination and pollution of a river and increased traffic, are among adverse development features affecting this sensitive open downland site situated

in the centre of an area where the space between north and south park boundaries are relatively narrow and built up.

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

1.3) Strategic Objectives: In para. 3.4 the AAP sets out strategic objectives, which outline the direction that the AAP will take in order to achieve the vision: 'a) Exemplary landscape led design, incorporating high quality architecture and a strong sense of place. b) Conservation and enhancement of some historic assets, and a design that reflects and commemorate its cultural heritage c) The Biodiversity Emergency to be addressed through landscape-led nature recovery, which conserves and enhances existing on-site biodiversity d) A sustainable use of natural capital that delivers ecosystem services and contributes positively to human health and wellbeing e) Opportunities for everyone to discover, enjoy, understand and value this part of the National Park including its landscape character and qualities, biodiversity, geology and industrial heritage f) A zero carbon and zero waste development that addresses the Climate Change Emergency through imitigation and adaptation g) A development that complements, but does not compete with the villages and market towns of the National Park and beyond h) New jobs and homes' Again, we fully support the stated objectives. The first, relating to landscape, will presumably take recedence to mirror the Park's Local Plan. The AAP needs to encapsulate the findings of the supporting Local Landscape Character and Sensitivity Study (the Landscape Study) to ensure the preferred option will be the result of a 'landscape led' approach. Many of our comments below make reference to the information in the Landscape Study. 6.0) Landscape: 6.1)We support the Landscape Study submitted and have referred to it in our other comments. We do believe supporting evidence on landscape heritage and ecological network is needed, either in separate reports or in an extended version of the Landscape Study. 6.2)We also suggest that the findings of the Landscape Report, and in particular Figure 4 the Opportunities and Constraints Plan and section 'Summary and Design Principles' (chapter 5), should be integrated into the final AAP. There appears to be some tension between financial viability of any development and landscape concerns.

(R37/session 60878; Mid Sussex District Council) Created **August 2nd 2022** 

Whilst the logic for focusing the majority of the housing within the Riverside area is understood the Council is concerned that, because of the landscape sensitivities and the open nature of the site, the quantum of development that can be successfully accommodated might be too limited to facilitate delivery of a viable and sustainable community. The main Cement Works sits within the quarried landscape which ensures the vast structure is only substantially visible from the west. Looking at the landscape evidence, the LUC Landscape Study (May 2022) describes the Riverside as being lowmoderate overall sensitivity and owing to the chimney on the main cement works building, this area is defined as moderate overall sensitivity. It is however difficult to assess how the Landscape Study has informed the development options without being able to view any layout, concept masterplan or massing diagrams and the Council strongly encourages the development of a more detailed masterplan which enables a clear understanding of how to optimise development within existing constraints. Placemaking and supporting a balanced and thriving community The draft AAP includes landscape principles which are supported however it lacks clear 'placemaking' principles which will support successful delivery of the development and provide for a sustainable community. These should include creation of a focal point and community centre, ideally close to an area of shared open space to help anchor the scheme and give the community a focus, creating a strong sense of place which positively interacts with the residential elements of the proposal. This offers real opportunities to successfully accommodate higher density development

and is particularly important where properties are being proposed without private garden space, as is being indicated as a potential option.

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

The visual impact of the site from the West is horrific and again nothing to be proud of and therefore everything possible should be done to mitigate this. Terracing the sheer walls to allow nature to get a foothold as has happened on other parts of the cliff walls would help.

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

2. Visual Impact One of SDNP's stated objectives is to deliver an "Enhanced visual impact of the site from both the nearby and distant public viewpoints". We suggest that the best way to achieve this would be to demolish the existing buildings (with perhaps the iconic chimney and kilns left) and the site otherwise left to rewild. We do not feel that the vistas outlined in any of the 4 options, which would be a mix of housing, light industry, water works and recreational facilities, would be at all a positive improvement to the SDNP landscape. In particular, we point out that a view from the west bank of the River Adur of housing fronting onto the east bank would be seriously worse than the current sight of trees hiding the industrial area on the Riverside. Similarly views of a major development on both sides of the road from any high point on the Downs would surely be a much worse landscape vista than one of the current site re-wilded with most buildings demolished.