



Response counts

Section	Count
Comments received	0
Question 26: Are there any particular ideas, issues or policies you would like to see in the Preferred Option AAP?	76
Question 27: Have you got any other comments on Shoreham Cement Works?	107
Question 28: Based on the Issues and options set out in this document, what are your three top priorities for the redevelopment of Shoreham Cement Works that should feature in the Preferred Option and why?	90

Comments received

No responses received

Question 26: Are there any particular ideas, issues or policies you would like to see in the Preferred Option AAP?

(R85/session 53501; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

Minimum housing maximum leisure businesses.

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

Free public access to the river

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

Be innovative and don't treat it like any other area.

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

no

(R144/session 53798; member of public)
Created June 9th 2022

To include a safe solution to the SDW road crossing to the north as part of S106 requirements

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

Yes, the reconnecting of the rail line to the site (retaining the Downslink alongside)

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

Rewild this site as the SDNP is so wildlife depleted. No housing, no shops, just wildlife.

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

Affordable housing

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

I would like to see a much more user friendly AAP consultation! What a difficult process to engage with?

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

Focus on building as many new houses as possible.

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

N/A

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

as far as possible a return to pre-industrial/development status

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

The cement works development should be linked to the Shoreham Development plan and a River Adur development plan

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

Make it mainly a nature reserve and try to put it back to an undeveloped site where possible

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

a leisure element to attract visitors, an artisan element to preserve crafts and artisan workers, artists etc

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

Encouraging a blending of living and working on site to create a community

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

Sustainable construction methods. Mixed-use development giving the site a new meaning to 'live work and play' with amenities for new residents, the local community and businesses. Options which help grow the local economy such as a film studio and spa hotel.

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

Safe for all access from Downs Link. A new cycle/footbridge to put Downs Link northwards back on railway route, returning the riverside path to pedestrians only.

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

Conserve and enhance scenic beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage

(R188/session 55268; member of public)
Created July 4th 2022

The inclusion of community-owned housing as proposed by the Adur Collective Community Land Trust

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

Housing should be the priority, especially affordable housing that is not ever going to be subject to right to buy or buy to rent. It should remain available for all future generations to rent at a locally affordable rent.

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

I would like to see the chimney used as a Swift nesting site of nation importance. "The first purpose of the Authority is to conserve and enhance its scenic beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage." This is sacrosanct.

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

I would like to have heard more about transportation. We must be looking to more sustainable transportation than we currently have available and for there to be no mention of anything other than a new roundabout in the plan is poor in my opinion.

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

Yes. Demolish. Leave the site to nature

(R97/session 55367; member of public)
Created July 7th 2022

I'd love to see a new Costco being built there! Great amount of space for one.

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

No

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

Focus on minimising development whilst ensuring removal of the hideous industrial buildings (and chimney)

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

As mentioned previously I think accommodation/ housing should be kept to a minimum, while encouraging outdoor activities and local start-ups should be the most important thing

(R106/session 55527; member of public)
Created July 11th 2022

We would like to see a provision for Sport, Leisure and Recreation within the plan, with supporting infrastructure, parking, club house, changing rooms, floodlights for outdoor and indoor activities. We are the local football club, and would be happy to be involved with both other Clubs and Sports in delivering state of the art facilities for the whole community to be engaged in. This might be possible in areas of the Cement works where housing, industrial or heritage development are not desirable and to provide a balanced preferred option. [REDACTED]

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

Give due consideration to the environment and biodiversity and also cultural heritage.

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

Mixed use leisure led scheme and 200 new homes - we must create employment and boost enjoyment of the park.

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

Just hold developers to ethical practices as the experience elsewhere has been that once they get permissions they renege on the agreements and compliance is not enforced. Trees chopped down, no affordable housing built, trees not replaced.

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

See above

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

Green approach

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

Please pay especial attention to the type of business that is designed into the space of the Works and the Bowl. Please make sure that public consultation like this is available at all stages of the process.

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

minimise destruction of current industrial heritage minimise house building minimise business and tourism activities minimise traffic increase preserve and enhance biodiversity create a nature park

(R198/session 56976; British Horse Society)
Created July 25th 2022

I am responding on behalf of the British Horse Society, the UK's largest equestrian charity representing the country's 3 million equestrians. As with many areas in the country, and especially the south east, busy main roads have rendered connectivity of public rights of way to either side impossible. This particular area is no exception to this issue. Within the local area, there are just over 1700 passported horses contributing in the region of £10 million to the economy per annum, much of it local. Furthermore, the two National Trails in close proximity to the site means there are likely to be many more equestrians wanting to use these from further afield, either for days out or as part of a long distance ride or as a riding holiday to the area. Currently, however, non motorised users (NMUs) must use an at grade crossing point north of the Quarry site (bridleway 3209 – South Downs Way) which is a very dangerous crossing and has long been the subject of requests for a signalised crossing. We believe the solution to crossing this road safely for NMUs would be to make use of the underpass running under the A283 (Shoreham Road), linking the riverside area on the western side of the road to the Cement Works on the eastern side. As this underpass was designed to be big enough for use by vehicular traffic, we believe the opportunity should be taken to use and restrict this underpass to NMUs and to create a link to the Downs Link on the western side with the South Downs Way on the eastern side for all users. The British Horse Society would be very willing to work with SDNPA and the developers to ensure the best outcome for NMUs.

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

preserve and maintain the sites unique character but also use the opportunity to use this brown site and largely unseen site with appropriate development

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

Constructive reference to the SDC/JC Shoreham Cement Works study, with its photo montages of a restored coombe (it's in the Millmore library and the Planners should know of it and use it as an aspirational goal) – the ephemeral, powerless AONB unit had this vision, now there is a permanent, powerful SDNPA what's to stop this being realised? See comments in Q1.

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

I should like to see the option that includes 240 houses so that the site development is viable or close to viable.

(R211/session 57853; member of public)
Created July 27th 2022

The AAP has addressed a number of the issues known on the site but the major one must

be who is going to develop the site and where is the money coming from. The site is currently owned by Steve Dudman who does not seem to want to develop the site as SDNP would wish and [REDACTED]. The Shoreham Project does have backing for a major development but on a much larger scale than SDNP are proposing. One reason for their want to develop in excess of 2,000 homes is the need for finance, I believe they maintain this requirement is necessary to deliver the funds to enable development. We also feel that the amount of housing SDNP are proposing, although providing some housing, is unlikely to get the backing of any large investors. No mention of funding for any development is mentioned in the AAP, is there some hidden investor ready to provide funding? When the PC carried out their work on the site in producing the NP and to provide what our local residents had asked for, we engaged Bill Dunster of the ZED Factory to provide plans and ideas for the site along with Zero Carbon and Green Eco companies. His plans were to provide around 650 homes on site of which a number would be for Holiday Rental, Affordable Homes and Market Driven. These numbers were required to cover some of the costs/funding for the site along with leisure projects, hotels, employment etc. These numbers could be reviewed in the light of your AAP and work could be done to see how we could develop a plan and vision for the site using your knowledge of SDNP and Bill Dunster's Worldwide knowledge of Zero Carbon, Green Eco Builds. A copy of his plan is attached and he is still willing to assist in any development that is more visionary and involves production, assembly, showcasing, educating, entertaining, selling, tourism and housing. This development is too important an opportunity to miss.

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

26. An emphasis on the site's cultural heritage and an educational facility for schools to take advantage of.

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

It must be sustainable, eco friendly and attractive. It needs to have its own schools, health facility and power generation capacity.

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

A policy to retain as much of the biodiversity already existing in the area and to ensure that any increase in traffic along the access road is manageable without a roundabout. A Nature Trail, small cafe, any accommodation to have heat exchanger pumps or solar panels, plenty of green spaces to ensure any air pollution is offset.

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

I would just like to see a sensitive plan in such an unusual setting. No huge buildings to detract from the surroundings which will be revealed.

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

A strong and coherent focus on re-greening/re-wilding and a respect for the impact of the site on many square miles of the most beautiful landscape in the South East.

(R76/session 57798; member of public)

Created **July 30th 2022**

Leave the site, manage its decline & re-wild it. Protect the nature & protected species who have made this place home.

(R76/session 57798; member of public)

Created **July 30th 2022**

I don't think you should be developing this site at all. Manage its decline & rewild.

(R222/session 57864; member of public)

Created **July 31st 2022**

Enhancing biodiversity of the area, maintaining peaceful parts of the area, carbon neutrality throughout, sympathetically remembering the industrial heritage

(R96/session 57924; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

An option which focuses on the unique landscape-scale opportunity for chalk habitat restoration and public enjoyment

(R126/session 57939; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

A proposal that will enhance nature and help to tackle the climate crisis and not contribute to it,.

(R130/session 57941; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Option3 with housing on the riverside, some housing on the main site. Making use of the bowl and moonscape area for outdoor sports activities, and nature reserve (for the public to walk.)

(R87/session 57957; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

No

(R202/session 57977; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

detailed transport impact plans

(R163/session 57979; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

No mainstream retail and entertainment commerce. Promote education, respect of the environment.

(R102/session 57990; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Emphasis and promotion of leisure and health - with an absolute respect for the local

environment. NO large retail to dominate the site!

(R143/session 57986; member of public)

Created August 1st 2022

Any development must be of a very high architectural quality, complimenting the South Downs, and following in the footsteps of other award-winning developments that have been undertaken in the South Downs National Park in the last decade. This is a nationally-significant opportunity to showcase high quality, sustainable, community-focused, redevelopment of a hideous industrial site that has blighted the area for decades. Secondly, please no low quality huge shops or sprawling cheap flats. Finally - let's finally have a beautiful hotel in this valley, that will provide a load of employment and draw visitors in to this part of the South Downs - with the focus on outdoor activities, the National Park, the environment and history of the area.

(R158/session 57982; member of public)

Created August 1st 2022

Sustainability and nature recovery should be at the core [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

(R63/session 60907; Upper Beeding Parish Council)

Created August 2nd 2022

The AAP has addressed a number of the known issues concerning the site but the major one must be who is going to develop the site and where is the money coming from. • The current owner, Steve Dudman, does not seem to want to develop the site as SDNP would wish and [REDACTED]. • The Shoreham Project does have backing for a major development but on a much larger scale than SDNP are proposing. Their wish to develop in excess of 2,000 homes concerns finance, It is believed they maintain this requirement is necessary to deliver the funds to enable development. • We also feel that the modest amount of housing SDNP are proposing, is unlikely to get the backing of any large investors. • No mention of funding for any development is contained in the AAP; so is there some hidden investor ready to provide funding? • UBPC carried out their work on the site in the process of producing the Neighbourhood Plan. We sought to provide what our local residents had asked for. We engaged Bill Dunster of the ZED Factory to provide plans and ideas for the site along with Zero Carbon and Green Eco companies. His plans were to provide around 650 homes. A number would be for Holiday Rental, some Affordable Homes and others Market Driven. • These numbers were required to cover some of the costs/funding for the site along with leisure projects, hotels, employment etc. These numbers could be reviewed in the light of your AAP. • Work could be done to see how we could develop a plan and vision for the site using your SDNPA knowledge and Bill Dunster's worldwide knowledge of Zero Carbon and Green Eco Builds. • A copy of his plan is attached and he is still willing to assist in any development that is more visionary and involves production, assembly, showcasing, educating, entertaining, selling, tourism and housing. • This development is too important an opportunity to miss.

(R69/session 60913; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

see above and in comments on management plan outcomes

(R2/session 60855; Adur and Worthing District Council)

Created August 2nd 2022

The Council would welcome clarity on the approach to delivering Biodiversity Net Gain.

There is an opportunity for the Area Action Plan to address the use of Design Codes.

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

4.0) Green and blue infrastructure In para. 3.6.6, ' Green and Blue Infrastructure', the AAC sets out broad aspirations for green and blue infrastructure but without giving any context for decision making going forward. It would be useful if information on relevant policies and initiatives such as plans for the River Adur floodplain and biological networks could be included in the AAP. ii) the Landscape Study findings need to be incorporated in the AAP to ensure the landscape led approach applies going forward iii) guidance on what work is needed to support any proposal could usefully be included in the preferred option version of the AAP

(R66/session 60910; West Sussex County Council (WSCC))
Created August 2nd 2022

The WSTP seeks a 'vision-led' approach to spatial planning that should be developed using an evaluation of site-specific mode share scenarios. The Transport Assessment is missing an analysis of the number of trips to and from principal trip attractors for site-generated trips that could be made by sustainable modes of transport in different mode share scenarios. Analysis should underpin the development of off-site infrastructure measures the are expected to come forward as part of the site development. This should be done for the chosen development option for Regulation 19 to demonstrate that the AAP is effective and viable in sustainable transport terms. Further investigation would also be required for the costs, design, and provision of cycle hire schemes and charging facilities for e-bikes to strategically improve generated non-motorised trips from the site to attraction areas which, as we are aware, will be largely dependent on further testing for viability and deliverability. In any event, given that the Transport Assessment was undertaken with a lack of representative observed traffic flows due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, this will need to be supplemented with new observed traffic flows and the junction assessments calibrated to those prior to the Regulation 19 consultation and AAP submission; this could potentially lead to changes in the any highway mitigation strategy.

(R68/session 60912; West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF))
Created August 2nd 2022

4. We are unsure about a short section of path which connects to the Downs Link and runs alongside the River Adur, close to the cement works. This is marked on the OS and WSCC interactive maps as a 'permitted bridleway'. Since the rest of the Downs Link is a PRoW with bridleway status, this apparent anomaly needs to be addressed, prior to any development of the site. 5 We are pleased to see that the July 2019 South Downs Local Plan p175 includes 'a southern loop from the South Downs Way' in the list of 'opportunities' offered by the site, and we would encourage planners to consider creating such a link for NMUs from the site to the South Downs Way, if it is possible.

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

We would like to see this as a development addressing a ravaged area of the Downs rather than a splendid building site for retail and housing. Rather than a 'milch cow' for the site owners, these should only be compensated rather than rewarded for their previous management of the site and expected to contribute to the cost of removing any pollutants and hazardous waste for which they are responsible.

(R1 /session 60844; Adur Collective Community Land Trust)
Created August 2nd 2022

We would like to see a firm policy about a proportion of the housing development being delivered by Adur Collective Community Land Trust or alternatively any other community led housing model. Community owned housing is neither commercial or social housing. It is a model of housing that means that homes remain a community asset in perpetuity contributing to long-term community wealth and wellbeing. Shoreham Cement Works is an extraordinary site and the SDNPA is looking for an exemplary redevelopment that will build back better, greener and more local. ACCLT considers that committing to support community led housing as part of the development will support achieving that goal. The site offers a unique opportunity to showcase more modern, sustainable methods of house construction that could model low energy homes that reduce living costs and that are cheaper to live in.

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

We welcome the preparation of the action plan for the purposes of guiding development of this extraordinary site and to assist in the production of an exemplary example of mixed-use development which is of local and regional importance.

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

Perchance you have not already seen the following images, I attach a link to the home of Ricardo Bofill (SEE ATTACHMENTS) Architect Turns Old Cement Factory Into His Home, And The Interior Will Take Your Breath Away When Ricardo Bofill stumbled upon a dilapidated cement factory in 1973, he immediately saw a world of possibilities. La fábrica was born, and almost 45 years later, the structure has been completely transformed into a spectacular and unique home.

(R28/session 60868; Horsham District Council)
Created August 2nd 2022

We recognise and welcome the references made in the AAP regarding the development's relationship with nearby settlements such as Bramber, Steyning, Upper Beeding and (looking beyond our district) Shoreham. The AAP states that it could be a complimentary relationship, with the new community looking to the existing centres for services and facilities but also the development becoming a new destination to the existing communities. It is considered, however, that more could be made of this and the impacts on the existing communities particularly in regard to transport, retail and infrastructure impacts, as discussed above, need further consideration.

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

Carbon negative development, sustainable travel emphasis, maximises opportunities for education in culture, biodiversity and geodiversity.

(R51/session 60894; Shoreham District Ornithological Society)
Created August 2nd 2022

The Adur Landscape Regeneration Project Within the consultation documents we were unable to find reference to the recently announced "Weald to Waves" project. We

understand SDNP are one of several organisations collaborating with this. The local element of this project is the "Adur Landscape Regeneration Project". Farmers and others owning land adjacent to the Adur are committing to various nature regeneration schemes to provide a wildlife corridor from the Weald to the Sussex coast. The information which is available to us shows only Pad Farm and Ladywells as committed within the SDNP section of the watercourse. Presumably SDNP will have been encouraging further participation from landowners and farmers in the Adur Valley. In planning to re-develop this site we encourage SDNP to place the site, or parts of it, within the context of the Adur Landscape Regeneration Project. This suggestion particularly applies to the "Riverside" section adjoining the river as the riverside vegetation is of significant value to the birdlife of the valley. In our view, any new buildings fronting onto the river and prominently visible from within the valley and surrounding downland, together with any associated removal of the riverside vegetation would seem in opposition to the aims of the Adur Landscape Regeneration Project. We have suggested in our submission that the development of the Plan should consider the need to conserve the present ornithological value of the site but also grasp the opportunity to enhance the ecological interest of those large areas of the site that will remain unsuitable for development.

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

I will probably be knocked down in flames for this – but how about a re-cycling plant and state of the art incinerator? We are told we are running out of landfill sites and energy generated from the incinerator could be used to help Shoreham. Needless to say it would have to be free from noxious emissions but I understand these can now be eliminated. The site has been commercial, is not attractive in any way and the plant could be tucked away out of sight. We all want energy and re – cycling and should not be NIMBYs Name redacted, June 7, 2022 at 5:02 pm I totally agree with Name redacted comments on a recycling plant and incinerator. We must stop sending the waste we create, to third world countries and landfill sites. We must deal with our own waste, recycling what we can, which is commendable, and even endeavour to greatly increase this amount. But there will be waste that can not be recycled, This is produced locally and must be dealt with locally. This is a one off opportunity, the site on the North east of the A283, is ideal for this, as it is self contained, even having its own chimney, the wind is predominately from the Southeast, and the site well away from any major urbanisation. Our nearest incinerator is in Newhaven town, which is where the Ouse valley reaches the sea, and is not obtrusive, but the cement works is a far more suitable site, The site could also be landscaped with trees and bunded banks

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

Simply changed to a natural site for wildlife etc. possible cafe/visitor centre only.

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

Climate change I think should be first and foremost, but also include the umbrella of issues that it covers such as biodiversity, wildlife, nature recovery, ecosystem services.

(R185/session 57963; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

As outlined in our previous responses, we would like to see policies requiring the use of SuDS and where/if possible to integrate these with a 'sustainable water management' policy that requires high levels of water efficiency, grey water recycling/rainwater harvesting to ensure that, as much as possible, water resources can be captured, stored,

used and recycled on site.

Question 27: Have you got any other comments on Shoreham Cement Works?

(R85/session 53501; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

A golden opportunity for an outdoor leisure complex in the South Downs national park.

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

Be good to see it developed

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

Prince Charles did a great job with Poundbury nr Dorchester, Dorset. Low rise housing, no street lights, reducing the night light pollution, quality living for residents. I'm sure that you have already studied the Poundbury plan?

(R144/session 53798; member of public)
Created June 9th 2022

Public access must be key, improved cycling and walking routes, maximising nature and biodiversity improvements, limiting housing numbers below 100 maximum

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

It's located on an already overloaded road, a sustainable alternative transport option is essential

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

Good and sustainable access and exit of the site will be very important

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

[REDACTED]

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

Rewild this site as the SDNP is so wildlife depleted. No housing, no shops, just wildlife.

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

I would love to see the riverside area accessible for all - not just expensive housing. There could be such an opportunity to provide walks, talks etc attracting visitors but especially providing access for local people to really enjoy our wonderful Sussex history and countryside. I'd hate to see an expensive housing complex with supermarkets, accessible only by car users!

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

Hope it gets used well all...

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

Focus on building as many new houses as possible

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

No

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

i acknowledge that the cost implications are a monumental burden for anyone seeking to address this appalling environmental eyesore but the owners of the site should be legally obligated to rectify the damage done. After all, enormous profit was made in the past at the expense of the environment. The cost is no excuse for avoiding environmental responsibility. Every effort should be made to return the location, in environmental terms to its previous status not seek further, profit generating, exploitation of the site

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

The plan must be economically robust and self sustaining

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

The cost of demolition and clearing the site has always made any development plans non viable financially. There have been 4 sets of plans of which only one went to a planning application. [REDACTED]

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

please make a difference - you owe it to the site and the environment, make it unique and sustainable, something other parts of the country want to align with/create too.

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

Major issue will be the Shoreham to Steyning Road. It will need widening and straightening

out to cope with the additional traffic

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

Linking habitat enhancement to the wildlife corridor proposed along the Adur

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

Do not build houses close to the river that might be liable to flooding in the longer term future.

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

No

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

The most sensitive areas should be protected and enhanced for biodiversity. The new development should not adversely affect them in any way.

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

This has been an excellent presentation. I have lived in Sussex for 60 years and had no idea the site was so huge.

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

I don't understand why our government insists on spoiling our countryside and environment by building more housing and increasing traffic congestion and making an already overloaded infrastructure that don't cope much worse.

(R97/session 55367; member of public)
Created **July 7th 2022**

The plans sounds great. Please make sure there are EV charge points.

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

No

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

It's an industrial site from when we didn't know any better: let's encourage nature back in.

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

preferred option is No 3 for leisure use and least no of houses

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

I think the key is adaptability. That way the site doesn't run the risk of becoming stagnant in terms of what it has to offer

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

I'm so pleased that there is an open consultation on this again ... it's an area that deserves the care and attention to ensure that it is used to it's potential.

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

There are a couple of references to the Arun (sections 3 and 4). I assume these should read Adur. There are references to peregrines nesting on the cliffs. Ravens also frequent the site and I believe nest on the cliffs. Common sandpipers frequent the stretch of the river adjacent to Riverside (despite their name, not a common species in the area). It is important any redevelopment does not adversely affect the wildlife of the river. The Ecological Appraisal mentions 65 species of bird within 2km of the site. I have been regularly walking the river paths for 6 years and have recorded 112 species between the Toll Bridge and the bridge just north of the cement works. I have also recorded weasels, common seals and many species of butterflies along the river.

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

The proposal to incorporate an improved crossing where the SDW traverses the A283 is a significant benefit as this is a cause for concern given that the development will increase traffic on the road.

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

Yes. Demolish the existing asap and build a REGIONAL/RECYLING/ENERGY PRODUCING FACILITY FORTHWITH. Just get on with it.

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

sooner it's developed the better

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

If the current owners of the site could be "paid off" then it might just be a good idea to see what happens: develop the riverside element for housing, flatten the works site, meld in the edges of the site as a whole to the surrounding Downs, create a road way, path way

provision, and then see who finds this an attractive site and wants to join. Try not to dictate too much, leave a whole lot to 'demand', let serendipity take charge and then shift and shape over a [eriod of ten years to see wqhat emerges. It is not the place to rush in, distate a vision, build the first 25% and then discover a white elephant has been created, like the site existsso take a deep breath and allow a certain amount of rolling development that does not necessarily fit with anything that might have been proposed. Allow a wide enough framework for creativity and innovation - seek out the widest possible group of stakeholders - including me - to help with this.

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

some people mistakenly say shoreham cement works is an eyesore. but i bet their eyes are drawn to it every time they pass by and they feel slightly like they are passing through a gothic film set or a supervillain's hideout. I think they would miss it if it were demolished for something more tidy and modern looking (heaven forbid a housing estate or business park). as it is now it is a stunning dramatic edifice akin to a castle ruin. it is this aspect i feel should be embraced and enhanced. shoreham cement works is unique and full of historical significance and it stands within a starkly individual landscape that is possibly not replicated anywhere else in the UK?? I would love to be able to walk through these buildings being made to feel small by their vastness and pass across the moonscape, feeling like i have ventured somewhere alien and magical and sit quietly to watch the falcons and bats surrounded by the towering cliffs. This is the gift of this place and re-development should enhance not destroy it's unique character. Housing and businesses can be built in other less unique places. I think the current owners have done future generations a favour by leaving things as they are, to disintegrate sedately and allow nature to take over. (look at what a tourist destination pripyat has become!) I read somewhere in the AAP that 'leaving things as they are is not an option' – why??? I support enhancing the industrial elements of the site with landscape design to turn it into a nature park, but if the only option is to demolish these starkly dramatic buildings to replace them with a development of unprepossessing houses and businesses then I would entreat the owner to have nothing to do with the AAP and to continue to let the site fall into ruin.

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

Well done to the team that researched and prepared the consultation document

(R198/session 56976; British Horse Society)
Created July 25th 2022

See response to Q26

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

This was owned by Blue Circle who should have cleared the site. Should this organisation be targeted? Holcim Foundation for Sustainable Construction who are successors to Blue Circle.

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

None

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

The technical history must not be 'dumbed down'.

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

The consultation is fundamentally flawed as it leads one into providing a pro-development answer (akin to Highways roads consultations "which do you prefer, the pink or the blue route?"). None of the options given "will deliver a significantly enhanced landscape" that is truly sustainable, will meet the SDNP's zero carbon and waste or deliver on significant nature recovery. Any preferred development proposal may well be "feasible, attractive and viable", but that totally misses the point.

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

It is overtime to do something about it.

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

Within the Action Plan there is mention that access to the site has not been easy in the past due it would seem the reluctance of Dudman's to become directly involved with future development. It therefore seems necessary to obtain from Dudman's their own detailed development proposal for the site that can then be considered. The continuation of the existing usage is not acceptable because a major brownfield site within the South Downs National Park that is of national importance is currently not fulfilling its current and future potential.

(R211/session 57853; member of public)
Created July 27th 2022

The Shoreham Cement Works has been part of Upper Beeding for nearly 300 years and we hope that some progress can be made within the next 5 years to produce a plan and start to deliver something amazing for the site that will give the majority of stakeholders something that they want. We do not want the site to remain how it is for another 25Years. ANY DEVELOPMENT MUST ENSURE THAT THE DOWNSLINK IS MAINTAINED DURING CONSTRUCTION OR A TEMPORARY LINK PROVIDED IF THIS HAS TO BE TEMPORARILY CLOSED FOR ANY REASON

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

Please don't miss the opportunity here to do something great. It can so easily be another failed glossy homogenous development

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

27. The site is a one-off opportunity for SDNPA to create a unique development that enhances the natural landscape and minimises disruption from vehicular usage by incorporating good public transport and PROWS, enabling visitors access with minimum car use. It would seem an ideal opportunity to insist the site was in some way designated

zero carbon from an operational point of view, e.g. no gas in new housing, maximise use of renewables, water recycling, waste treatment.. It could be a showpiece of how things need to be done in the future.

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

It should not be detrimental to the wellbeing, needs and services that are available currently to the local community. It must integrate and compliment the local infrastructure

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

A sensitive development to suit the area and retain as much of the history of the area would be my preference. Shoreham Cement Works has been an iconic area for hundreds of years and any development should ensure that that its history is retained.

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

Would like, after so many years, to see progress!

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

Please don't develop it & fill it with homogeneous boxes.

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

Please don't allow this site to be developed. Manage its decline, allow nature to take over.

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

Something definitely needs to be done as it's currently an eyesore.

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

i am extremely disappointed by the lack of vision and constrained thinking of the national park Authority. This is a unique and large scale opportunity for the restoration of priority habitats in the National Park. It can deliver the purposes of a national park on a scale which is greater than any other site i know in the South Downs - and all in a way which can go hand-in hand with the purpose of building understanding and enjoyment

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

From the NP website Why do we need to ReNature the South Downs? This is an opportunity to renature the site and contribute to this objective.

(R130/session 57941; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Apart from housing accommodation, make this a "Day out to visit" Historic, Arts, leisure and sports venue being innovative, "modern and forward looking" in its ethos. For people to come to from miles around, be it by foot, bike, coach or car.

(R87/session 57957; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

No

(R163/session 57979; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

The Cement works is responsible for scarring the local landscape. It's industry, whilst necessary at the time, is now redundant and there is no need to celebrate its passing. Use the space in a way that most returns the area to it's original form whilst taking advantage of the changes that have already been made.

(R102/session 57990; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

It seems that new Riverside housing (mentioned in one proposal) would be very desirable and give massive ROI, but this would negate the huge potential for water-based activities - there is massive potential for housing within the bowl - so no need for riverside housing development. The Developers will be rubbing their hands with glee - they MUST be kept in check!

(R158/session 57982; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

My main concern is that the current road system and infrastructure will not support any major development.

(R58/session 60901; member of public)

Created **August 2nd 2022**

I am writing to wholeheartedly support the representations made to you by Sussex Ornithological Society (SOS) about the future of the Shoreham cement works site. I have looked at the Placechangers app on the consultation website but as I do not think the site should be developed I feel it is better to send this email with my views. I used to work in Lancing and visit the area using public transport to enjoy walks and botanising, butterflying etc. It is a gateway straight into to the wilder parts of the Downs and any developments would have a huge impact on the area visually and increase traffic and cause damage to the embattled wildlife in the area, already suffering and declining from so many factors. Anchor Bottom with its Adonis blue population and orchids adjacent to the cement works site is a real jewel of a place, partly protected by its distance from big developments and lots of people.

(R59/session 60902; Thames Water)

Created **August 2nd 2022**

We can confirm that Shoreham area is not in Thames Water catchment area however we have no comments to make on this one.

(R6/session 60903; Civil Aviation Authority (CAA))
Created August 2nd 2022

While the CAA does not have any comments to make on the plan, we do wish to ensure Shoreham aerodrome are consulted (cc'd). Safeguarding responsibility in planning cases rests with the aerodrome. We appreciate the above may already be covered. Thanks again for the communication.

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

The Cement Works have been part of Upper Beeding for nearly 300 years and we hope that some progress can be made within the next 5 years to produce a plan and start to deliver something amazing for the site that will give the majority of stakeholders something that they want. • We do not want the site to remain in its present derelict state for further decades. • ANY DEVELOPMENT MUST ENSURE THAT THE DOWNSLINK THROUGH ROUTE IS MAINTAINED DURING CONSTRUCTION, ACKNOWLEDGING THAT A TEMPORARY DIVERSION (NOT ON THE A283) MAY BE REQUIRED.

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

Overall, we are supportive of the aspirations of the AAP in trying to deliver a redevelopment of this site in a sustainable and landscape-led way. The site offers a unique opportunity to deliver a significant amount of housing in the National Park, but is also heavily constrained by the inhospitable topography and contamination of the former cement works, the scale of which is currently unknown. It is clear that vast external funding may be required to bring forward this site and every opportunity should be taken to find a use that works financially. This should not preclude the need to develop the site in a sensitive manner, but it does require open-mindedness about uses. In this sense we support a range of options being considered, but suspect that a very much greater quantum of development will be required to render this site viable. The document appears to suggest the landowner has not been involved in the AAP to date. For this site to be considered deliverable in planning terms, particularly for a Local Plan allocation, it would normally be expected for the landowner to confirm a willingness and ability to bring the site forward in the intended timeframe and to agree with the development type and quantum proposed. The AAP does not appear to confirm the achievability of the site given the unknown level and extent of contamination and the marginal viability of the options proposed. A housing-led scheme would be the most likely to be viable, as noted by the Authority's consultants, although it is unfortunate that affordable housing is unlikely to be achieved through the proposed options and scenarios. Without affordable housing, we would question how the development would create a mixed and balanced community, and whether it meets the test of acceptable major development in a National Park. If affordable housing cannot be delivered through the current options and scenarios, then we would recommend reconsidering the range and scale of uses proposed and potentially increase the quantum or density of development in the options until affordable housing delivery becomes viable. The document suggests (para 5.7) "It could also be argued that the site is not a suitable location for affordable housing given the distance to local facilities such as schools, health care and shops" but we question why the site's remoteness makes it unsuitable for affordable homes but suitable for open market housing. The site's remoteness from nearby settlements is however a key issue and increased public transport provision is essential to ensure that future residents are not reliant on the private car. As things stand any residents will have a high probability of car dependence and so a sustainable transport strategy for any future development should incorporate measures such as electric vehicle hire, shuttle services to Shoreham train station and excellent connections to the cycle network. Density appears to be approached in an unusual way also at paragraph 5.8, suggests a low-density scheme would attract the highest sales values and avoid the need

for public transport investment. We would suggest that public transport investment would be needed for any residential development at this site to render it acceptable in planning and sustainability terms, and whilst typical "low density" housing design may attract higher sales values per unit than flatted schemes, clearly in terms of land value a higher density residential development (being flats or townhouses) can often yield more revenue per hectare than low-rise houses. We do question the presumption that all buildings on site require demolition. There is a huge amount of embodied carbon within the existing buildings as well as likely contamination which may be best left in situ. Some structures (such as the main cement works building) offer an opportunity to respect the industrial history of the site and offer opportunity for re-use without complete removal and replacement. Residential amenity is also likely to be a concern as dwellings within the main cement works area will have limited daylight/sunlight and outlook given the topography, and residential gardens have been raised as a risk by the Authority's consultants due to high levels of ground contamination. It is also important to ensure that the riverside area connects functionally with the rest of the site to avoid two unrelated developments emerging.

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

When I look at the current management plan, which I was involved with as a Partnership member at the time, the following outcomes seem to be relevant and any AAP and scheme must address all of them • enhance natural beauty 1.1 • create green infrastructure 1.2 • improve soil and water 2.1 • joined up habitats 3.1 • promoting arts and crafts 4.2 is a potential option for a use within a multi use scheme • any scheme will need to address 5.1 (park for all) and 5.2 (accessibility) • transport 5.3 will be a material issue as the current road scheme and capacity are challenged and the site is quite isolated for residents • 6.1 - outdoor learning has to be an opportunity - as a scout leader and academy governor, I would see this as an essential ingredient of any plan and developed scheme • health and wellbeing - the site has to be an opportunity - 7 as well as mitigating dereliction risk as described below • volunteering - linked to our door learning - 8. to very clear, volunteering won't fix the site or develop it, but s part of the ongoing solution • great places to live - 9 - the site detracts form this a lot, driving to work or being tourists going past the site show we don't care and detract from the wonderful offer we have in the park and surrounding area - also see 10.2 (its a liability in that context) • vibrant community - 9.2 - the development needs to deliver one of the right size, noting the issues above • strengthen enterprise - 10.1 - we need to work out what sort of jobs we want of this site that add value to the local economy and resolve some of the challenge we were shown in the CWS meeting that was hosted at work see above - this all taking far too long

(R7/session 60914; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

I'm emailing you in regards to the recently seen article on the Sussex Express website, published at the end of May. Within the article is a paragraph stating "The action plan will cover biodiversity and ecology, landscape and design, recreation and tourism, the economy and jobs, new homes, cultural heritage, transport and climate change."

(R70/session 60915; Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Hampshire)
Created August 2nd 2022

Whilst we thank SDNPA for consulting CPRE Hampshire in this matter of interest to the whole of the national park, it is CPRE Sussex that has local knowledge of the site and the area. Accordingly, from a CPRE perspective CPRE Sussex has the CPRE lead in this matter. Having considered the Response of CPRE Sussex submitted to SDNPA, this Response is to state the support of CPRE Hampshire for the views there expressed.

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

I would like to add, as a local resident in the nearby locality of Southwick, I am very concerned at the additional pressures new housing will have on public resources. GP and Dentist services are stretched to their limits; finding an NHS dentist locally is very difficult. Pre-School and further education facilities are also stretched and government statements informed public services are grossly understaffed and recruitment is vital for sustainable public services. However, I would like to add that although I sympathise with the proposals and strategic vision on how to mitigate for the housing, commercial and leisure development of this site, I strongly oppose the development ideas put forward.

(R8/session 60918; Coal Authority)
Created August 2nd 2022

The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department of Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy. As a statutory consultee, the Coal Authority has a duty to respond to planning applications and development plans in order to protect the public and the environment in mining areas. As you are aware, South Downs National Park Authority lies outside the defined coalfield and therefore the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on your Local Plans / SPDs etc. In the spirit of ensuring efficiency of resources and proportionality, it will not be necessary for the Council to provide the Coal Authority with any future drafts or updates to the emerging Plans. This letter can be used as evidence for the legal and procedural consultation requirements at examination, if necessary.

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

We therefore would prefer to see a full ecological survey undertaken, the site cleaned up as necessary, and a wildlife enhancing project being carried forward by the SDNPA.

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

The site is within the 6Km crane circle associated to Brighton City Airport. Cranes have the potential to impact on the OLS, IFP's and Navigational Aids. Therefore prior to the erection of any cranes, full construction details should be provided to the airport to allow them to carry out the necessary Aerodrome Safeguarding assessments. Thank you once again for this opportunity for Brighton City Airport to provide comments on this action plan, which we hope you have found informative? We look forward to any future consultations through the maturity of this development.

(R19/session 60854; Gatwick Airport)
Created August 2nd 2022

It is vital that their safe operation is not impacted upon by buildings, structures or works which infringe the protected Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS), impact on navigational aids utilised by the airport, distracting or confusing lighting or by development which has the potential to increase the number of birds or the bird hazard risk. Please note this list is not exhaustive. The Shoreham Cement Works site is around 30km SSW from the Aerodrome Reference Point (ARP). It is outside of our current safeguarding zone for developments at (15km), however our safeguarding zone in relation to Instrument Flight Procedures (IFPs) is being extended out to 55km possibly later this year or early in 2023 (to be confirmed). Any building or structure exceeding 150m above ground level on this site will need to be referred to us for assessment.

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

Viability The BPS study initial testing found all development scenarios, with a policy compliant 50% affordable housing provision, to be insubstantial deficit (making a loss). The scenarios were still in deficit with 100% private market housing with no affordable housing provision. Sensitivity analysis undertaken by BPS, shows a 'best case' scenario where Development Scenario 2 makes a surplus (is viable) and Development Scenario 1 is close to breaking even. Development Scenarios 1 and 2 include 400 and 240 homes respectively. A number of options arising from the viability evidence: ● A 100% private market scheme to maximise viability ● A mixed tenure development with a small proportion of onsite affordable homes ● Development required to provide a financial contribution in-lieu of providing onsite affordable housing The Council therefore notes the viability issues relating to this site. **Environmental Health** The following Comments have been made by the Council's Environmental Protection Team: These comments concentrate on the stretch of the Cement works that falls within Adur. Ground contamination in this area would have to be ascertained, the land is old chalk pits and may be infilled with unknown material. The site is currently used for storage of vehicles and other tanks which may be a source of contamination. Finally, there was a significant fire there some years back which will be a source of contamination. Given the land's location next to the River Adur (Controlled Waters) the Environment Agency will need to be consulted on any development and proposed land remediation in this area. With any development Environmental Health would look at the potential health impacts this could have on the locality. For example increased traffic movements affecting air quality. Consideration here should be given to both the development stage and the end use. Given the location, in the National Park, consideration should be given to any lighting that will be part of the development to ensure that it is sympathetic to the environment. Noise will be a consideration during any demolition and construction phase of the development. Also noise from the existing road affecting any new residential development. From our records that development of this site has been previously looked at and thus the Council anticipates that conclusions in this former report may still be relevant today

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

In order for the opportunity the site presents to be fully exploited a really robust evidence base is needed. We suggest the AAP could set out clearly what steps are likely to be needed in order to achieve that. An important aspect will be 'future proofing', to ensure innovative solutions are found to environmental issues that are only now emerging. An example of that is making sure that potential to enhance green and blue infrastructure networks is recognised as outlined in 4.0 below. At the moment there appear to be significant gaps in the information gathered, not least because access to the site has been difficult. We believe the information is needed before a preferred option can be put

forward.

(R25/session 60865; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

Fourthly, your consultation does nothing to guide potential developers of the site (and similar sites within the Park), in countryside protection and sustainable development. I hope that revised proposals will soon be forthcoming which reflect the needs and potential of the area.

(R40/session 60882; National Trust)
Created August 2nd 2022

We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Issues & Options version of the Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan (AAP) and have the following comment to make. As owners of land to the north of the AAP area at Shoreham Gap and Southwick we have to objection 'in principle' to the land-use options currently presented within the issues and options report given the highly sensitive characteristics of The Clifflands, The Bowl and the Moonscape which proposes these areas remain largely undeveloped, with the greatest level of change being proposed at the Cement Works and Riverside areas. We will look to review your 'Preferred Approach' version of the AAP which will provide more specific detail for us to identify any direct impacts, on National Trust assets and to identify whether there will be any opportunities for creating links for biodiversity or access.

(R42/session 60884; Natural England)
Created August 2nd 2022

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England does not consider that this Area Action Plan poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation. The lack of comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may wish to make comments that might help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of any environmental risks and opportunities relating to this document. If you disagree with our assessment of this proposal as low risk, or should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, please consult Natural England again.

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

Thank you for taking your time to read my concerns, Sussex is not expanding in size, but is struggling to ensure it can provide something for everyone. Please do not shrink the industrial portfolio of the National Park, Arundel Station is as much as of a concern too.

(R54/session 60897; South Downs Network)
Created August 2nd 2022

We believe a number of our members will have submitted their comments by tonight. We would add to these comments this overarching response: We are very concerned that your consultants have not been allowed access to the site. This doesn't bode well for future cooperation aimed at removing the eyesore of the abandoned Shoreham cement works buildings and replacing them with a development which accords with National Park

policies. Until one understands the site in more detail this is not the time to consider such questions as contained in your survey as: • What type of public space, such as public squares, pocket parks and skateboard parks, would you like to see and why? • Do you think houses with gardens or flats or a mixture should be built? • Who do you think would be interested in living at the redeveloped Shoreham Cement Works? The resolution of what to do with this ugly site in the beautiful South Downs has been delayed for many years and perhaps it's now time for the National Park to 'bite the bullet' and seek a way to compulsory purchase the site. This would then leave the way open for a range of dynamic partners to be engaged in the development of the site along the lines of a national ecocentric centre similar to the Eden Project which would enhance the National Park whilst meeting the purposes and duty of the national park to the benefit of the whole nation.

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

Restoration SWT response is clear that the future options for the site need to strongly consider delivering biodiversity recovery as the core objective. Given the site has been used as a location to extract minerals, SWT are keen to understand more clearly what responsibilities, expectations and conditions were or are in place to restore the site following the ceasing of activity. We are aware that whilst permission for this site may well be historic, other mineral extraction sites across Sussex have their permission in place with Review of Mineral Permission (ROMP) which ensures that the requirement to deliver meaningful restoration is delivered. We are keen to know what the situation is for Shoreham Cement Works in terms of restoration or if there are any suggestions this site might actively be used for future extraction if development does not proceed?

(R66/session 60910; West Sussex County Council (WSCC))
Created August 2nd 2022

We have not covered Minerals and Waste matters in the attached but we would like to reiterate the below from our response to the SA/SEA scoping Report: Shoreham Cement Works is an inactive chalk quarry with remaining chalk reserves which are safeguarded by Policy M9 of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan. It also has an aggregate recycling facility which is safeguarded by Policy W2 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan. Reference should be made to these documents and the safeguarding of the site so that the SA/SEA considers the impact of the loss of the reserves and the waste facility.

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

The following constitutes CPRE's formal response to the 2022 consultation on the future options set out in the Area Action Plan (AAP) for the Shoreham Cement Works. CPRE welcomes this opportunity to contribute and acknowledges the, already, considerable effort put into the preparation of this AAP. Although CPRE Sussex is sometimes seen as an organisation predominantly concerned with protecting the countryside and combatting inappropriate housing and infrastructure developments, we place great importance of responding to climate change, to ending the war on nature and recovering its diversity at our core. Our task must be to fight for that human health and well being so dependent on sustainable relationships between town and country and the rebalancing of humanity as part of nature. This perspective underlies our approach to the challenge of Shoreham Cement Works (SCW). We recognise that that the inability to extensively survey the SCW leaves the SDNPA with serious problems given knowledge of the site being limited to drone footage and desk research and the levels of polluted and hazardous waste it contains unknown. This currently undermines the practicality of the available options. We feel that this limits the usefulness of CPRE's and other agencies responses to the consultation. We recognise that 'no development or doing nothing' is not an option and that the restoration of the site and even the extent of nature recovery and rewilding will be limited. We currently doubt that the options in the AAP constitute an effective vision on

which to comment, rather they constitute 'kites flying'. We also note the lack of any financial 'envelope' related to providing a backdrop to the viability of any development proposals. While the AAP contextualises the SCW in its spatial portrait, its setting so close to two long distance paths, to Mill Hill and Five Ways, suggests that only by planning for the local catchment of the SCW, including its riparian corridor, as a whole (possibly an area from the South Downs Way, Five Ways and Mill Hill, to the Adur riverside/Downs Link, from the river foot bridge back to the National Park's signage entrance at the A283 roadside sign from the A27). Unless at least the area of the possible impact on any changes resulting from the the AAP proposals are modelled, good intentions will be undermined. (We note in Para 1.4 writing of the boundaries, only landscape and transport infrastructure are mentioned) Just to reiterate, that as well as the wider social context for this site, the SCW needs to be seen by relating any AAP proposals to its local context and therefore develop a broader catchment and neighbourhood plan.

(R1 /session 60844; Adur Collective Community Land Trust)
Created August 2nd 2022

The unique nature of the site means that it is the perfect opportunity to showcase alternative ways of approaching development. The SDNPA is clear it wants this. In terms of housing using ACCLT to deliver a proportion of affordable housing would be a way to demonstrate a new approach and give something back to the community. The site has used the natural and shared resources of the South Downs to build a business which created jobs and a product which has shaped our built environment. In the process it has become one of the most significant landmarks hereabouts. Its now time for the landmark site to be creating jobs and shaping how people can live in different ways.

(R10/session 60845; Cycling UK Brighton and Hove)
Created August 2nd 2022

I am a representative of Cycling UK's Cycle Advocacy Network which aims to make cycling a safe, accessible, enjoyable and normal activity for people of all ages and abilities. Our interest covers cycling as a form of day-to-day transport and as a leisure activity, which can deliver health, economic, environmental, safety and quality of life benefits, both for individuals and society. Below, I am addressing the consultation questions most relevant to our concerns. There has been time pressure on this response, and I would welcome a further opportunity to respond.

(R13/session 60848; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

It seems very wrong to me that development of the site should even have been considered in the first place considering it's location in the Adur valley and directly within the Downland scarp itself. The National Park should always put nature first, not the profits of development firms. I hope you will seriously consider what the SOS has proposed and the points that it makes.

(R14/session 60849; Environment Agency Chichester)
Created August 2nd 2022

The Clifflands have known bat populations – construction work methods may have to be changed to reduce light pollution and disturbance. This will need careful management, particularly as the site is within an intrinsic zone of darkness in the Dark Sky Reserve and so is susceptible to light pollution which will affect the entire site area. However, we note that the Clifflands have been identified as unsuitable for any development due to cliff stability. Finally, any development and the associated works on the site may require a permit under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 from us for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 16 metres of the top of the

bank of the River Adur. This type of permit is called a 'Flood Risk Activity Permit'. Further details about Flood Risk Activity Permits can be found on the gov.uk website using the following link – <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits> A permit is separate to and in addition to any planning permission granted. The granting of planning permission does not necessarily lead to the granting of a permit, and we recommend early engagement with us as plans develop.

(R18/session 60853; Friends of the South Downs)

Created August 2nd 2022

The FSD is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the Area Action Plan; at this time this is a strategic matter thus we will not comment on matters of design and layout.

(R20/session 60856; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

I am very concerned about the impact of any redevelopment on the site. Hazards from demolition could be detrimental to those that live nearby. Also the disruption caused during a construction phase. I would like to see the site regenerated for wildlife. Not a construction that further pollutes the surrounding area and river. Southern water supposedly released sewage into the river upstream for a vast proportion of last year. The waterways and downs should be utmost protected and celebrated. People have for decades suggested something needs to be done. First and foremost the site requires remediation. I'd be wary about creating a cul-de-sac of unsupported housing. And constructing housing for housing's sake. There are far more appropriate sites. However temporary business units and an exemplary visitors centre could work.

(R21/session 60857; Greening Steyning)

Created August 2nd 2022

Linking habitat enhancement to the wildlife corridor proposed along the Adur Additional comment on covering email: If this is possible, we would like to be considered as official consultees as the process unfolds. We have a large local membership (over 1000 on our mailing list) and are close partners with all the local wildlife and conservation groups.

(R225/session 60861; member of public)

Created August 2nd 2022

I would like to see it as a museum showing how it used to be. I understand it was a state of the art factory when first built, so it would be fascinating to have this re created.

(R29/session 60869; Health and Safety Executive)
Created August 2nd 2022

HSE is not a statutory consultee for local and neighbourhood plans. If there is a nuclear installation within or nearby your local plan area we recommend you contact the Office of Nuclear Regulation. HSE has provided Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) with access to its LUP Web App <https://pa.hsl.gov.uk/> and downloadable GIS consultation zones. These tools alongside HSE's published methodology (<http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/>) can assist you in ensuring that land allocations do not conflict with major hazard sites and pipelines, licenced explosives sites and nuclear installations. Your attention is drawn to the planning policy guidance provided by your central planning departments in England, Scotland and Wales. For England: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/hazardous-substances> in particular paragraphs 65 to 69 which explain an LPAs responsibilities when taking public safety into account in planning decisions and formulating local plans.
Email: LOCAL.PLAN-CEMHD-5@hse.gov.uk

(R31/session 60872; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

We are very conservation minded, which is why we think the development of the cement works offers valuable opportunities to educate our younger generation about preserving the planet and its species, and to be made aware of climate change. I am concerned at the suggested redevelopments containing houses and other commercial structures that will not be able to return the site into a 'green' winning project. Our suggestion will return some natural beauty to this site rather than creating another sprawling brick and concrete landscape .

(R30/session 60871; Jim Miller Design)
Created August 2nd 2022

PLEASE make sure construction is Passivhaus!

(R34/session 60875; Lancing College)
Created August 2nd 2022

I am writing, in my capacity as [REDACTED] of Lancing College, in regard to the consultation around the Shoreham Cement Works. I have read the Area Action Plan and am very impressed by the comprehensive and thoughtful nature of the document. Unfortunately, the College's Governing Body have not had the chance to discuss this and in reality, are unlikely to come to any formal conclusion different to my rather generic reply which follows. I haven't attempted to answer the 28 consultation questions "as Lancing College" because the questions are very specific and members of the Governing Body are likely to have very different personal opinions which would be very hard, if not impossible, to distil down to an agreed organisational viewpoint.

(R35/session 60876; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

recently visited Bio parc zoo Doue-La-Fontaine in France which has sensitively been built into an old lime quarry. <https://www.bioparc-zoo.fr/>

(R4/session 60881; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

Could I ask you to correct the title 'Shoreham Cement Works'. It's correct title is 'Beeding

Cement Works'. Locals and certainly myself have known it as this for the last 68yrs so why change it now. Local knowledge is a great thing!

(R41/session 60883; National Air Traffic Services (NATS) Safeguarding)
Created August 2nd 2022

NATS operates no infrastructure in the vicinity of the site and anticipates no impact from any redevelopment. Accordingly, it has no comments to make on the Action Plan.

(R44/session 60886; member of public)
Created August 2nd 2022

With holes in the ground in short supply, might I suggest that the site is used for landfill (like at Beddingham). In time the site would be returned to natural Downland. The chimney could be used as part of a power unit (as established in the 1980's at New Cross and proposed at Beddington - Sutton/Croydon). Access for refuse vehicles not ideal but the A27 is close by.

(R46/session 60888; UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) - Chemicals London)
Created August 2nd 2022

As the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) are not a statutory consultee, we would not normally comment on this type of consultation unless there are specific chemical & environmental hazard concerns which have the potential to impact on the health of local communities. Impacts on public health from local air quality, noise and contaminated land fall under the remit of the local authority and it is their responsibility to decide whether or not to comment on these aspects of any plan or application. If the authority has any specific queries relating to potential impacts on public health from chemical & environmental hazard exposures as part of the area action plan or any future planning application, then they are welcome to contact us for advice.

(R47/session 60889; Police Hampshire)
Created August 2nd 2022

I note that the Shoreham Cement Works is within Sussex, as I work for Hampshire Constabulary, I am unable to comment on the document.

(R49/session 60891; Surrey County Council (SCC) Minerals & Waste)
Created August 2nd 2022

Having reviewed the consultation material I can confirm that we do not have any comments to make at this stage.

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

No. We will continue providing advice at later stages.

(R53/session 60896; Sompting Parish Council)
Created August 2nd 2022

I write on behalf of Sompting Parish Council who have agreed not to respond at this stage but to keep an active eye on any progress being made.

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

The Sussex Ornithological Society (SOS) is the county bird society for Sussex. We promote the recording, study, conservation and enjoyment of birds in the County, have over 2,000 members and a database of over 7 million records of birds in Sussex. More information about us can be found on our website at www.sos.org.uk.

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

Many thanks for the chance to comment on the Shoreham Cement Works AAP. This development presents a great opportunity showcase exemplar future proof planning - to include Pollution prevention, Biodiversity Net Gain and environmental best practice. There is a great opportunity here: - To showcase national and local policy aims in an attractive, highly visible and practical way - To demonstrate responsible development in a sensitive location (source protection zone) - To include pollution prevention and environmental best practice at an early stage, which is always easier and more effective than having to solve problems later. - To add value to the development of the site as a model for sustainability.

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

Why do we need more and more housing? Shoreham is slowly being filled up and ruined. No consideration is given to the existing residents. Will the developer be made to invest in Steyning, Shoreham, Upper Beeding and Bramber's infrastructure, ie, doctors, schools etc, or will they be allowed to get away with it, as Shoreham Council have allowed in the past?

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

It is a huge opportunity, that will be exciting to see move forward. I think that it would be good to see a place to visit really utilised here. Put the South Downs on the map. Also I want to confirm that I did work on this project up to 1st July 2022, but put in my comments after not working at the SDNPA.

Question 28: Based on the Issues and options set out in this document, what are your three top priorities for the redevelopment of Shoreham Cement Works that should feature in the Preferred Option and why?

(R85/session 53501; member of public)
Created June 7th 2022

Infrastructure (road,rail,water ect.) will almost certainly not be upgraded so minimum housing and concentrate on child friendly out door leisure.

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

Modernise, community, housing

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

60% employment and leisure along with 40% housing. It should be a welcoming place like Brighton arena.

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

1. A higher percentage of green space to urban space 'giving back' the countryside to wildlife. 2. Plant lots of trees please. 3. Create a template for future developments of sustainable living.

(R144/session 53798; member of public)
Created June 9th 2022

Riverside - improved public access, open spaces, improved biodiversity and wilding of the cement works in general, including wetlands and natural drainage Limiting development - this is a poor site for housing as no local services/schools for walking Improved routes for pedestrians and cyclists - improve Downs Link and the South Downs Way road crossing to the north

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

The top issue is any plan that adds yet more traffic to the A283 would be disastrous. I didn't see any option for a train or tramlink despite the site having been serviced for most of it's life by the railway

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

1. Maintain the natural habitat. 2. Give sustainable employment.3.Support sustainable housing

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

Housing because it will make it viable and deliverable financially. An exemplar and high quality scheme that will be a benefit to the wider area. A new landmark to replace the derelict and contaminated neglected place it is now

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

Rewilding. Wildlife management. Creating a world-leading post-industrial wild landscape, featuring the very best chalk Downland wildlife.

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

Natural Recovery, A Place to Visit, A Place to Live

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

- That the development has the wider infrastructure (including schools and shops) to support the development. - That good walks are created. - That the preferred option is more focused on business than housing.

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

Low traffic. enhance the natural environment. self sustaining and carbon neutral.

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

1. Build new houses 2. Build new houses 3. Build new houses

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

1. Key visitor attraction for main site, with 2. ample parking and 3. protected views of the Downs all around

(R119/session 54505; member of public)
Created **June 17th 2022**

Employment, nature recovery, leisure/recreation

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

Environment, biodiversity, ecology

(R145/session 54557; member of public)

Created June 19th 2022

1) Should be linked to a larger plan that involves the symbiotic development of Shoreham Airport and the River Adur, 2) should become a major hub on the Southdowns Way rather than only the YHA and Upper Beeding pubs, 3) attractive river access to the site should be a feature for tourists

(R164/session 54096; member of public)

Created June 21st 2022

Make the site safe and minimum cost and return it where possible to nature as it used to be before cement production started

(R129/session 54811; member of public)

Created June 23rd 2022

it should combine leisure, some commercial and excellent green residential - all within a heavily wooded setting utilising renewables so that it is totally carbon neutral...

(R139/session 54943; member of public)

Created June 24th 2022

1. Make as much use as possible of the beautiful site. Countryside all around and the river frontage which could really add to the appeal of living there. 2. Do not allow it to become a manufacturing site, it should be primarily a residential area but have employment opportunities as well 3. Improve the main road so that it does not become a dangerous bottleneck

(R186/session 55093; member of public)

Created June 28th 2022

Of the four options proposed, I would prefer option 2 - Mixed use scheme with employment and 240 new homes. 400 homes feels too many for the local infrastructure to cope with. Fewer homes might make it less viable for a developer. I don't think a big visitor attraction would work.

(R219/session 55134; Greening Steyning)

Created June 29th 2022

Sustainability Biodiversity Enhanced public transport

(R178/session 55138; member of public)

Created June 29th 2022

Leisure facilities (including employment opportunities) Business park Homes

(R172/session 55230; member of public)

Created July 2nd 2022

Safe for all Downs Link access. A balance of housing, leisure and businesses sympathetic to National Park setting. Retain history in access and information, especially to the cliffs, but not in the buildings.

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

Focus on Nature recovery in all areas of the development Promote public access to nature and the river Traffic reduction to stop car use.

(R188/session 55268; member of public)
Created July 4th 2022

One priority: The inclusion of community-owned housing as proposed by the Adur Collective Community Land Trust.

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

Affordable housing(see above answer) mixed use - so that residents dont have to drive to get what they need to live, environmentally sustainable development for obvious reasons.

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

1. Protection, conservation and enhancement of biodiversity. 2. Residential and industrial development that is totally sympathetic to the biodiversity needs of the area. 3. Nesting enhancements, such as a benchmark Swift nesting project on the chimney, to be incorporated into the building scheme.

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

1. no residential housing development 2. no residential housing development 3. no residential housing development I am convinced that allowing a residential housing development will be the beginning of the end for the beautiful, peaceful, therapeutic local section of the national park that I cherish so greatly. We are very lucky to have such a wonderful asset in Sussex so please, please, PLEASE don't let that be destroyed.

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

1 Enhance the area for tourism, jobs and leisure. 2 Provide innovative sustainable transport options to and from and within the site. 3 Don't just build expensive homes on the riverside.

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

None. I don't agree with any.

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

1. Retain, protect and develop the SSI elements of the site 2. Return the area to Downland style village development, including renewable energy generation/ other forms of sustainability 3. Maximise local access to Downland, river and Downs link

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

1) removal of industrial buildings and chimney 2) enabling / encouraging light/green industry 3) minimising any development outside of the riverside and cement works areas

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

1) remove ugly buildings 2) restore landscape to nature 3) provide leisure use rather than industrial / housing

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

Sustainability, one time development

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

Providing opportunities for small businesses and local individuals. and outdoor attractions that will provide facilities for local individuals as well as attracting people from further afield

(R113/session 55940; member of public)
Created July 12th 2022

Leisure facilities, minimise environmental impact. Minimise housing unless it has strong green credentials.

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

1. Enjoyable for the local community. 2. Remembering what was there before the site is transformed. 3. A variety of opportunities. In order to entice visitors and companies. Don't let this fail like the i360 has.

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

Protect the environment, no industrial development, consider access and egress of the A283

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

Nature recovery, cultural heritage, a place to live.

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

1) Get rid of the ugly buildings (with the exception of the chimney); 2) Create a mix of affordable, energy efficient, shared housing (low level flats) and commercial spaces on the riverside and cement works; 3) Create things to attract visitors (cafe, restaurant, outdoor

activities centres, BMX park).

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

Protection and enhancement of the ecology of the area, especially to the east of the site. Development design that is sympathetic to the environment within which it sits, and the wider context, especially in terms of how it would be seen from the SDW to the west. Sustainability both in terms of impact on climate and environment, but also in terms of developing this as a community.

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

Sensitivity to the environment, the setting, to the effects of climate change. Trees and green spaces.

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

See above

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

A development proposal that is feasible, attractive and viable, to accommodate human & compliment the wildlife.

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

Green development, taking care of nature, pleasant place to live & work

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

1. Remove every last trace of the current eyesore, and enhance the current bio-diversity development.....before you even proceed with plans. 2. Create the Riverside housing element and the first of the necessary roundabouts to give that access. This will provide on-going capital foundations for supporting the work to develop the eastern side of the road - you may have to do the second roundabout on the assumption that something will happen to support this, eventually - see above about 'incremental' development. 3. Ensure that the new residents in the riverside area then begin to develop some ownership of the development, and allow them significant voices to both suggest and engage with what might be proposed on the other side of the road.

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

maintain as much of the industrial heritage as possible maintain and enhance biodiversity and natural beauty don't create a burden on local infrastructure

(R168/session 56899; member of public)

Created July 23rd 2022

Affordable housing - to help meet housing need in the NP area Energy and resource efficiency - in the interests of sustainability Good quality, sympathetic design - to fit with the ethos of the SDNP

(R79/session 56961; member of public)

Created July 25th 2022

That there is not crammed housing, that a less is more approach taken to try and preserve the beauty of it all. that its something that in decades to come wont be another eye sore but will still be attractive

(R198/session 56976; British Horse Society)

Created July 25th 2022

See response to Q26

(R195/session 56984; member of public)

Created July 25th 2022

I do not think that the high priorities which should apply to the site will be achievable under present NPFs and development frameworks due to the state the site is in. 1) Mixed housing built unsustainably 2) part of site to remain very lightly managed for bio-diversity 2) Only keep buildings which have high merit and / or are re-usable.

(R101/session 56990; member of public)

Created July 25th 2022

Use the riverside 'brown site for housing, use the Cement site sympathetically for housing, infrastructure and businesses and opportunities and maintain most of the rest of the site whilst incorporating recreation opportunities, a café and SDNP welcome centre

(R212/session 57028; member of public)

Created July 25th 2022

Explanation of the reason that the site exists; a place to learn about the past; a place where people will want to live.

(R184/session 57024; member of public)

Created July 25th 2022

None, see Q1.

(R221/session 57159; member of public)

Created July 26th 2022

Leisure led mixed development Cost effectiveness, ie profitable to attract investment Good for the National Park

(R103/session 56917; member of public)

Created July 26th 2022

Housing (240), Employment and Landscaping.

(R211/session 57853; member of public)
Created July 27th 2022

a A plan that meets the wishes and wants of the community and SDNP. A plan that can be funded and agreed by the current land owner and move forward. A plan that HDC, Adur Council, the Government, SDNP and other Governing Bodies involved can support and ensure agreement and progress involving those other site proposers (Bill Dudman, Bill Dunster & Shoreham Project) in producing one agreed way forward.

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

keep it as green and ecofriendly as possible

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

Net zero. Bioersivity net gain. Industrial preservation through recreation, health and wellbeing.

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

28. Focus on enhancing nature/ bio diversity on site, maximise the cultural heritage of the site, ensure any residential development incorporates the appropriate infrastructure that results in a self-sufficient community.

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

limited residential, 200 homes Business park for high tech companies High recreation use and access

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

Retain bio and geo diversity. No dense, overdevelopment of the area. Any developm of the Riverbank, which seems the preferred area for housing development, should sensitive and NOT an eyesore like the North Ropetacle site.

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

Landscape, sensible green credentials, no overdevelopment. Do not feel it is appropriate for a hideous site to be turned into something similar.

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

Protecting the landscape. and environment. Ecological sustainability. Building and safeguarding social cohesion.

(R76/session 57798; member of public)

Created **July 30th 2022**

Nature conservation, re-wilding, protecting the flora & fauna that live there

(R76/session 57798; member of public)

Created **July 30th 2022**

Nature conservation & protection

(R222/session 57864; member of public)

Created **July 31st 2022**

Improving/enhancing the biodiversity of the area, visitor facility to showcase the biodiversity, option with fewer homes (if less than 100 option was dismissed, then the option with 200 is preferred)

(R96/session 57924; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

1. Chalk habitat restoration - this is a priority habitat, it is a unique and major opportunity for nature recovery in line with the national park purpose 2. Enhanced public access for quiet enjoyment and an opportunity to increase awareness of the important habitats

(R126/session 57939; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

None. They are unambitious and do not contribute to the primary purposes of the NP.

(R130/session 57941; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Preserving and enhancing the historic and natural environment. Making a pleasant place for living. Bringing in visitors.

(R87/session 57957; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Nature recovery, community, cultural heritage

(R202/session 57977; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

minimise traffic impact, making the space a mixed use national park space, developing the bowl into a natural amphitheatre entertainment space

(R163/session 57979; member of public)

Created **August 1st 2022**

Minimise further impacts on the local environment. Redevelop in a sustainable way that is inspiring and educational. Provide facilities to the local community that are not reliant on people's wealth.

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

Promote sustainable leisure industry, Preserve and enhance the natural environment,
Create a healthy place to live and work.

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

1. High quality environment-led design; 2. Low density buildings; 3. Hotel & outdoor sports / leisure activities focus.

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

Plan for transport; plan for conservation and enhancement of biodiversity/existing wildlife; effects of development on local residents (contamination, traffic, water - the area isn't on mains sewage, noise)

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

A plan that meets the wishes and needs of the community, and is acceptable to SDNPA, HDC (95% of the site), ADC (5% of the site), other Government Departments and Agencies.
• Joint progress involving those other site proposers (Bill Dudman, Bill Dunster & the Shoreham Project) in producing one agreed way forward. • A plan that can be funded, agreed by the current land owner, and then progressed.

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

1. Demonstrate that any options considered are financially viable and consider a wider range or scale of potential uses if necessary. 2. Ensure appropriate affordable housing delivery with any residential development. 3. Ensure excellent sustainable transport links to nearby towns and employment opportunities.

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

see above for reasoning 1: clean safe site (no blight) within a year, 2: mixed use development which is economically and ecologically viable, 3 sustainable community in and around the site

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

No comments

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

In his introduction to the AAP, Ian Phillips writes of opportunities for 'visionary development proposals', 'incorporating innovative landscape, architecture and engineering design and enhanced public access'. He recognises the the need to be 'financially viable',

addressing 'practical constraints' producing 'solutions that will be imaginative, inspirational and deliverable'. CPRE shares in all these ambitions but expects responding to the climate emergency and nature recovery, contributing to environmental improvement and soil health, to gain greater salience in the SDNPA's ambitions for the SCW. However the AAP acknowledges that the Park's consultants have not yet had access to the site, so detailed knowledge of the levels of asbestos, poisoned ground, hazardous waste and ecology are severely limited. Realistic options for developing the site are currently incomplete and many Consultation questions therefore irrelevant. Unless there are plans for acquiring and developing this site, together with some outline costings and strategic investment options, commenting on this AAP is surely premature.

(R1 /session 60844; Adur Collective Community Land Trust)
Created August 2nd 2022

1. Community led affordable housing which puts sustainability at its heart because thriving communities need to have places where people on low to middle incomes can flourish and this is becoming almost impossible in Adur. 2. Frequent connective public transport links because communities should be designed around people with minimal harm to the environment and not cars. 3. Beautiful design which fits well in its environment and sets new standards because this is what the local community wants.

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

On-site pollution is a concern. A sustainable carbon neutral development that celebrates the chalk downlands and river.

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

Sustainability – in a world that is facing a climate crisis and growing evidence of the impacts of plastic pollution on our planet, wildlife and our own health, looking to projects that deliver against our needs today without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs is not only essential but a moral obligation. Biodiversity – the biodiversity crisis, intrinsically linked to the climate crisis, could lead to ecological collapse from which our ecosystem (our life support system) may never recover. In one of the most nature depleted countries in the world we must consider wildlife in every aspect of planned and development if we are to halt the massive decline we have seen in many species in recent years. Enhanced public transport – public transport not only offers benefits from a sustainability stand point but would also reduce the traffic burden on what is already a very busy road.

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

1. Exemplary in terms of sustainable performance. 2. Landscape-led design. 3. Accessible and inclusive

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

No housing or large scale business plan. Only nature related development. Nothing that will increase traffic, or put pressure on nearby residents' infrastructure, which is probably already strained.

(R91/session 55861; member of public)

Created **August 2nd 2022**

Carbon neutral Mix of homes and employment plus leisure uses that take people beyond the site and connect to the coast and the National Park good connectivity for road, cycle, walking and digital connectivity

(R223/session 58070; member of public)

Created **August 2nd 2022**

Habitat sensitivity is respected. Developments are environmentally and ecologically sound, future proofing for climate change. The natural and industrial history are integral.

(R224/session 58050; member of public)

Created **August 2nd 2022**

Return the site to nature as much as possible, minimise housing development, turn the buildings into something amazing that will inspire visitors