

Bexhill Future

A choice of designs for a vibrant seaside community

Questionnaire Results



for
Sea Space
Hastings & Bexhill Renaissance
April 2004

Contents

1. Introduction

2. Headline results

3. Questionnaire returns analysis sheets

4. Tick box input sheets

5. Tick box summary sheets

6. Comments transcript

7. The questionnaire

Introduction

- 1 This report contains the results from self-completion questionnaires which form one aspect of public consultation on Masterplan proposals for Bexhill Town Centre, East Sussex, and a proposed new development on the former Metropole seafront site next to the De La Warr Pavilion.
- 2 Alternative designs prepared by three architectural teams were exhibited for 7 days at 29-31 Marina, Bexhill. Visitors were invited to complete the questionnaires and place them in a ballot box at the exhibition. Staff from Sea Space were present at the exhibition at all times to help people interpret the displays and respond to queries.
- 3 The questionnaires contained two aspects:
 - a) Tick boxes to allow people to indicate their preference for the schemes in relation to 5 questions; two on the Masterplan and three on the proposed new seafront development;
 - b) Space for people to make additional written comments on any aspects of the proposals.

Personal data was requested to allow a breakdown of the responses by age, by which ward in Bexhill people live in or, if a visitor to Bexhill, the purpose of the visit. (The questionnaire is attached at the end of the report.)

- 4 The data has been set out comprehensively in such a way that further analysis can be easily undertaken by any of the interested parties involved. Some overall headline results are provided in the next section.

Headline results

- 1 856 completed questionnaires were returned. 747 of these (87%) were from Bexhill residents; the remainder were from visitors (for work 12, leisure 53, study 2, shopping 6, other 36).

- 2 Respondents were weighted towards the older age groups as follows:

under 12	9 (1%)
13-19	30 (4%)
20-39	88 (10%)
40-60	286 (33%)
over 60	351 (41%)
unspecified	92 (11%)

- 3 704 respondents (82.2%) used the tick boxes to indicate their preference - from the three options - for a Masterplan scheme for the town centre;

700 respondents (81.8%) used the tick boxes to indicate their preference - from the three options - for a new seafront development scheme;

125 respondents (14.6%) did not complete any tick boxes.

- 4 Overall preferences for the town centre Masterplan schemes indicated by tick box voting were as follows:

ABK	40%;
Aukett	31%;
Chapman Taylor	29%.

- 5 Overall preferences for the new seafront development on the Metropole site indicated by tick box voting were as follows:

ABK	43%;
Aukett	25%;
Chapman Taylor	32%.

- 6 For both the town centre masterplan and the new seafront development, the preference patterns were broadly similar for different age groups, for those from different wards and from residents and non residents. However, younger people were slightly more enthusiastic about Aukett and less keen on Chapman Taylor than the older age groups.
- 7 659 of the 856 returned questionnaires (77%) included written comments containing over 37,000 words.
- 8 Some key results from the written comments are as follows:
 - a. 210 (25%) expressed opposition to any development on the Metropole site.
 - b. 152 (18%) expressed considerable enthusiasm for one or all the new seafront development schemes shown.
 - c. 126 (15%) expressed concern that the new seafront development schemes shown were too bulky or tall but did not express opposition to development on the Metropole site in principle;
 - d. 116 (14%) expressed support for the town centre masterplan proposals in general. Only a handful expressed any objections.
 - e. 60 (7%) suggested the new seafront development, if needed, should be located on an alternative site; for instance in Sackville Road (32) or the old 'Grand' site.
 - f. 53 (6%) stated the importance of improving parking.
 - g. 35 (4%) stated that station improvements were a priority.
 - h. 32 (4%) stated the need to improve transport links to and from Bexhill.

- i. 28 (3%) expressed support for a new pier.
- j. 28 (3%) mentioned disliking the north wall of the ABK new seafront development scheme.
- k. 26 (3%) mentioned the need for more activities for young people.
- l. 18 (2%) stated that the De La Warr Pavilion should be refurbished before anything else was done.
- m. 12 (1%) mentioned the importance of improving pavements.
- n. 11(1%) expressed support for a spa.
- o. 9 (1%) mentioned the need for a swimming pool.

Note: Care needs to be taken in interpreting these results. It is important to remember that this information was provided, unprompted, in the 'Additional Comments' box on the questionnaire and was not in response to specific questions. So the fact that, say, 25% of respondents expressed a particular view does not imply that 75% hold the opposite view. Or that only 25% would take that view if asked directly.

- 10 A vast number of observations and suggestions were made relating to detailed aspects of the schemes as well as to general improvements needed in Bexhill as a whole. The responses require detailed study beyond the scope of this present report.

BEXHILL FUTURE - QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS ANALYSIS SHEETS

Category	Age group	Questionnaires returned
Bexhill residents:		
Central Ward	under 12	1
	13-19	4
	20-39	30
	40-60	45
	over 60	56
	unspecified	4
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	140
Collington Ward	under 12	1
	13-19	7
	20-39	12
	40-60	29
	over 60	58
	unspecified	6
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	113
Kewhurst Ward	under 12	0
	13-19	0
	20-39	4
	40-60	15
	over 60	22
	unspecified	2
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	43
Old Town Ward	under 12	2
	13-19	3
	20-39	3
	40-60	21
	over 60	21
	unspecified	13
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	63
Sackville Ward	under 12	1
	13-19	0
	20-39	4
	40-60	13
	over 60	26
	unspecified	4
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	48

Category	Age group	Questionnaires returned
Bexhill residents (cont):		
St Marks Ward	under 12	1
	13-19	3
	20-39	2
	40-60	21
	over 60	26
	unspecified	4
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	57
St Michaels Ward	under 12	0
	13-19	2
	20-39	1
	40-60	14
	over 60	22
	unspecified	1
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	40
St Stephens Ward	under 12	2
	13-19	4
	20-39	7
	40-60	19
	over 60	26
	unspecified	7
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	65
Sidley Ward	under 12	0
	13-19	1
	20-39	2
	40-60	11
	over 60	19
	unspecified	2
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	35
Ward unspecified	under 12	0
	13-19	3
	20-39	5
	40-60	43
	over 60	44
	unspecified	48
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	143
Bexhill residents total	under 12	8
	13-19	27
	20-39	70
	40-60	231
	over 60	320
	unspecified	91
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	747

Category	Age group	Questionnaires returned
People visiting Bexhill for:		
Work	under 12	0
	13-19	0
	20-39	1
	40-60	10
	over 60	1
	unspecified	0
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	<u>12</u>
Leisure	under 12	1
	13-19	0
	20-39	6
	40-60	30
	over 60	16
	unspecified	0
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	<u>53</u>
Study	under 12	0
	13-19	1
	20-39	0
	40-60	0
	over 60	1
	unspecified	0
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	<u>2</u>
Shopping	under 12	0
	13-19	0
	20-39	1
	40-60	1
	over 60	4
	unspecified	0
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	<u>6</u>
Other	under 12	0
	13-19	2
	20-39	10
	40-60	14
	over 60	9
	unspecified	1
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	<u>36</u>
Total responses	under 12	9
	13-19	30
	20-39	88
	40-60	286
	over 60	351
	age unspecified	92
	<u>total (all ages)</u>	<u>856</u>

BEXHILL FUTURE - QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS - TICK BOX INPUT SHEETS

Analysis of tick box responses

First choice = 2 points. Second choice = 1 point. Third choice = 0 points
 Hashes indicate that percentage cannot be calculated because of zero inputs.

Masterplan for Bexhill Town Centre
1. Which scheme do you like most?

Question	Category	Age group	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total points
			No	%	No	%	No	%	
MP 1	Central	under 12	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
		13-19	6	60	2	20	2	20	10
		20-39	23	38	23	38	14	23	60
		40-60	45	51	19	22	24	27	88
		over 60	42	34	39	32	42	34	123
		unspecified	2	25	4	50	2	25	8
		total (all ages)	118	41	89	31	84	29	291
MP 1	Collington	under 12	1	33	2	67	0	0	3
		13-19	12	57	7	33	2	10	21
		20-39	11	39	11	39	6	21	28
		40-60	35	50	20	29	15	21	70
		over 60	36	36	27	27	38	38	101
		unspecified	4	27	5	33	6	40	15
		total (all ages)	99	42	72	30	67	28	238
MP 1	Kewhurst	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	5	42	5	42	2	17	12
		40-60	10	36	11	39	7	25	28
		over 60	18	42	9	21	16	37	43
		unspecified	2	67	0	0	1	33	3
		total (all ages)	35	41	25	29	26	30	86
MP 1	Old Town	under 12	0	0	2	33	4	67	6
		13-19	3	33	3	33	3	33	9
		20-39	2	40	3	60	0	0	5
		40-60	20	39	14	27	17	33	51
		over 60	21	41	13	25	17	33	51
		unspecified	3	23	5	38	5	38	13
		total (all ages)	49	36	40	30	46	34	135
MP 1	Sackville	under 12	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	7	70	2	20	1	10	10
		40-60	14	52	8	30	5	19	27
		over 60	26	43	16	27	18	30	60
		unspecified	2	33	0	0	4	67	6
		total (all ages)	51	49	26	25	28	27	105

Question	Category	Age group	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total points
			No	%	No	%	No	%	
MP 1	St Marks	under 12	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		13-19	3	33	4	44	2	22	9
		20-39	1	33	2	67	0	0	3
		40-60	21	50	15	36	6	14	42
		over 60	20	44	7	16	18	40	45
		unspecified	3	38	2	25	3	38	8
		total (all ages)	50	46	30	28	29	27	109
MP 1	St Michaels	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	3	50	2	33	1	17	6
		20-39	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
		40-60	13	37	11	31	11	31	35
		over 60	9	24	17	45	12	32	38
		unspecified	2	50	2	50	0	0	4
		total (all ages)	27	32	34	40	24	28	85
MP 1	St Stephens	under 12	0	0	1	20	4	80	5
		13-19	1	8	8	67	3	25	12
		20-39	8	44	9	50	1	6	18
		40-60	17	47	6	17	13	36	36
		over 60	24	50	6	13	18	38	48
		unspecified	7	35	6	30	7	35	20
		total (all ages)	57	41	36	26	46	33	139
MP 1	Sidley	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		20-39	2	40	1	20	2	40	5
		40-60	12	44	5	19	10	37	27
		over 60	17	53	3	9	12	38	32
		unspecified	0	0	3	50	3	50	6
		total (all ages)	33	45	13	18	27	37	73
MP 1	Ward unspecified	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	4	44	5	56	0	0	9
		20-39	2	20	8	80	0	0	10
		40-60	31	34	37	40	24	26	92
		over 60	32	37	24	28	31	36	87
		unspecified	25	34	23	32	25	34	73
		total (all ages)	94	35	97	36	80	30	271
MP 1	Bexhill residents total	under 12	5	25	7	35	8	40	20
		13-19	34	43	32	41	13	16	79
		20-39	61	40	66	43	26	17	153
		40-60	218	44	146	29	132	27	496
		over 60	245	39	161	26	222	35	628
		unspecified	50	32	50	32	56	36	156
		total (all ages)	613	40	462	30	457	30	1532

Question	Category	Age group	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total points
			No	%	No	%	No	%	
MP 1	Work	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		40-60	12	41	6	21	11	38	29
		over 60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	14	44	7	22	11	34	32
MP 1	Leisure	under 12	1	33	2	67	0	0	3
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	6	60	0	0	4	40	10
		40-60	30	45	26	39	11	16	67
		over 60	12	55	8	36	2	9	22
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	49	48	36	35	17	17	102
MP 1	Study	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	0	2	67	1	33	3
		20-39	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		40-60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		over 60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	0	0	2	67	1	33	3
MP 1	Shopping	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	1	33	2	67	0	0	3
		40-60	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		over 60	4	50	2	25	2	25	8
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	7	54	4	31	2	15	13
MP 1	Other	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	4	80	1	20	0	0	5
		20-39	9	35	10	38	7	27	26
		40-60	16	48	6	18	11	33	33
		over 60	8	42	5	26	6	32	19
		unspecified	0	0	0	0	2	100	2
		total (all ages)	37	44	22	26	26	31	85
MP 1	Total ind responses	under 12	6	26	9	39	8	35	23
		13-19	38	44	35	40	14	16	87
		20-39	79	41	79	41	37	19	195
		40-60	278	44	184	29	165	26	627
		over 60	269	40	176	26	232	34	677
		unspecified	50	32	50	32	58	37	158
		total (all ages)	720	41	533	30	514	29	1767

Masterplan for Bexhill Town Centre

2. The aim of regeneration is to create more prosperous, attractive and vibrant communities. Which scheme do you think could best achieve this for Bexhill?

Question	Category	Age group	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total points
			No	%	No	%	No	%	
MP 2	Central	under 12	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
		13-19	3	27	4	36	4	36	11
		20-39	23	40	24	41	11	19	58
		40-60	19	31	21	34	22	35	62
		over 60	62	46	27	20	45	34	134
		unspecified	0	0	4	67	2	33	6
		total (all ages)	107	39	82	30	84	31	273
MP 2	Collington	under 12	1	33	2	67	0	0	3
		13-19	10	53	9	47	0	0	19
		20-39	14	50	11	39	3	11	28
		40-60	32	52	12	20	17	28	61
		over 60	33	36	22	24	37	40	92
		unspecified	3	20	7	47	5	33	15
		total (all ages)	93	43	63	29	62	28	218
MP 2	Kewhurst	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	5	42	5	42	2	17	12
		40-60	10	34	11	38	8	28	29
		over 60	14	38	12	32	11	30	37
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	29	37	28	36	21	27	78
MP 2	Old Town	under 12	0	0	2	33	4	67	6
		13-19	0	0	3	60	2	40	5
		20-39	8	73	0	0	3	27	11
		40-60	8	23	10	29	17	49	35
		over 60	25	48	12	23	15	29	52
		unspecified	2	20	6	60	2	20	10
		total (all ages)	43	36	33	28	43	36	119
MP 2	Sackville	under 12	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	8	80	1	10	1	10	10
		40-60	8	32	12	48	5	20	25
		over 60	25	45	12	21	19	34	56
		unspecified	2	25	2	25	4	50	8
		total (all ages)	43	43	29	29	29	29	101

Question	Category	Age group	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total points
			No	%	No	%	No	%	
MP 2	St Marks	under 12	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		13-19	5	56	4	44	0	0	9
		20-39	1	33	2	67	0	0	3
		40-60	18	45	17	43	5	13	40
		over 60	13	38	7	21	14	41	34
		unspecified	2	25	4	50	2	25	8
		total (all ages)	41	43	34	35	21	22	96
MP 2	St Michaels	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	3	50	2	33	1	17	6
		20-39	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
		40-60	12	40	9	30	9	30	30
		over 60	10	27	15	41	12	32	37
		unspecified	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		total (all ages)	27	35	28	36	22	29	77
MP 2	St Stephens	under 12	1	20	0	0	4	80	5
		13-19	3	25	7	58	2	17	12
		20-39	6	30	12	60	2	10	20
		40-60	16	48	4	12	13	39	33
		over 60	22	42	17	33	13	25	52
		unspecified	5	42	1	8	6	50	12
		total (all ages)	53	40	41	31	40	30	134
MP 2	Sidley	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		20-39	0	0	4	80	1	20	5
		40-60	9	41	4	18	9	41	22
		over 60	15	52	4	14	10	34	29
		unspecified	0	0	1	33	2	67	3
		total (all ages)	26	42	14	23	22	35	62
MP 2	Ward unspecified	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	4	44	5	56	0	0	9
		20-39	2	20	8	80	0	0	10
		40-60	33	38	34	39	21	24	88
		over 60	22	33	18	27	27	40	67
		unspecified	16	26	27	44	18	30	61
		total (all ages)	77	33	92	39	66	28	235
MP 2	Bexhill residents total	under 12	4	20	8	40	8	40	20
		13-19	30	41	35	47	9	12	74
		20-39	67	42	69	43	23	14	159
		40-60	165	39	134	32	126	30	425
		over 60	241	41	146	25	203	34	590
		unspecified	32	26	52	42	41	33	125
		total (all ages)	539	39	444	32	410	29	1393

Question	Category	Age group	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total points
			No	%	No	%	No	%	
MP 2	Work	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		40-60	10	38	8	31	8	31	26
		over 60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	12	41	9	31	8	28	29
MP 2	Leisure	under 12	0	0	1	33	2	67	3
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	6	60	2	20	2	20	10
		40-60	25	41	26	43	10	16	61
		over 60	11	65	4	24	2	12	17
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	42	46	33	36	16	18	91
MP 2	Study	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	0	2	67	1	33	3
		20-39	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		40-60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		over 60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	0	0	2	67	1	33	3
MP 2	Shopping	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	1	33	2	67	0	0	3
		40-60	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		over 60	4	57	2	29	1	14	7
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	7	58	4	33	1	8	12
MP 2	Other	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		20-39	13	50	8	31	5	19	26
		40-60	13	41	8	25	11	34	32
		over 60	9	41	3	14	10	45	22
		unspecified	0	0	0	0	2	100	2
		total (all ages)	37	44	20	24	28	33	85
MP 2	Total ind responses	under 12	4	17	9	39	10	43	23
		13-19	32	40	38	48	10	13	80
		20-39	89	44	82	41	30	15	201
		40-60	215	39	176	32	155	28	546
		over 60	265	42	155	24	216	34	636
		unspecified	32	25	52	41	43	34	127
		total (all ages)	637	39	512	32	464	29	1613

New seafront development on the former Metropole Site

1. Which scheme do you like most?

Question	Category	Age group	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total points
			No	%	No	%	No	%	
NSD 1	Central	under 12	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
		13-19	4	36	5	45	2	18	11
		20-39	24	39	21	34	17	27	62
		40-60	44	51	17	20	25	29	86
		over 60	37	32	29	25	48	42	114
		unspecified	4	50	2	25	2	25	8
		total (all ages)	113	40	76	27	94	33	283
NSD 1	Collington	under 12	1	33	2	67	0	0	3
		13-19	12	57	7	33	2	10	21
		20-39	9	32	9	32	10	36	28
		40-60	35	55	13	20	16	25	64
		over 60	42	42	16	16	42	42	100
		unspecified	4	40	3	30	3	30	10
		total (all ages)	103	46	50	22	73	32	226
NSD 1	Kewhurst	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	5	42	3	25	4	33	12
		40-60	13	45	7	24	9	31	29
		over 60	16	38	6	14	20	48	42
		unspecified	2	67	0	0	1	33	3
		total (all ages)	36	42	16	19	34	40	86
NSD 1	Old Town	under 12	1	17	3	50	2	33	6
		13-19	3	33	3	33	3	33	9
		20-39	2	40	3	60	0	0	5
		40-60	22	42	12	23	19	36	53
		over 60	21	40	10	19	21	40	52
		unspecified	7	47	3	20	5	33	15
		total (all ages)	56	40	34	24	50	36	140
NSD 1	Sackville	under 12	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	7	70	2	20	1	10	10
		40-60	15	60	5	20	5	20	25
		over 60	24	42	13	23	20	35	57
		unspecified	0	0	1	14	6	86	7
		total (all ages)	48	48	21	21	32	32	101

Question	Category	Age group	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total points
			No	%	No	%	No	%	
NSD 1	St Marks	under 12	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		13-19	4	44	4	44	1	11	9
		20-39	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		40-60	23	55	12	29	7	17	42
		over 60	21	49	4	9	18	42	43
		unspecified	3	38	0	0	5	63	8
		total (all ages)	55	51	21	20	31	29	107
NSD 1	St Michaels	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	3	50	0	0	3	50	6
		20-39	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
		40-60	16	50	4	13	12	38	32
		over 60	12	30	14	35	14	35	40
		unspecified	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
		total (all ages)	31	38	22	27	29	35	82
NSD 1	St Stephens	under 12	1	20	0	0	4	80	5
		13-19	2	17	8	67	2	17	12
		20-39	6	30	12	60	2	10	20
		40-60	17	50	1	3	16	47	34
		over 60	24	50	4	8	20	42	48
		unspecified	7	39	6	33	5	28	18
		total (all ages)	57	42	31	23	49	36	137
NSD 1	Sidley	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		20-39	2	40	1	20	2	40	5
		40-60	10	40	5	20	10	40	25
		over 60	15	52	3	10	11	38	29
		unspecified	0	0	2	50	2	50	4
		total (all ages)	29	44	12	18	25	38	66
NSD 1	Ward unspecified	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	5	56	4	44	0	0	9
		20-39	3	30	5	50	2	20	10
		40-60	32	33	34	35	30	31	96
		over 60	24	32	17	23	33	45	74
		unspecified	27	34	28	35	24	30	79
		total (all ages)	91	34	88	33	89	33	268
NSD 1	Bexhill residents total	under 12	7	35	7	35	6	30	20
		13-19	35	44	32	40	13	16	80
		20-39	60	38	59	38	38	24	157
		40-60	227	47	110	23	149	31	486
		over 60	236	39	116	19	247	41	599
		unspecified	54	35	47	31	53	34	154
		total (all ages)	619	41	371	25	506	34	1496

Question	Category	Age group	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total points
			No	%	No	%	No	%	
NSD 1	Work	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		40-60	13	48	4	15	10	37	27
		over 60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	15	50	5	17	10	33	30
NSD 1	Leisure	under 12	1	33	2	67	0	0	3
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	6	55	2	18	3	27	11
		40-60	30	45	25	38	11	17	66
		over 60	16	62	5	19	5	19	26
		unspecified	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		total (all ages)	55	51	34	31	19	18	108
NSD 1	Study	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	0	2	67	1	33	3
		20-39	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		40-60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		over 60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	0	0	2	67	1	33	3
NSD 1	Shopping	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	2	67	0	0	1	33	3
		40-60	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		over 60	4	44	3	33	2	22	9
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	8	57	3	21	3	21	14
NSD 1	Other	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	4	57	3	43	0	0	7
		20-39	14	54	8	31	4	15	26
		40-60	10	33	5	17	15	50	30
		over 60	8	36	5	23	9	41	22
		unspecified	0	0	0	0	2	100	2
		total (all ages)	36	41	21	24	30	34	87
NSD 1	Total ind responses	under 12	8	35	9	39	6	26	23
		13-19	39	43	37	41	14	16	90
		20-39	84	42	70	35	46	23	200
		40-60	282	46	144	24	185	30	611
		over 60	264	40	129	20	263	40	656
		unspecified	56	35	47	30	55	35	158
		total (all ages)	733	42	436	25	569	33	1738

New seafront development on the former Metropole Site

2. Which scheme provides most opportunities for business, tourism, leisure and culture?

Question	Category	Age group	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total points
			No	%	No	%	No	%	
NSD 2	Central	under 12	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
		13-19	4	36	1	9	6	55	11
		20-39	19	36	22	42	12	23	53
		40-60	37	49	19	25	19	25	75
		over 60	46	48	12	13	38	40	96
		unspecified	2	25	4	50	2	25	8
		total (all ages)	108	44	60	24	77	31	245
NSD 2	Collington	under 12	1	33	2	67	0	0	3
		13-19	9	43	3	14	9	43	21
		20-39	14	50	11	39	3	11	28
		40-60	31	51	14	23	16	26	61
		over 60	35	46	14	18	27	36	76
		unspecified	4	40	3	30	3	30	10
		total (all ages)	94	47	47	24	58	29	199
NSD 2	Kewhurst	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	6	50	4	33	2	17	12
		40-60	10	37	10	37	7	26	27
		over 60	15	32	14	30	18	38	47
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	31	36	28	33	27	31	86
NSD 2	Old Town	under 12	0	0	2	33	4	67	6
		13-19	3	33	2	22	4	44	9
		20-39	2	50	2	50	0	0	4
		40-60	15	36	10	24	17	40	42
		over 60	15	41	7	19	15	41	37
		unspecified	6	46	5	38	2	15	13
		total (all ages)	41	37	28	25	42	38	111
NSD 2	Sackville	under 12	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	7	70	2	20	1	10	10
		40-60	11	52	8	38	2	10	21
		over 60	24	42	15	26	18	32	57
		unspecified	2	25	2	25	4	50	8
		total (all ages)	46	46	28	28	25	25	99

Question	Category	Age group	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total points
			No	%	No	%	No	%	
NSD 2	St Marks	under 12	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		13-19	3	33	3	33	3	33	9
		20-39	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		40-60	18	42	17	40	8	19	43
		over 60	18	53	5	15	11	32	34
		unspecified	4	50	0	0	4	50	8
		total (all ages)	47	47	26	26	26	26	99
NSD 2	St Michaels	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	2	67	0	0	1	33	3
		20-39	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
		40-60	15	50	5	17	10	33	30
		over 60	12	34	10	29	13	37	35
		unspecified	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		total (all ages)	31	43	17	24	24	33	72
NSD 2	St Stephens	under 12	0	0	1	20	4	80	5
		13-19	1	8	5	42	6	50	12
		20-39	5	28	10	56	3	17	18
		40-60	13	39	6	18	14	42	33
		over 60	24	47	6	12	21	41	51
		unspecified	4	33	2	17	6	50	12
		total (all ages)	47	36	30	23	54	41	131
NSD 2	Sidley	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	1	33	0	0	2	67	3
		20-39	2	40	1	20	2	40	5
		40-60	7	35	3	15	10	50	20
		over 60	15	52	6	21	8	28	29
		unspecified	0	0	0	0	2	100	2
		total (all ages)	25	42	10	17	24	41	59
NSD 2	Ward unspecified	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	3	43	4	57	0	0	7
		20-39	2	29	5	71	0	0	7
		40-60	35	40	29	33	24	27	88
		over 60	22	36	16	26	23	38	61
		unspecified	21	37	19	33	17	30	57
		total (all ages)	83	38	73	33	64	29	220
NSD 2	Bexhill residents total	under 12	5	24	8	38	8	38	21
		13-19	26	35	18	24	31	41	75
		20-39	59	42	60	42	23	16	142
		40-60	192	44	121	28	127	29	440
		over 60	226	43	105	20	192	37	523
		unspecified	45	38	35	29	40	33	120
		total (all ages)	553	42	347	26	421	32	1321

Question	Category	Age group	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total points
			No	%	No	%	No	%	
NSD 2	Work	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		40-60	11	44	4	16	10	40	25
		over 60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	13	46	5	18	10	36	28
NSD 2	Leisure	under 12	1	33	2	67	0	0	3
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	5	50	2	20	3	30	10
		40-60	24	41	25	42	10	17	59
		over 60	9	45	7	35	4	20	20
		unspecified	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		total (all ages)	41	44	36	38	17	18	94
NSD 2	Study	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		20-39	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		40-60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		over 60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
NSD 2	Shopping	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		40-60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		over 60	4	67	2	33	0	0	6
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	4	67	2	33	0	0	6
NSD 2	Other	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	2	40	1	20	2	40	5
		20-39	8	38	9	43	4	19	21
		40-60	12	38	9	28	11	34	32
		over 60	9	39	7	30	7	30	23
		unspecified	0	0	0	0	2	100	2
		total (all ages)	31	37	26	31	26	31	83
NSD 2	Total ind responses	under 12	6	25	10	42	8	33	24
		13-19	30	36	20	24	33	40	83
		20-39	74	42	72	41	30	17	176
		40-60	239	43	159	29	158	28	556
		over 60	248	43	121	21	203	35	572
		unspecified	47	38	35	28	42	34	124
		total (all ages)	644	42	417	27	474	31	1535

New seafront development on the former Metropole Site

3. Which scheme do you think looks best from the four key views shown in the exhibition?

Question	Category	Age group	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total points
			No	%	No	%	No	%	
NSD 3	Central	under 12	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
		13-19	6	55	3	27	2	18	11
		20-39	25	40	23	37	14	23	62
		40-60	49	56	18	20	21	24	88
		over 60	52	42	30	24	41	33	123
		unspecified	4	50	2	25	2	25	8
		total (all ages)	136	46	78	27	80	27	294
NSD 3	Collington	under 12	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		13-19	14	67	5	24	2	10	21
		20-39	8	29	10	36	10	36	28
		40-60	37	57	12	18	16	25	65
		over 60	45	47	14	15	37	39	96
		unspecified	5	42	3	25	4	33	12
		total (all ages)	111	49	45	20	69	31	225
NSD 3	Kewhurst	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	5	42	3	25	4	33	12
		40-60	9	31	8	28	12	41	29
		over 60	15	48	6	19	10	32	31
		unspecified	2	67	0	0	1	33	3
		total (all ages)	31	41	17	23	27	36	75
NSD 3	Old Town	under 12	0	0	2	33	4	67	6
		13-19	4	50	2	25	2	25	8
		20-39	4	80	1	20	0	0	5
		40-60	22	43	9	18	20	39	51
		over 60	20	38	11	21	21	40	52
		unspecified	4	27	5	33	6	40	15
		total (all ages)	54	39	30	22	53	39	137
NSD 3	Sackville	under 12	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	7	70	2	20	1	10	10
		40-60	12	48	8	32	5	20	25
		over 60	29	48	11	18	21	34	61
		unspecified	2	33	0	0	4	67	6
		total (all ages)	52	50	22	21	31	30	105

Question	Category	Age group	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total points
			No	%	No	%	No	%	
NSD 3	St Marks	under 12	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		13-19	4	44	4	44	1	11	9
		20-39	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		40-60	21	50	12	29	9	21	42
		over 60	22	50	6	14	16	36	44
		unspecified	3	38	0	0	5	63	8
		total (all ages)	54	50	23	21	31	29	108
NSD 3	St Michaels	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	3	50	0	0	3	50	6
		20-39	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
		40-60	16	44	9	25	11	31	36
		over 60	10	27	11	30	16	43	37
		unspecified	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
		total (all ages)	29	35	24	29	30	36	83
NSD 3	St Stephens	under 12	0	0	1	20	4	80	5
		13-19	4	33	8	67	0	0	12
		20-39	7	35	11	55	2	10	20
		40-60	13	39	2	6	18	55	33
		over 60	25	47	5	9	23	43	53
		unspecified	9	47	6	32	4	21	19
		total (all ages)	58	41	33	23	51	36	142
NSD 3	Sidley	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		20-39	2	40	1	20	2	40	5
		40-60	16	44	4	11	16	44	36
		over 60	12	39	4	13	15	48	31
		unspecified	0	0	0	0	2	100	2
		total (all ages)	32	42	10	13	35	45	77
NSD 3	Ward unspecified	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	5	56	4	44	0	0	9
		20-39	2	22	5	56	2	22	9
		40-60	38	40	31	33	25	27	94
		over 60	29	38	20	26	28	36	77
		unspecified	20	32	18	29	24	39	62
		total (all ages)	94	37	78	31	79	31	251
NSD 3	Bexhill residents total	under 12	6	29	7	33	8	38	21
		13-19	42	53	27	34	10	13	79
		20-39	62	40	59	38	35	22	156
		40-60	233	47	113	23	153	31	499
		over 60	259	43	118	20	228	38	605
		unspecified	49	36	36	26	52	38	137
		total (all ages)	651	43	360	24	486	32	1497

Question	Category	Age group	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total points
			No	%	No	%	No	%	
NSD 3	Work	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
		40-60	12	41	4	14	13	45	29
		over 60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	14	44	5	16	13	41	32
NSD 3	Leisure	under 12	2	67	0	0	1	33	3
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	4	44	2	22	3	33	9
		40-60	32	48	22	33	12	18	66
		over 60	16	59	5	19	6	22	27
		unspecified	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		total (all ages)	56	52	29	27	22	21	107
NSD 3	Study	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		40-60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		over 60	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
NSD 3	Shopping	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		20-39	2	67	0	0	1	33	3
		40-60	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
		over 60	6	67	2	22	1	11	9
		unspecified	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		total (all ages)	10	71	2	14	2	14	14
NSD 3	Other	under 12	0	#####	0	#####	0	#####	0
		13-19	2	40	3	60	0	0	5
		20-39	12	46	10	38	4	15	26
		40-60	12	38	5	16	15	47	32
		over 60	7	33	5	24	9	43	21
		unspecified	0	0	0	0	2	100	2
		total (all ages)	33	38	23	27	30	35	86
NSD 3	Total ind responses	under 12	8	33	7	29	9	38	24
		13-19	44	52	30	36	10	12	84
		20-39	82	42	72	37	43	22	197
		40-60	291	46	144	23	193	31	628
		over 60	288	44	130	20	244	37	662
		unspecified	51	36	36	26	54	38	141
		total (all ages)	764	44	419	24	553	32	1736

BEXHILL FUTURE - QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS - TICK BOX SUMMARY SHEETS

First choice = 2 points. Second choice = 1 point. Third choice = 0 points

Percentages shown on grey background.

MP = Masterplan

NSD = New Seafront Development

ABK = Ahrends, Burton & Koralek

Aukett = Aukett Ltd

CT & HH = Chapman Taylor with van Heyningen & Haward

<i>Category and Question Nos</i>	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		<i>Total No</i>
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Central ward residents							
MP 1	118	41	89	31	84	29	291
MP 2	107	39	82	30	84	31	273
NSD 1	113	40	76	27	94	33	283
NSD 2	108	44	60	24	77	31	245
NSD 3	136	46	78	27	80	27	294
totals	582	42	385	28	419	30	1386
Collington ward residents							
MP 1	99	42	72	30	67	28	238
MP 2	93	43	63	29	62	28	218
NSD 1	103	46	50	22	73	32	226
NSD 2	94	47	47	24	58	29	199
NSD 3	111	49	45	20	69	31	225
totals	500	45	277	25	329	30	1106
Kewhurst ward residents							
MP 1	35	41	25	29	26	30	86
MP 2	29	37	28	36	21	27	78
NSD 1	36	42	16	19	34	40	86
NSD 2	31	36	28	33	27	31	86
NSD 3	31	41	17	23	27	36	75
totals	162	39	114	28	135	33	411
Old Town ward residents							
MP 1	49	36	40	30	46	34	135
MP 2	43	36	33	28	43	36	119
NSD 1	56	40	34	24	50	36	140
NSD 2	41	37	28	25	42	38	111
NSD 3	54	39	30	22	53	39	137
totals	243	38	165	26	234	36	642

<i>Category and Question Nos</i>	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		<i>Total No</i>
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Sackville ward residents							
MP 1	51	49	26	25	28	27	105
MP 2	43	43	29	29	29	29	101
NSD 1	48	48	21	21	32	32	101
NSD 2	46	46	28	28	25	25	99
NSD 3	52	50	22	21	31	30	105
totals	240	47	126	25	145	28	511
St Marks ward residents							
MP 1	50	46	30	28	29	27	109
MP 2	41	43	34	35	21	22	96
NSD 1	55	51	21	20	31	29	107
NSD 2	47	47	26	26	26	26	99
NSD 3	54	50	23	21	31	29	108
totals	247	48	134	26	138	27	519
St Michaels ward residents							
MP 1	27	32	34	40	24	28	85
MP 2	27	35	28	36	22	29	77
NSD 1	31	38	22	27	29	35	82
NSD 2	31	43	17	24	24	33	72
NSD 3	29	35	24	29	30	36	83
totals	145	36	125	31	129	32	399
St Stephens ward residents							
MP 1	57	41	36	26	46	33	139
MP 2	53	40	41	31	40	30	134
NSD 1	57	42	31	23	49	36	137
NSD 2	47	36	30	23	54	41	131
NSD 3	58	41	33	23	51	36	142
totals	272	40	171	25	240	35	683
Sidley ward residents							
MP 1	33	45	13	18	27	37	73
MP 2	26	42	14	23	22	35	62
NSD 1	29	44	12	18	25	38	66
NSD 2	25	42	10	17	24	41	59
NSD 3	32	42	10	13	35	45	77
totals	145	43	59	18	133	39	337
Residents - ward unspecified							
MP 1	94	35	97	36	80	30	271
MP 2	77	33	92	39	66	28	235
NSD 1	91	34	88	33	89	33	268
NSD 2	83	38	73	33	64	29	220
NSD 3	94	37	78	31	79	31	251
totals	439	35	428	34	378	30	1245

Category and Question Nos	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		Total No
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Bexhill residents total (all wards)							
MP 1	613	40	462	30	457	30	1532
MP 2	539	39	444	32	410	29	1393
NSD 1	619	41	371	25	506	34	1496
NSD 2	553	42	347	26	421	32	1321
NSD 3	651	43	360	24	486	32	1497
totals	2975	41	1984	27	2280	31	7239
Non residents visiting for:							
Work							
MP 1	14	44	7	22	11	34	32
MP 2	12	41	9	31	8	28	29
NSD 1	15	50	5	17	10	33	30
NSD 2	13	46	5	18	10	36	28
NSD 3	14	44	5	16	13	41	32
totals	68	45	31	21	52	34	151
Leisure							
MP 1	49	48	36	35	17	17	102
MP 2	42	46	33	36	16	18	91
NSD 1	55	51	34	31	19	18	108
NSD 2	41	44	36	38	17	18	94
NSD 3	56	52	29	27	22	21	107
totals	243	48	168	33	91	18	502
Study							
MP 1	0	0	2	67	1	33	3
MP 2	0	0	2	67	1	33	3
NSD 1	0	0	2	67	1	33	3
NSD 2	2	67	1	33	0	0	3
NSD 3	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	0
totals	2	17	7	58	3	25	12
Shopping							
MP 1	7	54	4	31	2	15	13
MP 2	7	58	4	33	1	8	12
NSD 1	8	57	3	21	3	21	14
NSD 2	4	67	2	33	0	0	6
NSD 3	10	71	2	14	2	14	14
totals	36	61	15	25	8	14	59
Other							
MP 1	37	44	22	26	26	31	85
MP 2	37	44	20	24	28	33	85
NSD 1	36	41	21	24	30	34	87
NSD 2	31	37	26	31	26	31	83
NSD 3	33	38	23	27	30	35	86
totals	174	41	112	26	140	33	426

GRAND SUMMARY - TOTAL RESPONSES

<i>Question Nos</i>	ABK		Aukett		CT&HH		<i>Total No</i>
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Masterplan 1	720	41	533	30	514	29	1767
Masterplan 2	637	39	512	32	464	29	1613
Masterplan totals	1357	40	1045	31	978	29	3380
New seafront development 1	733	42	436	25	569	33	1738
New seafront development 2	644	42	417	27	474	31	1535
New seafront development 3	764	44	419	24	553	32	1736
New seafront development totals	2141	43	1272	25	1596	32	5009
Masterplan and new seafront development combined totals	3498	42	2317	28	2574	31	8389

Comments transcript

Full record of comments written on the questionnaires available at the exhibition held at 29-31 Marina, Bexhill from 20th to 27th March 2004.

Please note that reference numbers following each comment are included for checking purposes only.

Comments are listed in categories in the order shown below:

	<i>page</i>
Bexhill residents:	
1. Central Ward	2
2. Collington Ward	17
3. Kewhurst Ward	28
4. Old Town ward	33
5. Sackville Ward	39
6. St Marks Ward	42
7. St Michaels Ward	49
8. St Stephens Ward	52
9. Sidley Ward	59
10. Ward unspecified	63
People visiting Bexhill for:	
11. Work	75
12. Leisure	76
13. Study	81
14. Shopping	81
15. Other	82
16. Additional sheets detached from questionnaires	86
17. Emails	87

Within each category, comments are listed in age groupings, youngest first.

1. Central ward residents

CENTRAL WARD RESIDENTS AGED 13 – 19

1. I like the overall masterplan for Ahrends Burton & Koralek, but I still think the idea of a spa and general activities which could be available would appeal and attract both tourists, and those who already live in the community at present. 2
2. They are a bit too big for Bexhill and it will completely put (sic) the De la Warr pavilion. You should spend more time on the centre of the town, eg shops and things for younger children. Bexhill doesn't need all the attention. I think it will just come like attraction. 3
3. My comments are that the buildings take up too much space on the ground and in height. But I do like the ideas of more shops in Bexhill. It will also bring many more people here to see the sights here. Altogether I like the idea!!! 4
4. Interested in job opportunities in the hotels. 42

CENTRAL WARD RESIDENTS AGED 20 – 39

5. Why build a hotel on the only open space on the seafront when most towns are attempting to preserve their green open spaces. Bexhill seafront, with its timeless gentility, is one of the town's best selling points. Surely regeneration does not include destroying what is good about an area. None of the designs are in keeping with the De la Warr. Why not site this hotel on the old Grand site – oh no, that's going to be a GP surgery – further evidence if needed about the unjoined up nature of these regeneration proposals. 5
6. ABK ideal for all except for the window layout on the building facing on to Sackville Road. Far to hectic. 6
7. ABK design compliments beautifully the Pavilion. More then the other two (schemes). And the viewpoints C and D of this proposed design are perfect. But viewpoint B is out of context, too industrial and dare I say 'ugly' – not an attractive viewpoint for the end of Sackville Road. Aside from this, it's an ideal structure – height permitting. Chapman Taylor design is way too imposing and seems to totally swamp the Pavilion. We need something contemporary, modern and stylish that flows with the Pavilion – plenty of glass please!!! 7
8. Space, light and greenery. 8
9. Like the Chapman Taylor design but too high! Please dig up Devonshire Square and start again. 9

10. The Aukett hotel design seems most in keep with the existing buildings and the De la Warr in height and placement. The large open area between the hotel and the West Parade creates the feeling of space and plenty of flow through. The townscape plan also uses the best of what Bexhill currently has. I feel that the improvements in Town Hall Square seem like a great improvement to the current set up. 10
11. Scheme is very welcome and important for the regeneration and future of Bexhill. 12
12. Very difficult to decide. All the schemes are very good. I would be happy with any of them. 15
13. The development ideas are excellent and I really look forward to whatever plans are finalized. Bexhill desperately needs this level of innovative regeneration. I've moved from London within the last few months and believe that others would follow with more incentive, thus boosting the local economy. I have a 9-month old child who will benefit from a thriving cultural town to live in and grow up in – the educational aspects of the Pavilion together with town improvements would make a massive difference. I support it all the way. 18
14. There isn't enough information to answer some the questions, e.g. No 2. I will say that the redevelopment is a fantastic idea. All the schemes surpass my expectations in terms of creating dramatic and exciting spaces to complement the Pavilion. To my surprise the Chapman Taylor scheme gets my vote because even though it's the most boring, it most complements rather than detracts from the Pavilion. I imagine most of the responses you will get from townsfolk will be very negative. It is a shame that this exhibition is not being held in the summer when there are more visitors or when the Pavilion is open. As a consequence you are likely to get a negatively skewed result. 19
15. I think the idea of developing the 'googe' site at the top of Sackville Rd, rather than blocking the sea view should be considered. 20
16. I feel that No.1 (ABK) fits in with Bexhill much better and looks more original which suits Bexhill. Also does more improvements in the town, very overdue. 23
17. I really like the van Heyningen & Haward, Chapman Taylor design as it is in my opinion, in keeping with the De la Warr Pavilion. 24
18. More piers please. 27
19. Super! 30

20. Not really convinced in terms of location – effect on views and nature of Bexhill. Economic case seems reasonable in terms of opening up opportunities for trade/ employment/ fit with infrastructure. Key issue is sustainability – importance of transport/ parking/ secondary and tertiary jobs. Still seems a bit weak on this. ABK seems best thought through as a whole package. 35
21. I think its important for Bexhill to grab this brilliant opportunity for regeneration. But whilst using the vacant ‘Metropole’ site I feel that its important that the new design doesn’t mask or dominate the De La Warr. It’s a fine piece of architecture and although the creation of a new inspiring building would contrast the architecture ideas and designs of the 1930s with today’s ‘up beat and funky’ designs, it should work will with the current environment and not dominate or down grade the De La Warr. Chapman Taylor bring the important point of sustainable energy. Should be used by all! 43
22. Although we like the Ahrends hotel building the most, the irregular windows that face that north are quite awful. Keep this wall plain, in keeping with the De La Warr. 52
23. Although over all I preferred the ABK proposals, there were some key features of Aukett which I thought were particularly good. Aukett: View A, very good, straight onto the beach; views towards the buildings not as tall as ABK, less threatening. ABK: View C, excellent – very pleasing to the eye; views towards the building are very modern but at the same time in keeping with the De La Warr 1930s. 53
24. Aukett: All schemes had good underlying ideas but the scheme by Aukett best responds to the overall context. What sold it to me was the sheltered space which respects the curve of the buildings in the West Parade. The L-shaped building also works well with the existing Pavilion on the one side (respects the geometry) and on the other extends the vista along the seafront (and reinforces it). The orientation of the square to the town will work very well – ‘brings the town to the sea’. The circular building will provide a well-needed accent whilst not being too overbearing in scale. The circular building closes the vista along Sackville Road and leads the eye to the seafront. The response to scale and edge conditions is well considered. The elevations are lively and may even work well against the sleek, simple lines of the Pavilion. I also really enjoyed the thoughts on the other parts of town, particularly how to bridge across from the other side of the railway which is a major aspect to consider in any proposal. Chapman Taylor: The idea of creating a ‘solitaire’ is a commendable one but the proposal competed too much in terms of scale and form with the existing Pavilion. It successfully forms an end to the vista along the Pavilion and its form encourages movement round it. It does not work with the scale of Bexhill however, and smacks of ‘big developer comes to Bexhill’; could be anywhere. ABK: Ambitious, exciting interplay of forms alongside the seafront. The spaces between the buildings will be exciting to meander through. Elevations smack of ‘big developer comes to Bexhill’. The

- orientation of one curve to the sea and one to the town is nice but this is not reflected in the treatment of the buildings (external). This proposal is too much in competition with its surroundings. 54
25. Impressed by all aspects of planning for a new Bexhill. As I am new to the town, I'm happy with all improvements to the town and sea front. 64
26. Masterplans: None of them, nothing Edwardian. New seafront development: They all look dreadful. Start again. What is the point of designating the centre of Bexhill as an Edwardian preservation area? 66a
27. Although the Chapman Taylor scheme is in keeping with 1930s architecture, not enough innovation to pull Bexhill out of the mire? 71

CENTRAL WARD RESIDENTS AGED 40 – 59

28. For the health of the community we desperately need at least two 25–33 metre swimming pools as well as cycle tracks and general sports faculties, sponsored by the council. I can swim in a beautiful state of the art pool in Beckenham for under £2. I want to be able to do the same here. More litter bins. Paint out graffiti the minute it appears. 17
29. Bit concerned the hotel will obscure the views from people's flats; over the road to the hotel. I know its progress but it is still a point. 22
30. Of the three hotel schemes, I prefer ABK ideas but would question siting any hotel on the site of the putting green as any scheme overwhelms the De la Warr. The children's scheme to place it on the garage site would keep open space and not spoil residents views. The town centre redevelopments would be good. Please don't let Aukett anywhere near building on the seafront as their design for the building is quite hideous in my opinion, and after 20 years would look even worse I imagine. Please leave our open spaces, you can't get them back if it all goes wrong. 34
31. ABK scheme – from photos, I liked viewpoint C. But did not like viewpoint B. Viewpoint C looked in keeping with the De la Warr, but the other side of the building shown in viewpoint B did not seem to match any current architecture. The design by Aukett does not require further consideration – it did not appeal at all. 41
32. The proposed buildings are currently too high and will detract from the De la Warr Pavilion. As much of the sea view should be preserved as possible. 45
33. I like the single hotel building from Chapman Taylor, but the height is just too big for the adjacent building. They could make it lower with more lower simple

buildings alongside without the ‘bity’ impact of Aukett or ABK. Anything to smarten up ‘rundown’ town centre will be acceptable. The hotel generates most public outcry. The design of the overall town plan will be dominated by opinions on the hotel. 49

34. Cannot see the need for hotel at all. 56
35. I have found it very difficult to choose which scheme I think is best - I certainly do not like Chapman Taylor’s having 7 floors - it is too tall to blend in with the seafront, although I do like the shape. I like the sea view of ABK but think it looks a bit too futuristic on the road side. I feel a good hotel, but not on this site, may work but we need more tourist attractions in Bexhill to fill it up. 60
36. More glass domes. Remember Marajah! Emphasis on saving the environment. Build examples of solar heating/small wind power out at sea. Buildings encouraging further redevelopment of older buildings. Love the sports area idea and love the pier, Bexhill looks cute from the sea. Where’s the cycle track ? 62
37. ABK are way out in front because: Their scheme is most sympathetic to the current architecture of the De La Warr; they have proposed sensitive priority development in the rest of the town; they presented their work in the best way for me. What are the plans for parking? 67
38. Bexhill does need a regeneration programme but I don’t think building a huge ultra-modern monstrosity on the seafront is the way forward. Such a building will blight the open vista and sea views currently enjoyed by the properties on West Parade. Why not look inland? Councillor Graham Gubby (who we spoke to at the exhibition) said he would like to see the current town hall demolished and the land along with links to Sainsbury’s and the station used to create business, leisure, etc. opportunities. I agree with this. If it is felt that a hotel must have sea views, this can still be achieved by building just a bit further inland at the edge of Sackville Road. If you look at towns like Hastings and Eastbourne, they have their modern complexes inland, in the town centre and have kept their seafronts unspoilt. 67a
39. The design of the hotel takes the essence of the De La Warr and adds an up-to-date perspective. What are the plans for parking? 68
40. I do not believe that the seafront, promenade or beach or adjacent open areas should be developed. The sites by the roundabout at the end of Sackville Road (currently the Skoda dealers and various poor quality buildings on the other side of Sackville Road) could be used. This would avoid obscuring views, blocking light and generally spoiling the open aspect of the area surrounding the De La Warr. Surely building next to or on the beach is not really necessary to make Bexhill a better town. 68a

41. I prefer the ABK solution for the hotel. Choosing between the town centre options is more difficult. Suggestions: a 5m wide passage from the De La Warr staircase down to the rear of the colonnade, as an access from the seafront to main building, an access in the reverse direction and as a linear art gallery for local artists. Suggestion: roof over the colonnade and put in a front to keep the wind off. Use it as a restaurant/civic reception area with access from seafront or main building. 69
42. Bexhill ought to retain what it has - which can be enhanced by just the current Devonshire Square/Sainsbury's area proposals. Any further expense would not be in keeping. 72
43. Whilst recognising and addressing key issues relating to the realignment of Bexhill's focus, the plans so far do not go far enough. Attention is required to the East along the waterfront to initiate commercial development. The schemes do not address transport (multi-modal, TOR assumed). However this remains the single most significant factor to trigger growth. Further work is required to harmonise signature developments with Mendelsohn's vision and execution. 74
44. These projects require strong inspirational leadership. History shows that Bexhill has been denied an exciting future because of the lack of foresight by our town leaders. New development needs to complement rather than compete with the De La Warr Pavilion. 76
45. ABK: Windows from viewpoint B not in keeping. The rest of the building complements the area, then you have a modern fascia to main (street site) of the building. Chapman Taylor: Looks like a lump struck at the end of the building – no connection. Need for parking space or all this is for nothing as tourists, day-trippers etc will not come as there is nowhere to park. 78
46. Although the ABK design is more eye catching and more in keeping with the De La Warr Pavilion, it does not appear to allow for many leisure activities. Chapman Taylor allows for a health spa and also involves a new putting green, but the building is too tall. Aukett has a spa but the design of this looks tatty and reminds me of a Butlin's of the 50s! The ABK masterplan has been well thought out and the attention to detail (i.e. putting telephone wires underground) is commendable. 80
47. There are good points in all of them, but I don't like any scheme over another. All the hotel schemes are too tall and will dwarf the De La Warr. They are also ugly. The ABK scheme looks exactly like a car showroom I have seen in London. I am highly concerned about losing the openness of the seafront from Galley Hill to Collington. I don't like the idea of lighting buildings in town, light pollution is a big issue. Change is necessary but is this the way? The cynical view is that private business will do as it likes because it has money! 81

48. I feel that the proportions of the buildings in the Aukett scheme are the most suitable for the use of space. However, I really like the '1930s' style of the Chapman Taylor design, and feel that the architecture is complimentary to the existing De La Warr. Having said that, the Chapman Taylor building is far too tall, and would need to be a similar height to the Aukett design. On the whole, very exciting plans. 82
49. You will need excellent publicity and groundwork to convince Bexhill residents that they have any power over decisions about their town. Good luck, it is all very exciting but we have seen too many half-hearted schemes recently. 83
50. The site for the hotel could also be used for multi-screen cinema or arts complex or a casino. 119
51. Key points in priority for me: Linking De La Warr Pavilion, Sackville Road, Western Road, then Marina, De La Warr Pavilion, museum, with consistent design themes, paved surfaces and street furniture to enhance the Edwardian architecture (history) and 21st century design; preserving some community green space and sightlines to sea from Sackville Road on old hotel site; that the town centre as a whole is impacted; that we do this! 120
52. Good. At last something to bring work and improvements to the town. My only concern is that all schemes dominate the view from the town towards the seafront. The station would be my priority in regeneration of the town. A good way to make the town better for our next generation. 121
53. Absolutely none. They are all vile. Bexhill is a unique seaside town enjoyed by families as it's quiet and safe - why ruin it? Money would be better spent on railway area and Sainsbury's area. 122
54. All schemes are too grand. Do we need such tall buildings? Why are we proposing to scrap the lovely green area currently in place and replacing with concrete jungles? 123
55. I welcome any expenditure on schemes of regeneration and hope it will attract younger, more modern and progressive thinking into this town. There has been an entrenched attitude of pessimism for a long time, as reflected in the many negative comments placed in the 'suggestions box' at the De La Warr Pavilion. I particularly like the inclusion of clock tower to museum link to bring it more accessible for visitors. 124
56. Bexhill Sailing Club would like to be consulted regarding any redevelopment that may impinge upon the area currently occupied by BSC and the immediate beach/boat storage area in particular between Channel View East and the Sailing Club. There are potential health and safety issues. 126

57. There was only one scheme and design that had any merit whatsoever (Aukett), so I have rejected the other two without rating. None of the proposals give necessary precedence within the designs to the current amenity provided by the views from and of the De La Warr Pavilion. Despite the awful seafront modern flat additions, there is still a heart of Edwardian style about Bexhill. To retain and maintain this style has to be a major, if not the key, objective. Without a heart to the future strategy, the revitalisation of the town will be totally commercially driven with the inevitable vulgarity that will entail, ruining what quality has survived the assaults of time. Local politicians are not known for their capacity to resist these commercial pressures. Currently, there is too much potential for a commerce/developer driven ‘bounce’ and a resulting final death knell to any quality in Bexhill as a built environment for residents and visitors alike. 829

CENTRAL WARD RESIDENTS AGED OVER 60

58. Bexhill does not really need this development. It will ruin the seafront and character of the town. What is needed is better amenities, pavements repaired and Devonshire Square, aka ‘Gubby’s folly’, should be reverted. I agree with a regeneration of the town but this development is far too large and imposing on an Edwardian seafront. 26
59. Could the development be constructed on the north side of Sackville Roundabout leaving the seafront intact and the De la Warr unobscured by another large building. The De la Warr has ample space to provide improved opportunities for business, tourism, culture and leisure. What feasibility studies have been done to ensure the success of the enterprise? Have comparisons been made with Hastings, Eastbourne and Brighton. In Eastbourne and Brighton the marina areas have brought inflated house prices, yet the retail areas appear depressed. Parking is already difficult during trading times and in the peak season, yet the schemes all seem to reduce open parking areas, whilst underground parking spaces work in the main to benefit the hotel and residents in the new building. It also appears on the plans that the parking areas in the existing De la Warr are going to be reduced. Finally, is there any intention to improve the roads leading from the A259 to encourage all these expected visitors? 28
60. Although my preference for the town centre scheme is the Aukett scheme, there is one feature of the ABK plan which should be included in any final solution – i.e. the proposal to develop underground parking next to the De la Warr Pavilion, leaving the above-ground space to be cleared of cars and landscaped. This would represent a massive improvement to the seafront views and enable the Pavilion to be seen as it should be seen, without the intrusion of an unsightly parking area. 32

61. Do they have to be so tall (Chapman Taylor)? The De la Warr will be dwarfed. 33
62. Do not like the idea of a new hotel on the Metropole site in any of the schemes. Why can't it be moved to the Skoda garage site or somewhere else. Such a shame to lose views and the putting green. 36
63. Would like to see more space allocated to young teenagers, lack of space and activities leads to idle hands, i.e. skateboarding, skating, playing football. 38
64. Would prefer seafront as it is. Consider all designs are very overpowering. 39
65. Aukett's design is more in sympathy with the height of the Pavilion and other buildings nearby. Also it avoids the disagreeable look of monumental, tall blocks of which the town has unfortunately got a few already. Aukett's plan is the only one that, to my mind, looks tailor made for Bexhill. 44
66. It is essential that a pre-let to a substantial hotel chain is achieved prior to construction commencing. Urgent action to agree terms for re-location of the station should be taken. A realistic car parking system is urgently needed for the town so that retailers can have a chance to provide a service and secure a return on their investment. A solution for the supermarket (Sainsbury) is much needed as otherwise it will close and the town centre will completely die. 46
67. It is difficult from the info in the exhibition to decide which scheme fulfils the regeneration criteria. The styles of architecture all bring interest and commerce. Although I have chosen Ahrends, a couple less floors and slightly increased footprint – reducing the height impact – would have raised Chapman Taylor to Number 1. 48
68. It is my belief that having a new hotel without a conference centre is just pouring money down a drain. Nowhere, but nowhere have any of the schemes mentioned that a conference centre is being provided. I like Chapman Taylor but is the hotel too high? 50
69. All the schemes are awful, grotesque. They are all quite inappropriate for Bexhill. No attempt seems to have been made to be sympathetic to the existing style and character of the town. Just glass and concrete blocks built to fill existing gaps. Update and improve by all means but get some original ideas too. Having moved from Hastings 18 months ago to escape 'rundown + no ideas' Hastings town, and remembering Bexhill in the past as a charming little town with character and style and a good place for holidays, visitors, etc., I am shocked that these schemes are the best you can manage. Utterly devoid of ideas for regeneration! 51

70. They are all vile. Bring back design with beauty. Sainbury's / station car park essential. Station must join Ashford to Southampton direct. Full bypass, Marsh to Baldslow a must. Leave the beautiful seafront alone. Tear up the abomination outside the post office. A 'total' traffic plan from Barnhorn to Sidley and Hastings. Hastings Road and De La Warr Road one way. 57
71. I consider all plans put forward by ABK to be the most suitable. It is hoped the De La Warr pavilion will be the first project to be completed, which should include a good theatre. 58
72. None. What's wrong with Bexhill as it is? I think removing the telephone-wires would improve the shanty town look. 59
73. Having living in Bexhill for the past 25 years I strongly believe that the time is now ripe to regenerate the town, providing that we can accommodate the young people in employment and affordable housing. The town plan by Chapman Taylor is in keeping with the present De La Warr which is looking like a bomb site. If any schemes materialise it can only mean a better Bexhill. 61
74. Ahrends plan looks the most attractive in relation to the DLWP /hotel site - parking underground is an excellent idea. For other parts of the town, the plans are without enough detail. The new museum with its lottery money bringing money into the town needs to be more prominently featured, without traffic humps as per Aukett plan. Chapman Taylor plans are too vague. No mention is made on any plan as to how the proposed link road to Hastings from London Road will effect traffic and these plans. A hotel is much needed, the site chosen is good – but on the whole the designs done are not good - especially Chapman's - and will not enhance the DLWP. 65
75. I like modern architecture, but Bexhill seafront in an open space is not the place. I think they are hideous – more wasted money – our money. Another Devonshire Square. Dreadful. We really want to sit in a windy square opposite toilets. Do we want all our sea views obscured? No. The Grand closed. Cooden Beach Hotel is practically empty except for a few months in summer. We need another hotel like a hole in the head. Aukett is the best of the bunch – preferably sited off the sea front. 66
76. Before all these proposals, Bexhill needs safer and better pavements and an attractive station with a café, toilets, and waiting rooms. Also, why not restore the De La Warr Pavilion in the very near future please. 85
77. I prefer the hotel design from ABK. It appears to me to be the most vibrant which complements the advanced design of the De La Warr when built in 1934/5. Chapman Taylor's design reminds me of the 'Rented Barracks' built in the 1950s/60s in East Germany and reminds me of the worst excesses of

that regime. The one advantage – only – is that as you approach Bexhill along West Parade you will still be able to see the two cupolas shining white in the distance. 86

78. The Aukett proposal shows great vision and, if built as shown, would put Bexhill on the map as the De La Warr Pavilion did in 1935. 87
79. None. There should be a small hotel on the corner of Sackville Road and Marina where the single-storey shops are now. There should be no paving slabs anywhere. Red tarmac should be used like that on the paths in front of the De La Warr Pavilion and/or on the north side of Parkhurst Road. The clock tower site is unsuitable for any development as it is too exposed to weather. (I live adjacent so I know). It is pointless to plant trees anywhere as the wind kills or blows them out of shape. There is no need to have a large hotel and the plans of the hotel on the putting green, where the Metropole was, are completely unacceptable. We would like the open space there to stay. Instead of trees planted in various places, there should be tubs similar to the millennium tubs already around. It is ridiculous to have any open squares for sitting at any of the road junctions, it is too windy and cold. It is imperative that what we have now should be improved. The railway station must be repaired. A good idea of Mr Mathews to use the area for newspaper shops/cafes, etc. Good luck to him. A very good idea to have the old Granville hotel (Grand Hotel) developed for doctors' surgeries with parking under and some flats. We do not need a 'pier' out from the seafront near the De La Warr Pavilion, as the sea destroys things like that. All pavements should be 'tarmaced' and proper ramps made so that users of wheelchairs, prams and 'scooters' can cross roads easily. 89
80. I do like the ABK concept for hotel. However, the window configuration on outer wall looks messy compared with the very clean glass concept on the inner concave view. That's why I've gone for the Chapman Taylor design. Get rid of the messy windows and I'll buy this scheme. Having said all that, the total use of the land and additional building is better with ABK. 90
81. Chapman Taylor's concept of retaining views is welcome. But what a horrendously ugly building. 91
82. Don't understand masterplans. 92
83. ABK's glass front is acceptable but not the hideous other side. Actually I really don't like any of them. Get on with doing what is necessary: the station etc. Why has Hastings station had priority? 93
84. We are all used to the open aspect from Sackville Road and towards Beachy Head. Perhaps something on a smaller scale. The first thing to do now is to continue the repairs to the De La Warr Pavilion and make it look used. Since

closing, it has deteriorated day by day. Thousands being spent on plans would be better used for some action. I would not really choose any of the designs.
94

85. Masterplan: none were detailed enough to invite comment; none reassure me that the large sums of money that would be spent would achieve the aim. New seafront development: All fail because the scale is not proportionate to what is already there, and the designs diminish the De La Warr. Any building of the size shown is out of keeping with the listed De La Warr. It's setting in the green is part of its attraction and design. Many other towns offer conference centres, seaside hotels, etc. Bexhill is almost unique in being a residential town beside the sea. Families come to holiday here because they have relatives living here. They enjoy sea, sun, sand and games in the park and promenade areas. It would be a mistake to spoil all this for 'pie in the sky' ideas. While building goes on, Bexhill seafront will attract no one so the financial loss to the town will be great. The Grand Hotel closed, unable to be viable. What convinces one that the new one would be? The decline in birth rate means there will be many more elders than youngsters in coming decades. The 40-80 age range have benefited from house price rises, therefore have more money to spend. It is a mistake for the town to disregard this. Development should take place in more suitable areas - i.e. the station area and Sainsbury's - both of which are ugly and out of keeping. 94a
86. The comments below relate only to the impact of the developments on the existing rowing club site and 22 Marina Court Avenue. The current rowing club site and a curved railed pathway divide 22 Marina Court Avenue from the De La Warr Pavilion. If - as is possible - the rowing club moves to a site adjacent to the Bexhill Sailing Club, then the rowing club site will revert to Council ownership. This will leave a strip of land including a staircase that is the property of 22 Marina Court Avenue, and currently includes a low wall, two garden sheds and then a high wall bordering the garden of 22 Marina Court Avenue. 22 Marina Court Avenue is a Grade II listed property. I would be concerned that any redevelopment of the site took account of the fact that the end wall of 22 Marina Court Avenue includes three bedroom windows, two at ground level and one at first floor level. Any development must take account of the privacy and access to light rights of the owners of 22 Marina Court Avenue, a joint freehold owned by (names omitted from this report for reasons of confidentiality). I would welcome the opportunity to discuss plans for this site at an early date when the scheme have been awarded and is moving forward. My overall comments as a Bexhill resident, on the three developments are as follows. *ABK*: The sweeping lines and clever linking of the hotel, restaurant and office accommodation - with a matching apartment block - is architectural magic and just what is needed to make the De La Warr Pavilion and Metropole site an exciting, newsworthy focus for visitors and residents. In addition *ABK* have looked at the whole De La Warr/Metropole/Marina Court Avenue site, removed the car parking

underground, and have landscaped the whole site attractively with a flowing, tiered low level hedges/walls and trees. It could become a major attraction, probably all the year round because it would be something unique on the South Coast and not ‘just another hotel and apartment block’. I also like the separate circular restaurant that can serve hotel guests, visitors to the De La Warr and residents alike. *Chapman Taylor*: This is a very practical approach, but rather over-dominant from some sightlines. But as it is glassed all around it does not have the rendered back walls that limit the visual appeal even of my preferred ABK design. Chapman Taylor has also given most attention of the three to the needs of Bexhill over and above the Metropole site. They have put forward good commercial development plans for the Sainsbury and station areas, and their design for the Metropole area still works well if most office development did move into the town. It can be a little lower if necessary, and each floor can operate as an office, apartment or hotel. I think this is the best plan for Bexhill as a whole, but the ABK design is stunning for the Metropole site. The plan also leaves the green space opposite West Parade open - and this open space feeling is something that is unique to Bexhill and a major plus. And I like the pier! *Aukett*: This is a rather routine and predictable plan: Ok but uninspiring and does not do justice to the De La Warr Pavilion. The hotel block on the sea front is too massive, it blocks the quite attractive view of West Parade, and the spa tower is a bit of a one-off gimmick, fun but not practical or valuable over the long term. And if it fails commercially a real white elephant! There is also a large triangular paved site to the rear of the hotel, with no clear function. This could become a depressed and windswept area, little used and unattractive. 95

87. *ABK*: I really like this one, a very striking modern and integrated ‘hotel, office and apartment block’ design for the Metropole site that complements the De La Warr Pavilion. Thoughtful landscaping of the whole De La Warr Pavilion area including the car park and Marina Court Avenue, sweeping down to the promenade with low level breaks, is impressive. Gives a dramatic and strong visual appeal to the whole site, whilst being recreational for visitors and residents. Putting the car park underground means that the whole De La Warr site can be developed as a focus for the Bexhill seafront. *Chapman Taylor*: A strength of this design is that it has given more consideration than the others to the total masterplan for Bexhill – with scope to remove the shops and commercial office development to the Sainsbury and station sites. The Metropole site design is rather prosaic but has the major advantage of being flexible, and also maintains the open feel that is linked to the existing putting green/grassed areas: open space is left, and the existing attractive buildings in West Parade are not cut off from the seafront. I also like the pier – a pleasant place to finish a walk in the summer! *Aukett*: This is a dullish design, and it incorporates a largish triangular paved area that could become depressed and windswept, without having any really positive value. The hotel block on the front is also boring and obstructs views from West Parade without offering any new visual appeal from any angle. The spa tower

looks like a pretty afterthought but, being custom built as a spa, limits any future flexibility if the spa does not take off commercially. The design overall is rather inflexible and solid, and does not appeal to me. 96

88. In all the schemes the hotel/office block seems to be too tall and spoil the view to the sea for the existing flats in Queens Court. Provides no parking spaces which would be needed for all of that block. 97
89. Need to be convinced that a hotel group is likely to be interested and able to be a going concern. Whilst some of the schemes are generating jobs, where are the workers going to live? More green field sites? Sainsbury plan is good for trade and parking – also for the elderly population who already live here. 98
90. No to a hotel. Like to see green area. 99
91. Retaining part of the green is very essential. Some views of the sea retained. Compact, good facilities. (Chapman Taylor favourite) 100
92. Restoration of the Pavilion is essential before any work is effected on the adjacent site. Design 3 (Chapman Taylor) appears to ignore parking requirement for the patrons of the proposed ‘beautiful single building’ with multiple amenities but designed to complement existing features. Total absence of estimated costs might influence opinions? See Bexhill Observer, March 26th 2004. 101
93. Needs to be lower to fit in with existing buildings. (Chapman Taylor favourite) 102
94. ABK viewpoint B proposed is not in keeping with the area and is very unattractive compared with the front view which compliments the De La Warr. Aukett vision would enhance the whole area. 103
95. Chapman Taylor hotel too tall. 104
96. All these buildings seem cheap and impractical – designed for appearance only. A more professional better designed building needed. But something should be done. Don’t forget transport links. 105
97. I think as it is a leisure centre the offices should be housed elsewhere. 106
98. This scheme (ABK) is attractive. My main objection is that offices are planned on a prime site which should be used for pleasure and relaxation for residents of Bexhill. Offices should be planned elsewhere. A first class hotel is needed in Bexhill and possibly attractive apartments. Please consider the main element of the population in Bexhill, i.e. the elderly. 107

99. Although ABK is the most striking looking development, I feel Chapman Taylor gives the better business opportunities, and Aukett the better sports and social facilities. I am concerned that the quality of any contractors is far superior to those used in Western Road. 108
100. Cars, busses, coaches, traffic. Transport to keep everyone moving in and out and through Bexhill-on-sea at peak times. The time it takes now if you want to go anywhere in a hurry or for an appointment. 109
101. I think it is a waste of open space and whilst I accept the idea of a hotel, I feel a less intrusive site could be found. 110
102. Good ideas but until roads and pavements are improved, graffiti stopped, yobs curbed, you won't get any improvement. 111
103. Has anyone instructed the architects in the changes that will occur to Bexhill as a result of the new expansion of Ravenside shopping centre? 112
104. I warmly support station entrance in Devonshire Square. I support a bridging design on the Metropole site between Victorian/Edwardian houses – the De La Warr Pavilion is an extreme contrast with them. Devonshire Road is the only decently wide street in Bexhill – I oppose any plans to make it narrow. I support Sainsbury's bridge access. The curved design of ABK blends better with curves of the De La Warr Pavilion, but the rear is awful. Look at uneven levels of Devonshire Square. Leave Town Hall Square alone. Cater for future parking needs, i.e. allow plenty. 113
105. I do not wish to see a hotel built on the seafront. The putting green area is a much used facility during the summer. I dislike all the designs for the area and we certainly cannot sustain a 60 bed hotel. I am not against the regeneration of other parts of the town. 114
106. Reduce the height of the building (Chapman Taylor) and it would fit on the site well. At the moment, it is too high for the space. The spa is a good idea for all to use and needed in the town. 115
107. I really do not think such a large project is in keeping in such a small town - a complete waste of money. There are plenty of small things that are in bad need of make-overs; some of the older property; the so called 'hotel' opposite to the De La Warr a rundown doss house! Do some of the smaller needs instead of such a hair-brain large unnecessary expense! 117
108. The best one is Chapman Taylor. As you still get a good view and it doesn't spoil any of them. And a good building. 118

CENTRAL RESIDENTS - AGE UNSPECIFIED

109. Would like to see some more amenities for teenagers like ten-pin bowling, skateboard park or cinema. 131
110. Buildings to reflect the age/history of existing Bexhill buildings. Smaller/less floors, older – not so ultra-modern facades. 132

2. Collington Ward residents

COLLINGTON RESIDENTS – AGED UNDER 12

111. Don't feel Bexhill needs a hotel. Too many already. Might as well spend money on shops. 133

COLLINGTON RESIDENTS – AGED 13 - 19

112. I much prefer the ABK version. I like the shape of the hotel, as its different. Although I'm not sure about the windows. I hate the Chapman Taylor version, as, although the shape is great and in keeping with the De La Warr it's so tall that it will dominate the whole seafront. The swimming pool idea/spa are good ideas though. Great computer imaging. Good change. I think the young people will like ABK best as it's the most interesting and different from average hotels. 134
113. I like the idea of the ABK as it has a very attractive design but I feel that the large use of glass could provoke vandalism. The pier in the Aukett Ltd is a rather good idea that could be expanded on. I think that the plan chosen should include clubs/activities for Bexhill's youth to keep them off the streets etc. But at an affordable cost. Its no use having a big complex unless you connect the design with the future generations to help prevent the high crime rate of Bexhill as there are large groups of lads that 'cause mischief' to say the least. Just a simple indoor/outdoor supervised area for them to sit and chat, use internet etc but not have to cost large amounts to use. 135
114. The idea of a health spa and gym from some of the plans is a very good idea and would be very beneficial for the town because people can get fitter and relax at the same time. It would be good to have internet cafes, get a new cinema and shopping place, so there are plenty of things to do here instead of travelling somewhere else. It would attract a lot more young clients to the town, and they will want to come back here again for a holiday. If there are

more things to do the younger generation will want to stay in Bexhill not move away. 136

115. I think the running track on top of the Chapman Taylor with Van Heyningen and Haward is extremely dangerous and a bad idea. I think it would be a good idea to build internet cafes and some ice cream parlours and a new cinema that shows films when they come out and not about three weeks later. This would also help to get a lot of youngsters out of trouble. 137
116. I really like the ABK design because I think the design is fresh and will bring a new look to Bexhill. Although it is different, it still looks as if it blends in with the De La Warr. I really like the shape and the prospects for Bexhill. I'm not too keen on the Aukett Ltd because of the building design. I think it looks ugly and doesn't fit well on our seafront. However, I like the idea of the spa as it will bring more people into the town if they know there are good facilities. I think all these ideas are an improvement for the town. Bexhill definitely needs a lot of work to make it more recognised! 138
117. I like the design of the ABK because it looks attractive and a fresher look to the seafront. I also like the ideas of the Aukett Ltd design, because I think they offer a lot to the people of Bexhill. I think the design the Chapman Taylor with van Heyningen and Haward really sticks out, and doesn't really suit the town of Bexhill. 139
118. Need more shops and facilities to attract younger generations. Shouldn't be as high as the possible sites are at the moment. Keep green areas and parking. 140

COLLINGTON RESIDENTS – AGED 20 - 39

119. The CT with HH building stupidly mimics the De La Warr. The ABK is clumsy playing with shape and form but is simply superficial. The Aukett scheme has a true interest in improving the quality and vibrancy of Bexhill by showing an interest in quality public spaces providing opportunity for residents social interaction. 142
120. I feel that the ABK project is more attractive, futuristic and original. 143
121. I like the ideas in the Aukett Ltd scheme. It provides varied improvements for everyone, young and old, and would bring people in to the town. I don't much like the building and prefer the more contemporary design ABK have. I think the other design (CT) looks like a prison. The idea I assume is to attract the young people in Bexhill and attract tourism making it a vibrant good place to live. Entertainment and employment are key to this. Lastly after all

this debate I hope that something is actually done!! Also road links must be improved. 145

122. All schemes expect to increase local employment. Would the design and construction of such schemes utilise local engineers (structural engineers - like ourselves) local contractors, other suppliers and designers? For a project to provide a boost to the local economy, surely local companies should be used. I bet they won't though, and I would be very disappointed about an opportunity missed. 146
123. For the overall future for Bexhill I believe that the ABK development would be the best. It is in keeping with what Bexhill wish to do in the future, ie a home for arts, design, etc. It's outlook for the rest of Bexhill makes good sense. What they want to do with the station is good. 147
124. I would like to see more entertainment use included such as cinemas or bowling alleys. 148
125. I would be concerned about any proposal blocking off the crescent, and I am not sure what demand there would be for office space. I agree with hotel and conference facilities, but think recreational activities such as cinemas or bowling would be more appropriate. Underground parking and surface landscaping would be preferred if practical. More cycle facilities should be included as well. A pier is a must! 149
126. I like ABK on the whole, their vision of Bexhill will move the town forwards. Reservations on ABK centre on the apartment block, which I believe is unnecessary. Relocate the offices to the north of town (town centre) and put accommodation into one of the two remaining buildings. 150
127. The design of Chapman Taylor building is more sympathetic to the design of the De La Warr. However, their plans for the rest of the town are limited. Despite protestations, Bexhill badly needs more pedestrianised areas and safer roads for the very young and old. Provide more parking and don't be afraid to close roads to traffic - other seaside towns manage to do this successfully. The trouble with Bexhill is people like to keep it a secret but the lack of tourism and day trippers in summer and poor communications will not help business or future generations. Just don't get too radical with the architecture. Aukett's water tower design at the front of the building is an ugly feature and detracts from their other good ideas. 152

COLLINGTON RESIDENTS AGED 40 – 60

128. Whilst I strongly agree that Bexhill needs regeneration and bringing into the 21st century, I don't feel any of the proposed plans, as seen today, are

sympathetic to the current architecture or character of the town. The De La Warr is a superb building and all the plans to redevelop the Metropole site are unsympathetic to the DLWP and some positively detract and destroy views of it. I also feel, I have not had sufficient opportunities to view the plans - the display was hard to follow and view in a very small space. 153

129. Keep the parking free. Nobody will pay to park to shop here. Cycle routes on seafront. Aukett's idea for that ghastly water-tower-like thing is awful. Where's the office space for new companies? 155
130. Although all designs are of the highest spec, etc., I personally feel that there is no need for a development of this scale on the present site. It would spoil the views both looking towards the De La Warr pavilion and looking away from the De La Warr, towards Eastbourne. None of them are in keeping with the present architecture in the town. There are plenty of eyesores in the area which could be regenerated, i.e. the Grand, station (tip) and many others. Why spoil one of the best views in the town with these modern monstrosities. 156
131. We desperately need to bring change in Bexhill for all age groups. So any business is welcome, although we need to improve transport as well. 157
132. I like the pier idea. Need to develop the eyesore spots in the centre of the town. 160
133. I like the shapes of the ABK hotel development - I would like a pier - that's a nice touch missing from it. I think the shapes of ABK complement the De La Warr Pavilion. 161
134. Chapman Taylor design is sympathetic to lines of De La Warr but to avoid over-shadowing De La Warr, suggest it's 3 floors lower. Is additional parking addressed sufficiently bearing in mind that many of Bexhill's population need to park close to town centre shops (note Wainwright Road car park)? Traffic calming - have not noticed traffic needs calming - usually there's a gridlock!! 162
135. Don't agree with losing the only green space. Each design dwarfs De La Warr and it would lose views to Eastbourne. Other option, knock down De La Warr and build a hotel on site. Knock down eyesore shops on opposite road ie Priceless etc. I wonder who will stay in hotel, if business people - hotel doesn't need to be on seafront. I doubt if families would find enough to do - so wouldn't stay. 163
136. I dislike the schemes proposed by Chapman Taylor and Aukett, with the ABK I like the glass structure but object to the height of the hotel block. 164

137. All the schemes swamp the Pavilion and are all too high, blocking all the views towards Beachy Head. The ABK design if it was much lower would be my preferred design. 165
138. Link shops commercial centre as part of an active square with interface of a moved/new railway station. The resulting Commercial Square would front with hotel and De La Warr (south), railway (north). Commercial growth corridors make up the rest of the square. Builds on a growth sq in centre of town including Sainsbury's. The town is no longer fragmented. 166
139. Having just moved to Bexhill (from S.E. London) I probably view this development very differently from the many (older) folk who resist change and are somewhat blinkered when visualising the future and its merits. Yes there will be problems and stumbling blocks for debate but overall it is a positive project, although even on a fine day in January you cannot park along the marina or parade in some places. I feel two of the three proposals fail to blend the major hotel building into the remaining area and in fact the two hotels are monstrous when seen from viewpoint B. Having made my choice (ABK) I really feel that it needs much more time for a proper evaluation. 167
140. Suggest the space is left as it is open - green grass area. The council appears not able to run the De La Warr - let alone a hotel!! 168
141. I still think the hotel would be better across the road - especially on the NE corner of the roundabout. They're all too big and dominate DLWP - number 2 is best (Aukett). Town centre plans look exciting but please sort out station and shops at bottom of Sackville Road. 170
142. Excellent exhibition - clear and easy to understand. Bexhill needs this! 171
143. None of these is in keeping with current views - what happens to the putting green, what about "lost" parking places. 172
144. Whilst many residents are against the loss of the green space and putting green, the Ahrends scheme complements the De La Warr Pavilion more than the others with its curved facades. I agree that Sackville Road roundabout area is an eyesore and could be vastly improved by any one of these schemes. It was good to see so many people interested in this exhibition and being proactive - something not known about much in Bexhill. 173
145. Bexhill needs safe cycle paths - especially on the seafront. 174
146. I think van Heyningen and Haward's "hotel" and office development is too tall. I think a swimming pool available to the public is important. Keeping as many views of the seafront is crucial, from the De La Warr. Provision of

something for young people is also necessary. I don't like the windows on ABK's office block. 175

147. The buildings on the Metropole site are too tall in the ABK scheme or they are trying to fit in too much. I definitely prefer leaving the green areas as untouched as possible. 177
148. All these schemes are visionary and have merit. We need to achieve high quality redevelopment to generate economic prosperity so I would support any scheme which is eventually adopted. My order of preference is based on my liking the architectural design and appearance of the proposed seafront development by ABK which is graceful, exciting and proportionate. 179
149. While I agree Bexhill needs a major lift, the principle of blocking westerly views of the De La Warr I do not agree with. Aukett scheme - intrudes onto the promenade - bad idea. Chapman Taylor - sympathetic to views - except for the west. And the idea of building a further office block is unappealing. ABK most inspiring - but overly dominant. 180

COLLINGTON RESIDENTS AGED OVER 60

150. The regeneration of the town centre is the most important issue. Why build a new hotel when other ones have closed because of lack of business? Also, why provide more office and shop space when the town already has many empty premises available. There are no guarantees that a new hotel complex will work - put the town centre right first. The seafront and Pavilion are two of the main assets of Bexhill - do not spoil it. 182
151. We don't need another white elephant. If another hotel is required it should be built on the site of the Grand, Sea Road. 183
152. The need for improved rail and road links has been identified. Without this improvement the complete concept is not viable. Better restaurant facilities would also be essential. The one largish hotel within Bexhill is unable to attract the business customers it requires - so why more unused beds? The masterplan shows an area for maritime clubs/sports - this has not been adhered to by Aukett who only consider sailing/mixed use. Ahrends are not clear on this point. Chapman Taylor give no information. All in all much more integration, with government assistance, is required. Personally I do not consider any of the hotel designs acceptable for the site. 184
153. ABK scheme good but too high for the site (dwarfs DLWP). However, design excellent. C.T scheme too plain (almost modern version of the old Metropole). Aukett scheme too bitty and unconnected. 185

154. It seems to me that all three hotel schemes will use an existing open space which is highly appreciated by visitors and residents alike. So I am strongly opposed to all three schemes for a hotel on this site. What evidence is there that this complex will bring in revenue? Who will gain from this sale of the land? These are a few of the questions that should be answered. 186
155. Any change can only be for the better. I have lived in the town for 27 years and have seen the town degenerate year by year. 187
156. This is the wrong place and will spoil the seafront. A hotel and office complex if needed should be built over the railway on Devonshire Square. We moved to this town not Hastings or Eastbourne because it was residential not commercial. The last hotel, the Belle in Old Town is closing from lack of business the grand closed through lack of business. This new plan is another white elephant like the piazza - or how to waste public money. 188
157. Are there any facilities for a cinema? I do approve of a hotel which will bring Bexhill up to a resort as opposed to a town above the sea. Perhaps consideration could be given to a Department store in the town. Visitors will come to Bexhill if we have something to offer, choice and enjoyment - we cannot guarantee the weather so indoor enjoyment is essential. To come to the sea - a sea view is normally required. 189
158. ABK - most interesting design, but western aspect of the De La Warr is lost and dwarfed - also lost (with all designs) is the open sea view gained from Sackville Road. Car parking underground – very good. Aukett - appears very disjointed. Rather angular - not reflecting any of the De La Warr's lines from the sea side. Jetty idea good. Stilts - no. 190
159. The plans (Masterplans for Bexhill town centre) suggest one or two cosmetic improvements to the town, but none is worthy of being described as a 'masterplan'. None of the schemes (for the new seafront development) relates in any way to the existence or setting of the Pavilion as a Grade 1 listed building. None of the schemes relates sympathetically to surrounding development. The exhibition is well-staged and presented. The architect s taking part, however, were given an unacceptable and highly contentious brief. It has not previously been discussed with the people of this town and is not wanted by most of them. They want the land left open. The architects have thrown discretion to the winds in their attempts to achieve greatest viability. They have treated the scheme as a studio exercise. It results in each case with a wild over-development, without regard to the Pavilion or surrounding properties. I consider the council are acting irresponsibly, and possibly illegally, in promoting a scheme of this nature without regard to proper statutory consultation procedure. 191

160. As we have so many empty shops already, will more shops be of any help? Our other big hotel went out of business through lack of custom, despite refurbishment at one time. Will a new one do any better? The hope that it will bring conferences etc is doubtful. What would they do in the evening? 192
161. The Chapman Taylor Metropole scheme provides a single building out of proportion with its surroundings. Aukett has too many angles and straight lines. ABK splits the scheme up, and uses curves giving a more pleasant affect, and more sympathetic to the existing surroundings. 193
162. Good scheme in principle, but am reluctant to lose what is probably the best open space vista in Bexhill. 195
163. Chapman Taylor scheme throughout is preferred. Hotel block to be turned a few degrees to the west so at an angle to Sackville Road. 196
164. All three designs will mean that views from the De La Warr will be lost for members of the public, giving instead the views to the hotel users. I like Ahrend's design because it removes the car park in front of the De La Warr pavilion. Chapman Taylor plan is neat but building is too high. 197
165. Office accommodation should be considered over a newly revamped station and not included in the hotel on the seafront. 200
166. None. A disaster. The only good point is the regeneration of Sackville Avenue. 201
167. All designs much too large, will block views along from both east and west, and from local residents living near site. 202
168. All these schemes for building on the site of the putting green will completely cut out the wonderful view from the first floor and staircase of the De La Warr Pavilion. In my opinion this is quite the wrong site for this development. How about building on the other side of the road and demolishing the ugly one-storey shops? 203
169. Sorry - can't choose any schemes. I do not agree with building on the Metropole site at all. The tinkering with the road system - especially in town hall square seems a total waste of money. The 'architect-speak' with reference to the linking of shore to sea is very high faluting to an average person in my view (strong public spaces, realms etc). 204
170. We wish Sea Space every success with this project to regenerate Bexhill. We look forward to seeing the wining scheme take place. 205

171. There seems to be a basic assumption that the putting green area (ex-hotel) must be sacrificed when Bexhill is full of brown field sites awaiting demolition and re-development. I have yet to meet a person who is in favour of new build on green open space. Moving the station to Devonshire Square must be a priority, surely. Decking over the railway for car parking and maybe high rise above - yes. Re-developing the two corner sites entrancing Sackville Road - yes. Re-siting library to old station building - yes. Resurfacing footpaths and once again Western Rd (no warranty?) – yes. Priorities for Bexhill: Roads (access to motorway network without which any regeneration will fail – East/West access ie Folkstone - Honiton trunk road); car parking; station at Devonshire Square; smooth pavements. 206
172. I particularly liked the suggestion by Aukett Ltd to improve Marina corner which is an eyesore at present. I regret the loss of the putting green as at the moment it is the only facility on the seafront for young children. 208
173. Any building over 4-storeys high would have an effect on the amount of sunshine reaching the promenade in the summer evenings. 210
174. Two or three floors should be lopped off the (Chapman Taylor) building - as it stands in diagram it is out of proportion and looks like a beached whale. I think it should be remembered that Bexhill is a small town and does not aspire to be another Brighton – over-develop and it loses the charm it has. And it is not a garish sea-side town which so many sea-side places have become. 212
175. Feel it is important that the whole be developed in as large a tranche as possible - not be piecemeal. Much depends on the De La Warr being restored and developed to its maximum potential eg art, architectural aspects and restaurant. 213
176. All schemes interrupt the current views from town to sea and also divide the view along the front. The Chapman Taylor proposal would be more acceptable if the hotel were to be sited further back from the sea and had fewer storeys. 214
177. Family putting not wanted (by the redesigners). Jobs for the boys, ie the builders. Good views required by business workers. I feel residents are not required. I have known Bexhill from the age of a toddler and have enjoyed the facilities and all my family has enjoyed the long clear walks along the prom. With the shopping pushed out to Ravenside of course the shops are struggling. So many of our friends have appreciated an uncrowded prom and feeling of space. What's wrong with the sea! An underground swimming pool really! 8 floor 'Metropole'. Think of all the views from the whole town gone. 215

178. Chapman Taylor with H&H building is the best of a poor arrangement, but the building is too high. 216
179. Like the Van Heyningen and Haward Chapman Taylor. But think it is much too high and takes away the charm of the De La Warr. It is also very similar to the Arc in St Leonards. Getting rid of part of the car parking facilities is not showing any consideration to the fact that Bexhill has a majority of elderly residents. 217
180. I do not think that Bexhill needs a hotel especially in the position the plans intend to use. But I do think that the railway and Sainsbury's site need redeveloping. 218
181. I found that the proposals put by Chapman Taylor etc were the most sympathetic to Bexhill. I have opted solely for their solution so as to not procrastinate further discussions/solution. 219
182. What about car parks. If more visitors are to come to Bexhill they must have additional car parks. 223
183. Although I would like to see the putting green and open spaces left as they are, if the council are pushing ahead with this scheme, then I feel the ABK scheme and design will look better alongside the De La Warr. As for the rest of the redevelopments, I would say the sooner the better. I thank you for giving me the chance to comment. 225
184. Where will car parks be placed. 226
185. Do not like designs at all (new seafront development). 230
186. Are we obliged to have any of these? All of them totally obstruct the view from the west of the De La Warr Pavilion - which is a listed building, we are told and this should be visible and protected. Any such construction will cause additional traffic congestion round the Sackville Road roundabout and lead, no doubt, to more loss of the present parking facilities at the town end of West Parade. Has anyone considered how the proposed monstrosity - height wise any way, will totally dominate the seafront, which residents cherish?
231
187. I do not want more buildings on the seafront. Improve the open spaces which exist. Put offices - shops and flats away from the seafront. Keep extra traffic off the seafront - landscape Metropole site if under used as a golf course. 232
188. I do not want any of this proposed development to be undertaken. I consider none of them will increase the ambience and suitability of Bexhill as a town where people can retire to. Bexhill is after all a town for retired people. Why

do we have to change its purpose. Retired people have sufficient disposable income to maintain this town. 233

189. I do not like any of the proposed plans. 234
190. Good display gives something for everyone. 235
191. The effect of any of the schemes would be disastrous for the De La Warr Pavilion. It becomes totally eclipsed, and hidden from many directions. The wonderful views at sunset from the south staircase which are extremely popular with the young (30ish) people I know who like to visit, will be lost. It would be dwarfed. All the schemes will date dreadfully whereas the beautiful modernist Pavilion looks as fresh and new as in 1936. Possibly bring new jobs, but at what cost. 236
192. Aukett plan best apart from round tower/spa which looks like a gas tank. It is also too high and dominates the sky line. Sculpture pier an excellent idea. 237
193. Dislike them. All cut off view of the sea which is limited anyway. There is a lot of run down property around which could be used eg, corner of Sackville Road opposite car sales. Clean that site and build a smaller hotel there and find a site for a theatre and cinema which will give our visitors some entertainment. Keep putting green as that is an entertainment. People need things to do not more commercialisation. 238
194. I am totally opposed to any development which infringes on the current grassed areas adjacent to the pavilion. This would totally negate the effect of the Pavilion's restoration and remove a delightful open space (I do not argue that this space should remain as a crazy golf course. It should be maintained as a green setting for the Pavilion). Whichever scheme is adopted, it must make provision for a major car park over the railway. Bexhill must make provision for the motor car! 241a
195. ABK: Although an excellent modern design we feel this scheme would be too overpowering and would dwarf the De La Warr Pavilion. Aukett: This design does not, in our opinion, blend in with the seafront. Chapman Taylor: This is a stylish compact structure having a good open sea frontage. It would complement the De La Warr Pavilion (the design is similar to the Peter Jones store in Sloane Square, London, which is also a listed building of the 30's). 818

COLLINGTON RESIDENTS – AGE UNSPECIFIED

196. I feel that the old Metropole site is quite the wrong place. The derelict shops area on the left of Sackville Road and garage on the right would be more

appropriate, having the De La Warr Pavilion, with the lovely opening of the grass area, showing the building and colonnade up to perfection. The designs of ABK would be appropriate for these areas and complement the De La Warr. The existing piazza could have been improved by covering it with glass, or some other material - completely pedestrian and the traffic flow in St Leonards Road - east-west, using only part of the road west/east to the GPO and post office yard. I do hope some of the schemes reach fruition and Bexhill really does start to regenerate for the coming generation. 239a

197. Have not enough time to absorb all aspects; enough to form opinions in detail. 240
198. All three mentioned a leisure centre. How are the local people going to afford this? Most people who live here are over 60 and those who are not, those between 13 and 18, do not have money to spend on such things. 240a
199. The proposals for change are only acceptable to those who do not like Bexhill as it is. I cannot see that the proposals will encourage the retired fraction of society. I believe many are here to get away from 'modern' development which frequently attracts the aspects of life today which intimidate older people. I would rather the money was spent on an effective bypass ie, as already rejected. Many 'non-daily' terms used reduce clarity of intent eg 'business confidence', 'clever location to live and work', 'cultural tourism destination', 'making more of the seafront', 'evening economy', 'animated Sainsbury's elevation'. 242

3. Kewhurst Ward residents

KEWHURST RESIDENTS AGED 20 – 39

200. Would be nice to keep the open space on the putting green. Could the hotel not go on the Sackville Road corner sites, joined over the road. Worst part of ABK's proposal is not only blocking out the sea view down Sackville Road, but replacing it with a concrete block with an ugly arrangement of windows. The other key views are very good but it doesn't have the consistency of the other two proposals. Take aspects from all three: key views C+D from ABK; replace their smaller standalone tower with something that looks more like Chapman Taylor's tower. Separating office and hotel into different buildings also a good idea. 244
201. Any regeneration will benefit Bexhill we have to think of the younger generations and not listen to old people's comments all the time. Update and regenerate Bexhill. 245

202. It would be nice to be able to maintain the view of the sea down Sackville Road - if not possible, c'est la vie! Bexhill needs and deserves regeneration. 246

KEWHURST RESIDENTS AGED 40 – 60

203. High front line buildings are a bad idea, blocking natural south facing light. Money better used to modernise existing De La Warr building. A pier is a good idea along with some kind of attraction of boats, maybe a small harbour. Tourists want nice open spaces/boats water theme, not a spar/health club. 247
204. I think the hotel should be located where the tatty shops are at the bottom of Sackville Road. The view across the putting green is attractive. It is one of the most pleasant parts of Bexhill as well as providing outdoor facilities - it would be a shame to destroy it. 248
205. Road and rail links to Bexhill to improve. Library and Sainsbury's development to be considered. A 5* hotel is far too ambitious - what else can we offer these visitors when they can go to Brighton and Eastbourne. I hope this doesn't prove to become another white elephant. 248a
206. It should be noted that the height of the building should be strictly regulated. 249
207. Need to go back to the drawing board. Feel none of the designs are fully suitable for Bexhill seafront in the proposed site. Bexhill needs something fairly radical but its got to be right and these proposals are not the answer. 250
208. Good to keep sea views through/around the seafront development at bottom of Sackville Road. Better to have hotel, office and residential apartments in separate buildings. Station definitely needs to come into Devonshire square. Covered market area idea for existing station very good. Lovely to have more space around library and more trees in general around town. 251
209. Building on this site will create an enormous upheaval and loss of views etc to the immediate residents without any guarantee that the scheme will prove viable. There were several hotels in Bexhill in the 1950's - how many are there now? a prospective conference centre? This is a booming business but the competition is getting stronger every day and without a much improved infrastructure in the area generally (and this must stretch much farther than Bexhill and Hastings) these schemes could absorb a great deal of money which would not benefit the existing residents. Those who live in Bexhill and who have moved here live here because of what Bexhill is - we don't want

another Brighton or Hastings or Eastbourne. Has anybody carried out a feasibility study into the usage of a hotel/conference centre/office complex?
253

210. Pier too narrow. Should be wider and longer. 254
211. Do not feel Bexhill needs a hotel complex. Better to spend money on town centre promenade, etc. 255
212. Prefer the putting green not to be built on, spoils the openness of the seafront and views of the present flats on the seafront. Like the idea of the station moving to Devonshire Square. 256
213. We like Chapman Taylor if the number of floors were reduced to 4 or 5 on the Metropole site. We like the rest of your plans for the town. 257
214. Best idea: new station onto Devonshire Square. Why new hotel when old ones couldn't manage to be viable. Why spoil the lovely architecture at present on show along our promenade. A huge building in front will downgrade the existing buildings. All three choices are too tall and will spoil the view from what is supposed to be the jewel "De La Warr Pavilion." We have a very pleasant green view from the west up to the De La Warr. This and the rest of the promenade are part of the reason why we chose to move to Bexhill. If you want vibrant you can go to Brighton or Eastbourne. Bexhill has a wonderful peaceful atmosphere. Not all change is for the best. 258
215. This is the wrong place for this scheme. Does Bexhill really need this type of development? 259

KEWHURST RESIDENTS AGED OVER 60

216. Whatever is the outcome, please consider a planting programme of palm trees along our promenade, that hopefully would complement the new buildings. The committee that makes these decisions surely needs to finish the De La Warr first before its next big project. The De La Warr doesn't see any start as I write this and I suggest we get this right first. 260
217. You must get more 20 - 30 yrs interested to push any scheme forward, the best of luck moving the town on. 261
218. Are our young people showing interest in this regeneration as they hopefully will benefit from the changes? 262
219. The apartment block in the ABK design could be lower to reduce eyesight prominence from approach along seafront. ABK design links in very well

with the Pavilion. I like the idea of keeping the sea elevation glass like the DLW and the plain side on the road. I like the Aukett ideas for extension and redevelopment of the Sainsbury and station sites, and plenty of trees. 263

220. ABK design is very exciting and is by far the best with its clever connection and design with the De La Warr. 265
221. Aukett: Preferred, but concern over the lost view of the De La Warr when approaching from the west. Three built units could be combined with centre spa less prominent and more sympathetic to the De La Warr. Like the little piers (at least not too dominant). Heights generally more acceptable in Aukett than others. ABK: too much glass and also not in keeping with environment, too much height, too many buildings on footprint. Quite like curves of building footprint. Chapman - too high! Uninteresting. 266
222. All this is a waste of time, if roads to Bexhill are not improved. Railway Station should be made into multi-storey car park over the line. 267
223. I would prefer no development on this scale. 268
224. To attract people to the area the road structure into and around the town must be improved. The link road itself is not sufficient. Owners of rundown buildings must be made to effect repairs thus enhancing the general appearance of surroundings to proposed schemes. 269
225. No, no, no, no, no, no to a hotel on the putting green. The Metropole Hotel went years ago as did many other smaller hotels. The fact that we have large blocks of flats on our seafront from South Cliff to Galley Hill indicates that we didn't need hotels to replace the Sackville which used to be a premier hotel in the south. 270
226. We object strongly to all the schemes. Please leave Bexhill alone and do not destroy the open space and putting green. Also please do not take away any more parking spaces as the Town has suffered enough with the post office square development which has made parking for the disabled extremely difficult, if not impossible. 271
227. Bexhill needs more facilities of a high class nature for visitors - eg Eastbourne and NOT Hastings - and to incorporate activities for the young people of Bexhill. 273
228. We have selected what we consider the best of three unnecessary schemes to waste money better spent tidying up the present seafront. 274
229. Not at all keen on a hotel on the seafront spoiling the sea view. 275

230. Do not need a hotel, this town is for retirement and peace. 276
231. Do not think a hotel is needed. Bexhill is a quiet retirement town. If you want to alter this, just say so! 277
232. Reduce height by say, 2 floors (Chapman Taylor + scheme). 278
233. Best option - leave things as they are!!! Repair shop fronts, renew paving, clear site of Grand Hotel. Smarten the town up. Stop wasting residents money on these high flying schemes, which would change the character of the town out of all proportion. Not impressed!!! 279
234. Despite any reasonable argument regarding the need for a hotel complex the site chosen would spoil the Bexhill seafront. Choosing from the proposed plans does not get round the problem. Most residents like Bexhill as it is (after the existing buildings are renovated) and do not want the seafront spoiled. If the money is to be spent really improving Bexhill then the infrastructure must be vastly improved (both road and rail). Build a new station. We do not want commercial development but welcome visitors. Recent events such as the Bexhill 100 and the street market have been cancelled. These were the type of events necessary for a town like Bexhill. We are not a commercial centre. We want to be a contender for "small town of the year." 280
235. I am totally opposed to the development of this site. Why fill this adorable amenity space when there is a facade of very old tatty single-storey shops ripe for redevelopment right opposite. Also, if the garage site on the opposite corner could be redeveloped at the same time the whole vista from the promenade would be brilliant and a welcoming transition from seafront to shopping centre. All Bexhillians were totally delighted when the Metropole was demolished and the seafront opened up at this point. A large building in that position funnelled the prevailing wind into a (?) a gap, thus increasing its velocity on the corner of Sackville Road/Marina where shop windows were (?) blown in and pedestrians blown over. Has a survey been undertaken to ascertain the number of vacant shops? Is there knowledge of any prospective firms wanting sites in the town? What sort of number of enquiries are there for hotel accommodation in the town? All these seem to me to be relevant questions which the public need answered in order to make useful comments. 280a

KEWHURST RESIDENTS - AGE UNSPECIFIED

236. Already there are too many empty shops and derelict buildings without more eyesores. No more trade will actually come with these proposed hotels. Tidy

up what we have so far. Save architects pipe dream. Spend the money wisely.
281

237. I particularly liked the ABK design as it complemented the more unusual architecture of the De La Warr and would make Bexhill more interesting to visit. The eastern corner site of Sackville Road, sea end, should be the first to be upgraded if none of these options go ahead. It is very embarrassing to bring visitors along West Parade to the town and come face to face with the semi-derelict shops. 282

4. Old Town ward residents

OLD TOWN RESIDENTS AGED UNDER 12

238. I think Bexhill should be more modern and there should be much more for children to do, but that includes things for adults to do. If I were to build anything in that place I would have the Chapman Taylor. I would do one half for adults and the other half for children. 283
239. I think Bexhill should be more modern and there should be a lot more for children to do, but that includes things for adults to do too. If I was to build anything I would have it one half for children and the other for adults. 284

OLD TOWN RESIDENTS AGED 13 - 19

240. I don't like the look of the ABK Metropole site as it seems like they have completed work round the sea view side but the view from the town centre looks odd, as if they are trying too hard to modernise it. I like the idea of a cinema in Chapman Taylor's design as a cinema would attract many visitors since we don't have a decent cinema in the town. I would like to see the idea of a sports shop included in one of the designs because the town has been without one for a long time. 285
241. I prefer ABK because it won't just help tourism, it will help the community too. I prefer the seafront design without the "funky" windows because Bexhill isn't designed to be "funky", its designed to be a calm and relaxed environment. However, I do like the idea of a spa on the seafront, it would be good from both touristic and residential point of view. I also like the thought of a walkway to look out to sea. That would be elegant and I'm sure tourists and residents would be very responsive. 286

242. I think the structure which would provide the most comfort space for tourists and residents of Bexhill would be the Chapman Taylor. With the increased space a new golf course could be added. The Aukett Ltd looks very similar to Bexhill High (Dunn Road site). ABK would be an easier target for vandals, being made mostly of glass. There are a lot of rocks on Bexhill's beach that could smash the glass and it may cost a lot to repair and refurbish the design. I think that they are all good designs. 287

OLD TOWN RESIDENTS AGED 20 – 39

243. Keep it simple. Keep the curiosity of Bexhill alive. Extend development into Old Town Bexhill. Employment opportunities for young (attractive opportunities). Greater choice of nurseries 12mths +. 288
244. No thought given to what Bexhill is; a Victorian seaside town. The word folly comes to mind. Get the business and leisure, then concentrate on catering for it. To be honest, they all look a bloody mess. 290

OLD TOWN RESIDENTS AGED 40 – 60

245. Better trains, better places to eat and drink. Places for the young to go. 291
246. What about car parking? This town has a lot of disabled and elderly people in it, there seems to be little help for them! There does not seem much for youngsters either - tots upward. 293
247. ABK with pier concept from Aukett's proposal. 296
248. Parking. 297
249. Please reserve me an apartment! 299
250. I am not against the building of a hotel, providing that it does not spoil the look of the promenade, etc., or create chaos with parking. It has to be considered, however, whether it is a viable venture, bearing in mind the number of shops that are closing. If it brings work, etc., to Bexhill then I am all for it. 300
251. The Aukett scheme is more in keeping with a seaside town. It will add to, not detract from, the Pavilion. The Ahrends project is exciting and new. I like the wave like features but am concerned that it is too dynamic and will overshadow the Pavilion. It is, however, an exciting design and would provide a powerful new image for Bexhill, perhaps a little too powerful! The Chapman Taylor project is too tall and would overshadow the Pavilion. It is

ugly and lacking in imagination, very 20th century not very 21st century. We should be aiming for something different as in either of the other projects.
301

252. Very exciting concepts. 302
253. Please do not build a hotel on the Metropole lawn. It will overshadow and detract from our lovely De La Warr Pavilion. We don't need another landmark site - we already have one! If the Grand (Granville) Hotel closed through lack of business why build another? I agree with many of the suggestions for the town centre, especially vis-a-vis the railway station. Devonshire Square is a joke. Hope the idea will become clear as time elapses. Looking forward to sitting on the balcony of the De La Warr and watching the sunset - with no hotel to block the view. 303
254. Chapman Taylor design blends in and does not compete with DLWP. Its "foot print" is smaller, leaving more green space, does not block the view entirely from Sackville Road. ABK dwarfs the DLWP and will detract from its importance on its site. Aukett is HORRIBLE! 304
255. There is a need to accommodate sports facilities for all ages, e.g. Polegrove pavilions. A new complex to cover bowls, cricket and football on the site would benefit all. The proposed developments on the putting green are not in keeping with the town's architecture. 305
256. Need to go back to the drawing board. I feel money was wasted on Devonshire Square and we can't afford to waste anymore. 306
257. I find it hard to say definite yes or no. All have points of merit for now and the future. Bexhill needs to move on, keep our young people wanting to stay here. Suggestion: use ideas from all three, put them together and exhibit again to the public. 308
258. ABK architecturally seems most compatible with the De La Warr. CT etc too tall. Aukett reasonably good, especially small pier idea. 310

OLD TOWN RESIDENTS AGED OVER 60

259. I not think we need another hotel, as many have closed because of lack of custom. I do not think we need more shops, when there are already empty shops. It is a shame to take away the one piece of green on the seafront. It seems the plan for Bexhill is to move the commercial area to the seafront, expect people to leave the seafront to sit at the top of Devonshire Road. 312

260. All of these proposals reduce light/views for people from all aspects and would be better kept to single storey. 313
261. From an aesthetic point of view there really is no contest. ABK win hands down. 314
262. Chapman Taylor doesn't restrict views of sea. Retains plenty of green. 315
263. From the photos in Bexhill Observer I thought I would prefer Chapman Taylor. But on visiting the exhibition I have really fallen in love with ABK designs. The quality of the architecture is far superior to the other designs and shows a great feeling for the way one can create a sense of movement with solid form. This is very important beside the sea. I found talking to Pete Ahrends also very helpful. The scheme would greatly enhance Bexhill. (NB: A good example is the Guggenheim in Bilbao.) 316
264. Please allow events to take place throughout the period of construction. 320
265. The town needs the green space of the putting green where it is. The town also needs more long term parking near the shopping centre for the residents who live above the shops in the upstairs flats. The town is a retirement place for pensioners from London or larger towns. 321
266. No to the whole sorry scheme. We do not want another empty hotel - look at what happened to the Grand /Granville. 323
267. Don't want the De La Warr overshadowed by tall buildings. Also need the west side of the open space by DLWP left clear. Not too sure re a large hotel but don't want the town completely changed. Good luck with all the work being done. 324
268. I have voted for the Chapman Taylor scheme as I feel the construction of this building is less likely to deteriorate over time and cost less to upkeep, providing only rustproof metal is used. The Aukett scheme looks best from the Sackville Road view but I really dislike the 'water tower' type structure on the sea-side. The ABK scheme looks like a sixties building on the Sackville road view and will soon look shabby as all concrete or rendered buildings do and will cost a great deal of money continuously to keep in a good condition, as the De La Warr does. 325
269. Would prefer hotel, etc., development to be elsewhere - not on the seafront - as this would destroy a pleasant green patch. If development is to take place on the seafront - then Chapman Taylor's proposal has less impact. 326
270. You should 'spread your wings' in the development to include all the adjacent sporting facilities (bowls, cricket, football) which are very close to this

proposed development and attract very many local and visiting people - bringing in revenue year round from across the country. More exposure of all these facilities would genuinely improve and attract visitors - if the facilities were right and proper. 327

271. One questions the wisdom of spending money on hotels when so many have closed over the last twenty years. Those that are left have difficulty in making a profit. Who thinks a new hotel will be any different. Regeneration is a pipe dream until the A21 is improved to at least a dual carriageway. When that is put in place the regeneration will follow automatically. 328
272. Essential that scheme has a 21st century appearance. Sympathetic to existing buildings, especially the De La Warr Pavilion. 329
273. They are all good - but it comes down to personal preference. Certain aspects need urgent attention: railway station; old site from Grand Hotel. The object must be to retain the older style of Bexhill, but move forward in the 21st century – upgrading the area. Parking also must be a large consideration. 330
274. Do not approve or agree with any of these designs. It is extremely difficult to choose between the three designs. Because none of them are relevant to the existing Edwardian theme and image of Bexhill town. I would suggest further discussions and invite other architects to put forward further plans that fit in with the existing environment. 331
275. In my opinion all these schemes are completely out of scale with the De La Warr Pavilion. The shadows cast will overwhelm this building and the squares formed. Where will the people come from to give even 50% occupation. No direct road links Bexhill with north, east or west of the country. The rail link via Eastbourne or Hastings is the end of a roundabout line. People will not be attracted to a third rate art gallery proposed for the ground floor of the pavilion (no top lighting). Staying 10 years ago in the Grand Hotel we were accompanied by one other person. Conference centres exist in many other seaside towns directly each other. Little old Bexhill hasn't a chance to compete. 332a
276. I dislike them all. Apart from the loss of green open space, the proposed building would detract from the attractive design of the Pavilion. What is needed is a better rail service and a new road system linking Bexhill and Hastings. The building of a hotel adjacent to the Pavilion will ruin one of the most attractive green open spaces along the seafront. A hotel built on one of the many derelict urban sites in the town centre would provide accommodation for visitors. A 'proper' cinema which opened more frequently than four nights a week from 8pm would be a useful addition to the town. 332b

277. A brilliant design (Chapman Taylor). 332c
278. The seafront hotel proposals for all three ideas are totally unacceptable to the image of Bexhill. All are too high and block the De La Warr, which seems to be crowded out of the design for the future. Some of the plans for narrowing roads and unnecessarily widening pavements are deplorable. The example of the present new Devonshire Piazza which is a waste of valuable public funds, is an example of the high flown impractical plan. We moved to Bexhill for the value of its present layout, parking and quality of life. Leave well alone. 332d
279. Not in favour of any development on seafront. This would dwarf De La Warr Pavilion and spoil views of Beachy Head. Devonshire Road is easy to drive down, easy to cross the road and pavement seems adequate. Do not waste taxes on unnecessary changes. 332e

OLD TOWN RESIDENTS – AGE UNSPECIFIED

280. De La Warr Pavilion should be reopened as soon as possible with proper maintenance. 332g
281. Some of the English is terrible - eg pedestrian permeability! 332h
282. Very exciting. Bexhill needs it. (Aukett favoured) 332j
283. Am not in favour of hotel as proposed. The open view as now is far better - we do not need another hotel. Am very much in favour of turning the station into a market, and making entrance/exit in the Piazza. Present station is absolute eyesore. All in all the money available I'm sure could be spent in a far more beneficial way. I have not filled in overleaf as I'm not in favour of any proposal in total. 333
284. This is a complete fiasco. Nothing of any merit at all. 334
285. I think the exhibition was very informative. I feel the Chapman Taylor hotel is the best shape to complement the De La Warr Pavilion but I do not think the Metropole putting green site is the best position. Perhaps on the existing seafront car park to the east of the De La Warr or where the garage is on the corner of Sackville Road and Egerton Park Road. Bexhill does need regeneration. Let's try to get it right! 334a

5. Sackville Ward residents

SACKVILLE RESIDENTS UNDER 12

286. I think that Chapman Taylor with van Heyningen & Haward should have thought that business and hotel and flats would not like to be joined in one. That's why I like Ahrends, Burton & Koralek because they are separate buildings but linked up. I like Aukett Ltd. because it helps other parts of the town. It makes places to go to have fun. 335

SACKVILLE RESIDENTS AGED 20-39

287. The Aukett scheme appears to be some sort of oil terminal! The Chapman scheme is far too tall! It doesn't follow the line of flow of the DLWP and will leave this fine building from which it takes its inspiration in a state of perpetual shadow! Only the ABK option represents a viable and well thought out scheme. 336

288. Impressed by all concepts. If funding is secured and one of these designs is chosen, then one of my main concerns is construction materials and how they would withstand the abrasive elements. They might look pretty for 5 years but 15-20 years down the road, how will they fare? Overall I wish the projects the best of luck! 337

289. Ahrends conceptually and artistically looks to the future – others are too retro. Possible modification of window design would be a good idea. Any scheme requires something artistically looking to the future in terms of form – so that the rest of the town will follow when regenerated. The question remains whether the public will really benefit from this if too much is given over to offices and commercial enterprise. 338

SACKVILLE RESIDENTS AGED 40-60

290. None. Best as it is (town centre). It is all very ugly (new seafront development). There should be more car parks for visitors coming to the town centre! Since Devonshire (ugliness) Square is closed to cars. People are a nuisance with cars in front of owners houses! 340

291. Do we need a hotel at all? Keep the local popular library in mind. 341

292. Very much all the Aukett's areas identified on their masterplan we like, especially the much better use of the open public spaces with green trees. 345

293. I like ABK seafront idea except for the Viewpoint B – the windows. I like Aukett's walkway going out from promenade over the sea. 346
294. ABK – exciting, innovative design – viewpoint C. But have reservations about fascia of viewpoint B. Feel design complements the De La Warr whereas the other two designs seem to fit more uncomfortably in the landscape. 347
295. I would welcome the development of the town and would particularly like to see more leisure facilities on the seafront as well as cafes, restaurants etc. – sadly lacking at the moment. I am also pleased to see architects proposals are innovative – badly needed as 'Rother' do not have the ability or resources to look at the bigger picture. Fascinating. 348
296. I suggest to pull the De La Warr Pavilion down, but keep the seafront café area. Construct a pier to the sea as envisaged in the plans. Build a modern complex like the Chapman Taylor plan on the site. Doing it this way would be the least obstructive to the neighbouring areas and to maximum utilisation of the site. The new construction may even look similar to the Pavilion. 826

SACKVILLE RESIDENTS AGED OVER 60

297. ABK's cluster of buildings looks an inspiring design. Its separate elements give a feeling of light and space. The main objection is always going to be the site: Bexhill people have got used to the lawns/putting green, forgetting that the Metropole Hotel was once there. And Mendelsohn's scheme for a hotel (8 storeys by the look of it – see photocopy) would also have completely blocked the view across to Eastbourne from the Pavilion. 352
298. The hotel concept is good. My preference is for a smaller low rise development but accept high density occupation is commercially necessary. Not much information on the forecast increase in activity such as retail take up in the town. I am sure that every effort will be made to develop the use of the De La Warr as a cultural centre. Bexhill is great and individual. No influx of high street giants (Gap, MacDonalds). Please try and keep this array of small traders. Please don't fiddle with the promenade with red tarmac spots and white lines. Thank you for your efforts. 354
299. Although Bexhill is not my 'permanent' home, I live here part of the time and own a property here. I am still interested to see any proposed plans and to have a say in any proposed developments which will eventually be made at some future date. 355
300. I think it would be a pity to build on the Metropole site, it should be kept as an open space. A more suitable place would be where the garage is at the end

of Sackville Road. The beauty of Bexhill seafront is its open spaces. I think many of the proposals are good and Bexhill certainly needs livening up. 358

301. Leave it as it is. Why do we need another hotel in Bexhill when the Grand closed for lack of business and others are struggling? What happened to the concept of a couple of years ago of maintaining the town's Edwardian style? 359
302. A development of an off-shore safe bathing/swimming area would be an added advantage. 360
303. ABK – I liked view from South but NOT from Sackville Road. Building blocks feeling of sea being at the end of the road...otherwise NO. Aukett: – Complements existing De La Warr building – my choice for looks and organisation of space. Chapman Taylor: – Sackville Road building horrific and old hat. Does not add anything to De La Warr building. 361
304. Chapman Taylor hotel acceptable if lower and further back from sea to keep view to Eastbourne from Pavilion Terrace. Access to station from Devonshire Square needed. Old station building would make a good indoor market. 362
305. Too much focus on Metropole site. Too little attention to station/town centre. Exhibition seems geared to building design rather than regeneration. Would like to see economic/social implication leading rather than buildings. 365
306. None. Demolish De la Warr Pavilion. And rebuild with theatre, hotel and flats, keeping open space. 366
307. Any development should not over lap existing shops, restaurants, cafes etc. already in town. 366a
308. As well as a new hotel we also need a new station and more general entertainment encouraged into the town. 366c
309. Before doing anything else, have all pavements repaired with proper dropped kerbs at every corner. 366d
310. All three schemes will obstruct the view from the De la Warr – especially from semi-circular panoramic view from spiral staircase. Evening sun will be obstructed. 2. It is hoped that Bexhill will retain its quaint charm and shops which serve the public well. We don't need a miniature Eastbourne or Hastings – it would defeat the whole ethos of the town. 3. None of the buildings should be higher than the De la Warr Pavilion. 366e
311. I have indicated that of the 3 hotel plans Ahrends, Burton & Koralek appear to blend in with the De La Warr Pavilion best. I do not wish to see the

seafront destroyed as it is the most beautiful seafront, better than Eastbourne or Hastings & St. Leonards. It would be an outrage to spoil its character. 366f

312. Bexhill-on-sea is a residential town, not predominantly a seaside or business resort, i.e. Hastings or Eastbourne. I would prefer it kept that way, but, of course, making way for progress, but not on such a large scale. Up date, yes, but in line with its present status. We moved here for this reason and would be very disappointed to see it copy all other resorts. It is individual and I would prefer it kept that way. 367
313. Chapman Taylor takes up the least space BUT it swamps De la Warr Pavilion. Priority – station first. 368
314. De la Warr Pavilion and seafront development must retain the space to show off clean lines and aspect of the Pavilion. In many ways would be better position on the corners of Sackville Road – leaving the space around the Pavilion. Great importance should be given to town hall, town centre and station area. To me this is the district that really needs the development proposed. 371

SACKVILLE RESIDENTS – AGE UNSPECIFIED

315. Do not like ABK and Aukett. 373
316. I'm pleased to see at long last 'Bexhill' is about to be modernised. At the moment we are in a time warp. We want Bexhill to be a place of the future for the young people who live here. 374
317. None. All plans for hotels block my view of the sea and domes. The value of my flat will drop without the wonderful view I now enjoy. It will stop so much light coming in my windows. I will have to move. 375

6. St Marks Ward residents

ST MARKS RESIDENTS AGED 13 - 19

318. All good. We should definitely have something modern to bring Bexhill into the 21st century and make it more appealing to younger citizens. 378
319. The ABK looks very good from the sea but the outward view is disappointing. It has nice open areas but is let down by the rectangular glass on one side. The Chapman Taylor design with cinema sounds great. I think

that the best looking designs are ABK and Aukett Ltd. 379

ST MARKS RESIDENTS AGED 20 - 39

320. None. I do not think that a hotel is needed here. 380

321. I like the design of the hotel/office/apartment blocks of ABK. But I think the vision of the design of Aukett's bid re the rest of the regeneration of the town is excellent. 381

ST MARKS RESIDENTS AGED 40 - 60

322. This is a biased questionnaire. There is no opportunity to express an opinion 'none of the above'. I am absolutely horrified and upset by the idea of plonking a huge eyesore next to our De La Warr Pavilion (see key views). We will be sitting on the balcony of the Pavilion looking at something like a 1960s car park instead of the green lawns at present - and the views of Eastbourne will be restricted. If you must have a hotel, please, please build it somewhere else: Sainsbury's area, the Grand site, improve the station and use some of that site, etc. The Cooden Beach is often half-empty - and remember the Grand? 382

323. The ABK proposals offer the most attractive of solutions. It would also permit removal of the town's eyesore, the railway station. 383

324. We like the design of this building, but do not agree with the block of flats. Flats need to be built at the end of Sackville Road near the garage area. 384

325. The Chapman Taylor Van Heyningen and Haward proposals most respect the De La Warr Pavilion and the views from properties opposite the current putting green. Enhancement of Sackville Road would be of great benefit, as would moving the entrance to the railway station. The only question is 'does Bexhill really need a large hotel development on the seafront?' Particularly as one is also planned for Hastings. 385

326. Do not think the Metropole site should be developed. 387

327. I feel it is more important to develop the area around the Devonshire Square/Sainsbury's/station and concentrate on a good road infrastructure before embarking on the seafront area. Please do not obstruct the view to Eastbourne and Beachy Head. 388

328. Now get on with it! 389

329. Bexhill needs something new and exciting for the future. Looking at old photographs there was a hotel before so it is not something new. ABK is the most interesting design and will attract visitors to Bexhill. 390
330. It is vital that the area through the rail corridor giving increased attention to the whole town is part of the scheme. Provisions for employment are key to the sustainability of the whole town. The correct balance of age groups is so important. 391
331. None of them. I cannot realistically see any of these plans coming into reality. Bexhill is and always has been an elderly person's town (and has always catered for the old). 392
332. Please get on with it. 393
333. Aukett is the most attractive scheme as the landscaping is in keeping. Also there is allowance made for gradual development in case one of the elements of the planned development does not work (e.g. hotel). 394
334. They all spoil the seafront. The one I have chosen seems to be the best of the bunch (Chapman Taylor). I feel sorry for the poor souls that will have their view of the sea ruined! 395
335. Upgrade of main roads in the area. Particular attention to the A21. This is the greatest chance to modernize Bexhill, to do away the Victorian fascia. The old farts have had their day. Give it to young and future generation. I would not want to see the Victorian look in 50 years time. 396
336. It is very important that the views of our young people are given great credence too, since they are the ones who regeneration is aimed at. Whilst everyone is entitled to their own opinion the 'keep things as they are brigade' do not have the long-term future of the town and future generations at heart. There are elements in each of the schemes, which have great merit. I hope that the opportunity is taken by the 'winning' company to include the best elements from each. 397
337. ABK: Superb concept but north elevation rather unattractive and contrived compared with south. Aukett: Most visionary for the town centre as a whole. Chapman Taylor: Boring - little imagination. 398
338. Ensure car parking and delivery access to all major key points of town. Encourage retail outlets in shopping area, not office based shops. Encourage major retail groups, i.e. M&S, Debenhams. Improve town link roads. 399
339. The De La Warr Pavilion is an important listed building and should not be overshadowed by modern buildings of highly questionable design. This is an

Edwardian / 30s art deco town which needs smartening up - especially the station. But it does not need to be turned into a place for tourism and business at the expense of it's quiet, peaceful, residential atmosphere. That is why people live here and that should be protected. Bexhill does not need another hotel. It does need more parking facilities. But leave tourism to Hastings and Eastbourne. 401

340. I do not like any of the proposals - they are all unsightly and not in keeping with the character of the town. Please let us have some positive ideas! 402

ST MARKS RESIDENTS – AGED OVER 60

341. We do not particularly like any of these schemes as we do not want to see the putting green space built on. Is there a need for a hotel anyway? 404
342. In view of the siting of the De La Warr Pavilion, a Grade 1 listed building and virtually unique, I do not consider any of the schemes appropriate, as they all block the view of the Pavilion, particularly from the West. It would be far preferable to redevelop the area behind this site, adjacent to Sackville Road as this area is a complete eyesore. Schemes for the improvement to the rest of Bexhill such as Devonshire Road, Bexhill railway station (are OK). 405
343. I would like to see a development which is sympathetic to the existing architecture, particularly the Pavilion. Nothing too tall or dominant. 406
344. None. Wrong position. 407
345. Anything that improved the pavements and parking has to be good for the town. Plus more trees and flowers around the town. The putting green should remain as it is. We object strongly to any hotel being built on this site. The obvious site is the bottom of Devonshire Road. 408
346. No one scheme for overall regeneration stands out although all have merits and aspects I do not agree with. ABK has many good points but I think pedestrianization of Devonshire Road would be dependent on convenient parking being made available. It is vital that any hotel should complement and not dominate the De La Warr Pavilion. Chapman Taylor hotel complex is the only one acceptable. But I would like to see it rather lower and perhaps angled slightly westwards. 411
347. With any regeneration and development scheme it is absolutely essential to get first things first in this modern age. This means priority should be given to transport and communication i.e. Bexhill must have a good road and rail transport system. Therefore a full Bexhill and Hastings bypass road should be

built as soon as possible. The fact that it was refused was a disaster. Surely one route could be found with give and take to satisfy environmentalists as well as fulfill the requirements of transport. Then the regeneration scheme should start - without the bypass Bexhill will not attract business or the youngsters. At the same time the rail system should be improved and stations modernised. The state of Bexhill, St Leonards, Hastings and Cooden Beach stations is a disgrace. Chapman Taylor building is best but would be better lower - without the offices - these should be moved elsewhere. 412

348. An excellent exhibition with most innovative designs and proposals. The Chapman Taylor hotel, etc., design is the most compact and simple giving one unified building and preserving the maximum open space around it as well as preserving most of the sea views. The ABK scheme is more visually exciting but occupies much more of the site. It would be ideal if the two other corner sites on the Sackville Road roundabout could be developed at the same time with sympathetically linked designs. It seems that the regeneration of Town Hall Square and the Sainsbury's site would also be a great asset and could be greatly improved and made much more user friendly. This is as important as the seafront scheme. It would also make sense to relocate the station to Devonshire Square, making it small, modern and efficient; relegating the existing station to other uses. Rother and Sea Space should also lobby the government for reinstatement of the bypass (in full) as good transport links are the main requisite for successful regeneration of a town. 413
349. The option chosen (Chapman Taylor) is only the lesser of three evils. My own view is that the site for a new hotel could be on the site of the recently demolished 'Grand Hotel'. 414
350. West Parade to roundabout, no parking to be allowed both sides of road. 415
351. A major car park should be incorporated in the town plan. 416
352. The De La Warr Pavilion should not be dwarfed by additional buildings - it is our jewel. Why not incorporate a library and coffee area for residents. A major car park must be incorporated in town plan. What about children and young people? They must be welcomed. The idea of the pier is an excellent one – at one time we had the Kersal(?). Redevelopment is long overdue. Good luck! 417
353. The hotel (viewpoint A, ABK) has too many storeys. It is out of proportion. Regarding the De La Warr 'theatre' we are concerned that there will be continued use as a 'live' theatre as part of the regeneration of our town. 418
354. As a retired chartered building surveyor, I consider ABK plans and proposals to be far better than the two alternatives. I positively dislike the Aukett

scheme. 419

355. None. All the schemes have lost the spirit of Bexhill. 420
356. Please - if it is going ahead, get on with it! We have had years of pussyfooting around and getting nowhere (think of the abandoned De La Warr Pavilion). But - and it is a big but - first of all be sure that Bexhill actually needs it! 421
357. Is additional hotel accommodation a realistic proposition? If yes - what additional car parking provisions are to be provided? Are utilities to be enhanced to accommodate the foreseen increase in population? What recreation facilities are to be provided to satisfy increased demand? 422
358. None. Is the project (?) going to be called “Gubby’s folly”? 424
359. All equally appalling. Seafront development: Old Metropole site should remain as green space - open views. Any hotel developments would ruin views of Bexhill’s greatest pride, the De La Warr Pavilion and views from it westwards. I also greatly question the economic viability of any such hotel development. Town centre upgrade: What is most needed is imaginative approach to Devonshire Road/ the station/ town hall square/ library area which join on to the “railway corridor” through the town centre. Main features of my long considered notions for the town: cover over railway from Sea Road bridge to post office footbridge - for landscaping and car parking; relocate station at end of Devonshire Road (parking provided in ‘covered’ area of railway); join up north and south of railway by suitable pedestrian over bridge or underpass (as in Hastings/Poole) via Sainsbury’s to Town Hall Square; develop library area; pedestrianise where possible. 425
360. The hotel design submitted is excellent but put it at the other end of the seafront. Suggest knocking down old buildings beyond Devonshire Road (the amusement arcade is located there). 426
361. This can’t come too soon. This town is a disgrace – appalling shopping area which doesn’t make anyone want to shop here. In short, it’s a complete shambles. This Council now has a great opportunity. Aukett has shown with even a small amount of investment this town could be a pleasant environment and that perhaps the Council actually cares and stop penny-pinching. This company’s display was also the best presentation of the three. Seafront development: ABK’s proposal could be the only one – sympathetically in keeping with the De La Warr, although the face onto the roadside should be looked at again to make it in keeping with the seafront elevation. 825
362. Only ABK’s Metropole site fits with the De La Warr Pavilion architecturally, however, it should be limited to two, not three block units to avoid the

‘scattered look’. Clearly Aukett employ good landscape architects – this part of their masterplan proposal is the best of the three. When will the work ever be done? Metropole site: Aukett’s buildings are dreadful 1960s – crude. Chapman Taylor’s buildings are tall and uninteresting – no doubt very cost effective – which I am sure will appeal to Rother D.C., the land owner! ABK’s building scheme stands head and shoulders in design attractiveness above the others. 828

ST MARKS RESIDENTS – AGE UNSPECIFIED

363. My husband and I do not want a large building (hotel) on the seafront. We fully endorse the views of Cllr Peter Fairhurst expressed in the Bexhill Observer (page 8, 26/3/04) on the refurbishment of the De La Warr. Site of the hotel: do we need one in the town? Sackville Road alterations and development of the very popular putting green: no more buildings obstructing the view of the seafront which could be made more interesting with: a) activities like Regatta’s, rowing races with “information personnel” (not loudspeakers) explaining what is going on; b) keeping the beach clean all year round. Refurbish station and encourage use of rail day trips, etc. (leave cars at home). 427
364. No strong preference. All the schemes seem to achieve very similar objectives. 428
365. I thought there were many excellent and imaginative ideas re making Bexhill a more pleasant and attractive place to live and visit: Aukett’s tree-scaped areas; library; town hall square, etc.; developing a real ‘piazza’ at Devonshire Square (which means limiting vehicle access); and converting the old station into a covered market with a new, modern station on Devonshire Square. These were also practical ideas which could be cost effective, low budget. I’m less sure about the Metropole. If Bexhill (or someone) can successfully market a hotel – and I need convincing – it wouldn’t seem necessary to have to go bang next to the De La Warr, spoiling the view. If it did, it shouldn’t be high rise. But the idea of a spa hotel is good – very good. You must put these plans on a website or in brochure form for people to study properly. 430

7. St Michaels Ward residents

ST MICHAELS RESIDENTS AGED 13 -19

366. Aukett Masterplan by far the best. Redevelopment of the corner sites of Sackville Road must happen at the same time for the hotel development to be a success. 432

ST MICHAELS RESIDENTS AGED 20 - 39

367. Like inclusion of projects for town centre and overall concept. Nice to have a pier back. Tower spa dominates rather, could be scaled down. Wooden louvres may not weather well. 433

ST MICHAELS RESIDENTS AGED 40-60

368. Is a hotel on the Metropole site needed? Without improved roads and rail links to the rest of the country will visitors or business come to Bexhill? Is there an alternative site? All options in my opinion spoil the view of the seafront. With regards to the actual Metropole development it was difficult to choose between my choices 1 and 2. Choice 1 (ABK) appears better when viewed from the De La Warr, but not from the street side. The curves and glass are lovely, but not the concrete structures with what looks like windows stuck on it at random. This completely spoils it. My choice 2 (Chapman Taylor) its preferable as it still leaves some green space, but is far too big - needs to be about 4 stories smaller. 435
369. This is a positive scheme for Bexhill. I hope this regeneration goes through. Good luck. 438
370. The sea is everything Please don't obscure the view. 439
371. Professional outlook with the Chapman Taylor group has the requirements. Sympathetic with existing De La Warr Pavilion. 440
372. In my opinion Aukett's designs blend in with the surroundings and do not impose on the surroundings. 441
373. Not happy with proposed site, but assume no alternative is being considered. 442
374. ABK: I consider the design inventive, interesting, But a lot of consideration has to be given to the types of materials use in construction to cope with

extreme high winds. Any mechanism for operating blinds will have to be internal as hinges, etc., would not survive 70mph wind speeds, especially during the winter months. The hotel must be made accessible to local people for recreational drinks, e.g. coffee, and must not become an exclusive facility for the wealthy residents. It would be nice to make it disabled friendly with automatic doors, etc., for easy access, to include disabled toilet and plenty of visible space to operate wheelchairs. The Heyningen & Haward (Chapman Taylor) design is a mistake. Allowing open balcony access could result in accidents or suicide attempts from such a tall building (not well designed – rather boring). The Aukett design is interesting. Very creative in using energy with fuel saving designs and areas of light and dark. Good access for all including the disabled. 443

375. Any development of the Metropole site is deplored. Goodbye open space. 445

376. To enhance ‘seaside’ development. To encourage a stay rather than an ‘en passant’ approach to the town. 446

377. The Metropole is the wrong site for a hotel. Each of the designs is visually overpowering and would dominate the street scene to an unacceptable degree. The Skoda garage site and the opposite Sackville Road corner offer the natural choices, affording the hotel sea views without being intrusive. A hotel is needed but not on the Metropole site. I can remember the Metropole – it threw Marina into deep shadow. 447

ST MICHAELS RESIDENTS – OVER 60

378. The Chapman Taylor complex is far too tall and blocks out the light and views too much. The Aukett Ltd section is better, but the Ahrends complex is the best of all with its modern style, varying heights and see-through areas. 448

379. Very impressive plans. 449

380. I don’t really approve any of the schemes. I think Bexhill does need renewing but with not so much of the high-rise buildings please. I am sure a lot of the new proposals could be much more tastefully designed with not so much building on the seafront. We do need more room for car parking underground. The station certainly needs to be moved to opposite the post office and get rid of the toilets which should also be modernised. We certainly do not want such a big hotel on the seafront. All new buildings should complement the older tasteful style. 452

381. Any development on the Metropole site will be a blot on the landscape. We must retain the few remaining open green areas. However given the remit that

one feels the decision has been made regardless of public opinion, the two tall buildings are totally unacceptable. The Aukett proposal is therefore the lesser of three evils. At all costs another Devonshire Square fiasco must be avoided. 453

382. Although we have put our preference for the hotel, it doesn't help the people living opposite taking their view. Is there really a need for this on the seafront? 455
383. Although we have filled in the boxes according to our preference, I do not feel the need to put a hotel on our seafront at all. People visit Bexhill because of the uniqueness and an ultra modern hotel on the seafront completely destroys this image. We agree the town needs regeneration – but not this way. 456
384. The wind effect on the curved structure (Chapman Taylor) would be horrendous. The loss of parking at the Pavilion site, even though it is being moved to the proposed hotel site, would not, not be helpful to old folk. It would mean them walking further on the windiest corner in Bexhill. As a member of Bexhill Rowing Club I am concerned that we may be overlooked. I know plans are in hand for a new look house, but I would take this opportunity to mention this. 457
385. Height of Aukett development most keeping with the De La Warr. Please keep the most green landscaping you can. 458
386. Unless a proper evaluation of the need for a hotel is done, I cannot see how viable this would be. Unless the town has many other leisure opportunities, a hotel is not going to be successful. Why have all the existing hotels been turned into nursing homes? 460
387. Do not think that the proposed hotels complement either the De La Warr Pavilion or the colonnade. Agree the station needs replacing but what about its status as a grade one listed building? Upgrading the shopping area just makes it into another new area. In my experience of talking to visitors, they like to come to an old style shopping street as a change from all the 'Arndales'! 464
388. The Chapman Taylor seafront scheme is the only one to leave some open space at the west end. But the main building is much too tall and out of keeping with other buildings already there. Who is likely to want to live sandwiched between offices and hotel rooms? 465
389. Quite honestly we don't want a hotel on the old Metropole site. 466

390. With the population demographics in Bexhill, too much exclusion of transport from the main shopping roads may lead to people going elsewhere. Walking is not an option for many in Bexhill. A scheme with any building over five storeys will lead to the ridicule that was given to the NHS building and the high tower block in Eastbourne. Bexhill is not a high town like Hastings. 467
391. No development to be on seafront green. Children's scheme in the 'Observer' worth looking into. No cycle routes shown. Town centre schemes would be better with a combination of ideas. Devonshire Road parking not 90° but 45°. Booking hall and Sainsbury's access in Square. Good. Multi-storey parking over Sainsbury's. 822
392. I do not feel that any of the schemes will be an improvement. Some of the ideas, like a ticket office in Devonshire Square and much needed parking would help greatly. Also, the additional parking along Devonshire Road, but only if it is 45°, otherwise the cars will have difficulties turning and reversing in and out. Thus causing more hold ups. 823

ST MICHAELS RESIDENTS – AGE UNSPECIFIED

393. Is the infrastructure available in Bexhill to make these schemes sustainable in the long term? 468

8. St Stephens Ward residents

ST STEPHENS RESIDENTS – AGED UNDER 12

394. We would like to see: nice bar / restaurant like the De La Warr bar - but bigger. Lots of big windows, so you can see the sea. A big fountain and a swimming pool with water slide. We would also like to see telescopes on a viewing platform on the top of the building. 470

ST STEPHENS RESIDENTS – AGED 13 - 19

395. Aukett seems to be the most thought out plan. It also has encapsulated the surrounding environment within the plans and would be the best plan for the regeneration of the area. Environmentally is good too. It also compliments and does not detract from the De La Warr. Very good, new, different. 471
396. Aukett: The idea of having fountains come up from the ground, as it would

occupy children in the summer. The hotel is fairly ordinary and plain. ABK: the glass side of the hotel looks futuristic and modern, but the other side looks unfinished, unattractive and cheap. The developments in the town aren't interesting and will not help with community. Chapman Taylor: I do not like the look of the hotel but I like the trees on the roads. A pier would be a great idea with arcade and ice rink. The station definitely needs developing, as it is depressing and dull. Also, it needs a cinema and a shopping centre so young people do not have to travel to Hastings or Brighton. 472

397. The rear view of the ABK design looks outstanding but the front view disappoints me greatly. I believe that a spa and gym would be very good and I think in the future a better variety of shops are needed so that it can attract more tourists, therefore bringing more money to the town. To improve Bexhill I believe that a train station needs to be included at Glyne Gap, Ravenside. If there were regular shows at the De La Warr it would take in a lot of money, for example, Boxing Day event always fills the seats and is sold out. 473

398. Aukett: I like the idea of having fountains coming up from the ground, as it would be a fun activity to occupy children in the summer. ABK: The side of the building that faces the sea (the glass side) is really nice and modern, but I really don't like the side that faces the town, as it is not at all attractive and looks unfinished and cheap. A pier would be good. The station definitely needs improvement, as it is depressing and dull. Chapman Taylor: I don't like the hotel idea, as it is pointless. It needs to hold activities i.e. cinema's, ice rinks so people don't have to travel outside of town to have something to do. 474

ST STEPHENS RESIDENTS – AGED 20 - 39

399. Any developments would be welcome. Not keen on the Chapman Taylor tower block. Too bland. Much preferred Aukett Ltd design, it looks and feels more leisurely as opposed to corporate and bland; much better for the seaside setting. 475

400. As a young person living in Bexhill it is time we moved into the 21st Century. I am all for history but we must look forward to the future and give opportunities to the younger generation of Bexhill to help us once again become a great seaside town that we can all be proud of. 477

401. These changes should be made to increase popularity among young people. 478

402. All designs need to be toned down. We already have a beautiful building. Enhancement is required. Gardens, etc. 'Bexhill is unique'. Visitors to

Bexhill want calmness, tranquility and pleasure. I work in the city of London and commute every day. I find the De La Warr a timeless piece and a remarkable piece of engineering. Some of the designs need to be more sympathetic. People like to walk the seafront, to sit and enjoy the sea. Do we want shops? Do we want offices? Think please! I'm more than happy to talk about any points. 479

403. You need to create an open space (plaza) for the site including the De La Warr. Remove traffic / parking from site and town centre. Office space should be away from the seafront and building height similar to De La Warr. 480
404. Any design needs to be in keeping with Bexhill as it is currently. I like the idea of trees, traffic calming, underground parking and facilities for local people as well as hotel guests. The weather must be considered and I like idea of the shutters. Having large open green spaces is nice but will be unused for a large proportion of the year. Large glass buildings are not practical in bad weather - salt corrodes. Windows get dirty very quickly in high winds. 481

ST STEPHENS RESIDENTS – AGED 40-60

405. Chapman Taylor scheme looks the best, but it is too high and too near the sea. The building concept is neat. They have, however, not dealt with redevelopment of other parts of the town. It seems a shame to build on this open space. Instead, I think some trees, shrubs and plants should be put on this site to enhance it - not a huge building. Some seats could be placed around the perimeter, making it a nice place to sit during a sunny afternoon or to eat sandwiches at lunchtime. 483
406. Anything that will revitalise the centre of Bexhill would be welcome. 484
407. I strongly dislike all hotel proposals as sited. I have no strong views as to the necessity of the hotel, but if it is to be developed, please use another (brownfield) site in the town. I acknowledge that the original De La Warr Plans allowed for additional buildings, that is not necessarily an argument for further development now. Furthermore, do any of the designs fit into the town anywhere? .485
408. Move building back so it doesn't spoil the view or throw a shadow on the Pavilion. Make it lower. 487
409. This development does not fit into the lifestyle of Bexhill. The way forward is to upgrade what is already here. Bexhill cannot sustain this type of development and it will go bust. Before any consideration is given to major improvements, the transport infrastructure has to be improved. Has any

consideration been given to existing business because it will clearly impact on them in a negative way? The residents of Bexhill live there because it's a town that fits their lifestyle. It is not Hastings. 489

410. I do not like any of the plans! Why can't the money be spent on the De La Warr? I understand that the roads will not be upgraded so how will the existing roads cope with the increase of traffic and will we have to pay for the new parking facilities? Will we as a town end up like Hastings? 490
411. I don't see why we can't have the De La Warr enlarged to include a hotel if we have to have a hotel at all. We have just lost one to fire, as it was derelict. We love our De La Warr and need it in the town to work with everybody. 491
412. While I can admire the skills of the designers I cannot vote for any of these developments. Hastings is about to be ruined - please not Bexhill too! I am against loss of green open spaces and especially against new high rise development on the seaward side of the sea front road. I am against restrictions to traffic flow and loss of parking. We do not need a hotel or offices towering over the beach. We should restore, upgrade, paint and enhance the town and make use of empty shop units. A Sainsbury redevelopment bridged to Western Road would be okay. Redevelop tatty brownfield site - leave seafront views unobstructed. PS. What about facilities for younger people! 493
413. I've always felt that Bexhill station is an absolute disgrace which is why I'm pleased to see it featured in two of these proposals. I also feel that no proposal should 'overpower' the De La Warr Pavilion, and shouldn't distract from the 'Sunday afternoon stroll' feel of Bexhill seafront. 495
414. Very much like the station plans - to develop the link between the piazza and crossing the railway to get to the town hall square area. I like the idea of an innovative hotel next to the De la Warr Pavilion but feel the design should be very sympathetic to the Pavilion's appearance. I like the landscaping through the whole town. 496
415. The concept for a new hotel is very interesting. However will it be successful? The putting green and view is great and I will be sad to see this disappear. Could a new site for the putting green be found? If a new hotel is built, I hope it provides a decent sized swimming pool. Bexhill greatly needs a decent sized swimming pool. Regarding tourism, Bexhill does not appreciate its history. The church tower, which is 100 years old, still requires a plaque, along with many other historical places. Good luck, in regeneration but I hope some of the history can be maintained. 497
416. Like Ahrends Devonshire Road proposals especially. Aukett Town Hall Square. Van Heyningen_sports area, preserving views down main roads and

retail. Town pier/sculpture pier is a good idea. 498

417. Would bring people to Bexhill. 499

418. I think design 3 (Chapman Taylor) is the most suitable and will fit in with the Pavilion. 827

ST STEPHENS RESIDENTS – AGED OVER 60

419. The ABK proposal is aesthetically the most appealing and would appear to blend well with the existing De La Warr Pavilion. So striking a good balance with the town's existing architecture and the need to modernise the town and make it more attractive to both visitors and residents. The addition of an attractive water feature (not some abstract concrete monstrosity) would worth a consideration. I decline to grade the other two designs as I feel that the Chapman Taylor design is already featured in Hastings and is too boxy and disjointed and fails to blend in with existing surroundings. The Aukett design just does not bear consideration as it is so far out of character. 500

420. None. All too high and obtrusive. The beautiful De La Warr would be completely obliterated. Providing more shops when the ones in the town are empty seems a silly proposal. Directing everything to the front will be of no benefit to the businesses already struggling. 501

421. I like Chapman Taylor, it is much neater. I like the layout in that position and it reflects the De La Warr in a very sympathetic way. I really like it. 502

422. None. The hotel as envisioned is totally out of sympathy with the surrounding buildings and landscape. It is far too small to be viable as a conference centre and putting so many different features into the overall design constitutes a gross overuse of what is a very small site. 503

423. While I like aspects of all designs, I think Cllr Fairhurst's children's group idea of putting the hotel on the Marina where the Skoda garage is sited (instead of the flats that are proposed) and conference rooms etc where the shanty town (Di Paolo's etc) is sited is a superb idea. This would retain the open space that we love. An underground car park with play area above would be perfect where the existing car park is sited and the railway / Sainsbury site should certainly be developed. Under no circumstances should a building alongside the De La Warr be taller or wider or longer than it. 504

424. Chapman Taylor design retains more open sea views generally but in particular for those existing residents in the flats on West Parade. Your question 2 in both cases I find extremely odd and unnecessary since the remit to all architects was the same and all designs encompass the requirements.

We have a chicken and egg situation. Is this the first proposition the first requirement? Where is the office accommodation and good transport facilities to attract commerce and should not these be provided in the first place? 505

425. As seen overleaf ABK has my approval. A 300 car underground park needs to be designed for the safety of users. Please keep this in mind. The roofs, I'm told by the architect could be 'green'; ie grass /wild flowers or 'brown' pebbles. This is an excellent idea. Finally, once a decision is made is the council going to tell us: "Oh dear, we cannot go ahead our own funds and promised funds are not now available?" Sadly, my feeling is that it will be a case of talking, consultations and finally nothing being done. 506
426. Views of Beachy Head seem to be lost. Would it not be a better idea to demolish the De La Warr Pavilion and build a hotel and a leisure centre? 507
427. The scheme (ABK) is good but not the design of the front. A bit too modern for the type of original architecture. Apart from viewpoint B, ugly! 508
428. The case is not proven for a large hotel. The south facing vista from Sackville Road is delightful and should not be spoilt. Why not demolish the scruffy amusement arcade and develop that area? Until steps are taken to reduce the train time to London from a ridiculous 2 hours, the plans for the station are irrelevant. A Glyne Gap station with a frequent metro service between Ore and Cooden Beach would take some traffic off the road. Parking could be sited over the station platforms. The council must continue to fight for a bypass. 509
429. The hotels are too modern for Bexhill. Until we can go round chosen hotel it is impossible to make a decision. 510
430. I like everything about the ABK design and wish it good luck. Hopefully I will see it completed in my lifetime. 512
431. Many interesting aspects from each scheme - development is certainly necessary but reservations about the hotel. Any scheme adopted should preserve the sea views from existing dwellings. Use of the "new" building should not be in conflict with events, exhibitions, etc. staged in the De La Warr Pavilion. 513
432. The problem of regeneration remains - we desperately need road links. All the time this is denied there will be major difficulties in bringing in businesses and tourism. However, in regard to the three schemes, ABK is forward looking, good design and certainly a step in the right direction. 514
433. Maintenance of some open green space is important. More emphasis should be given in information to the public of approachability of development for

residents/locals. Edwardian heart of town must be sympathetically enhanced by modern (hopefully Modernist) developments. ABK - Possibly less 'cluttered' window design on non sea facing aspects. 515

434. Should office space be nearer station which should open into Devonshire Square? Hotel approx. 60 bedroom with restaurant and leisure complex. 516
435. Car parking is a must in this age of the car. Offices should be nearer the main station. 517
436. Prefer ABK scheme but consider the block of apartments will totally deface the seafront line and are unnecessary. The hotel retail complex however is attractive. 518
437. I question the suitability of placing this proposed development on this particular site. By placing it there, you remove the only green space used extensively by children and adults (in vast numbers) during the tourist season. As situated at present - people find it conveniently placed - humanity being what it is - people will not be prepared to walk the extra distance to eg. the park (if they even know about it). Tourists want easy access to everything. You would also be restricting the view of the sea and Beachy Head. Not a good site at all! 519
438. The only facility for children (crazy golf, etc.) has been lost. Where are new equivalent facilities to be made available? They should be close to town and toilets etc. If no new facilities are prepared it will be a disgrace and I am sure it will stop families from visiting Bexhill. Will there be enough car park slots in the town? Has due concern been taken of possible flooding of underground car parks should storm conditions occur with high tides? Will "glass" be safe with flying stones? Why not put the library in the De La Warr Pavilion where it should always have been? 520
439. I think the whole concept of a hotel on the seafront is crazy and I am totally against it. 521
440. I am not in favour of any hotel on the site proposed but if it must be, then the scheme by Chapman Taylor is preferred. My concern is that the original plans for the De La Warr Pavilion may be frustrated by the building work undertaken for the hotel once the DLWP has been completed in 2005. Assuming that these will not be delayed because of the imposed hotel plan. 522
441. Links from Sainsbury's to Town Centre essential. Do not wish to see Costa Del Sol Hotels here. Like flow of ABK hotel etc. 523
442. Bexhill needs regeneration and it is exciting if it happens! The first priority is

the station and derelict areas. 525

ST STEPHENS RESIDENTS – AGE UNSPECIFIED

443. No tall buildings! My choice (Aukett) is the best in keeping with the De La Warr and surrounding area, with adequate parking facilities. 526
444. All three are too modern. 529
445. The high bulky building proposed by Chapman Taylor will block out evening sunshine to the De La Warr Terrace which is one of its most useful and used functions. The innovative design by Ahrends Burton and Koralek is a very appropriate match for today, echoing the foresight of 1930s design for the De La Warr Pavilion and is most appropriate. 530

9. Sidley Ward residents

SIDLEY RESIDENTS AGED 20–39

446. On the seafront there is no mention of a cycling route. Bexhill cycling forum is pushing for Bexhill to stop being the ‘missing link’ in the Sustran network. Only Bexhill has no cycling network. Cycling has the best sustainability. Promoting this would benefit Bexhill tremendously. As a Cycling Forum member I would invite you to our meetings held in the town hall. 534

SIDLEY RESIDENTS AGED 40–60

447. Do we need a hotel at all? Parking? Local traders? 535
448. We do not see the overall necessity for any major development to the West of the De La Warr Pavilion, especially when it takes away any part of the existing open green area. Residents in West Parade have had an open sea view for nearly 50 years. Why take that away? The one picked (Chapman Taylor) is the least intrusive and follows the line of the original Hotel Metropole. 536
449. The Chapman Taylor design is the only one to be in line with tidy good design as the De La Warr is, and multi-storey car park is needed somewhere. As is a decent sports gym and swimming pool in town. So overall, it is the best to fit in with the existing town and vastly improve town overall. 537

450. The De La Warr balcony has lost views to Eastbourne. If we are presenting Bexhill as Edwardian (lamp posts, flower beds, etc. are all Edwardian), why have we gone ultra modern with the hotel? Too tall - dwarfs the De La Warr. If we took ABK scheme just as a hotel - we could lower the building and keep views. Use as a hotel only and regenerate other sites for retail and offices. 538
451. All seem to dwarf the De La Warr Pavilion. Consider the people who's views are blocked. An exciting prospect but please look for other sites. I would like to see this area remain as it is. 539
452. I would prefer to see the site left as it is. Do we need a new hotel, when others were not viable? If you take away the putting course, what other facilities will there be for children? Will the schemes that incorporate leisure centres be available to residents? Will we be able to afford them? Car parking over the railway and regeneration of Sainsbury's area is essential. Top end of Sackville Road, by roundabout, is an eyesore. 540
453. I would like Bexhill to be able to use this building at a low cost. 541
454. I like the Van Heyningen and Haward Chapman Taylor but I do think it is too high, and will take away views and sun from the flats. It also reminds me of the arc in St. Leonards. 542
455. I don't like the mismatch of windows town side of Metropole site in ABK scheme. 543
456. I love the idea of a modern small pier. I like the ABK curved design - fits with futuristic De La Warr design - is it wind tunnel tested? I like Chapman Taylor design incorporating a fitness centre. Please move rail station entrance to Devonshire Square - all designs suggest this. I like Aukett beach access - wide open steps and ramps. I like the idea of a restaurant overlooking the sea. Chapman Taylor design is too high - lower by three storeys and relocate office space. Try to keep view of Victorian buildings (view D). 544
457. I liked the Chapman Taylor design best. I note there is no cycle track included in any of the designs. A cyclist is shown on the design plan but no designated cycle path. I also like both of the other designs and some aspects of them could be included in the winning design. Ideas like the urban in-fills are excellent ideas that should be looked at along with other town centre ideas for traffic calming and the town's railway station and Sainsbury's development. 545

SIDLEY RESIDENTS AGED OVER 60

458. The View towards the downs from the De La Warr should not be obscured. This is Bexhill's main feature. ABK's scheme is fine but can another location be found? 546
459. None of the designs appeal. You will spoil one of the best panoramic views along the South coast - the sweeps of the bay towards Beachy Head. Coming the other way towards the Pavilion, you will lose the view of lawns sweeping up to the De La Warr. You will not see the headland from the De La Warr. All the designs are too large and look like carbuncles. Why not site the hotel at the bottom of Devonshire Road or along towards Galley Hill? 547
460. Leave Bexhill seafront as it is. We do not want a hotel or more shops. We have enough empty ones now. Try getting the station done instead, and build a car park over the top. Put Devonshire Square back how it was. What a fiasco it is now! Make the De La Warr somewhere the young ones can use. 548
461. Has a feasibility study been carried out regarding a hotel? It would need at least 80-90% occupancy throughout the year to be profitable. History shows that hotels don't work here. By all means regenerate Bexhill, but work on the original infrastructure and then build from there. Do not try to make Bexhill another Hastings or Brighton. People come here for what it is not what it might be. I think the hotel designs are good but don't think they are for Bexhill. 549
462. I think the hotel site should not include offices which should be sited on a business park at the North of Bexhill and not create traffic to the seafront. (Chapman Taylor is favourite.) 550
463. Bexhill desperately does need something doing. Priority should be the completion of the refurbishment of the De La Warr Pavilion. Secondly, in my opinion, upgrading of the station complex is essential. For a first impression of Bexhill it is disgraceful. From these, Bexhill can then progress into the ambitious scheme for the seafront areas. My first choice is ABK, they seem to fill my ideal. But I have lived here for 7 years. This is at least the third such exhibition I have seen or discussed. The other two disappeared and were never to be heard of again. So my initial enthusiasm is somewhat dimmed, and I'll believe the scheme when I see it! 551
464. Prefer different site for hotel, not on seafront. I feel Chapman Taylor's plan is more sympathetic to Bexhill buildings than other two. But would like hotel re-sited as displayed by school children (and it is their future) in this weeks Observer. Doing nothing for Bexhill is not an option I agree with. 552
465. Considering the residential and narrow forms of the roads in Bexhill, it would seem to be sensible not to introduce additional traffic to the seafront by office

users. These could be better sited North of Linfield Road, and the seafront kept for those enjoying the views and tourists would continue to visit. 555

466. If a hotel is considered necessary, and I am not convinced it is, it needs to blend in with its setting without dominating it. The Chapman Taylor scheme is the only one which does not take up the whole of the Metropole site with buildings. 557
467. Although I like the ABK design, like all the others it obliterates the main feature of interest to be viewed from the terrace of the De La Warr Pavilion, the sight of Beachy Head to the West. No building on this site could compensate for such a loss. 558
468. More pleasing lines to buildings. Fits in with the sea - flowing lines. (ABK) 561
469. I don't think having a new hotel complex on the seafront will be enough to attract visitors to Bexhill. We have no big name stores in the town, a third of the stores are charity shops, and most of the rest are shops selling knick-knacks. The reason the Grand Hotel failed was lack of interest in Bexhill as a holiday resort, what guarantee is there that a new hotel will generate any more interest in Bexhill? When you compare Bexhill with Eastbourne there's no contest, enough said. P.S: What impression do visitors get of Bexhill when they arrive at our grotty railway station? 821
470. I am very concerned that a new hotel will prove to be a failure. The old Grand Hotel was only a short distance from the seafront, but without sea views I grant you. I am very much in favour of much needed regeneration for the town but it is vital that whatever takes place must be for those of us who live here in Bexhill and not to satisfy architectural schemes that leave us where we are now – a town sadly declining. Thought must be given to the views of the seafront as you approach it from the town centre. We do not need huge monstrosities that block out light and sun from existing buildings. Every effort must be made to improve our dreadful station. To have it properly staffed would be a beginning! 824

SIDLEY RESIDENTS – AGE UNSPECIFIED

471. Attracting more people to Bexhill means more cars. A multi-storey car park positioned at Devonshire Square spanning over the railway would seem to be one possibility and would join the two halves of the town separated by the railway. The hotel scheme should be sized to suit the number of expected people using it. We don't want another white elephant like the Royal. The Chapman Taylor design is too tall. 564

10. Bexhill residents – ward unspecified

RESIDENT – WARD UNSPECIFIED - AGED 13-19

472. I was particularly interested in the Aukett design for the Metropole site as it seems to have much potential in business and in leisure. It has a very modern design in the 'L' shape. Also I would like to support the idea off a small pier for Bexhill as I think that it will attract even more people and tourists with the design for the Metropole site! 565
473. Bexhill needs to develop in order to provide better business opportunities and prospects for the younger generation. It is a nice town but we need a better reason to stay. The modern designs will help bring Bexhill into the 21st century. If this had been better advertised, then more youngsters would have shown up to express their opinions. The future of Bexhill needs to be more accessible to all. 566
474. Bexhill needs to be modernised and needs changes to enable locals to enjoy a taste of Modern architecture. There also seems to be very limited business opportunities and a strong lack of interesting and exciting activities. In my opinion Bexhill doesn't hold many opportunities for the younger generation and there's not anything about the town that makes me want to live here permanently. 567

RESIDENT – WARD UNSPECIFIED - AGED 20-39

475. I believe that relocating the station to Devonshire Sq would be massively beneficial, completely changing the initial perception of Bexhill on arrival by train. Also, giving the town a much greater sense of importance while in the town centre. In terms of seafront/Metropole site proposals, I think sea views are a crucial asset, and the Chapman proposal is the only one that maintains these. This building also appears the most confident, and not silly. However, it is hard to gather what is proposed for the town from all but the Aukett one, and I think this is more important than a hotel on the sea front. 568
476. The Pavilion is a landmark building already. I am not convinced sitting a second flag ship building directly on this site is the best way forward when there are plenty of other potential seafront sites that could potentially be developed that would provide a much improved sense of journey along the whole promenade. 572

RESIDENT – WARD UNSPECIFIED - AGED 40-60

477. I do not think a hotel is needed in Bexhill or additional retail outlets - we already have many empty premises. Money would best be spent on renovating/ refurbishing existing town areas - especially the station. Bexhill has a certain charm which should be retained. 573
478. Whichever 'scheme' is successful it must not be long in coming as Bexhill is slowly 'slipping away'. 574
479. I do not like any of these schemes. The De la Warr Pavilion and its surrounds is the most picturesque area of Bexhill. Any development on this space will be to the detriment of Bexhill. This area should be enhanced not destroyed. Bexhill has its own unique character; that is why people choose to move here. If regeneration involves the destruction of this character , then I for one will not be staying here. 575
480. I think it's important to maintain both the scale and aesthetics of the existing town. It seems to me unlikely that, with the proximity and accessibility of Brighton, Bexhill would attract potential international conferences. Whilst the facilities provided are important, accessibility for this part of Sussex remains a problem. Tourists coming for a week or more can accommodate this but I would doubt whether short-term conferences would feel the same. The De la Warr Pavilion is a great asset to Bexhill and should be treated as such. It would be unfortunate if it were to be swamped by any new development. 576
481. You need to offer an outline to take away or people cannot be fully informed by just viewing the displays - Q1 and 2 relate to the general town plan, and it is not clear what regeneration benefits are attached to each option. Only Aukett Ltd. is on a reasonable scale but all views/sunlines towards Beachy Head are lost by the De La Warr in all schemes - very regrettable. 577
482. Hope that this will be good for Bexhill children and OAP's catered for. Parking has to be an issue. 578
483. Every effort should be made at the key points - i.e. seafront development and Sainsbury's redevelopment area - to maximise the parking spaces. Additionally major improvements need to be made to the main I/L and O/S car access to the town. I like this seafront development (ABK) and the fact that the cars are removed from the De La Warr site. 579
484. Liked the ideas of ABK and Chapman Taylor, van Heyningen & Haward for the regeneration of town centre shopping, business and communications, via rail and bus. The Chapman Taylor proposal improves amenities and attractions through provision of integrated hotel and sports/pool facilities. The car parking provision also meets the needs of the extra visitors without loss of

the green frontage along the promenade. 580

485. Maximum underground car parking space in this project is very important, as losing ground level parking. Not very keen on window design on office area. Could this be improved to be more aesthetic – possibly 1930s art deco effect? Overall impression – design excellent. 581
486. Please get on with the De La Warr Pavilion first. 583
487. I dislike all designs. 584
488. After looking at all three options there was no contest. The Chapman Taylor with van Heyningen & Haward was by far the best proposal I have seen as it seems to fit in with Bexhill without taking away too much of the very pleasant promenade or changing too much of the town for the worse. 585
489. I think it is vital that we keep the character of the sea front and the ideas for town wide development are done tastefully and sympathetically – an English seaside town. Not with materials that make it look like suburbia (Hastings) or just tasteless (the ‘balls’ in the new Devonshire Square). 586
490. I like the ABK best overall but Aukett has interesting plans for the rest of Bexhill. I particularly like the station being moved to Devonshire Sq to make better use of the ‘eye sore’ it is at present. The office and residential areas should be separate from the hotel. 587
491. All the schemes are unsuitable for the location due to their mass and size. In addition Bexhill’s best views are to be destroyed. The proposed buildings are all interesting in their own right and would complement the De la Warr if built in other parts of the town. Built next to the Pavilion, it destroys the Pavilion and the views to and from it. There are many run down/derelict sites in the town which would benefit from a new building. 589
492. Adequate parking would be essential - including free short-term parking. Any scheme should not hinder access for the elderly to retail outlets. 590
493. Bexhill should remain as it is. Put money into the station repairs and old run down buildings. We moved from London to Cooden, Bexhill to escape sky scrapers and too much noise, pollution and traffic, etc. Where are all the cars and traffic going - a flyover?! On the start of the building works - lorries cannot be accommodated. Trouble now with Glyne Gap Road congestion to Hastings. More noise people do not want - go to a larger town, like Brighton! Car parks concerns - maintaining - costs - rental of shops. Will they stand empty like other buildings in London – Canary Wharf and the Millennium Dome? 591

494. I would prefer the Aukett hotel if the design was more glass - front elevation looks like prefab concrete. More could be made of the pier element, possibly to include mini marina, harbour. 592
495. I am horrified to see the size of all the proposed buildings totally spoiling the views and the green spaces. I love the view of the De la Warr and this will be totally blocked. The idea of a hotel in Bexhill seems crazy - who comes here for holidays? Its just a lovely reserved seaside town that up until now has not been destroyed. Please go away and think up some other plan for somewhere else. 593
496. None. All three designs do not seem to bear any relation to the domestic scale of Bexhill. 594
497. To encourage young to stay, work for young, plenty for young to socialise. 596
498. I like the pier, I like the way the Aukett design is integrated into the De La Warr area. But the Aukett building isn't very attractive. 597
499. We hope it happens – and sooner rather than later! The future of Bexhill is new people coming to the town - many of the 'baby-boomer' generation like us. Bexhill has some wonderful attributes already and we have every confidence that with skilful regeneration – the town will prosper. 598
500. On all the schemes with this influx of people where are they to park? The underground car park will not suffice the number of people proposed in using this development to enable it to be financially viable. 599
501. Love the Aukett version. It is low, doesn't dominate the De la Warr Pavilion and is pleasing to the eye - it nicely reflects the De La Warr architecture. I hope we get the Aukett plan. 600
502. It would be nice if the area beside the De La Warr Pavilion could be left vacant and the view over Beachy Head left as it is. I object wholeheartedly to a large multi-story building being built. That said, I am not against progress and appreciate that things have to change, although my husband and I moved from London two and a half years ago because we liked the look and feel of Bexhill as it is. If a development is to go ahead, then Aukett has the least impact on the skyline. 601
503. ABK scheme is exciting and on par with the Pavilion next door in its day. However I will miss the sunset from the Pavilion balcony in all three schemes. 602
504. None. Don't develop the seafront. It's great as it is. Global warming will

bring people here when the South of France gets too hot. I don't want any of them (hotel schemes) on the proposed site. Nice ideas, wrong place. 603

505. I don't really like any of the proposed schemes. One of the first problems is the road connections that serve our town, which are all dreadful and need to be addressed urgently! Some of the so-called improved road schemes are also terrible, narrowing roads, bumps, etc are of no use at all. We have a large number of empty shops already, which could be used and improved. More wasted money such as the post office square. I despair of this Rother and local government. 604
506. The success of any redevelopment project to have visitors employers and investors come to Bexhill is wholly dependant on the availability of good public transport, far better road networks and adequate parking facilities. Cycle paths and more greenery is also essential. 605
507. It would be helpful if there was further information as to how West Parade will be supported whilst building work takes place and what measures will be taken to avoid congestion whilst building takes place. There is no information as to obstruction of view from West Parade. Living directly opposite the putting green I would like to know how much attention has been paid to the deterioration of property values on West Parade between Beach Towers and Queens Court. As yet we have seen models. When will a detailed analysis of the impact of building be available? 606
508. Exhibition was really rather too detailed and needed a lot more explanation for the layperson. Would have been better to have a list of facilities/amenities next to each one for direct comparison. Some of the features pleased greatly but not all views – so I personally liked parts of two projects (ABK and Chapman Taylor). 607
509. Key views – Chapman Taylor in views A and B. Don't like views C and D – too much of a 'block'. Looks too 1960's from these views. Main reason for preference of Chapman Taylor is they seem extremely aware of views. Love the idea of developing Bexhill in all these ways but is there any other site that can be used for the hotel. It's so unusual for a seaside town to build on a site that blocks such wonderful sea views. 608
510. The plans do not make clear the parking facilities, especially at the De La Warr. Whatever plan is decided, it should be sympathetic to the De La Warr. The issue with Chapman Taylor is whilst the building occupies least land, its height would dominate the area. 609
511. ABK are the only people to show designs with graceful curves that are in keeping with the Deco style of the De La Warr. It is hugely important to be as aesthetic as possible, the other designs were eyesores. 610

512. The idea of any large development on that site is a travesty. Haven't planners learned anything from past mistakes? 612
513. I have looked at the three sites and I cannot put my tick against any of them. You will kill the lovely viewpoint. What about the parking facilities? Building next to the lovely De La Warr Pavilion – it's a sin. And we as the taxpayer will end up paying for this in the long run. I do not agree with any of this. 613
514. Rather than going for glory with one big building we need to create more, smaller improvements around town. Firstly I do not think the golf course/grassy area should be developed - this is what 'sets off' the De la Warr Pavilion – the white against the green. Any development near to the De la Warr Pavilion should be secondary to the Pavilion, ie. the Pavilion should be the main focal point. Tall buildings will spoil many residents' views of the sea and we need to retain a sense of space. None of the developments/ideas sit comfortably next to the De la Warr Pavilion – the styles clash. I think the money should be used to fund more, smaller improvements around the whole town and thus generally improve the whole town – keeping the De la Warr Pavilion as the focal point. P.S: Why didn't we have a feature, ie. fountain/wind sculpture, a focal point by the post office. I think this was a missed opportunity. 614

RESIDENT – WARD UNSPECIFIED - AGED OVER 60

515. No business case has been made to show that a hotel complex would be financially viable in the long term. The town has had to support the De La Warr financially for many years. All the way through any scheme runs the question of money. With two-thirds of the population on retirement/fixed incomes, we must have clear limitations on the towns monetary commitments. I am firmly against all three schemes. Very little thought has been given to car parking. This is key to most people. 616
516. I would like to see a modern pier built without amusements so that boats could use the pier. 617
517. Chapman Taylor could go up in choice if building was not so tall. (Aukett – first choice) Like the idea of a pier. Lets hope that we (the public of Bexhill) do not have to subscribe to the costs. 618
518. When I moved to Bexhill 5 years ago I was attracted by the promenade and views of the sea and particularly the De La Warr Pavilion. I don't normally enjoy 1930s architecture but this is something special. Looking from all angles at the present it is quite exciting. If one adds any of the schemes

overleaf it would get swallowed by ugliness. The most important improvements should be new pavements (the number of people – old, young and even children I have seen falling over), car parking over the railway. I have lived in many places in my life but never come across a station with no parking spaces. A few more exciting shops and can the road between De La Warr and shops be made pedestrian? 619

519. What a talented lot all of you. For me, an impossible choice – fantastic plans for little old Bexhill. But keep Bexhill with its unique, historic background inherited from the Sackvilles to the De La Warr. Let us keep its character – not to be another Black pool or Brighton. We need another hotel – but does it have to be on a putting course? This is an attraction, not only for promenaders but as part of the sea view - from Sackville Road and the houses opposite. Please keep some open space – keep our unique reputation for peace – while at the same time making it home for the young ones. 620
520. None, leave as it is (Metropole site). Devonshire Square is a nightmare and drains confidence when one think of the rest. By all means develop – especially the old Granville/Grand as a health centre. The station is a total disgrace. The shops we have don't let and hotels don't pay. Bexhill would spend a fortune of taxpayers money trying to compete with Brighton and Eastbourne. They'd do better to bring back attractions like Bexhill 100 which brought people to the town. 622
521. Bexhill is in desperate need of regeneration: i.e. multi-storey car parks; jobs to keep the young people in the town; help local shop keepers, not penalise them. 623
522. I like the whole idea, but I seriously wonder whether it will work in reality. The size of the hotel complex seems enormous for the use it will have. Sixty bedrooms? I don't think the B+B's will be very happy. And every hotel of any size in Bexhill has either been closed or pulled own. However, I wish you the best. The plan, as laid out is rather attractive and things must move forward! 624
523. Very much like the ABK design, but would like to see glass all round the building not just the sea view. 625
524. Number 2 (Aukett) has a very good (the best) seafront view but the back (office) view is ugly. Number 2 echoes the Pavilion best in the seafront view. 626
525. Essential: Urgent regeneration of town is needed to create interest and employment for 16-30 year olds. Improvement and styling of rail access by closing existing station and development with Sainsbury's of enlarged store and improved parking/rail access. 627

526. None. The site is being over developed. Nobody seems to have given any thought to the economics of the development. The estimated income to fund the development from rents etc. will not be achieved. There are no transport facilities to bring in a major work force and start-ups will not be able to afford the rents. With 12+ charity shops in Bexhill plus empty shops there is no demand for shops. The rent the hotel will require would result in hotel charges that the public cannot afford. There is insufficient car parking being provided for the new development, let alone all the cars that will be displaced from local parking. Very interesting schemes, ideal for large towns but not Bexhill whose main occupation is servicing retired residents who ensure a big income for the town in excess of that proposed to be produced. Recommend that the scheme be dropped and the money spent on producing better roads and transport. Business will then regenerate the town. 628
527. We don't want a hotel in Bexhill; and not one that dwarfs the De La Warr. Better bus services and I would have more time to comment. 629
528. Must the hotel be located on the proposed site? If it could occupy a site on the corner of Sackville Road and the marina this would be less far less intrusive. I have to say that the Aukett proposal is flattered by my 3rd place marking! It should not hit the starting line. (ABK – first choice). 631
529. It seems that the parking facilities are inadequate. 632
530. We do not want any of these projects to take place. Not in keeping with Bexhill town. Seafront shops possibly become empty due to high rates, leaving local hooligans to break windows, etc. The projects will effect our property (most concerned about tall buildings taking place – spoiling our views etc.) 633
531. Don't agree with any building here. We haven't the back up to support a seaside holiday town. 634
532. Demolish the De La Warr, give Devonshire Square back for parking, and build a community centre for all ages. 635
533. Chapman Taylor building needs reducing by 2 floors as it tends to dwarf the De La Warr. 636
534. Since one of the main concerns for me is the development of the Metropole site, I find the ABK plan the most imaginative and pleasing architecturally. 637
535. They all have advantages and disadvantages but the town needs a hotel. 641

536. Why use the Metropole site when a hotel, straddling Sackville road could be the ‘gateway’ to Bexhill? Please, please leave the Metropole site as a green area for children. Where else can they play if this is taken away from them? In redesigning the Devonshire Square/station front, Sainsbury’s and Sackville road railway bridge, can a two-storey multi car park be considered over the railway, linking all the above with the library? Seems a sensible way to solve part of the parking problem. The De La Warr will be swallowed up within the boundaries of any hotel on the Metropole site. 642
537. I do not agree with the building of the hotel on this site - it will totally block the view of the houses along the Western Parade. Do we need a hotel at all? Redeveloping the Grand would be better for business people arriving by train. 643
538. In my opinion the ABK is artistically the better design. Chapman Taylor is ugly and uninteresting, while Aukett has some interesting features. Aukett’s ideas for the station area are imaginative. 645
539. Exciting prospect and opportunity to improve the town. I prefer the ABK as the building follows lines of the Pavilion and is the most attractive of the three designs from there. 646
540. While all three schemes have some good points I feel that, while the town centre does need general improvement, particularly the railway station, the site of the Metropole should be left more or less as it is now. Except for some tidying up. 647
541. I think the Aukett design is unattractive and does nothing to improve the area. 649
542. The hotel complex is too high and needs to be set closer to Sackville Road. Why is it taking so long for the De La Warr Pavilion renovation? It looks an eyesore and we have more than enough of them already! 650
543. More details required – building, landscaping, etc. 652
544. No proposal that involves building on the Metropole green site meets my approval. Of the three proposals the Chapman Taylor one best deals with this, but the Aukett proposal seems best in all other aspects. Perhaps the model produced by the local school children should also be submitted for public approval. 653
545. Financing of the scheme: What size white elephant will the tax payers have to support if the ‘hoped for’ commercial interests fail to materialise? Access to Bexhill: 60 years old rail rolling stock - A21 - A259? Car parking: Insufficiently addressed. Few people cycle to conference centres, etc. If the

town centre is to survive it must be made accessible which means more cars and more space to park them. Urgent need to redress the lack of maintenance of existing infrastructure before embarking on such schemes, i.e. resurfacing of access roads (Western Road, Cooden Drive etc.) 655

546. I object strongly to any building on our lovely green site next to the De La Warr Pavilion. Please retain the green. Don't block the view of the sea for all to enjoy. None of the hotel designs are in keeping with the atmosphere of Bexhill. If you must build a hotel, build it on the corner of Sackville Road, where the car show room is. 656
547. I am deeply suspicious of this term 'regeneration'. It smacks far more of 'commercialisation', and appears to be an attempt to change Bexhill into a dormitory of Hastings; to remove its 'retirement' feel – for the purpose of commercial gain (including increased income for the council, thereby increasing its power). In view of the above, I cannot vote for any of the schemes. 657
548. Metropole site: By all means please redevelop the car showroom site and the ugly parade of shops on the other corner. Provide a feature of significance on the roundabout outlined against the skyline looking down Sackville Road. Do not diminish the view of the De La Warr Pavilion by allowing development of the attractive and unique greensward. This is short-term commercial vandalism – even if viable! 658
549. I know this is a difficult issue but what is happening to the De La Warr? 659
550. We do not favour any of the proposed developments. A seafront hotel would destroy a nice open green area and would dwarf and dominate the Pavilion. The town needs:- restoration of the station which is a disgrace; relocation of the Devonshire Square toilets; rapid development of the Grand Hotel site; rapid completion of the Pavilion restoration; resurfacing of the many dangerous pavements; regular removal of the disgusting gum deposits; regular removal of graffiti; more foot patrol police. These are the sort of things Bexhill needs, NOT grandiose schemes. Bexhill is not Brighton nor even Hastings. We don't need 'regeneration'. We need a nice clean and quiet seaside town. 819

RESIDENT – WARD UNSPECIFIED - AGE UNSPECIFIED

551. I do not like any of the proposed changes. 661
552. None. None. None. None. 662
553. I personally believe that if a hotel is to be situated in Bexhill it should be

towards Galley Hill and not diminishing the De La Warr building. It would not enhance Bexhill to build where suggested by any of these schemes. The seafront should be open with more gardens to allow citizens of Bexhill to promenade and develop the town towards more of the type in America Florida. A town that is famed for retirement. The pensioners nowadays are the population with the spending power. Stop trying to turn Bexhill into something new which residents do not want. Could you mend the pavements? Wheelchair friendly please? 663

554. There is a danger in all the schemes, that the Pavilion will be dominated and at worst become second best. The Aukett complex fits in better with the 1930's style, but is one storey too high. A compromise between commercial and aesthetic is always difficult but if the Pavilion becomes second best then one of the main attractions for people coming to the new development will have gone. 665
555. South-East corner of Sackville Road to be renewed. Replace ugly current railway station, despite its listing. 672
556. I am delighted that new buildings are to be erected. 673
557. Much needed, the sooner the better! 674
558. None. Cooden Beach Hotel is adequate for Bexhill's needs. 676
559. In my view, the Chapman Taylor building is the best, but too many storeys high by two levels. 677
560. Sixty bedrooms are the icing on the cake for whoever is going to benefit financially from the potential office space. I hate all these ideas, not because of their design, but because this is not consideration for Bexhill people but an opportunity for financial gain. Money follows money – how long before the arcades and fast-food places follow? Please stop violating our seafront! No consideration is given for the views of the local residents. And please stop representing this scheme as a beneficial one for local development. This is commercialisation by the back door! 681
561. ABK scheme most sympathetic, but exciting. Works well juxtaposed with the De La Warr Pavilion. 686
562. Could not the De La Warr be dismantled and the whole site be brought up to date. The De La Warr looks old and decrepit and needs a full make over. 687
563. I would like to see Aukett Ltd landscape the surrounding area, and have access to the public. Also to have views across to Beachy Head from the De La Warr. 693

564. Jaw - dropping. 695
565. Very futuristic but blends well with the De La Warr Pavilion. 696
566. Don't think we need another hotel. 702
567. The wonderful thing about Bexhill is its natural unspoilt coastline - free all the year round for everybody to enjoy to walk, cycle, ramble, push wheelchairs or pushchairs. Wide boulevard – leave the seafront alone please, please, please. Mend the pavements, the De La Warr - (that's beautiful and a lovely space for art and community projects). The station is a lovely building - I use it daily to commute to Eastbourne - which is boring and dirty. There are thousands of us who love it the way it is. Small shops who care about serving you, very nice restaurants - a safe and caring environment. Very busy and happy voluntary sector – please don't spoil it all in my name with any of my money. There's lots going on here if you have half a brain to look for it and use it. 703
568. Please, no hotel it will ruin the promenade. Also – parking? 704
569. Please keep the green. 705
570. None of them. ABK scheme: Modern and inspiring, sea-like, waves very in keeping with sea location. But feel it would better enjoy a space of its own. Sackville elevation very hard/heavy. Aukett scheme: Does allow some of open space retention to West Parade. Do not feel a pier is appropriate. Chapman Taylor scheme: Very heavy 30s build. Looks like a liner (old hat). The De La Warr Pavilion enjoys an openness that would best be retained. Its existing free space works well. Don't use proposed site, but use/redevelop either Skoda Corner, it is opposite low shops corner site, or even consider the 60s flats in West Parade. Regeneration/redevelopment needed on the roads/rail infrastructure and major construction to demolish/rebuild throughout the current proposed town area. 706

11. People visiting Bexhill for Work

VISITING FOR WORK AGED 20 - 39

571. It is important that Bexhill has landmarks to give the town focal points. ABK designs are the best for fulfilling this role. Also I think the most important thing is to sort out the Sackville Road site. Its really looks awful and ruins the seafront. The ABK design really stands out. 707

VISITING FOR WORK AGED 40 - 60

572. Very exciting, but will it happen? 708

573. The colonnade must stay at all costs, it is the oldest building compared to the De La Warr Pavilion and is classical in design. 709

574. ABK respects most the site and its location. It is a more fluid design but could be set back or remodeled to retain broad aspect of historic grade 1 building. 710

575. Bexhill needs development A.S.AP. 711

576. I like the ABK design and the business regeneration. But concerned about parking local to shops. 712

577. Scale of all proposals overshadows existing De La Warr Pavilion. Chapman Taylor proposal too reflective of Pavilion. Underground pool is a good idea. Jetty is a good idea. ABK proposal is good but over-dressed. Relocation of rail ticketing office to Devonshire Square is a good idea. Consider Chapman Taylor proposal in keeping with original curve idea. 713

578. The Grand rebuilt as a hotel - the doctors 'surgery' repositioned slightly out of town to allow everyone easy parking. 714

579. Not impressed with any of them. Get the Council to remove those awful concrete bollards in Devonshire Square and make car parking available and a bit of greenery first to prove intentions. Otherwise any new development will proceed along the same awful line! I am one very disgruntled resident. 715

580. All three are too massive compared to the De La Warr Pavilion, partly because of brief and partly because none of the buildings occupies the whole site. 716

581. As well as the regeneration of areas in the town, the creation of extra parking

is essential and all the schemes should provide sufficient on-site parking for all uses of the scheme and extra parking for visitors. 718

12. People visiting Bexhill for Leisure

VISITING FOR LEISURE AGED 20 - 39

582. The Chapman Taylor scheme is by far the most sensitive and considerate to the existing site. However, the De La Warr is capable of standing on its own as a very fine building and arts venue. Every effort should be made to enhance, and not dwarf, the De La Warr. The pier is lovely and an excellent idea! 722
583. But prefer a lower building (Chapman Taylor preferred) 723
584. Maybe the current proposals are too large to sustain an area like Bexhill. If the current developments were 50% smaller this would avoid blocking the view from the De La Warr towards Eastbourne which is upsetting the residents who enjoy the views from there. I think the designs are exciting but maybe you could consider the developments on a different plot of land, that doesn't ruin the idyll that is Bexhill seafront. 724
585. All eyesores. Anything else, bar Art Deco. Spend the money on something that fits in with the environment. Development of the Metropole site will be a failure. 725
586. The hotel will obscure one of the best views in Bexhill. It is far too big and doesn't fit in at all. 726

VISITING FOR LEISURE AGED 40 - 60

587. ABK seems to have the most interesting and modern scheme by far. 728
588. I hope that the adopted scheme keeps the character of Bexhill as well as achieve stated aims. I think that it is essential that the road structure is improved as part of the scheme. Bringing in business and tourists is ideal provided the roads do not get more congested. One ideal aspect of Bexhill at present is the ability to park on the seafront and I would not be happy if this became impossible or it was necessary to pay to park. More should be done for leisure, particularly for the ages of 5-20, without becoming tacky. 731
589. I don't like the idea of building being too high on the seafront - out of

keeping with the area. I agree with the business increase of facilities but would like to see some improved facilities for locals of all ages. Eg theatre, cinemas, cycling, parks and skateboarding areas. The area needs to encourage young families to stay, and have facilities for the older generation. 732

590. Chapman Taylor is the only scheme that respects/responds to the site and geometry of the existing building. The formality and siting are exemplary. The expression of the building might benefit from being more distinctive compared to the De La Warr Pavilion. 733
591. The ABK scheme combines good designs, landmark buildings and still manages to complement, and not over dominate, the existing area. 734
592. Although Potmans Lane is postally in Bexhill, it is actually in Wealden. However, Bexhill is our town so we do not see ourselves as visitors to it. (Chapman Taylor is first choice.) 735
593. Aukett shows a well thought out concept and set of objectives and the fact that it is well presented inspires confidence that the execution would be done well. The ABK scheme is visually most attractive, The other team (Chapman Taylor) can't be bothered to present in a readable manner and font, and do not deserve consideration. Their proposed view from viewpoint D is awful and completely blocks the openness of the space. 736
594. Development of the seafront involving removal of cars is attractive, particularly focus on leisure activities and redevelopment of rowing club alongside the sailing club. New railway station bringing it into town centre is key. Separation of hotel, offices and residential accommodation is preferred. 737
595. Would prefer to see a public sports/facility centre instead of a hotel. I prefer the ABK design but would like to see something for the residents leisure time. Where will the putting green be? 740
596. More leisure for young and old alike, Replace the putting green so we don't lose it. Better car park facilities and better bus services out of town. 741
597. I was a little disappointed that the designs were not more cutting edge. It would be a shame to miss the opportunity to build something really stunning and looking to the future. I chose the more exciting of the designs (ABK), but I feel the architects were all a bit conservative. 742
598. I much prefer the design concepts of ABK; they have taken more care in blending in architecture style. I would like to see more in their design incorporating the seafront (shingle area). The elliptical building is my least favourite part of their design, but on the whole I very much like ABK. 743

599. ABK is the only choice. 744
600. The staff were very helpful and informative. Display well set out and easy to understand, visual photographs very helpful. Its good to see a council involving the local people in the decision-making processes. 747
601. The De La Warr Pavilion is one of the most exciting and important buildings in the U.K. The development of this and Bexhill as a whole is a necessary and a tremendous opportunity for the town. Bexhill's situation is unique and there is the possibility of the town having a very bright future. The masterplan and the seafront development should be supported and encouraged. Good luck!
748
602. The design seems to fit in best with the existing surroundings. (Aukett) 749
603. Landmark design from ABK. Compatible with Mendelsohn's Pavilion. 750
604. When I come to the coast I want to enjoy the open space and freedom looking at the sea gives me. I feel the Aukett design best complements the existing architecture and enables the best view of the seashore and sunset. 752
605. Please don't have large buildings like those proposed by ABK and Chapman Taylor dominating the seafront. Too big, boxy and not interesting as architecture. 753
606. There is no other seaside town in the South-East of England of comparable size and population that has so much potential to be an upmarket cultural resort as Bexhill. It is one of the cleanest and has the nicest beach of any town in the area and pleasant residential districts – but, it is so boring! It needs a council, business people, architects and residents with very bold vision to bring the resort into the 21st century. No half measures or half hearted plans. Any of the 3 proposals would be an improvement - at the moment it is in a time warp circa 1950. (ABK is favourite) 754
607. None, all do not match existing architecture or ambience (Masterplan). None, all too big and dominate the De La Warr (Metropole site). The De La Warr Pavilion ought to be the centre of the sea front and all proposed developments should enhance this building rather than detract from it. Other proposals for the town centre are fine, but again need to fit in- Bexhill has a charming ambience – do not ruin it. 755
608. I do not think that any of these are good. The most pleasing is ABK but all will overcome the Pavilion and none have as good a design. Why ruin this site? You can regenerate the area by building elsewhere. All I can see coming from these proposals is money for the hoteliers, and eventually the demolition

of the De La Warr. Spend the money on repairing what is here now. 756

VISITING FOR LEISURE AGED OVER 60

609. Why do you want to change the ambiance of Bexhill? It is marvelous as it is. Although much needs updating, ruining views across the seafront is not the way to go. I live in Hastings and come to Bexhill for the old fashioned charm. So much money is wasted on consultancy fees to design these monsters which never get the investment needed for such large 'hotels'. Hastings has not been able to fund any of the proposed schemes so far and Bexhill will find the same problem. 757
610. My wife and I don't like any of the proposals for the Metropole site. All of these buildings would detract from the appearance of the De La Warr Pavilion. If a building is necessary, and we don't think it is, it should be low and in keeping with the De La Warr - perhaps an extension of it. The Chapman Taylor proposal is particularly bad - this big lump of an unimaginative building would overshadow the De La Warr and ruin the extensive views from it. 760
611. The ABK scheme is undoubtedly the most beautiful and ambitious scheme. However it will probably be the most expensive and its use and popularity far exceeds the vision and ambition of Bexhill town people and for this reason, is likely to be rejected. All overall plans for Bexhill development rightly include: a new station opening on to Devonshire Square; multi-storey parking at station/town hall square; underground car parking on the seafront. The suggestion from ABK to reorganise parking along Devonshire Road is very interesting. 761
612. All three masterplans have a common theme. It is therefore difficult to say which will best regenerate the town. Similarly, all three seafront developments provide equal opportunities. 762
613. Chapman Taylor have car parking over the railway – this is good. Devonshire was a mistake. Another re-fit would be an improvement. More car parking is of prime importance as with ABK. Not just with the seaside plan but with the masterplan as the architect says! It is nice to see Bexhill looking forward instead of back to Edwardian. 763
614. The ABK scheme looks to have more potential for employment. It would offer more scope for young people and the play area proposed would be good for children. Visually it seems more attractive. Obviously the Chapman Taylor building is the cheapest option but, looking to the long term, do you gain by going for the cheapest option in the short term? The Aukett buildings have some merit but the sea view aspects of the main block is very bland. 764

615. The Aukett scheme is less monumental and better ‘integrated’ into the seaside environment without detracting. 765
616. Chapman Taylor: Why can’t it be set back – more towards the roundabout, so improving West sea views from the De La Warr Pavilion. The Mendelssohn scheme for instance curves away at South end of building. It seems the best thought through scheme – less simplicity. It is the only scheme to have given thought to sustainability. 766
617. Would a hotel be viable? The Granville was not. Are you justified in destroying a well used amenity – the putting green? Bexhill is visited and liked for its natural unspoilt front. 767
618. Inadequate information in the exhibition to decide which town centre scheme I like most. I don’t know which will best achieve regeneration but am suspicious that people will not really get a choice. I don’t like any of the seafront developments – all seem to reduce the impact of the De La Warr. 768
619. As a visitor to Bexhill, I think it would be a great pity to ruin the seafront with these modern buildings. Bexhill rates very highly in my estimation as a beautiful residential seaside town which compares favourably with continental seaside towns such as Ostend and Calais. In these towns, apartments and other residential properties line the seafront (such as we have here in Bexhill at present, and there are few such pleasant seaside towns on our South coast) and commercial properties such as hotels and shops are established in roads further back. Why ruin the very pleasant residential town of Bexhill? What Bexhill needs is the ring road around Bexhill and Hastings on this main coast road – do this first!!! 769
620. A large hotel on the seafront is an awful idea. The views of the sea are a vital part of Bexhill’s attraction . Bexhill needs updating but I feel the plans as represented will not add to Bexhill’s attraction to tourists. Visitors like the long seafront, sand and free parking. What they hate are the rundown shops, station and uneven paving in the town. Some trees planted in the town would be an improvement but huge buildings on the seafront will kill it stone dead. 770
621. ABK with its dramatic curves and use of glass is exciting as was the De La Warr Pavilion when that was built. Go for it. 771
622. All three schemes have one central failing – they are all too tall for the site and would destroy the essential openness of the seafront. Is it necessary to build so high? Bexhill seafront is currently unique in not being cluttered with a surplus of unnecessary commercial outlets and as such is relatively rare.

Why spoil it forever with a development of dubious value which could well become an eyesore for the future. Far better to spend on refurbishing properly the existing De La Warr Pavilion which is currently being starved of funding.
772

VISITING FOR LEISURE - AGE UNSPECIFIED

623. I agree with the regeneration of Bexhill. (ABK is favourite.) 773

13. People visiting Bexhill for Study

VISITING FOR STUDY AGED OVER 60

624. I dislike the thought of a hotel, blocking view of sea and seafront from Sackville Road. Also a hotel will never pay; the Grand Hotel is an example. Why not use this space? Hotel, non payer. The town centre needs pavements seen to, we are still waiting! Shops already closing, this plan will not help. Just prove an expense. Even whilst looking at these plans, no one was in favour as I talked to many, and so for me this is a waste of money. No work even started on the De La Warr, a year's money gone. 775

14. People visiting Bexhill for Shopping

VISITING FOR SHOPPING AGED 20-39

625. ABK scheme provides an exciting and architecturally interesting complement to the De La Warr and although filling the site, its permeability means it doesn't dominate. However, the masterplan, while highlighting some areas that need or would benefit from regeneration, does not seem entirely practical at this juncture. The Chapman Taylor proposal is interesting in that it combines all the mixed uses together within one building, and has some interesting echoes of the De La Warr itself and the original proposal for the site. I am concerned that it seems to be a very dominant feature and perhaps doesn't provide the same opportunities for experimental interaction with the building. Aukett's masterplan has identified and tackled major issues with its regeneration masterplan. 776

VISITING FOR SHOPPING AGED OVER 60

626. If the redevelopment goes ahead we prefer the Aukett plans. 778
627. I should prefer to see development of the railway station/Sainsbury's site, giving a good link to Town Hall Square to make it part of the main town centre. Improved shops are essential to attract people to enjoy and spend money in Bexhill. We need some good stores one can walk around, especially in poor weather. Sufficient parking and easy access is necessary. 781

14. People visiting Bexhill for Other reasons

VISITING FOR OTHER REASONS AGED 13-19

628. Don't build in front of Sandringham Court. 782
629. I think the Chapman Taylor looks like yet another boring tower block which cuts out large areas of the view and replaces it with a big ugly building! I think the ABK one looks nice and works with the De La Warr. It is also mostly glass so it lets a lot more light through it. 783

VISITING FOR OTHER REASONS AGED 20-29

630. The Aukett designs are the most innovative. The design doesn't appear to dominate the seafront as the others do, but at the same time is very modern and unusual. The spa rooms sound gorgeous. The look is a bit retro which I like rather than an 'office block' feel that the others have. It looks like a nice place to 'hang out'; this would encourage people of all ages into the beach area. 786
631. Aukett plans respond to the local environment more, seem to understand Bexhill more. The building is lower and fits into the streetscape more. But the architecture needs some more work. But the scale is right. ABK scheme: Bold but far too big for the site. No relationship with the De La Warr. It is a strange shape, just placed in the site and has no context. No strategy for the town, only deals with the seafront around building. Chapman Taylor: Not a lot of imagination here. It doesn't respond to the De La Warr. Very high and will dominate the front. It has no context with the town centre. 788
632. ABK - very good, but needs swimming facilities! 789
633. Very poor public space in all three. At least 2 schemes look to keep the green

areas. Little informal activity areas. Hotel dead duck - full use all year round? Transport - why come to Bexhill? It is not well served and this needs to be addressed first. 790

634. Having grown up in the area and visiting the De La Warr on many occasions, I feel that such a sensitive site creates many problems for the architects. I wholeheartedly support the regeneration of the town as a whole and am impressed by the architectural ideas on show. I think it is essential to encourage modern architecture to develop in Bexhill and feel that all three schemes offer interesting design solutions. I do however feel the scale of the designs for the site next to the Pavilion is unacceptable. I don't think any of the architects have dealt well with addressing the existing building. It will be interesting to see how the winning scheme develops. Very good exhibition! Well done. 791
635. We like spas. Should use the opportunity to do something architecturally different/forward looking. Chapman Taylor and ABK seem to dwarf the existing De La Warr building (even though the designs are very good). Maybe fewer floors/storeys? 792

VISITING FOR OTHER REASONS AGED 40 - 60

636. I believe that whichever scheme is chosen, it must complement the De La Warr Pavilion, since this is an important historical building. Although I now live in Battle, I was born in Bexhill and lived there until 18 months ago. 794
637. I do not see the purpose of the large building (on all proposed plans) to the left of the De La Warr Pavilion facing the sea. It blocks the view of the De La Warr from both sides. 'Spa Bexhill' – what is that? An up-market gym for a small minority who can afford it. Improve transport links to Bexhill and perhaps people will come here! Why does there have to be any building next to the De La Warr? The space around is necessary to show off the architecture. 795
638. I feel a hotel to be a waste of time and space. Large hotels have never prospered here (the Grand is a classic example). If a large hotel was a commercial prospect, then a hotel group would have moved here by now. All hotel designs spoil sea views, take away current facilities and, in my view, add absolutely nothing. If this sort of money is available, spend it on something better. 796
639. We think the ABK fits better with the De La Warr Pavilion. Although I still feel sorry for residents of viewpoint D. 797
640. All schemes would add to the vitality of Bexhill. All schemes however suffer

from a requirement for too much new accommodation on the Metropole site. The formal response of the Chapman Taylor scheme is appealing. But would improve with reduced massing. The treatment of the site in the ABK scheme is attractive in its ambition to improve the wide area around the Pavilion. 798

641. As someone who is moving to Bexhill in April, I welcome the development initiative. Moving in from another town in East Sussex, it is clear to me that the town centre is in need of refurbishment. The railway station is disgraceful and needs to be brought into the 21st Century. The seafront area needs to be significantly tidied up, especially around the De La Warr Pavilion. I prefer the ABK futuristic design, since to me it offers a vibrant potential. I am not sure that Chapman Taylor's design would add anything to the seafront whilst the Aukett design is difficult to conceptualise. Timber louvered shutters also seem to me to be inappropriate in our climate on the South coast. 801
642. I am about to move to Bexhill from Eastbourne and am delighted at the prospect of its regeneration - much needed in order to attract people to the town! Its nearness to Ashford could make it attractive to European visitors and provide employment opportunities for young people living locally. 802
643. How can such an architecturally important building as the De La Warr Pavilion be essentially ignored in these schemes, other than in – arguably – the Chapman Taylor scheme. By ignoring, I mean visually – only the Chapman Taylor scheme acknowledges the Pavilion – and ignoring in terms of dwarfing the Pavilion. The Chapman Taylor building is too high, too dominant. Don't you think? It's really difficult for me to guess and/or comment on regeneration, etc. but my feelings about the hotel buildings are strong. I am convinced that any scheme must acknowledge the Pavilion. 804
644. The ABK scheme seems to me to be the most contemporary and most responsive to the De La Warr Pavilion and the sea itself. 805
645. I actually feel that this space would be best left as it is. 806
646. I think it is a shame that this development will block out the view of the sea and would be best built elsewhere. I.e. at the back of the town. 807

VISITING FOR OTHER REASONS AGED OVER 60

647. General redevelopment on corner site of Sackville Road opposite the De La Warr. 808
648. Whether ABK's scheme is the best, I don't know. But their presentation is much the clearest and their scheme the most elegant. 809

649. Chapman Taylor hotel: If pictures reflect height of hotel, I think it is too high. The same with ABK. Liked the idea of pier on two. 810
650. Most interesting exhibition. As a visitor, I have visited Bexhill over the past six years and am disappointed with the fast dilapidation of the town. Any development should improve this as this is a wonderful coastal town. Good luck. 811
651. Bexhill will take a lot of convincing to improve anything, so I am not hopeful. Listening to some of the comments, I despair, so I hope you don't. Best of luck. 813
652. There is a parking problem in the area at present. By bringing in all these employers (and employees!!) and builders, it will be far worse. Leave centre of Bexhill alone and please build a great hotel and exhibition complex at Glyne Gap. Much better in all ways. 814
653. Exciting plans for Bexhill. I am always pleased to visit the town, and look forward to seeing many improvements in future, very especially to the De La Warr Pavilion. An excellent exhibition, am very glad to have the opportunity of seeing it, and talking to the lovely chaps who explained their plans to me. Thank you. 815
654. All schemes have pros and cons. Chapman Taylor's scheme leaves more of the site open and obstructs existing views the least. However, it does look rather overpowering when viewed looking West from the sea side of the De La Warr. The Aukett scheme provides a more in scale enclosure looking West. Chapman Taylor's scheme would not give the same sea views from the hotel/restaurant/bar as the other two. Is it possible to mix all three uses in one building? Usually developers strongly resist this. The apartments might be more valuable if in separate blocks and ABK's flats are the best location. However, ABK's proposals do take up a lot of the site and I wonder how strong winds would affect the curved, enclosed spaces between the buildings. Wind tunnel tests are important. 816
655. Chapman Taylor is the most practical scheme. Height more or less matches Mendelsohn's project. Could work on commercial offices or residential. 817

15. Additional sheets detached from questionnaires

656. ABK: All these proposals should be lower and not in competition with the De La Warr and cast a shadow. Apart from the aesthetic viewpoint, there is the problem of setting a precedent for high-rise buildings and further down the line it perhaps would result in a dreadful ribbon high build along the front, like the Spanish coast. The ABK design is very attractive and more in keeping with ethos of the De La Warr than the others but it too is too high. Furthermore, the 'S' shaped buildings in the designs raise the question of how the wind would swirl around with rubbish in its wake. Also, a potential area for drug addicts, and those bent on doing damage. At present, Bexhill is fortunately also quite free of road rage, graffiti and vandalism. Every effort must be made to make it stay that way. Underground car park is a good idea but needs to be 'safe'. I don't like the squared-off stair wells! I don't like the North-facing façade – ugly! Aukett: Also a good height but don't like the 'spa' building – looks too small and unsightly and reminds me of a concentration camp armed look-out turret on legs! 830
657. I have visited the exhibition over two days to get a better view of what is being proposed. The impression given a few weeks ago was that this was a competition in respect of a hotel complex. I find that the hotel is linked by the company concerned with their concept of the town centre needs, which implies that whichever, if any, is selected then that is what we shall get elsewhere in the town. Personally I feel that the whole idea for a new hotel complex on the proposed site is wrong. It takes up the remaining piece of green open land this side (West) of the Pavilion. I recall that not long ago, Rother Council turned down an application to build housing/flats on the Bowling Green up by Brassey Road at the other end and one of the reasons given was that it would take away the last remaining piece of open space. That site is less than half a mile from this one. A golden opportunity has been missed over the old Grand Hotel site, which could have been replaced by a modern complex and would not have caused too much opposition. What are we getting? A new medical centre and 15 luxury flats. I don't see much regeneration there. Certainly not of the type being bandied about by the various task forces and regeneration committees, most of whom the general public don't even know let alone meet. Unfortunately, the one place that is large enough to accommodate a general meeting to air all these points, and I mean the De La Warr Pavilion, is closed. I see that application has been made by one small hotel to be allowed to turn itself into bed sitting rooms. 831
658. I am not sufficiently well-informed to make a judgement as to whether Bexhill needs a hotel (Grand was not viable), however, if one is needed, is the putting green the only suitable site? It does seem a shame to lose the wonderful view of the Pavilion from the promenade along West Parade. That said, if the putting green site is used, my views of each option are expressed

overleaf. I like the idea of the redevelopment of the Skoda garage site and the site of the curved parade of shops opposite (both are eyesores!). I also like the idea of a link between Devonshire Square and Town Hall Square and the relocation of the station to Devonshire Square (its original site). Bexhill only needs a ticket office and a small waiting room. Without being unduly pessimistic, if the glazing were even to be replaced on the long ramps from the platforms to the station, they would surely soon be vandalised. I am sure that a good use could be found for the existing station building. (page missing?) Western Road is already a nightmare to get along pavements because of obstructions by signs, bollards and shops taking up space with their goods. (As part of the pavement belongs to them – it was once small front gardens – they do this legally.) The same with London Road. I do not like any of the proposed plans for any of the places. I came back to live on West Parade because I like it, and the town, as it is. The De La Warr Pavilion should be ‘done up’ very soon, and the idea of ‘contemporary’ arts centre is ludicrous. Why not make things suitable for those who already reside here and improve facilities for the younger people, teenagers and children. Stop having ideas which will just not work for Bexhill and its residents. No new young people will come here before train, bus and roads, including a proper ‘bypass’ are made. Why not ask local residents to draw up rough plans of any improvements they would like to see and not waste money on all sorts of grandiose ideas that are just not sensible for this town. Use that money on improving and repairing what we already have. 832

16. Email messages

659. Having looked at the 3 proposals for the hotel I believe it would be best to site it across the road on the garage site. This leaves the seafront unspoilt and gives prominence to the De La Warr Pavilion. The hotel would have sea views and perhaps be the start of building regeneration of the town centre. 833

When answering the following questions, please place the schemes in order of preference by putting a 1, 2 or 3 in each of the boxes.

(1 = first choice 2 = second choice 3 = third choice)

Masterplan for Bexhill Town Centre

1. Which scheme do you like most?

- Ahrends, Burton & Koralek
- Aukett Ltd
- Chapman Taylor
with van Heyningen & Haward

2. The aim of regeneration is to create more prosperous, attractive and vibrant communities. Which scheme do you think could best achieve this for Bexhill?

- Ahrends, Burton & Koralek
- Aukett Ltd
- Chapman Taylor
with van Heyningen & Haward

New seafront development on the former Metropole Site

1. Which scheme do you like most?

- Ahrends, Burton & Koralek
- Aukett Ltd
- Chapman Taylor
with van Heyningen & Haward

2. Which scheme provides most opportunities for business, tourism, leisure and culture?

- Ahrends, Burton & Koralek
- Aukett Ltd
- Chapman Taylor
with van Heyningen & Haward

3. Which scheme do you think looks best from the four key views shown in the exhibition?

- Ahrends, Burton & Koralek
- Aukett Ltd
- Chapman Taylor
with van Heyningen & Haward

Ref No

Please complete the form overleaf to validate the questionnaire

Bexhill Future

A choice of designs for a vibrant seaside community

