

From: **Christopher Nevell**

Date: Thu, 10 Sept 2026 at 15:25

Subject: AWDM/0737/26 - Objection

To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

This message was sent from outside Adur & Worthing Councils

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#)

Please take this as a formal objection to the proposed development on Marine Drive AWDM/0737/26, to be added to the Portal

From: Christopher Nevell, 7 Sea Lane, Goring-by-Sea

Objection

While reluctant to respond again to this ongoing application, another submission by Mr Dixon has necessitated a further objection, based on safety.

The applicant has provided what is titled a Swept Path Assessment but that is by title only. Instead, the offering is a front wheel track drawing. A correct Swept Path analysis provides the exact area a vehicle occupies, reflecting that rear wheels do not follow the front wheels precisely but create a different curve, i.e. a full sweep.

This is important for a classified road (the C250), as it does not provide assurance that risk associated with traffic, highlighted by West Sussex County Council, has been mitigated. A specialist analyst uses CAD tools to reveal issues not immediately evident. Given 25% of the land is reserved for parking, indicating a substantially higher volume of visitors forecast compared to this year, the risk mitigation needs to be evident.

From this, the current submission, which appears to be a self-assessment by the applicant himself, must be upgraded and replaced with a fully independent professionally produced assessment from which firm conclusions on safety can be based.

Examples of where this latest submission falls short is:

- Parked cars on the road opposite the entrance have not been included, and so the 5.2m road width is overstated
- No mention of speed here. What may be practical at a crawl may not work as well at a higher speed
- The front wheel track drawing gives the appearance that the kerb will have to be mounted when accessing from the West
- No continuation in the drawing on how traffic will flow once on the site. It has a current laissez-faire feel of a mingle of cars, cyclists and pedestrians which while unintended, indicates risk and needs to be evidenced as to how it will be managed to mitigate any risk of collision/injury.

Other points of concern:

- The placing of the pedestrian gate in its current position increases the risk of cars hitting pedestrians when departing in an easterly direction. A driver turning left on exit may look towards Ferring to check for cars, then start driving while adjusting their view (without full care and attention) and encounter an immediate

pedestrian flow from the greensward that has little scope to alter course or return, as there is no pavement for them. Instead, pedestrian access into the proposed side road entrance appears safer, and so more feasible.

- The current placing of the bin in the plan obscures car driver view on departure
- With mention of bays and a tarmac entrance, there is still no statement on what the car park surface will be. For the parking in the Plan, a hard-core tarmac surface at the highest point of the field will lead to water run-off. Within the Local Plan, Rural England terms the land as Best and Most Versatile agricultural land and so concreting (or the equivalent) 25% of the land is not acceptable and sets a precedence for the remainder of this field and other surrounding land.
- No mention of whether hedges/planting will be removed to accommodate the revised entrance. The required biodiversity report for the land as a whole, remains absent and must be delivered.