

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 03/01/2026 3:09 PM from Mr Robert Niall.

### Application Summary

Address:	94 Marine Crescent Worthing West Sussex BN12 4JH
Proposal:	Subdivision of existing dwelling plot to provide 2 bedroom chalet bungalow style detached house in rear garden with parking accessed off St John's Avenue
Case Officer:	Jo Morin

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

Name:	Mr Robert Niall
Email:	
Address:	34 Marine Crescent Worthing West Sussex

### Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Design</li><li>- Loss of General Amenity</li><li>- Overdevelopment</li><li>- Trees and Landscaping</li></ul>
Comments:	<p>On behalf of the Goring and Ilex Conservation Group</p> <p>We consider this opportunist back garden development to be visually offensive to the detriment of the local amenity, overdevelopment of the property, having an adverse effect on biodiversity, ill-sited and poorly designed.</p> <p>The proposals do not reflect the character of the properties in St John's Avenue which is the main elevation for these proposals. The existing properties are all single storey or chalet bungalows, some with minor dormers. These proposals show a heightened ridge line together with a prominent gable end which introduces the character of a two storey ill balanced house into the Avenue which provides an incongruous and conflicting appearance to the other Avenue properties.</p>

The proposals attempt to gain the most square footage from the plot as possible without much thought being given to the neighbours with the proposed building being uncomfortably close to the neighbouring property in the Avenue when it could have been sited nearer the Marine Crescent property. The proposals also project not just beyond the St John's Avenue building line but also beyond a projected line from the property in Marine Crescent to that of No8 St John's Avenue. It is also closer to the pavement boundary than the West elevation of 94 Marine Crescent.

Although some planting is proposed, the proposals include the removal of a large area of trees/shrubs and replacement of soft landscaping with buildings/hard surfaces which, rather than increasing biodiversity, reduces it and may also have an adverse effect on local drainage.

We appreciate that there is pressure for new housebuilding at local and national level but this should not be at a cost to the local amenity and these proposals are unlikely to add to the stock of affordable housing. A less ambitious redesign may sit more kindly within the local framework although this may not be possible when taking into account flood risk and other requirements in which case, the plot would not be suitable for another property. We would ask, however, that these current proposals be rejected.

Bob Niall  
Secretary, GICG

---