

From: **Peter Charley**

Date: Tue, 7 Jul 2026 at 18:42

Subject: Objection to Planning Application AWDM/0396/26

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

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Planning Application AWDM/0396/26 – Objection

I write to formally object to the above planning application.

My objection is based on the following material planning considerations, with reference to the Worthing Local Plan (2011–2036), West Sussex County Council guidance, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

1. Poor Design and Inadequate Living Standards

The proposed flats are only designed to meet the minimum Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) for one-bedroom, one-person units and, in practice, function as undersized studio-type accommodation.

This conflicts with:

Worthing Local Plan Policy DQ1 (Design Quality) which requires high-quality, usable living environments

NPPF Paragraph 130 which requires developments to ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users

The cramped internal layout fails to deliver genuinely functional one-bedroom homes.

2. Lack of Natural Light and Poor Outlook

The east-facing units (particularly ground and first floors) will receive limited natural daylight, leading to substandard living conditions.

This is contrary to:

Policy DQ1 (Design Quality) – requiring buildings to optimise outlook, daylight, and sunlight

NPPF Paragraph 130(a) – requiring good design and amenity outcomes

3. Overlooking and Loss of Privacy

The proximity to existing Bedford Row properties will create harmful overlooking and loss of privacy.

This conflicts with:

Policy DQ1 (Design Quality) – protecting residential amenity

NPPF Paragraph 130(f) – ensuring developments create places with a high standard of amenity

4. Potential Rights of Light Issues

The scale and siting of the development raise serious concerns regarding Rights of Light for Bedford Row residents, indicating poor contextual design and insufficient regard for neighbouring impacts.

This further demonstrates conflict with Policy DQ1.

5. Lack of Parking Provision

No parking is provided within the scheme, placing pressure on an already constrained area.

This is contrary to:

Worthing Local Plan Policy T1 (Sustainable Transport) – requiring appropriate parking and transport considerations

West Sussex County Council Parking Guidance – which sets expectations for parking provision

NPPF Paragraph 111 – development should only be prevented if residual cumulative impacts on the road network are severe; in this case, impacts are likely to be significant

6. Insufficient Amenity Space

Multiple units lack private amenity space, including:

West side ground and first floors

East side first and second floors

This conflicts with:

Policy DQ1 (Design Quality) – requiring adequate private or communal amenity space

NPPF Paragraph 130 – ensuring a high quality of life for future occupants

7. Lack of Accessibility and Adaptability

No units meet Building Regulations M4(2) or M4(3) standards.

This conflicts with:

Worthing Local Plan Policy DQ1 – inclusive design

NPPF Paragraph 130(f) – promoting inclusive and accessible environments

8. Overdevelopment of the Site

The density and layout indicate overdevelopment, prioritising unit numbers over quality.

This conflicts with:

Policy DQ1 (Design Quality) – requiring development to respect site constraints

NPPF Paragraph 130(c) – ensuring development is sympathetic to local character

9. Misleading Visual Representation

9. Misleading Visual Representation

The submitted visuals show parking where there is currently a loading bay used for servicing and as a passing place on a narrow one-way street.

This undermines proper assessment of the proposal and conflicts with:

NPPF Paragraph 44 – requiring decisions to be based on adequate, up-to-date information

10. Traffic and Congestion Impacts

Marine Place is already heavily constrained and will face increased pressure following the nearby Debenhams redevelopment (79 flats). We reported concerns about the impact on Marine Place ahead of this earlier development, and it is our view that the council needs to understand the impact of their earlier decision before adding further fuel. Between Iceland deliveries, refuse collectors, delivery vans, the impact of emergency vehicles often waiting for long periods in the road, and an added increase of visitors and deliveries for (currently) 79 flats, in a road that struggles before construction even started.

The development will generate additional vehicle movements and servicing demand without mitigation.

This conflicts with:

Policy T1 (Sustainable Transport)

NPPF Paragraphs 110–111 – requiring safe access and managing transport impacts
Cycle storage provision alone is insufficient to offset the absence of parking or broader transport impacts.

Conclusion

The proposal fails to comply with key policies within the Worthing Local Plan and the NPPF, particularly in relation to design quality, residential amenity, accessibility, and transport impact.

It represents an overdevelopment that would result in poor living conditions for future occupiers and harm to neighbouring residents.

Additionally, local residents have been subjected to road closures, noise, debris, and inconvenience. We have also been required to call the Police three times due to lax security on the current site leading to trespass/criminal damage.

And with the ongoing (uncommunicated) work by Mackley through the night on Worthing Pier since January 2022, we also just think it would be good to give residents a break from the noise and disruption, and actually assess the impact of earlier Council decisions before compounding the above issues.

I therefore respectfully request that the Council refuse planning permission for application AWD/0396/26.

Yours faithfully,
Peter Pearce



