

On 28 Aug 2026, at 14:46, planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk wrote:

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0628/26

Dear Sir/Madam,

Mr Robert Stranks,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 28/08/2026 2:46 PM from Mr Robert Stranks.

Application Summary

Address: Land Between Sword Street And Martlets Way Worthing West Sussex

Proposal: Full planning application for a mixed-use development comprising 123 dwellings and commercial floorspace together with associated parking, landscaping, open space and drainage [Land at Durrington Gasworks]

Case Officer: Giles Holbrook

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr Robert Stranks

Email:

Address: [23 Sword Street Goring Worthing West Sussex BN12 4FS](#)

Comments Details

Commenter
Type:

Member of the Public

Stance:

Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for
comment:

- Other

Comments:

Planning Application AWDM/0628/26

I object to granting planning consent to this application in its current form for 2 material planning policy reasons:

It is contrary to the council's development plan in significant respects;

It is contrary to the council's Employment Strategy and therefore likely to have adverse consequences as regards the council's climate change strategy.

It is contrary to the council's development plan in significant respects.

This arises because it is self-evidently contrary to the Worthing Local Plan. In this regard, I invite the committee(I have submitted my objection in these terms because if required I would intend to present these in person at the necessary time) to look at the WLP, specifically Part 4, Site Allocations, sites A8, HMRC Offices, Barrington Road and site A10 Martlets Way.

A8, HMRC Offices

According to the plan(which underwent numerous iterations and periods of consultation, including examination by the Planning Inspector before being adopted by the council) the spatial extent of this site is the whole area bounded red in the plan. For the avoidance of doubt, this includes Durrington Bridge House. However, the narrative refers to Durrington Bridge House in these terms:

'..it is expected that HMRC will retain a presence in Durrington on the adjacent site(the more modern Durrington Bridge House) located to the east.[presumably of site A8!] '

'the site[that is to say site A8 as defined] currently comprises offices..which range from single storey units up to a five storey section of one of the buildings'.

As some members will know, although DBH is comprised of 5 floors it seems at odds with its scale that it would be referred to as 'one of the buildings'.

So, which is it, is DBH within site A8 as shown clearly on the plan, or not?

The 'Indicative Capacity' of site A8 stated in the plan is:

250 residential units;

Provision of care home/sheltered accommodation.

There is NO provision for commercial/employment uses(other than to a limited extent in any care home).

My research shows that DBH, which was designated for office use, extends across 6,000 sq.m.

I refer the committee to planning consent AWDM/0942/23 (the development on the HMRC site), which related to 287 residential units. You will see that the red-lined spatial extent excludes DBH.

By virtue of NOTICE/0016/24, the council gave approval to a change of use application in respect of DBH which had the effect of redesignating 6,000 sq.m. of office space so that 101 residential units could be developed.

Therefore, as regards site A8 in the context of the area specified in the plan, and presumably the area which officers took into account when presenting evidence to the council regarding land use needs during the plan period, a simple comparison gives the following:

'Indicative Capacity' - 250 residential units;

Approved units - 388 residential units.

I submit that it is not possible to consider the planning and wider land use issues in respect of the current application without a clear understanding of the above.

Planning application AWDM/0626/26

I refer the committee to the spatial extent of this proposal in the applicant's submitted documents and invite you to compare this with the red-lined area of Site A10 Martlets Way. To all intents and purposes they are the same.

It must therefore follow that the application should broadly be in line with the 'Indicative Capacity' shown in the plan which is:

'10,000 sqm employment & 28 residential units'

However, the applicant is seeking permission to build:

'123 dwellings and commercial floorspace together', which are:

123 dwellings

2348 sqm 'gross new internal floorspace'

The committee might ask itself what is the difference between '10,000 sqm of employment space' and '2348 gross internal floorspace'.

At best they are equivalent, at worst, who knows?

In terms of numbers between the 2 sites specified in the Worthing Local Plan:

Site Indicative capacity Approvals/requested

A8 250 residential units 388

A10 28 dwellings 123

278 511

Loss of commercial floorspace: 13,500 sqm

In its Spatial Strategy, the council identified a need for approx. 50,000 sqm of developments for 'commercial' and 'employment' uses.

As regards 'employment uses' alone, the Strategy identifies 3 sites totalling 34,000 sqm.

Site A10 is identified as being a site suitable to provide 10,000 sqm of employment space i.e. approx. 30% of the total need.

However, if the subsequent loss of 6,000 sqm with the redesignation of DBH is factored in, then the gross need would increase to 40,000 sqm with one fewer site to contribute.

The council would fail to meet the employment needs of the borough.

It is concerning that the applicant received pre-planning advice on their application but despite it being at such variance with the WLP they decided to continue, no doubt at significant cost. This could suggest that officers might be minded to recommend this application.

Given its significance, this must be a matter referred to committee and I submit that the

committee cannot approve application 0628/26 because it is as such variance with the Worthing Local Plan approved by the full council.

In short:

The council has already given permission to develop 388 dwellings on site A8, 133 (33%) above its indicative capacity.

Site A10's primary use is EMPLOYMENT, not residential.

It is now being asked to disregard the Development Plan in respect of Site A10 and thereby prejudice the council's ability to promote a complementary portfolio of land for employment uses.

Which begs the question: where would all these residents find gainful employment? If in other councils' areas and therefore a distance, then this could hardly be regarded as sustainable development.

Permission must be refused.

I might also add that despite Sword Street being the only access/egress to the site, the applicant's pre-application 'consultation' failed to include us.
