



Support Planning <support.planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0629/26

1 message

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

10 July 2026 at 15:24

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 10/07/2026 3:24 PM from Mr TONY howard.

Application Summary

Address:	Courtlands 37 Parklands Avenue Worthing West Sussex BN12 4NG
Proposal:	Change of use of the site to a Special Educational Needs (SEN) School (Class F1) for up to 80 pupils, including retention of two replacement outbuildings (sheds), erection of 2no. lodge-style classroom buildings, installation of a Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA), polytunnel and associated external works including 3.34m high gate piers (with in-built CCTV camera) and automated metal entrance gates to the drive and galvanised steel security perimeter fencing.
Case Officer:	Jo Morin

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	Mr TONY howard
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	3 Warnham Close Worthing West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Detailed Objections to Classroom 2 adjoining No.3 Warnham Close Last summer work started on clearing the undergrowth area from under TPO tree 23 and back towards TPO tree 27. These trees are both significant and substantial protected Lime trees. This future building site was scraped clean by a mechanical digger and the lower limbs of TPO tree 23 were removed without Permission to allow the erection of a polytunnel. This was reported to Planning Enforcement in July 2025 but there was no Planning Application for lopping of the TPO lime tree or Crown lifting. On building the house where I have lived at 3 Warnham Close since 1997 my company at that time (JW Stratton Ltd) was required to avoid erecting a fence to the boundary

with Courtlands and next to this Lime Tree TPO 23 which is directly in front off and to the north side of my house.

Therefore we built a low wall with a wrought iron decorative railing on the boundary to allow us and our neighbour to enjoy the vista looking East into the grounds of Courtlands but more importantly to retain the openness of the southern grounds of Courtlands, which was imperative.

The Application now seeks to completely close that gap with a new even larger Polytunnel (no details) but also a very large industrial shed-like building similar in design to that already constructed within the trees and without Planning Permission but is called Classroom 2.

In my opinion this proposed classroom is poorly designed, out of keeping, unneighbourly, unsightly and inappropriate within the grounds of a listed building. Classroom 2 would be clearly visible from the main building as it projects into the grounds of Courtlands.

This building would represent one of four new buildings all directly clustered around my house in what appears to be a coordinated attempt to bring the school back out into the grounds of Courtlands.

This is totally the opposite of what your your Heritage Officer advised as he commented The buildings (classrooms) are "sizeable structures with a strong visual presence". Moreover he said "these buildings are impossible to mitigate through siting and context".

If permitted, we will have and without any regard for sensitivity, privacy or amenity a huge building of over 1000 square feet (the size of a bungalow) immediately alongside our property.

It will have massive impact on our house and would also affect the morning light from our bedroom window.

It would have an enormous impact and cause harm to us partly for the following reasons;

The Applicants admit there will be significant noise which could be constrained with the classroom and to do this the door and windows would be kept closed!

In this changing climate I challenge this approach, consider it false and unrealistic and consider the opposite would be the case! Or the children will have to be sent home!

The building is a single skin and is unsuitable as a school building and falls short of requirements for modern day school buildings.

Additionally there would need to be toilet facilities and services to the Classroom which are not being identified in any way.

Also included but not identified are proposals, (quite contrary to the "quiet" areas suggested for learning), to include a gym and leisure facilities such as a fitness suite, again unspecified or as to siting or the effect it would have on neighbouring properties.

Planning Permission was granted only a few years ago in to bring back Courtlands into use by allowing to be used as a school for 23 resident children. This never happened and I am told that no children are in residence - the opposite of that approved.

If you now allow a 350% increase in children attending the school then one must assume that the need for 2 extra classrooms (plus the one in the woods) is because the school is unable to support that increase in numbers of children.

I urge you to refuse this application.

Thank you
Tony howard

Kind regards