



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

Fwd: Additional comments to Planning Application AWD/0737/26

1 message

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

10 July 2026 at 10:41

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

Planning | Adur & Worthing Councils
01903 221065 | <http://www.adur-worthing.gov.uk>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [REDACTED]
Date: Fri, 10 Jul 2026 at 10:21
Subject: Re:Additional comments to Planning Application AWD/0737/26
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

This message was sent from outside Adur & Worthing Councils

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

Dear Planning Department,

I note that MR Dixon has added several supporting documents to the application based on some of the objections raised. I believe it is fair for me to be able to respond further to those comments.

The applicant's suggestion that temporary planning permission should be granted if permanent permission cannot be supported is respectfully rejected.

The request is founded on the premise that the Council's concerns arise merely from uncertainty about the future operation of the development. That is not the case.

The issues identified throughout the assessment are matters of planning principle rather than uncertainty. The proposal represents development within the Green Gap, conflicts with the strategic objectives of the Worthing Local Plan, results in the permanent loss of protected open space, introduces an urbanising commercial use into the countryside and fails to satisfy the policy tests that permit such development. None of these conflicts are capable of being resolved simply because the permission is granted for a temporary period.

Temporary planning permission is intended for circumstances where the principle of development is acceptable, but there is genuine uncertainty regarding the effects of the proposal which can reasonably be assessed over time. It is not intended as a mechanism to allow development that is fundamentally contrary to the Development Plan to proceed on a trial basis.

The applicant suggests that impacts relating to visitor activity, parking, landscape, operational management and protection of green space could be monitored during a temporary consent. However, these are not the principal reasons why the proposal conflicts with planning policy. The proposal gives rise to an unacceptable change in the character and function of protected open land from the outset. That change occurs immediately upon commencement of the development and would exist irrespective of how well the site is managed.

Nor is it accepted that the development is genuinely reversible. Although individual structures may be capable of removal, the planning harm identified is not limited to the physical presence of those structures. It arises from the introduction of a commercial leisure destination, associated visitor activity, parking demand, increased traffic movements, noise, infrastructure, and the permanent change in the character and function of the land. Those impacts would occur throughout any temporary consent and would conflict with the objectives of the Worthing Local Plan for the duration of the permission.

The applicant also places reliance upon licensing controls and operational conditions. This conflates two separate regulatory regimes. Licensing controls are concerned with matters such as public safety, crime

and disorder, and the sale of alcohol. They do not address the fundamental land-use planning issues of principle, policy compliance, protection of the Green Gap, landscape character, visual impact or the loss of open space. Consequently, the existence of licensing conditions cannot overcome objections arising under planning legislation.

Furthermore, the Planning Inspector has already determined, in relation to the previous appeals concerning this site, that the proposed leisure use constitutes a material change of use requiring planning permission and that the introduction of the proposed facilities represents development in planning terms. The Inspector concluded that the Council's position was well founded and dismissed the appeals. The Inspector's reasoning was based upon the nature of the development itself rather than any lack of operational evidence, confirming that the planning issues are matters of principle rather than matters capable of being resolved through a trial period.

For these reasons, a temporary planning permission would neither overcome nor reduce the identified conflicts with the Development Plan. It would merely postpone consideration of matters that already establish the proposal to be unacceptable in planning terms. Accordingly, the grant of a temporary permission would not constitute an appropriate or proportionate planning response.

The applicant requests an explanation as to why planning conditions could not reasonably address the Council's concerns. The answer is that planning conditions cannot make acceptable development which is unacceptable in principle. Conditions may regulate the manner in which development operates, but they cannot remove the fundamental conflict with the Development Plan, nor can they remedy the loss of protected open space, the conflict with Green Gap policies, or the inappropriate commercialisation of the site. Consequently, neither temporary permission nor additional planning conditions would overcome the reasons for refusal.

For the reasons outlined above, I strongly object to planning application AWDM/0737/26 and respectfully request that the Council upholds the purpose of the Green designation by refusing permission for the proposed development.

Yours faithfully,

Colin McKail
[23 Fairview Avenue](#)
Goring by sea
BN12 4 HT

From: Virginmedia [REDACTED]
Date: Thursday, 25 June 2026 at 21:47
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to Planning Application AWDM/0737/26