



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

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0737/26

1 message

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

11 July 2026 at 16:16

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 11/07/2026 4:16 PM from Mr Mel Humphrey.

Application Summary

Address:	Land South East Corner Of Amberley Drive Marine Drive Worthing West Sussex
Proposal:	Commercial use of regenerated land, including use as a community green space for recreational and leisure use. Retention of land for biodiversity use. Bore hole for extraction of natural water. Use of land to produce natural green energy, for example solar. Provision of vehicle parking use (including overnight camping use for kite surfers and sea swimmers), 2 x 6m flag poles, provision of food and drink from temporary structures, mobile toilets, shower and baby changing facilities. Two recessed shipping containers for site storage and use. Tree shaded sandpit and tumble-down mound for young children and toddlers to use. Animals to use for entertainment purposes, for example Shetland ponies. A decorative flowerpot boat at site entrance. Bin storage use. A wheeled advertising trailer, measuring approx. 5 metres by 2.5 metres located within the site boundary to promote Worthing, local events and tourism.
Case Officer:	Gary Peck

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Mel Humphrey
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	9 Aldsworth Avenue Worthing West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Whilst I absolutely agree with all of the comments made by the numerous objectors I make further comments to add weight to what should be an obvious refusal. * I note the latest correspondence from Mr Dixon was to ask for a temporary permission ? this should not be considered in any circumstances, in anything further scrutiny from the planning enforcement team should be carried out to ensure that the existing

permissions have not been contravened.

* The block plans do not show the position of the WC block? with what looks like no wheelchair facilities ?, difficult to achieve with the existing ground conditions?

* All of the features proposed are alien to this seaside location , where this strategic gap must be maintained sterile .

*There are no details of the shipping containers , justifying their appearance , no elevations , use , floor plans etc.

*The submitted flood risk assessment submitted relates to another scheme completely.

*There is no detailed ecology/biodiversity statement.

*The Goring Hall Plan of 1936 has no relevance at all.

* Does the road name Amberley Drive shown on the block plan actually exist ?

* The meeting between local councillors and Mr Dixon should be investigated and minuted to ascertain the parties present and what advice and support if any and by whom was given , as I m absolutely sure all of those present were not familiar with relevant Planning policy?

Whist writing I confirm

- 1, Contrary to the Local Plan, which reserves this area as Local Green Gap, not available for development of any sort (Local Plan pages 58 - 61)
2. Not compatible with the site's designation as a Local Wildlife Site
3. Biodiversity loss, when biodiversity gain is required
4. The proposed activities on the site, the vehicles and equipment, and the shipping containers for storage out of season would detract from the visual appeal of the Goring Gap.
6. The entry and exit of vehicles would cause unacceptable traffic congestion in Marine Crescent and adjacent roads.
 1. Noise pollution
8. Allowing overnight accommodation for camper vans would encourage overnight parking of motor homes on the carriageway, which WSCC has prohibited
9. The history of the site is inaccurate and misleading. Planning applications for housing were refused by WSCC in 1951 and 1954 and upheld on appeal. The Inspector said, 'It would be wrong for anything to be done to impair the effective agricultural use of the land'. Subsequent applications and appeals have all been rejected, The last use of this land was agricultural, not housing development

This application clearly warrants refusal...

Kind regards