

Mrs. Eva Macdonald.
Flat 2,
14 Tower Road, Worthing
West Sussex
BN11 1DP

Date: 02/07/2026

Adur & Worthing Councils,
Development Management
Place Directorate
Worthing Town Hall
Worthing
West Sussex
BN11 1DP

Subject: Planning Application ref: **AWDM/0539/26**

Dear Sirs,

2nd July 2026

Your Reference: AWDM/0539/26

Regarding to the above planning Application, I wish to lodge my strongest objection to the application on my well researched points below.

I am writing this to submit a formal objection to the proposed development consisting of 17 shipping containers intended for mixed commercial and community use. My household, along with many neighbouring properties, will be directly and severely affected by this development. I urge the Planning Department to reject this application for the reasons outlined below.

Excessive and Antisocial Operating Hours

The proposed opening hours of 7am to 10pm Monday to Saturday and 9am to 8pm sun, are wholly inappropriate for a quiet residential area. These hours extend far beyond typical office or community facility hours and would significantly disrupt the daily lives of residents, particularly families with young children. The extended operating window increases the likelihood of noise, disturbance, and antisocial behaviour late into the evening.

Severe Noise Pollution

The development introduces multiple sources of noise pollution:

Mechanical ventilation, heating, and cooling systems for each of the 17 containers, placed within approximately 2 metres of neighbouring garden walls.

Each air-conditioning unit is rated at 69 dB, meaning the combined output could reach close to 78 dB, equivalent to heavy city traffic. World Health Organisation guidance recommends a maximum of 52 dB over a 40 hour week. The proposal anticipates approx 78 dB over 102 hours per week, far exceeding safe and acceptable levels for a residential neighbourhood

The Phillips Surveyors acoustic report explicitly warns that AC units should not be placed in enclosed or semi-enclosed courtyards due to sound build-up and exhaust discharge. Yet the proposal places single-storey studios with the AC units facing boundary walls, less than 2 metres away creating exactly the conditions the report advises against.

Additional noise from footfall, commercial activity, music, and ambient sound are not taken into account in these calculations and would be substantial. No evidence in the proposal has taken this into consideration

Visual Intrusion and Unsightly Industrial Appearance

Conflicting information in the proposal regarding the height of the development, (in the planning statement it states single story throughout with no structure exceeding 3.2m at parapet . However, the proposal includes 17 shipping containers, some stacked to nearly 6 metres in height. When photovoltaic units are added, the total height could reach 6.5 metres. This is far above the typical 2 metre height of surrounding garden walls.

The result would be an intrusive, industrial structure looming over private gardens and bedrooms. Containers on the café side would have direct sightlines into neighbouring bedrooms, causing a severe loss of privacy.

The surrounding housing stock is over 120 years old, characterised by traditional flint

and brick vernacular. The industrial aesthetic of shipping containers even with modifications suggested is entirely out of keeping with the historic residential environment.

Inaccurate Characterisation of the Site as “Town Centre”

The application repeatedly refers to the site as being in the “town centre.” In reality, the location is deep within an old residential area, surrounded on all four sides by housing. The roads serving the site—Tower Road and Upper High Street—are narrow, single-lane one way residential streets already suffering from severe parking pressure.

Introducing a commercial hub in this location would worsen congestion, reduce parking availability for residents, and create safety risks.

Commercial Dominance Over Community Benefit

The development allocates 70% of its total space to commercial use, with only 30% designated for so called community purposes. This imbalance demonstrates that the primary motivation is commercial profit rather than genuine community enrichment.

The proposal cites “community wellness” but provides no definition, evidence, or measurable financial benefit for local residents.

Worthing Town Centre already has:

30+ cafés

12 gyms

public wellness saunas

15 dedicated music and culture hubs

35 art studios

7 flexible work hubs

There is also a vibrant, established community centre—the Sydney Walter Centre—located less than 320 metres from the proposed site.

The claim of a “critical gap” in local infrastructure is therefore unfounded.

Proven Issues from the 2025 “Test Phase”

During the summer of 2024-5, two temporary test events were conducted. Residents experienced:

Overwhelming noise, including amplified music.
Strong food and waste smells drifting into gardens and homes.
Antisocial behaviour associated with late-evening gatherings.
My household was unable to sit in our garden throughout the events due to the intrusive noise and odours. These issues were not hypothetical—they were lived experiences that demonstrate the real-world impact of the proposed development.

Traffic, Parking, and Overcapacity Concerns

The proposal reduces on-site parking from 38 spaces to 17, while increasing potential on-site daily users of up to 178 people, excluding event visitors.

The proposal anticipates up to 2,000 visitors, yet provides no realistic plan for parking, traffic flow, or safe access.

The surrounding roads are single-lane, one-way residential streets already under strain. The development would exacerbate congestion, reduce resident parking, and create hazards for pedestrians and cyclists.

Lack of disability Accessibility Provision

The proposal fails to address basic accessibility requirements for the disabled :

No clear provision for disabled toilets.

No accessible route to the first-floor units.

No details on general accessibility .

This omission is unacceptable for a development claiming to serve community need

Environmental and Utility Concerns

The proposal claims “minimal ground works” but provides no detail on:

Waste management systems for 17 commercial units.

Utility connections (water, sewage, electricity) for each container.

Ventilation exhaust placement.

+100 solar panels would be required to fully power the air conditioning units needed to heat/cool the container structures. While the 28 planned are welcome this feels more a token gesture to gain planning consent. This does not take into account all the other power requirements of running a site

The AC units are placed less than 2 metres from neighbouring boundary walls, discharging exhaust fumes directly into private gardens. The proposal incorrectly states these units are “furthest away from neighbours,” which is demonstrably false.

Threat to Residential Amenity and Community Wellbeing

The cumulative impact of noise, smells, visual intrusion, loss of privacy, increased

traffic, accessibility failures, and antisocial behaviour represents a significant and unacceptable threat to the wellbeing of all neighbouring residents.

This development is fundamentally incompatible with its surroundings and would cause lasting harm to the character, tranquillity, and safety of the area.

Health and Safety

This plan shows an overly ambitious development of a site which has only one access route both in and out. Any outdoor event with these restrictions that expects to have 2000+ attendees would be prevented from taking place under UK safety regulations. Statutory guidance only allows a maximum of 60 people at any one time to enter. Indeed the daily employees, studio and workspace residents and "community" users may well exceed this amount.

There is a doubt whether there is adequate space to hold these type of events at the size indicated. The proposed 2000+ attendees at a cultural and catered event would need 4180m2 and +25 additional toilets (source the Purple Guide chapter on crowd management and Health Safety Executive)

Consultation Process


There are many neighbours who would be impacted by this development who were not informed of the application and there has been no visible signage on the property perimeter or public highway.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, I strongly urge the Planning Department to reject this application. The proposed development is unsuitable for a residential neighbourhood, inconsistent with the local vernacular, and detrimental to the quality of life of surrounding residents, raises many health and safety issues

Thank you for considering this objection.

Yours faithfully,



Mrs Eva Macdonald.

Flat 2,

14 Tower Road,

Worthing,

West Sussex.