

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

From: **ROSE-MARY VICTORY**

Date: Tue, 1 Sept 2026 at 22:12

Subject: Planning Application AWDM/0628/26 – Durrington Gasworks, Phase 2.

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

This message was sent from outside Adur & Worthing Councils

New Sender Alert! You don't often receive emails from this sender.

For the urgent attention of: Shannen and/or Giles

Dear Planning Officer,

Objections by:

Mrs Rose-Mary Victory
2 Sword Street
Goring by Sea
Worthing
BN12 4FS

Planning Application AWDM/0628/26 – Durrington Gasworks, Phase 2.

Objection to proposed 123 dwellings, commercial floorspace and associated development.

Please accept this email as my formal comment submission re the above Planning Application. I am emailing as despite trying to submit my objection and comments via the Planning Portal I just keep getting error messages back. Therefore I have no idea or indication as to whether my submissions have been successful. I am also unable to access any comments made by any other persons. I have used the portal successfully in previous years so it's not a case of me not knowing what to do, there is clearly a problem with the portal. A neighbour has kindly given me your email with names and advised me you are accepting comments via this method so I am now doing this.

I am objecting to this application on all the grounds as follows:

As a resident of Sword Street, Elizabeth Square (with my husband) I am extremely worried

and concerned. This is primarily, but not exclusively, due to singular access by ALL residents vehicles via Sword Street to Phase 2 of the proposed build. Currently for Phase 1 this is only via Barrington Road east onto Sword Street and this is already very dangerous. The turning is narrow and is a blind corner and it is an accident waiting to happen. Motorists and pedestrians are all at risk of injury or fatalities. Access out onto Shaftesbury Avenue is treacherous and equally so is access into Barrington Road or Roseberry Avenue.

If Phase 2 is also accessed via this route the risk will be seriously increased and the ensuing congestion and risk to life and limb will be exacerbated further.

Our house is directly on Sword Street and we can see children, parents, the elderly and pets regularly crossing this road to and from the park and their homes. By allowing another 123 residents (246 based on 2 cars per property plus vehicles of friends, relatives and visitors etc all using this singular access is a disaster waiting to happen. This is notwithstanding the noise and pollution this would pose to residents by such a volume of traffic. This will pose a serious risk of injury or death to persons on Sword Street.

Additionally. we are still embroiled in the middle of building works to Phase 1. The roads have not been finished, the dust is constant, the noise is disruptive to daily lives and estate road works are incomplete. It is totally unreasonable to expect residents of Phase 1 to put up with and cope with 1, 2 or possibly 3 years of more disruption including large industrial vehicles etc all accessing the Phase 2 residential new build This is a risk to health and safety and by proposing Phase 2 access via the same route is idiocy and madness. It is incredibly dangerous!

If the build of Phase 2 is to go ahead then access needs to be from the opposite end where the commercial access is proposed e.g. Barrington Road West and Martlets Way. Indeed as new prospective Phase 1 residents we were told by Bellway that access to Phase 2 would be via Martlets Way only. It would appear we were possibly lied to and this is completely unacceptable.

Access from the west end of Barrington/Martlets is obviously not ideal from the point of view of residents living at the west end of Barrington Road but it is far more sensible than using Sword Street for access to construction of Phase 2 and then, on eventual completion, the ensuing onslaught of residential vehicles to access the new homes. It is patently clear that there is no further scope for more vehicular access on Sword Street.

Please please take our objections into account, review the application and deny it.

Additionally, with permission from the writer who wrote this below, I wish to concur with her comments.

I wish to object to planning application AWDM/0628/26 for Phase 2 of the Durrington Gasworks development.

I am not opposed simply to the principle of development. My objection is principally concerned with the proposed access arrangements, the premature commencement of a further substantial phase of development while Phase 1 remains incomplete, highway and pedestrian safety, construction traffic, and the cumulative impact on the residential amenity of residents already living within Phase 1.

1. Phase 2 is being proposed while Phase 1 remains substantially incomplete.

Phase 1 comprises approximately 287 dwellings, including four blocks of flats which have not yet been constructed and the independent McCarthy Stone development still in construction.

Residents are already living within Phase 1 while significant construction and infrastructure works remain outstanding. These include unfinished roads and pavements, incomplete street lighting and landscaping works (additionally ongoing maintenance). There is therefore a fundamental difference between assessing Phase 2 as an addition to an established and completed residential development and assessing it in the circumstances that actually exist on the ground:

Phase 1 remains an active construction environment.

Importantly, the applicant's own Transport Assessment acknowledges that Phase 1 is still under construction. It is therefore concerning that a further 123 dwellings and approximately 1,100 sqm of commercial development are now proposed, potentially resulting in overlapping construction activity for a prolonged period.

1. The proposed vehicular connection into Phase 1 is a major concern.

The applicant proposes two vehicular access points from Phase 1 into the Phase 2 residential development. The Transport Assessment expressly states that the southern part of Phase 2 would be served by a continuation of the Phase 1 secondary road. This would effectively create a continuous vehicular route between an occupied Phase 1 residential development and the new Phase 2 development.

This is particularly concerning because the existing Phase 1 road – Sword Street, is already serving a large residential population and is not an appropriate route through which to introduce the additional burden of Phase 2 construction traffic, HGVs, deliveries, associated

construction activity and future Phase 2 residents. The situation is made more concerning by the proposed road geometry. The applicant describes the southern connection as including a 3.7m-wide narrowing which prevents two vehicles from passing each other. This should be carefully considered in the context of construction traffic, large delivery vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists and existing residents using the Phase 1 road – Sword Street, and then the additional Phase 2 residents in the future.

1. The applicant has identified a suitable HGV access elsewhere.

This is, in my view, one of the most important issues with the application.

The applicant proposes that the commercial/employment parcel will be accessed directly from Martlets Way. The Transport Assessment states that the internal road will be 6.5 metres wide and sufficient for HGV access. The application also states that the commercial units will have appropriate turning arrangements for fire tenders, refuse vehicles and HGVs.

This raises a fundamental question:

If the Phase 2 site already has an access from Martlets Way which the applicant considers suitable for HGV traffic, why should heavy construction and commercial traffic be routed through an occupied residential development in Phase 1?

There appears to be an opportunity to segregate commercial and construction traffic from the Phase 1 residential road – Sword Street, network.

I therefore request that the Council requires all appropriate Phase 2 commercial and construction traffic, including HGVs and heavy delivery vehicles, to use the Martlets Way access, rather than the Phase 1 residential road – Sword Street.

1. I propose that Phase 1 and Phase 2 are connected by walking and cycling routes rather than a general vehicular route as a reasonable and practical alternative.

The northern part of the applicant's own proposal already uses an upgraded pedestrian/cycle link. I therefore, ask the Council to consider requiring both phases to be connected by pedestrian and cycle routes, rather than creating a further general vehicular connection through the Phase 1 residential development.

This would maintain the important connectivity between the two communities while avoiding unnecessary residential, construction and commercial traffic being introduced into Phase 1. This proposal is also consistent with the applicant's own emphasis on sustainable travel. The Transport Assessment identifies existing walking and cycling connections and

states that the proposals seek to improve active travel.

The two phases do not need to be physically isolated from one another; they can be connected for pedestrians and cyclists without making Phase 1 a construction, commercial and future residential traffic route for Phase 2.

1. Mature trees in the grounds of Phase 2.

There are mature trees that need to be taken into consideration. The felling of all mature trees would not be acceptable and alternative arrangements to this should be stated in the plans.

The mature trees in Phase 1, with no consultation or accountability to the developer were completely demolished. The developer promised to plant new trees to mature but this has not materialised and the current tree landscaping that they have managed to do is either frugal or dead.

1. The existing barriered residential road should remain closed.

There is also a smaller residential road – Omaha Place, within the existing development which is currently barriered off.

I strongly object to any proposal or subsequent arrangement whereby this road is opened to provide an alternative construction route for Phase 2 or an alternative route for residential traffic for Phase 1, or Phase 2 when completed.

The solution to the inadequacy of one residential route should not be to transfer heavy construction traffic or residential traffic onto another smaller residential road.

I therefore, ask that any planning permission makes clear that neither of the existing residential routes, Sword Street and the barriered Omaha Place, should be opened or used as a general Phase 2 construction/HGV route and Omaha Place, to not be used as an alternative route for residential traffic.

1. Cumulative construction impacts have to be properly considered.

Residents are already experiencing significant construction-related impacts from the development and surrounding construction activity, including dust, noise, heavy vehicles and prolonged disruption.

Phase 1 is not yet complete and the four blocks of flats within Phase 1 have not yet been

constructed. There is also separate construction activity from the independent flats project – McCarthy Stone.

Introducing Phase 2 before these works have substantially progressed risks creating a prolonged period during which residents are exposed to overlapping construction activity from several projects. The applicant's Transport Assessment acknowledges that construction of Phase 1 is still ongoing.

The Council should therefore, consider not only the traffic generated by the completed 123-home development, but also the construction-phase impacts and cumulative effect of the remaining Phase 1 works, the four blocks of flats, independent flats project – McCarthy Stone. and Phase 2 construction.

1. Construction traffic management should be secured before development begins.

If planning permission is granted, I request that a robust Construction Traffic Management Plan/Construction Environmental Management Plan is secured before any Phase 2 construction works commence.

It should specifically:

- prohibit Phase 2 HGVs from using the Phase 1 residential road – Sword Street;
- prohibit the opening of the barriered residential road – Omaha Place, as an alternative construction route;
- require commercial and HGV traffic to use the Martlets Way access;
- establish clearly defined construction vehicle routes;
- control delivery times;
- prevent vehicles waiting within residential streets;
- provide effective wheel washing and road-cleaning arrangements;
- control dust emissions;
- control construction noise;
- provide adequate traffic marshals where required;

- protect pedestrians and cyclists;
- prevent construction vehicles from obstructing residents' access; and
- ensure that construction traffic is kept separate from residential traffic wherever reasonably practicable.

1. Highway and pedestrian safety.

The Council should give particular consideration to the interaction between construction vehicles, existing residents, pedestrians and cyclists.

The application itself identifies a bend and a narrow section on the proposed southern Phase 2 connection. The applicant states that the narrowing would be only 3.7m wide, meaning vehicles cannot pass one another at that point.

The application also contains a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit which raises concerns about the arrangement of a raised table near a bend and the potential implications for two-wheeled users. These matters reinforce the need to ensure that the residential connection is not subjected to unnecessary HGV and construction traffic.

Conclusion.

I respectfully request that application AWDM/0628/26 is refused unless the access and construction arrangements can be satisfactorily amended.

In particular, I ask the Council to:

1. Prevent Phase 2 construction and HGV traffic from using the Phase 1 residential road network.
2. Retain the existing barriered residential road – Omaha Place, as closed to Phase 2 construction and any residential traffic.
3. Use the existing/proposed Martlets Way access for Phase 2 commercial and HGV construction traffic, given that the applicant's own Transport Assessment states that the proposed 6.5m-wide internal road is sufficient for HGV access.
4. Connect Phase 1 and Phase 2 by pedestrian and cycle routes rather than creating an unnecessary general vehicular construction route between the two residential areas.

5. Retain the mature trees on the grounds of Phase 2.
6. Require a comprehensive Construction Traffic Management Plan and Construction Environmental Management Plan before Phase 2 construction begins.
7. Properly assess the cumulative and prolonged impact of Phase 2 construction alongside the incomplete Phase 1 development, including the remaining four blocks of flats, McCarthy Stone flats and existing surrounding construction activity.
8. Ensure that the safety and residential amenity of the people who already live within Phase 1 are not disproportionately compromised by the construction and operation of Phase 2.
9. Residents should not be expected to endure several further years of avoidable HGV movements, dust, noise and construction traffic through an occupied residential development when the applicant has identified a separate access to the Phase 2 commercial area – Martlets Way, which is specifically designed to accommodate HGVs.

I respectfully ask the Council to give these matters significant weight when determining this application.

It is very very important that our objections are addressed and the proposals are looked at again and denied.

Regards,

Mrs Rose-Mary Victory