

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 29/06/2026 2:45 PM from Mr Peter Coe.

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 Peter Coe
Email:	
Address:	14 Alderney Road Ferring Worthing

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity

- Other
- Privacy Light and Noise

Comments: I have strong objections to the planned use of this site for the following reasons.

1. This is contrary to the Local Plan in that it sits outside of the built-up area boundary, which, therefore, means it is classified as "countryside and undeveloped coast" and is designated as a Local Green Gap (sections 3.40, 3.41 and 3.45). The plan looks to protect and enhance the countryside, which includes informal recreation such as cycling, walking, horse-riding and other Non-Motorised Users (NMUs). It is considered that the proposed use is not informal recreational use.

2. The use of the site would have an adverse impact on vehicle access to the area. The limited parking acts as an effective control on vehicle numbers, and the addition of 150 parking spaces would have a significant effect on traffic in the area. The risk of an RTA does not appear to have been addressed; drivers generally already have an awareness of other vehicles and pedestrians. This adds another dimension in that there is potential for pedestrians, especially children, to rush across the road.

3. There is a statement that there would be no increase in biodiversity contrary to planning requirements. This is compounded by there being no start point in terms of a report, as the land was stripped, destroying habitat, before this application was submitted.

4. The loss of visual impact. The presence of the "temporary" structures which remain on site at present, in excess of the 28-day period as noted in the attached application. "The General Permitted Development Order permits the use of the land for any purpose for not more than 28 days in total in any calendar year and the provision on the land of any moveable structure for the purposes of the permitted use. 28 days would run until mid-June"; therefore, it has a negative impact on the view to and from Highdown and across the gap, and the advertising trailer, which has been there for an extended period, plus the number of vans and trailers is a blot on the landscape. Add to this 2x 6m flagpoles and the Containers, which it assumed would remain on site in the off-season.

5. The plan for overnight camping for kite surfers and sea swimmers is contrary to restrictions on camper vans on the adjacent road and also presents a potential for anti-social behaviour and, specifically, noise pollution at night for neighbouring properties (in and close to Sea Lane, Ferring) across the open field.

6. In one of the statements, mention is made of locals fearing future development, which is denied. However, in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment it states at para 3.1.1 that the "proposed development involves the construction of a residential nursing home, housing and a café". Whilst

this may be a cut and paste error, it demonstrates a level of inconsistency in the application.

Kind regards