

From: **John Pandal**

Date: Tue, 14 Jul 2026 at 14:15

Subject: Objection to Planning Application AWD/0737/26 – Land at South East Corner of Amberley Drive / Marine Drive, Goring-by-Sea

To: <[planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk](mailto: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.

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

Dear Planning Department,

I wish to object to the above application, which proposes a collection of commercial and leisure uses on open land at the corner of Amberley Drive and Marine Drive. I have considered the submitted documents and set out below the planning grounds on which my objection is based.

### **The status of the land**

This site does not sit on ordinary countryside at the edge of town. It forms part of the gap between Goring and Ferring which the adopted Worthing Local Plan (2023) deliberately protects as a Local Green Gap under Policy SS5, supported by Policy SS4 (Countryside and Undeveloped Coast). That designation was tested and confirmed through independent examination of the Local Plan, and its purpose is simple: this land is to stay open, so that Goring and Ferring remain distinct places rather than merging into continuous development along the coast.

The law requires the Council to determine this application in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Policy SS5 permits development in the Gaps only in exceptional circumstances, and only where the integrity of the gap is not compromised. Nothing in this application comes close to demonstrating exceptional circumstances, and I can identify no material consideration that would justify setting the plan aside.

### **What is actually being proposed**

Read as a whole, the application describes the fitting-out of a commercial visitor destination: parking and overnight camping, catering from temporary units, shipping containers recessed into the ground, an advertising trailer, flagpoles of some six metres, welfare units, play features including a sandpit and mound, attractions involving animals, solar equipment and a borehole.

It would be easy to look at any one of these items and conclude it is modest. That is not the right approach. Planning judgment on a site like this must weigh the combined effect, and combined these elements would change what this land fundamentally is - from an open, quiet green space into an operating leisure business with the structures, vehicles, signage, lighting and activity that come with one. Openness is precisely the quality Policy SS5 exists to defend, and openness is lost cumulatively, item by item, not in one dramatic step. I would respectfully ask officers to assess the scheme in the round.

## **Landscape and the setting of the South Downs National Park**

The gap forms part of the open coastal plain that can be seen from Highdown Hill within the National Park, and it provides the visual breathing space between the two settlements at the coast. Containers, catering units, an advertising trailer and flagpoles would introduce an unmistakably commercial, engineered character into a landscape that presently reads as open and green. The NPPF requires great weight to be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in and around National Parks; this proposal pulls in the opposite direction.

## **Wildlife, traffic and neighbouring residents**

The application gestures towards biodiversity but proposes the very things - sustained visitor activity, vehicle movements, overnight occupation, lighting and noise - that disturb habitats and wildlife. The inclusion of animal-based attractions within a sensitive open space adds a further layer of ecological concern. No proper ecological assessment accompanies the application, and no demonstrable biodiversity net gain is shown.

The traffic and parking consequences are equally unexamined. Marine Drive and the surrounding roads already carry heavy pressure, and a destination generating visitor and overnight traffic would add congestion, highway safety risk, noise, waste and littering - impacts already recognised as material in relation to development pressure on this gap. Nearby residents, meanwhile, would face the loss of tranquillity that comes with a commercial operation running through the day and, with camping, into the night. The submission does not meaningfully address any of this.

## **Inadequate information and the precedent at stake**

Across several elements - the solar installation described only as "natural green energy, for example solar," the borehole, the operational arrangements - the application simply does not contain the detail needed to assess siting, scale, appearance or environmental effect. Where the Council cannot properly assess likely impacts, it cannot be satisfied the development is acceptable, and the precautionary answer is refusal.

Finally, the Gap only works while it stays open. Consent for a cluster of commercial uses here would mark a real step in the incremental erosion of the designation and would invite further intensification on land the development plan intends to keep undeveloped. That direction of travel is itself a legitimate planning consideration.

## **Conclusion**

For the reasons above - conflict with Policies SS5 and SS4 of the adopted Worthing Local Plan, cumulative harm to openness and landscape character, harm to the setting of the South Downs National Park, unassessed ecological, highway and amenity impacts, insufficient supporting information, and the precedent that would be set - I object to application AWD/0737/26 and ask the Council to refuse it, upholding the protection this land was given for good reason.

Yours faithfully,

John Pandal  
12 Ilex Way  
Goring-by-Sea  
Worthing  
BN12 4UZ