

From: Peter Barnett <peter.barnett@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 July 2026 15:05:08 UTC+01:00
To: "Diane Aldridge" <djaplanning@outlook.com>
Subject: Re: The Gardner's Arms, Sompting - AWDM/0423/26

Hi Diane

The heritage comments were received and uploaded on July 17th. I am aware that the comments include reference to the roof alterations and no regard will therefore be had to those parts of the consultation response.

The application has been considered in detail, including all your additional information, but we cannot support the proposed change of use and the application will therefore be refused. A decision should be issued later today or tomorrow.

The Officer's Report sets out the LPA's reasoning and this will be available to view on our website once the decision has been issued.

Regards

Peter Barnett

Principal Planning Officer, Development Management
01903 221310

Adur & Worthing Councils

Worthing Town Hall, Chapel Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN11 1HA

<http://www.adur-worthing.gov.uk>



On Tue, 21 Jul 2026 at 18:30, Diane Aldridge <djaplanning@outlook.com> wrote:

This message was sent from outside Adur & Worthing Councils

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

Peter

I note that comments have now been received from the Conservation Consultant. They are dated 30th June but were only uploaded onto the on-line system on 17th July. As the comments focus on the box dormer windows in the roof - which are not proposed in the description of the development; were clearly stated as having been deleted from the scheme in the Planning Statement and were not shown on the Block Plan - but were still shown on the elevations that came through the Planning Portal (despite uploading the plan without the

dormers) - can you confirm that the Conservation Consultant has now been provided with the correct elevations and it has been clarified to him that there are no box dormers and only very minor changes are proposed to the building externally - all as summarised in my original Planning Statement? This would address one of the two areas that have been identified as allegedly causing "less than substantial harm" to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

As for the comments about the role of an unviable, vacant, run down pub now being the focus for social cohesion and as a meeting place, it is difficult to square those views with the assessment made by the Council regarding the application to designate The Gardner's Arms as an Asset of Community Value. That is the key tool the Council has to seek to secure for the future the use of the building for the community and yet that assessment was that The Gardner's Arms *does not* warrant being identified as an ACV and the building *does not* warrant that level of protection to further the social interests of the local community. That decision is a key material consideration in the determination of the application to change its use. The heritage comments must be balanced against this specific assessment and, with respect, the ACV assessment must carry greater weight than the suggestion that an unviable, non ACV listed, vacant and gradually dilapidating pub will somehow re-open and assist with matters of social cohesion and community focus. It is understood that when open, the police were regularly called due to issues arising from the use of the pub. There is absolutely no guarantee that, if this change of use is unsuccessful, the pub will ever re-open. This relies on either a financially secure tenant, or owner, that will somehow miraculously turn around its fortunes.

I therefore suggest that the "social and functional dimension" posited in the conservation consultants comments, have already been assessed in the ACV, where the significance and impact of continuing, not just a pub use, but a potentially wider community role (if the ACV was granted), have been rejected. The change of use to residential and the much needed improvements to the building and its context, with the screening of the large unsightly car park and its change to a garden space, will preserve this important building and its context and importantly allow it to continue to perform its role, architecturally, of significance and impact in the village and the Conservation Area. There is no harm and any harm is negligible or mitigated.

As demonstrated in the supporting Planning Statement and the Viability Report, this is not the only meeting place for the local community and the lack of trade and therefore viability over the past years before the pub was marketed and then sold, is a testament to how little it was supported by the local community that now seeks to retain its use.

I note that a new date of 24th July is now given as the target date for a decision. I would be grateful if you could advise what your recommendation will be in light of the additional information you have before you.

Best wishes

Diane

Diane J Aldridge BA(Hons) MRTPI

Director



Lunge Haven Studio, Station Road, Hellingly, East Sussex BN27 4EU

07988 723077 djaplanning@outlook.com www.djaplanning.com

Sussex Heritage Trust Award (Commercial Award, 2022): Planning Consultants for The Star, Alfriston BN26 5TA