

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 02/07/2026 12:22 PM from Mrs Pauline Cory.

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:	Mrs Pauline Cory
Email:	
Address:	46 Beechwood Avenue Worthing West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	I am not sure what kind of development is actually permitted on this agricultural land, that is also a Local Wildlife Site. Bearing in mind the huge number of previous objections to any kind of development, I doubt that the sensitive nature of this will have changed in the past 2 years, i.e.:

1. It runs contrary to the Local Plan, which reserves this area as a Local Green Gap, not available for development of any kind (Local Plan pages 58 - 61).

2. This is a Local Wildlife Site and none of what is mentioned in the application seems to take that into consideration.

3. If the proposal is allowed to go ahead there will be loss of biodiversity, when what we need in such an over-developed area such as Worthing is biodiversity gain. Bearing in mind that Worthing, per capita, has the least amount of green space than any other town in the country, we need to retain all the green space that we can, and this strategic green gap/wildlife corridor contributes to the "lungs" of our area.

4. The proposal is impractical, in that all of the following could not be contained within this actual site, i.e. - parking for 150 vehicles, food and drink stalls, toilets and shower facilities, entertainment from animals, large shipping containers, a bore hole for water, solar panels, and a play area for children. All of this would also result in a greater level of noise and would completely change the character of this tranquil rural area of land.

5. The proposed activities on the site, the vehicles and equipment, and the shipping containers for storage out of season would detract from the visual appeal of the Goring Gap, which is part of a wonderful open sweep of green space, rarely found along the south coast now.

6. The entry and exit of vehicles from the site would naturally cause traffic congestion in Marine Crescent and adjacent roads, which is not consistent with the nature of the area.

7. Allowing overnight accommodation for camper vans runs counter to the WSCC probation of overnight parking of motor homes on the adjacent carriageway, and indeed on the grassy areas, which are regularly already invaded by travellers - and could be seen as an encouragement for this practice to increase.

8. The history of the site is inaccurate and misleading. Planning applications for housing were refused by WSCC in 1951 and 1954 and upheld on appeal. The Inspector said, 'It would be wrong for anything to be done to impair the effective agricultural use of the land'.

Subsequent applications and appeals have all been rejected; the last use of this land was agricultural, not housing development.

Due to the very sensitive nature of this area of land, I feel that any inappropriate development should be nipped in the bud at this stage, before it sets a precedent and escalates to other nearby plots of land,

and indeed could then even be used as a springboard for building permanent structures, such as housing.

Kind regards