

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 01/07/2026 12:56 PM from Mr Matthew Oakes.

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 Matthew Oakes
Email:	
Address:	58 Little Preston Street Brighton

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I strongly object to this proposal of a mini-amusement park and cafe on this site. Goring Gap is one of the few large green spaces in the

area and allowing this commercial development in it risks setting a precedent for future development.

I also object on the grounds that the space will have "animals for entertainment". The space is small and the developer has also listed many other uses on the site. It is likely that the space allocated to animals will be very small and there will be issues with animal welfare.

I also object because half of the site would be used as a car park, likely leading to it being paved or gravelled over.

This development should be rejected as it was previously. It would be more appropriate if this was a proper public park rather than a commercial enterprise.

Kind regards