

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 30/06/2026 9:22 PM from Mrs Dana Raynard.

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 Dana Raynard
Email:	
Address:	32 Ilex Way Worthing West Sussex

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 - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I object to the entire proposal because it represents an over-intensive, inappropriate and environmentally harmful use of of

so called 'regenerated land'. The mix of commercial activity, vehicle parking, overnight camping, temporary food and drink units, mobile sanitation, shipping containers, advertising structures, animal entertainment and children's play installations would significantly damage biodiversity, increase noise and traffic, and undermine the natural character of the gap. It is not needed

The introduction of industrial features such as solar arrays, borehole extraction, flag poles, storage containers and a large advertising trailer would create substantial visual intrusion and conflict with the purpose of ? land regeneration. The proposal would also generate waste, disturbance, and management issues incompatible with a sensitive natural environment.

Overall, the scheme is excessive, visually harmful, environmentally disruptive and commercially intrusive, and should not be supported. I feel that his proposal is chaotic and his intentions are not for the community but aimed to start the process of approval of building on the gap This green gap needs protecting for us and future generations.

Kind regards