



Support Planning <support.planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0737/26

1 message

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
To: support.planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

13 July 2026 at 11:49

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 13/07/2026 11:49 AM from Mrs Joyce Aalen.

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 Joyce Aalen
Email:	
Address:	4 Petworth Avenue Worthing West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Overdevelopment
Comments:	I am writing to formally log my strong objection to the above-referenced planning application. As a local resident, I believe the proposed development is entirely unsuitable for this site for the following material planning reasons: Conflict with the Local Plan (Local Green Gap): The proposal directly contradicts the adopted Local Plan (specifically pages 58-61), which explicitly reserves this specific area as a Local Green Gap. The policy dictates that this land is strictly unavailable for development of any sort in order to prevent urban sprawl and preserve open spaces. Impact on Local Wildlife and Biodiversity: The application site holds a designated status as a Local Wildlife Site. The proposed development is entirely incompatible with this protection. Furthermore, national and local planning policies require a net biodiversity gain, whereas this proposal would result in significant biodiversity loss and habitat disruption.

Visual Amenity and Landscape Character: The introduction of the proposed activities, commercial vehicles, heavy equipment, and the placement of shipping containers for out-of-season storage will severely detract from the unique visual appeal and open landscape character of the Goring Gap.

Traffic Congestion and Highways Safety: The entry and exit of vehicles associated with the proposed use will generate an unacceptable level of traffic congestion on Marine Crescent and its adjacent residential roads, compromising both highway capacity and pedestrian safety.

Noise Pollution: The nature of the proposed activities will generate substantial noise pollution, severely disrupting the tranquility of the area and negatively impacting the quality of life for nearby residents.

Precedent for Illicit Overnight Parking: Providing overnight accommodation for camper vans on-site will actively encourage the unlawful overnight parking of motorhomes on the adjacent public carriageway-an activity that the West Sussex County Council (WSCC) has already strictly prohibited.

Inaccurate Site History and Planning Precedent: The historical context submitted within the planning application is inaccurate and misleading. The long-standing planning history for this site shows a consistent refusal of development. Specifically, applications for housing were refused by WSCC in 1951 and 1954, judgements that were firmly upheld on appeal. The Planning Inspector explicitly stated at the time that "it would be wrong for anything to be done to impair the effective agricultural use of the land." All subsequent applications and appeals have similarly been rejected. The established, lawful last use of this land is purely agricultural, not a housing or commercial development site.

For these reasons, the proposal represents an unsustainable and inappropriate development that violates both long-standing local policies and historical planning protections. I urge the planning committee to refuse this application.

As a long, standing resident of this area I strongly object to this application for the reasons given above. I am convinced that the true purpose of the application is not to provide facilities for local users of the area but to erode the important and long standing policy against any change of use in the expectation that development on a much grander scale will then become irresistible. That would be a disastrous outcome for our town.

Kind regards