



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

10 July 2026 at 12:29

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 10/07/2026 12:29 PM from Mr Robert Pope.

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 Robert Pope
Email:	
Address:	5 Arlington Close Worthing West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Dear Sirs With reference to the application AWDM/0737/26, I wish to lodge an objection. The reasons for my objection are as follows:

1. The proposed development is contrary to the Worthing Local Plan 2023 (adopted 28

March 2023) which, at 3.50 (page 58-61) refers to the Goring-Ferring Gap as being a Local Green Gap which (SS5 on page 60) "...will be protected in order to retain the separate identities and character of these settlements".

2. The proposed development is contrary to the opinions raised in the Draft Goring Hall Conservation Area Appraisal 2023 which makes reference in section 5 of the unique views within the conservation area and, at section 7.9 states "The green setting of the conservation area to the south and southwest should remain undeveloped to conserve the rural context of the historic Goring Hall Estate and the remnants of the historic context of Goring itself".

3. There is no reference in the application to safety, particularly in the roads adjacent to the site. I believe that in particular there is real risk of accidents to pedestrians (especially children) crossing to the proposed site or to the greensward. In summer the area is particularly busy with visitors and this will increase with the attraction of a children's sandpit and establishments which are selling alcohol. It is particularly concerning that an entrance to the site has been established which leads directly onto Marine Drive, which can be a busy road and with many blindspots.

4. I have been following the progress of this developer for the last two years and as well as various planning submissions there have been many social media posts in which the developer has clearly set out their intentions to build on the site. In more recent posts the developer has mentioned a nursing home amongst other structures. I therefore believe that this application for "Commercial Use of Regenerated Land" is a tactic in order to achieve that aim, and to facilitate other development opportunities in the future.

5. I believe that the development will cause biodiversity loss as well as noise pollution.

6. There is already commercial activity on the site and I believe that the developer should not be given the benefit of planning approval for a site which has been presented as a "fait accompli".

7. In my opinion and as a nearby resident the site already looks an eyesore and the developer appears to have no regard for the natural beauty of this (up to now) unspoilt area. This will only get worse.

In summary, I strongly believe that the proposal should be refused and I request that this objection is taken into account.

Robert Pope

Kind regards