

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Michael Pritchard
Organisation (if applicable)
Member of Public from adjoining area
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
Yes
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
Yes it sets out a clear direction
Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?
The use of Brownfield sites identified in the 2011 Local Plan should be clearly identified
Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?
Agree
Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?
Yes
Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?
Agree
Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?
Key employment areas are vital and encouragement for major corporates to relocate to Worthing as an improved way of life and a focus of routes should be a pre requisite
Q3c - In addition to the sites already identified as having the potential to deliver employment land are there any other sites that could accommodate employment growth?
Large office blocks like Columbia House Durrington and Centenary House which are under used should be identified on a map
Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?
Yes in part but as a visitor coming in down the A24 the approach into Worthing get a distinct down at heel vision from Broadwater and through Teville Gate
Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?
Focus on places like the Guilbourne Centre which is not an attractive shopping Centre should be investigate to see what can be done to improve things. Could this be demolished and something better as a replacement be worthy of consideration? Or Residential on the first floor
Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?

Encourage more eating establishments--E G Slug and Lettuce. Bills
Encourage main stream shops like Crew Clothing

Are there too many centres in Worthing--can there be a focus on one key area?

Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?

Yes

Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?

Encouragement for more hotels to relocate

Compare the cafe culture in other West Sussex Towns like Horsham and Haywards Heath which have been successful

Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?

The 1960s AMF Bowling Alley needs replacement and its attendant multi Storey Car park

Q6b - Do you have suggestions for how the Local Plan could resolve these?

see above

Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?

Yes to a degree

Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?

There should be a proper A27 By Pass around Worthing such as it is around Brighton.
Tinkering about with the existing road is insufficient.

Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?

Yes

Q8b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could reach a balance between competing needs?

The Council should consider all Brownfield Sites first and ensure that Strategic Gaps like Goring are retained undisturbed.

Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?

I and many others would not want to see any building on the Goring Gap regardless of development needs and the attraction to developers given its flat nature.

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

Parks are essential and also the green Strategic Gaps abutting the SDNP and on the border of Worthing Borough Council's catchment area e.g. Goring Gap.
Such areas are invaluable and will become ever more so with the obvious need for more high density housing--recreational space will be a pre requisite.

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

Neither should be given priority but should be part of cohesive living community

Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

There may be a need to consider siting social housing in blocks rather than place these amongst market housing developments.
Why should social housing be of the same quality as market housing?

Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?

To ensure that open spaces are left as they are.
Insufficient focus on later life needs whether it be downsizing or Care homes for the elderly giving independent living for as long as possible

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Yes

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

Yes-- however most of these sites were identified in the 2011 Local Plan yet 5 years later there has been little obvious action.

It must be regarded strongly that Brownfield sites must be developed first and owners of these sites made to make them available without delay.

I did read about a year ago that the Government and Centrica were trying to ensure that old Gas Works sites would be dismantled and scrapped so that urban sites could be used for building--could this be considered for the Gasworks site next to Waitrose?

It is frankly a disgrace that Teville Gate, the above and the land next to the Connaught Car Park have not been developed before now!

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

Use of all the Brown Field Sites for flats, housing especially first time buyer accommodation
There is precious little 1 & 2 bedrooomed dwellings being constructed.

Q10c - Are there any other potential development sites within the current built up area that should be assessed?

None other than identified

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Please protect the entire Goring Gap

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

Yes

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
John Rogers
Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?
No
Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?
We must have a supply of lower cost housing restricted for sale to first time buyers who already live in Worthing. No good keep building houses just for people to move into from Adur and Brighton. Bring back self-build schemes, they were very successful in the 1970's and could be again.
Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?
Yes, must protect areas of the town such as High Salvington and Charmendean where people have moved into such wards because they want space around them, not more properties built in the garden next door.
Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?
With reluctance yes.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Ross Carruthers

Your general comments:

As a keen cyclist, I would really appreciate safer more joined up cycle paths. Particularly to key areas like linking the hospital to town center safely, broadwater to town center safely, perhaps traffic calming measures, the pedestrian crossings which allow cyclists to filter through are quite nice in the main town road, just south of maplins opposite subway, the bit from st pauls northwards is really dangerous to cycle. Especially the broadwater stretch. Its just lethal. Considering students have to get there to study, I think much more needs to be done to create a safe route linking the town center and broadwater.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Ross Carruthers

Organisation (if applicable)

www.rosspctraining.co.uk

Your general comments:

I have had some detailed thoughts on how to cost effectively connect the hospital to town center a bit better with cycle lanes.

Directly south of the hospital is a park, the western side has vehicle access but strictly no cycling, maybe on the west side could be a shared use cycle path / pedestrian / park vehicle access past the public toilets leading to the aquarina, here there could be another set of traffic lights to allow easy crossing to the new aquarina and from there a cycle path to the side of the aquarina leading to the promenade and the cafe by splash point

Directly west of the hospital are some fairly complex one way systems which are fairly painful for cyclists, that keep pushing them into busy angry traffic. there could be clearly marked cycle paths that could lead west two ways for cyclists to bunces and south two ways towards lidl. At the moment it pushes cyclists to that lethal corner by the gas works and waitrose. Maybe there could be cycle path around waitrose some how on the southern side.

i am still not clear on how to calm down the traffic at teville gate, maybe a shared pedestrian cycle path on the bridge, perhaps a green park area with clear lines of sight to prevent crime and traffic accidents at teville gate to make it a bit less industrial wasteland

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Ross Carruthers

Organisation (if applicable)

www.rosspctraining.co.uk

Your general comments:

if the goring gap development is going ahead please make sure there is a decent cycle path running along the gap so we dont have to deal with all the extra drivers and associated cycle accidents.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Susanne Barthelmes
Organisation (if applicable)
Menuhin Competition
Your general comments:
<p>Knowledge about the existence of this consultation document should be more widespread.</p> <p>I feel the local plan could be more ambitious with more focus on vision, creativity and innovation and a strong focus on sustainability and environmentally friendly development.</p> <p>Regarding housing developments, I would not advocate high-rise building but increase housing stock with 4 to six floors to raise density rather than increase the spread of the town.</p>
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
In part
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
To some extent but it could be clearer and more ambitious and most of all visionary
Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?
<p>Yes. I would like to see Worthing's motto 'Ex terra copiam e mari salutem' (from the land plenty and from the sea health) reflected in the vision by explicitly incorporating environmental considerations, sustainability, health and wellbeing. I would also like to see a more ambitious take on innovation; inviting innovation and being innovative in vision, planning and delivery. Lodged between the South Downs National Park and the sea, Worthing might want to aspire to become the greenest, most creative, innovative and environmentally friendly town in Sussex. I would suggest rewording the vision by adding a few highlighted words.</p> <p>By 2033 Worthing will be recognised as an innovative, highly desirable, healthy and safe place to live, work and visit, continuing to attract high calibre businesses and significant inward investment that will help the town's economy to grow and improve its regional competitiveness. Regeneration of the town centre and seafront will have built on recent successes to deliver a vibrant and diverse retail, cultural, leisure, health and wellbeing offer for residents and visitors of all ages.</p> <p>Limited land resources will have been developed in the most efficient, environmentally friendly and sustainable way to maximise the delivery of the widest range of identified needs, whilst at the same time ensuring that the Borough's intrinsic character and its beach and countryside setting have been protected and enhanced. High quality environmentally friendly and sustainable new development will have been integrated with existing communities and opportunities taken to deliver new and improved facilities and services that enhance the quality of living and the wellbeing of Worthing's population and its visitors.</p>
Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?
<p>I would add to the proposed objectives but would add a health element to the Community section. Obesity and lower life expectancy in deprived areas is a challenge as was pointed out. The community development should address this challenge, encouraging a healthy lifestyle.</p> <p>Under economy I would like to see a stronger link between the growing educational facilities in Worthing and keeping the educated workforce in town to foster the innovative and creative industries as well as the trades.</p>
Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?
Not really
Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?

Yes. I think it should be an aim of the economic strategy to reduce the percentage of the population that need to find work outside of Worthing. The type, education- and salary-level of available work opportunities in Worthing should grow to be more diverse; attracting better educated and higher paid workers to stay and work in Worthing

Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?

Definitely protect and further develop key employment areas

Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?

Affordability of retail space for quality independent retailers has not been addressed. The use of vacant retail spaces in a way that keeps retail areas attractive in the interim has not been addressed. The recent regeneration of other coastal towns such as Hastings and Folkestone is largely built on creative and innovative retailers rather than chains – this should be an explicit aim for the Worthing as well.

Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?

No. The Guildbourne Centre is an outdated uninviting eyesore and the Arcade near the pier could be substantially more inviting.

Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?

Rather than entirely new development, redevelopment seems the way forward. The Lido is very dated and could be a much more attractive higher value tourist proposition. The multi-storey car park and bowling alley next to M&S occupy prime seafront space, as does the bus depot next to the dome, the unused plot and car park between Waitrose and the Connaught Theatre as well as the old Aqarena seem to be prime locations for attractive redevelopment.

Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?

The attractiveness for tourism lies in the reputation of a place as offering something distinct. Worthing still suffers from its blue-rinse image.
I agree that a vision for tourism in Worthing is urgently needed and clarity about the quantity and quality of tourists the town wants to attract. Regional? National? international?

Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?

Stand out from other towns, emulate the best ideas and develop something distinctive to the location and the facilities available. Higher end quality tourism rather than the masses would sit better with the transport infrastructure. The seafront and its facilities are blissfully underutilised. With such excellent water and a long promenade, the place could be a much more attractive tourist destination.

Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?

I believe that a unique leisure facility is overlooked and underutilised. The Assembly Hall is a good size concert venue with one of the best acoustics in the country. The Southcoast is poorly equipped with decent size venues for acoustic or classical music. It could become a touring, run-in and recording facility for orchestras and ensembles to be an equivalent in music to what Chichester Festival Theatre is for West End productions. - providing a first rate culture leisure facility and tourist destination in one.

Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?

Outdoor spaces for 'younger' leisure facilities - skating, surfing, ball-games, ping-pong, beach voley-ball etc - basically recreate the activity opportunities around Coast cafe in other parts of Worthing to make it's parks more attractive for families and residents and encourage an active lifestyle - tackling obesity etc

Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?

I disagree with the statement that there are a limited number of sites where sustainable modes of transport are most suited. Worthing could easily create dedicated cycle, bus and car routes in and out of town.
A major challenge to cycling in Worthing is the poor and partly dangerous state of road surfaces. Rolling resistance is high and pot-holes hazardous. I would encourage the town planners to visit other European cities that have become cycling cities (Muenster/Germany, Copenhagen/Denmark and any Dutch city).
A challenge is the high cost of bus travel in Worthing. Attracting residents to leave their car and take the bus needs financial encouragement.

Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?

Create a better infrastructure for it; particularly for bikes - low cost - high impact on many levels (transport and public health and wellbeing)

Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?

The rise in emissions and CO2 levels from a growing population, more housing and transport is missing. Addressing those and focussing on environmentally friendly, sustainable and where possible green-developments should be an explicit focus.
New housing developments should be required to deliver a significant element of renewable energy, be it from solar, rainwater or ground source heat.

Q8b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could reach a balance between competing needs?

Encourage and invite innovation. Not the cheapest developer for housing, retail or business developments, but those who create the most sustainable and hence in the long-run cheaper developments.

Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?

If it destroys historical landmarks, undeveloped coastline or green-spaces in town.

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

Very high value. It is what adds to the quality of life in Worthing and attracts residents and tourists alike.

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

Absolutely not! New residents already struggle to register with a GP; young families need schools and to balance transport requirements, job opportunities in town should grow in line with its population.

Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

Look for successful models and examples for the development of such specialist housing – also outside of the region or even the country. Invite innovation; work with universities and visionary specialists in the field. Create national and international competitions for urban planners to come up with innovative concepts.

Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?

Transport needs and requirements for community, education and health facilities.

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Inappropriate development, yes – but what determines appropriateness? If existing residential developments can be extended within reason to accommodate more dwellings or space for clerical and creatives businesses (in form of garden studio/workshops), these developments should be encouraged.

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

Yes

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

The bus depot next to the dome would make for an ideal creative quarter with workshops, boutiques, creative businesses, exhibition space, in-door and outdoor space and gastronomic outlets – maybe less restaurants but more food stalls of high end street-food (a mix of the OXO tower galleries in London and paper island in Copenhagen)

Q10c - Are there any other potential development sites within the current built up area that should be assessed?

Yes – the car-park & bowling alley complex next to M&S
The Charmandean Centre complex.
And for small scale tourist, leisure and retail development – the shelters along the seafront to create a variety of destinations along the promenade.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I strongly advocate the retention of green spaces and agricultural land and limit housing developments to existing inner city sites. Protection of the Goring gap should be a priority

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views

on how they should be developed?

Sympathetic to their environment, environmentally friendly and safeguarding the provision of required infrastructure (schools, GPs and sustainable transport for housing).
For any housing developments adjacent to Southdowns National Park I would love to see cutting edge eco-housing developments.
Sites with good access to major transport routes should be earmarked for commercial, low-impact manufacturing/industrial developments – equally with a requirement to be an environmentally friendly development using/producing renewable energy.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

Turn green spaces into attractive outdoor spaces that encourage outdoor leisure activities. Sites near housing developments should have green spaces and playgrounds for families; encouraging healthy lifestyles and the outdoors. Community gardens, food-growing co-operatives, etc would also be a good use.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

Can the Council guarantee that the towns transport, health and education infrastructure can cope with the number of new residents?

Q12a - Do you have any views on how any of the listed policies should be worded?

In plain English, concise and explicit

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Wendy Sidney

Your general comments:

I feel strongly that green field sites, such as the area around Titnore Lane, should not be allocated for development. The ancient woodland must be preserved at all costs. Additionally, development on any sites, brown or green field, should only be permitted if mature trees are preserved. Worthing council makes a big thing about tree preservation and it is difficult for owners even to trim trees with preservation orders on them. It, therefore, makes a nonsense of the Council's own preservation rules if it permits trees to be cleared for building. An example of this is in the Rustington/Littlehampton area (Arun Council I believe) where dozens of mature trees have been hacked down so that the site can be developed for a car showroom. Worthing & Adur should not permit a similar occurrence.

Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?

Guildbourne Centre is shameful and needs replanning/redeveloping. Are the rents too high (presumably privately owned) and is this the reason why the upstairs has been vacant for so long?

Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?

The ugly concrete car park over the bowling alley should be developed. A range of cafes and restaurants with sea views (of which there are currently very few) would be a great attraction for visitors and locals alike. The Lido is in a disgusting state and needs replanning and cleaning regularly! Car parking needs to be as cheap as the Chichester car parks.

Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?

Public Transport to High Salvington is shameful. One bus an hour only Mon to Sat. with no evening service, no Sunday or bank holiday service. If you want people to visit restaurants, theatres, cinema and shops then a full service should be provided. The no. 7 bus is often full by the time it reaches Thomas a Beckett and similarly on the return route at certain times of day. Durrington is served by the Pulse route every 10 minutes plus, I believe the 5 and the 10. These buses often run almost empty. The 700 route is also very frequent. I would suggest looking at providing a Sunday and evening service in High Salvington by diverting one of these buses perhaps, even if it is only once an hour. There is a mistaken belief that all residents of High Salvington drive and have cars.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Michelle Sidney

Your general comments:

A 37-page document is not ideal for the vast majority. People simply do not have the time...

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

No - we have too much housing in this area.

Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

Existing developed sites need to be used to their full potential - built to accommodate as many as possible. We cannot keep building into our greenspace - where will this end?

Flats seem to be the most suitable solution.

Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?

Teville Gate has sat for so many years - knock down the shop shells and develop this. Ideal for train commuters.

The shopping centre next to Wilko is always empty and is occupying a large area. Again rethink this - remove it and develop into flats.

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Yes absolutely. Stop this concreting over of lawns completely too. You should also enforce tree orders on residential gardens as so much land is developed that the removal of trees from gardens will impact on the environment.

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

Please just leave our greenspaces alone.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Are they really 'needs'? I think with regards to volume that more needs to be done at Government level to address the issues that are pushing this demand.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Tom Wye
Organisation (if applicable)
High Salvington Mill Trust
Your general comments:
Section on The Historic Environment should include all facilities/buildings that merit protection. Salvington Mill is one of these site. It has had a mill on the site since 1615, it is one of the only working mills in the country and recently an ancient water mill has been restored and is in full working order and very soon there will be a wind mill producing electricity. The educational, environmental and historical importance of this site cannot be overstated. It is a major tourist attraction to the town but also a major local community asset with many of the local residents involved in the maintenance, preservation and operating of the mill. The wind is obviously vital to the operating of all three mills and the attraction to schools and visitors is the fact that they are operations. If they cease to be operational a major attraction to the town will be lost. They should be included in the Local Plan and protected.
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
I agree with the VISION but would like to see something more about preserving what we have
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
Yes
Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?
More protection for buildings of historic relevance
Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?
I agree with the Strategic Objectives but again would like to see some protection for tourist attractions/buildings etc
Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?
Yes
Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?
Maybe more protection for tourist attractions
Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?
Yes to key employment areas.
Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?
Why only enhance the Town Centre, surely we will attract more tourism by offering a wide range of facilities
Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?
WE should not limit tourism to the Town Centre exclusively. We should also be promoting the like of Highdown Gardens and Salvington Mill. The beach is very important but has limited attraction out of season.

Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?
Widen the appeal of Worthing
Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?
Yes
Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?
Agreed
Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?
Agreed
Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?
Very important
Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?
No, houses without jobs is not sustainable! Houses without community facilities is unsustainable.
Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?
Inappropriate development must be resisted at ALL times
Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?
Yes
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
I agree with what is laid out on page 25
Q12a - Do you have any views on how any of the listed policies should be worded?
Section The Historic Environment should include all facilities/buildings that merit protection. Salvington Mill is one of these site. It has had a mill on the site since 1615, it is one of the only working mills in the country and recently an ancient water mill has been restored and is in full working order and very soon there will be a wind mill producing electricity. The educational, environmental and historical importance of this site cannot be overstated. It is a major tourist attraction to the town but also a major local community asset with many of the local residents involved in the maintenance, preservation and operating of the mill. The wind is obviously vital to the operating of all three mills and the attraction to schools and visitors is the fact that they are operations. If they cease to be operational a major attraction to the town will be lost. They should be included in the Local Plan and protected.
Q12c - Are all of the listed policies required?
Yes

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Susan Gosden

Your general comments:

the greensward is for everyone and in particular the locals who pay expensive council tax to live in this wonderful area. There was a caravan park with all amenities in Titnore road but this was downgraded when the caravan club left.

There are so many other sites for a caravan park - it is unnecessary on a beautiful part of our seafront which should be for us all to enjoy not just passing tourists.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Robert Smytherman
Organisation (if applicable)
Goring Chase Residents Association Ltd
Your general comments:
<p>Goring Chase Residents Association Ltd are asking for The Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm to be protected. We have included some reasons –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separating and protecting the individuality of two communities (Goring/Ferring) and two council's (Worthing/Arun) • The gap offers an uninterrupted and unique views from the sea to the South Downs • Building would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape • Grade 1 agricultural land will be destroyed if developed • Flood Risk as Ferring Rife runs through our land. • The gap is a habitat for sea birds and wading birds who are roosting or resting during migration times • Rural environment with an easy urban access
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
Broadly, although more focus should be given to providing affordable housing for young families
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
Yes
Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?
No

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Julia Bolton

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

No it needs to be balanced to take account of the towns ability to absorb additional residents into the area.

Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

We should always address the housing needs based on LOCAL people who have lived in the area for ten years or more and apportion the house type in line with that statistic. And always always take into account the existing parking issues before considering new requirements. its folly to assume that if you loive near the railway station you will not need your own transport - self employed people usually always have their own cars/vans.

Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?

Parking, and the detriment caused to existing residents when adding in new housing. Privacy and peace are important for everyone's health and wellbeing

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Absolutely YES!!!! Cramming housing into back gardens results in intensive living and raises tensions around neighbourhoods as everyone is kliving on top of each other.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Andrew Cobby
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
No
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
No
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
<p>The sites at Goring Gap and Chatsmore farm should be protected at all costs they are the separation zones between Ferring and Goring, the Goring gap is one of the last places where from the Sea the downs can be viewed uninterrupted, any building would have a detrimental effect on the local character of the landscape and would also be detrimental to wildlife especially sea and wading birds and those resting on their migratory route. The land at present is agricultural and should remain so otherwise this land would be lost.</p> <p>The Council should consider what options are available to protect these very special areas from any future development such as village green status</p>

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Garry Southon

Your general comments:

Producing long-winded complicated forms like this automatically exclude and put many individuals off providing or providing feedback. I personally have found it difficult to complete the document as you have requested, it may have been simpler if you had linked the the areas your asking feedback on to this document. however I submit the following principles which I sure are only repeating what others have stated. I would only support very minimum development in the area until the government fulfills there obligations by improving the infrastructure namely the A27 by pass and improving rail links for commuters. Until the infrastructure of the area is improved only like for like changes should be considered, ie replace a four storey dwelling with the same ect

No development on any green belt land between the National Park and the sea other areas could be considered, once all brown fill sites are allocated and the infrastructure improvement is guaranteed.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Derek Wigzell
Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?
HMRC Offices. This site might be used for housing. With some shops.
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
The Goring Gap South Side and Chatsmore Farm should not be used for any types of building. They are free open spaces that the public with care are allowed access. The farm land is unique in that it is costal fields, these are used by birds as a larder and some roosting. Also at this time the land seems to hold water after heavy rain.

Derek Wigzell

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

HMRC Offices. This site might be used for housing. With some shops.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

The Goring Gap South Side and Chatsmore Farm should not be used for any types of building. They are free open spaces that the public with care are allowed access. The farm land is unique in that it is costal fields, these are used by birds as a larder and some roosting. Also at this time the land seems to hold water after heavy rain.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Stephen Alexander

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

The Goring Gap south side and Chatsworth Farm sites must be protected in perpetuity against ANY form of development.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

NO part of either the Goring Gap south side site or the Chatsworth Farm site must be developed.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

It is essential both of the sites are protected in perpetuity for the following reasons:

*The sites both separate and protect the individuality of the communities of Goring and Ferring and also the two councils of Worthing and Arun.

*The Goring Gap offers an uninterrupted and unique view from the sea to the South Downs and vice versa.

*Any building work on either site would have significant and detrimental effect on the character of the whole landscape.

*Any building work on either site would aggravate the possibility of flood risk to the this flat low lying area.

*The Goring Gap south side is a valuable habitat for sea and wading birds who either roost and/or rest there during migration times.

*Both sites together/separately provide unique open rural environments with easy urban access.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Gill Pearson
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
They should all be protected. The infrastructure in the area is already under severe strain with too much traffic and the gradual erosion of green spaces. Local people expect the Council to protect and preserve our right to enjoy and benefit from the Goring Gap both north and south side and not give way to outside interests gradually eroding our green spaces. It is all done for financial greed and must be stamped down on very hard
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
No development other than within built up area boundary
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
Only use for recreational benefit of local people
Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?
I do not object to sensible development within the built up boundary provided it is sensitively carried out

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
David Beardsley
Your general comments:
The plan needs to be circulated wider to gain more support and feedback
Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?
Clear ways across the town for free movement of traffic
Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?
Vital resource that should be maintained
Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?
Worthing is already over congested with high density flats and infilling. Movement around the town will be made worse if further building takes place. Doctors surgeries are already closed to new patients. Until this is solved no further building should be permitted
Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?
Yes
Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?
Worthing is already over congested with high density flats and infilling. Movement around the town will be made worse if further building takes place. Doctors surgeries are already closed to new patients. Until this is solved no further building should be permitted
Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?
Only if the infrastructure is improved, ie at least 8 new doctors, adequate school places and care for elderly
Q10c - Are there any other potential development sites within the current built up area that should be assessed?
No
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
Goring Gap South Side and Chatsmore Farm must be protected to: a) Maintain the separation and identity of Goring and Ferring b) Maintain unique views of the downs from the sea c) Prevent damage to the local environment and character of the landscape d) Prevent destruction of Grade 1 agricultural land e) Minimise flood risk f) Protect habitat for sea and wading birds
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
Goring Gap South Side and Chatsmore Farm must be protected to: a) Maintain the separation and identity of Goring and Ferring b) Maintain unique views of the downs from the sea c) Prevent damage to the local environment and character of the landscape

- d) Prevent destruction of Grade 1 agricultural land
- e) Minimise flood risk
- f) Protect habitat for sea and wading birds

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Susan Beardsley
Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?
Town clear ways for easier flow of traffic
Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?
Worthing is already over congested with high density flats and infilling. Movement around the town will be made worse if further building takes place. Doctors surgeries are already closed to new patients. Until this is solved no further building should be permitted except on brown filed sites
Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?
Very high but these must be maintained
Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?
Worthing is already over congested with high density flats and infilling. Movement around the town will be made worse if further building takes place. Doctors surgeries are already closed to new patients. Until this is solved no further building should be permitted
Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?
Yes, Worthing is already over congested with high density flats and infilling. Movement around the town will be made worse if further building takes place. Doctors surgeries are already closed to new patients. Until this is solved no further building should be permitted
Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?
Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm must not be developed
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
Worthing is already over congested with high density flats and infilling. Movement around the town will be made worse if further building takes place. Doctors surgeries are already closed to new patients. Until this is solved no further building should be permitted a) The separation of Ferring and Goring should be maintained b) The Gap offers unique views of the downs from the sea c) Building in this area would have a detrimental effect on wildlife and habitat d) The farm land is grade 1 and should be protected e) Building would increase flood risk f) The area is extensively used by the public as a rural amenity
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
Worthing is already over congested with high density flats and infilling. Movement around the town will be made worse if further building takes place. Doctors surgeries are already closed to new patients. Until this is solved no further building should be permitted
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
Worthing is already over congested with high density flats and infilling. Movement around the town will be made worse if further building takes place. Doctors surgeries are already closed to new patients. Until this is solved no further building should be permitted

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Ray Graham
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
Never develop Green Field sites, the long term effect will be devastating. We have more than enough brown field sites that need developing without the same concerns.
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
Never develop, our environment would be changed and not for the best environmental reasons.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Sally Rollings

Your general comments:

I strongly feel that the farmland at Goring Gap south side and Chatsmore Farm north side should be protected. This land separates and protects the individuality of both Goring and Ferring and provides a beautiful rural atmosphere to a largely urban area. It provides a safe habitat for many animals and birds including sky larks and woodpeckers which are increasingly endangered. Building would have a significant detrimental effect on the landscape and the greensward which is so popular with residents and visitors to the area and the increased traffic on the narrow roads would be dangerous in the south and devastating along the A259 which is already gridlocked at peak times. While I understand that extra housing is needed I feel it would be a terrible mistake to site it in this area where the sea meets the downs in such a beautiful way. Like many others I walk my dogs on Fernhurst Recreation Ground and walk along the Ilex and Plantation and without the farmland this would become just another playing field devoid of much of the wildlife and birdsong, and demean the wonderful ancient Ilex trees which are among the best in the world according to the information board along the path.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Janet Newnham

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I support the councils view in the Local Plan that the Goring Gap South side and Chatsmore Farm should be protected at all costs and remain as they are.

I grew up in Ferring so have enjoyed these uninterrupted and unique views from the sea to the Downs. Separating and protecting the individuality of Goring and Ferring. Building would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape. Grade 1 agricultural land will be destroyed if developed. There will be a good risk of flooding. The gap is a habitat for sea birds and wading birds who are roosting or resting during migration times. We need rural environments with easy urban access, and we need open spaces to breath!

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Alexander Keevil
Your general comments:
With reference to The Goring Gap South side and the Goring gap North side. These Greenfield sites should be protected against redevelopment. The public from many parts of the town, county and country have enjoyed the openness of the Goring Gap for tens of years. It would not be progress to build on this land. The surrounding roads would not sustain the traffic, Doctors could not cope with increase of resident people, and schools are already overcrowded.
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
No
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
NO
Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?
No

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Tracey Stanford

Your general comments:

no more big supermarkets, they are destroying the small shops. 10 years ago the mulberry parade in goring was always busy and shops were successful. now with a sainsburys there and a Tesco within a 10 minute walk plus asda up the road the little shops are dead. these small shops create a community, loose them and you loose the pride in where you live. people stop caring. for your plan to work you need people to care about where they live. or Worthing will be a large rough housing estate.....

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

green spaces are a must, very important and should not be developed

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

goring gap & chatsmore farm MUST be protected & remain undeveloped green space, it is one of the attractions of the area, a natural beauty spot & a haven for wildlife and nature. It also keeps ferring and goring separate else we would just be one big ugly urban sprawl.
Leave it as agricultural land

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

these sites should have a protection order on them so they can never be built on.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Peter Rhodes

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

The Goring Gap

This farmland and footpath area separating Goring from Ferring, opposite the greensward / beach, should be protected from housing development or other types of development such as caravan / camping park etc. It is an important rural space, enjoyed by thousands all year round, a haven for wildlife and migrating birds.

There is great natural beauty enjoyed by the views both to north and south. It represents a distinctive character to the Goring / Ferring coastal area. It is prone to flooding in winter and unsuitable as building land. PLEASE PRESERVE THIS OPEN NATURAL SPACE FOR PEOPLE TO ENJOY.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Mr Anthony and Mrs Gillian Spenner

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

We agree with our Council's view that both the Goring Gap South Side and Chatsmore Farm should continue to be protected for the following reasons:

This unspoilt and unique tract of land represents part of our heritage freely enjoyed by residents and visitors. Indeed back in 1936?, when development was a threat, local people including our now elderly relations persuaded planners that the status quo was in everyone's best interest. Indeed when we moved from Bristol 15 years ago, the attraction of the separation and individuality of Goring and Ferring with the wonderful views offered was a big factor in choosing to live here.

There is an abundance of wild life, particularly birds attracted by the suitability of the habitat, and coexistence with human visitors flourishes for the pleasure of all in its beauty and accessibility.

To build on this so rare coastal site would detract so much from the charm of the area, be totally environmentally unfriendly and many would consider it a crime.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

Our road systems and infra structure are obviously inadequate to accommodate development already exacerbated by the new building and indeed further approved plans in the north and west of our lovely town. Both The Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm land in particular would be unsuitable for development given the demands there would be on under local services and roads.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

With cost being of major importance our Council and "Taxpayers already incur minimal expense in preserving "Both North and South Gaps", their maintainance represents no cost whereas with the risks of flooding and other service provision expenses building would reverse this happy state of a treasured amenity free for all.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Helen Smith
Organisation (if applicable)
n/a
Your general comments:
<p>Q11 Edge of town development opportunities I support the council view that these Greenfield sites should be protected and remain as they are. The gap is unique and offers uninterrupted views from the sea to the south downs. There is a flood risk on this land. Any building would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape. If developed grade 1 agricultural land would be destroyed. The gap is a habitat for sea birds and wading birds who are resting or roosting during migration times. It separates and protects the individuality of Goring/Ferring communities and protects the individuality of Worthing /Arun councils.</p>

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Colin Smith
Organisation (if applicable)
n/a
Your general comments:
<p>Q11 Edge of town development opportunities. I support the council view that these Greenfield sites should be protected and remain as they are. Goring Gap MUST be protected from any building development for a number of reasons- Building would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape. The gap offers uninterrupted and unique views from the sea to the South Downs. The Gap separates and protects the individuality of two communities (Goring/Ferring) and two councils (Worthing/Arun) Grade 1 agricultural land will be destroyed if developed and there is a flood risk on this area. The Gap is a lovely rural area with an easy urban access and is a habitat for sea birds and wading birds who are roosting or resting during migration times.</p>

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

David Burt

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I agree that the Goring gap south side and Chatsmore Farm should not be developed for the reasons given i.e. significant & detrimental effect....

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Nita Jacobs
Organisation (if applicable)
Goring Residence Association
Your general comments:
Please do not take away the natural greenfield sites of Goring /Ferring they need our protection. The Sea and unique views are so beautiful and and the wild life and habitat of so many species. Let's keep this part of Worthing natural.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
David Crossley
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
Leave Goring Gap South Side and Chatsmore Farm alone!
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
Leave Goring Gap South Side and Chatsmore Farm alone!
No development here!
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
Leave Goring Gap South Side and Chatsmore Farm alone!
No development here!
Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?
Leave Goring Gap South Side and Chatsmore Farm alone!
No development here!

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Christopher Lane

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

Martletts Way and the adjacent HMRC site are not areas of merit or beauty. The development of the old LLoyds Building has been a great success and in great demand. With train connections close by the area is again most suitable to medium rise mixed housing. The area is well served with shops and transport links. Go for it.

The Lyndhurst Rd Gasworks should be a multi-story car park as the site is polluted and most people try to park free in Waitrose so it's not much further. The Grafton Rd site and the bowling alley car parks could then be demolished as they are not fit for purpose and about to collapse anyway. This would free up mixed housing land.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Teville Gate needs sorting, 25 years I've been resident in Worthing and it was an issue when I arrived. Goring Gap is the only coastal green space between Littlehampton and Roedean School. It is the lung of Worthing and Ferring, an area of respite and tranquillity. This area enhances the quality of Highdown Hill and creates an unrivalled vista towards the Channel. Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm must remain unspoiled.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

Move the bus depot to Teville Gate, integrated with rail station. This frees up the stagecoach site for mixed low cost housing, not a high rise, and the development will increase footfall in the town centre.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Kenneth Hearne

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Goring Gap should be protected because:

1. There are few areas not built up along the south coast.
2. The rural nature of the Gap is an amenity to local residents.
3. Any buildings or structures in the Gap would be detrimental to this green space.
4. Migrating birds use the Gap to recover from the sea crossing in the Spring, and to re-fuel when flying south in the Autumn.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

The site should not be developed.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

Goring Gap should remain primarily for agricultural use.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Tina Green
Organisation (if applicable)
N/A
Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?
Not sure. I would like there to be more public consultations on developments in the town centre. Has anyone considered vandalism issues with the new Sails!
Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?
If Worthing were to be modelled on Chichester then it would be a vast improvement. Chichester has lots of varied shops many of which are individual.
Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?
Only if the parking in Worthing were to be improved or a cheaper bus service to bring people in.
Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?
Yes I agree with the main challenges. If more housing is built there will need to be more community and leisure facilities plus the updating of existing facilities.
Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?
I would love to see more adult exercise equipment such as the facilities recently provided at Pond Lane Durrington. There is a park in hove which has various stations around the park to allow you to do some training on your way round the park. The leisure facilities at Worthing Leisure centre are very dated and they are the poor relation compared to Splash point, they also keep joining people which is great but some classes are hard to get into. With the population rising we may need moore facilities around the town.
Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?
yes I agree with the main challenges.
Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?
I would like to see the bus services at an affordable level rather than free for the over sixties. A cheaper fare would encourage more use of the bus and less use of the car.
Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?
No I don't think housing should have higher priority. I do realise housing is needed but it puts pressure on infrastructure.
Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?
We will need more doctors surgeries, libraries, schools and be aware of safety on the roads where new housing creates access issues.
Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?
Yes definately.
Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration

opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

most of these sites are good opportunities if dealt with sympathetically and no high rise blocks are built which would be totally out of keeping.

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

They should be developed for mix use of housing and retail. No high rise blocks which will only cause isolation to the residents of such properties.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm should be protected for future generations. The Gap is a beautiful serene place offering peace and tranquility for one and all, offering unique views from the sea to the downs. The separation of the two communities of Ferring and Goring is important to protect the individuality of Ferring. Any building on this land would be a terrible loss for residents and visitors to worthing. It would be a ruination of the landscape and a great loss of Grade 1 agricultural land. There would be possible flood risks and threats to seabirds and wildlife. PLEASE PROTECT THIS SITE.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

Sympathetically.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

I would like to see more discussions on any proposal for each site and opportunities to comment on each.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

Yes.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Trevor Rollings

Organisation (if applicable)

Goring Residents Association

Your general comments:

Having lived in Worthing for thirty five years, there have been many welcome developments, improving facilities and the built environment. There remain however the consequences of some poor planning decisions in the 1960's, the loss of many character buildings, and some awful structures put in their place, especially along the seafront. The multi-storey car park is a carbuncle by any standards. The key point therefore in future developments, as opportunities arise, is to regain the graceful regency character of the town to enhance it as a place to visit. Aesthetics is an entitlement, not a luxury. The region needs housing and economic growth, but not at the cost of quality and civic distinctness, which is why people are attracted to the town in the first place.

Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?

Teville Gate remains an eyesore and a huge missed opportunity as the gateway to the town. It is an urgent priority that this area be developed sensitively and in the interests of many users, combining accommodation, entertainment and commerce.

Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?

Theatre and entertainment programming has improved substantially in the last couple of years. This must be sustained if Worthing is to hold its own against other coastal resorts, and attract the young. The seafront needs a regular investment in annual planting and maintenance of flower beds, otherwise the impression is that the town is philistine and depressed, a turn-off for visitors. A little investment would go a long way in this area.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

The Goring Gap is a unique feature along this part of the coast, a jewel to be protected for posterity. It is a rare link from the Downs to the sea, and an important habitat for wildlife. Skylarks for instance, which have become rare elsewhere, regularly sing overhead and breed.

Many use the Gap as the lungs of Worthing, a reassurance that the country side is never far away, and a containment of urban sprawl. We owe it to future generations to keep this area as natural and unspoilt as possible. Once planning permission is given for dwellings of any kind, it will only be a matter of time before the whole area is in-filled. The Gap is a great opportunity to retain balance, hold back the tide of development on an increasingly crowded coastal strip, and assure people that there are other values besides profits made from bricks and mortar. Future generations will not thank us for allowing this special area to disappear on our watch.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

There has been talk of a new rugby stadium near Goring station. If done sensitively, this could enhance the area without detracting from its charms. It must not however become the thin end of a wedge which eats up the whole area.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Leslie Roberts
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
My view is that Goring Gap & Chatsmore Farm areas should be protected from development. The Gap is an important habitat for roosting and migrating birds. Both areas offer unique contributions to the local landscape and building would destroy this. Important agricultural land would also be destroyed and could result in flood risks.
Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?
Yes, these areas should be developed to go towards local housing needs

Leslie Roberts

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

My view is that Goring Gap & Chatsmore Farm areas should be protected from development. The Gap is an important habitat for roosting and migrating birds. Both areas offer unique contributions to the local landscape and building would destroy this. Important agricultural land would also be destroyed and could result in flood risks.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

Yes, these areas should be developed to go towards local housing needs

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Julian Reed
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
No - it is waffle. (Try inserting a negative and see if the statement is plausible - if not, it is useless.)
Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?
Yes
Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?
More flexible
Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?
I agree.
Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?
A high value.
Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?
In dealing with this it is important to identify and, where possible, quantify the adverse effects of more housing on the quality of life (and economic activity) for example on traffic congestion and pollution.
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
Goring gap is worth protecting because it provides a gap in the largely continuous coastal development.
Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?
In principle I regard any significant increase in housing in Worthing as mistaken, because it is better to encourage development outside SE England. But given current Government policy I do not oppose the proposal to bring forward these sites.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Jenny Ellis

Your general comments:

I am glad that changes are being made to the previous plan as ways of living, shopping etc have changed over the last few years. People are now shopping for the basics more on line and going in to town for experiences - restaurants and cafes, hairdressers, beauty, etc.
There also needs to be more encouragement for people to live in town rather than on the outskirts. Convert space above high street shops into accommodation. This not only makes good use of empty space, but also keeps the town centre more vibrant in the evenings so that people will feel more comfortable about coming in to town.

Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?

Yes, Worthing has great potential to be a very desirable place to live. The semi-derelict sites around the town, particularly Teville Gate and Union Place are sites that shame our council. Residents should no longer be prepared to put up with these disgusting eyesores.

Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?

We need a greater variety of shops and shopping experiences. An area similar to the Lanes in Brighton with small individual shops and boutiques; large more vibrant department stores eg. John Lewis; clothing - Zara, Matalan, Primark; household - Ikea, Habitat.

I find Worthing boring for shopping. Brighton is obviously on a different scale and we can't compete with that, but look at Horsham, Chichester or even Arundel which are all more of a 'destination' shopping place than Worthing

Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?

More things for tourists to do on a wet day!

Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?

Health needs, particularly GP surgeries are a growing problem in the area. With an increase in residents there will need to be greater provision of GPs surgeries, Health Centres, dentists, etc.

Also, additional school places in large new developments

Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?

A park and ride scheme would be good.

Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?

Green areas around the built up area should be banned from development. As already stated Worthing is bounded by sea and downs, so space available for development is limited. It is therefore vital to keep all green spaces as such. Development should only be on brownfield land.

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

See above, green spaces are vital and should not be built on.

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

No, it is important to balance development. We do not want to end up with hundreds of houses but nowhere for people to work or play.

Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?

If housing density increases then maintaining open green spaces around the town becomes even more

important

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Residential gardens should only be developed where the resulting development still has reasonable open space and access

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

Yes, these sites should be developed as quickly as possible

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

A mix of retail - shops, leisure - restaurants and cafes, business use - small spaces for start-up businesses, and residential use - flats above perhaps. Encourage people into the town in the evening so that it becomes less threatening as an empty town.

I do not see the need for a multiplex cinema in Union Place. We already have the Dome and Connaught which show a variety of films.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

Yes, these sites should be developed

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Gwen Gentry

Your general comments:

The Goring Gap is of vital importance to the local community providing uninterrupted views of and direct pedestrian access to the beach. It separates and protects the individuality of the Goring and Ferring communities. This would all be annihilated by building on the area. Grade 1 agricultural land lost as would the habit of seabirds and wading birds resting and roosting during migration. There is a serious risk of flooding in the area which would be exacerbated by urban development. Infrastructure, water, roads, transport, schools, NHS services are all stretched and under pressure. Further urban expansion in the area of the Goring Gap will have an adverse effect on the facilities for local residents and tourists alike.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Graham Clements

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Whilst appreciating the need for additional housing in west area of the borough, both the Goring Gap South Side and the Goring Gap North Side - which I believe are being considered - are quite unusual in sea-side areas - providing an uninterrupted view from the sea to the Downs. The fact that this is also a working agricultural area has protected development for many years and I believe that housing proposals would destroy the unique feature of the area which hitherto has been a peaceful and charming - as well as popular - place for those of us living nearby. An incursion of housing would permanently destroy the attraction of knowing that we have a rare semi-country area adjacent to the sea which has been available for many years and enjoyed by the many local people who walk, rest, and relax in those acres. Please do not go ahead with any plans to spoil the charm of this unusual area.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Mike Sturt

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I firmly believe that both The Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm must be protected for future generations. Green spaces are rare these days and both these areas provide unrivalled views of the coastline and South Downs. Having only recently received National Park status it would be a disaster to lose these views. In addition, by developing this area the boundary between Ferring and Goring would be sadly lost.

Surely there are far better areas to develop first and areas that attract tourists to visit and then spend money in our town should be protected.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Caroline Hatherall
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
The Goring-Gap South side and the Goring Gap North Side. These areas should be protected as they are the only stretch of green open beautiful country side in this area.. Building would be significant and detrimental on the character of the landscape and the unique views from the sea to the South Downs. So important to preserve this area not only for the habitat but also a place of unwinding and one of the only places I know where the landscape gives a feeling of freedom. Goring and Ferring would become one. At the moment it looks like all the way from Worthing to Littlehampton and beyond will eventually become one area. Of course the risk of flooding and the destroying of Grade 1 agricultural must be a consideration. This is a rural environment open to all. Long may it last.
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
No development.
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
Protection order on land for no development full stop.
Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?
No View

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Graham Forshaw

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

strongly opposed to any form of development in the Goring/Ferring gap. the open space is an essential break in the ever increasing sprawl of urban development. The open space allows a vista from the beach to South Downs. It provides a haven for wildlife and a protection from flooding. It is a rare example of grade one agricultural land in the concrete development between Brighton and Bognor Regis.
To allow building in this strategic gap would be detrimental to the local environment and destroy a cherished local amenity.

My comments apply to both the southern and northern sections of the strategic gap..

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Paul Lambden

Your general comments:

ref Q11 Edge of town development opportunities.

Bearing in mind the strong local opposition to development on either the North or South Goring Gaps, shown at the meeting the other year, I am amazed that the sites are still included within the Local Plan. Surely a responsible stance should be taken to safeguard these sites for future generations to enjoy , yes the government dictates we need to provide more houses but at what cost!! These sites are the only buffer between Worthing and the urban sprawl which goes right along the coast to at least Portsmouth, the whole area will, if a stand isn't made, will become a ribbon development between the Downs and the Coast with no character or individuality is this what we really want of Sussex. I think not. Apart from the special nature of the sites there just isn't the infrastructure along the coast for any more major development , unless urgent measures are taken to ease the traffic situation the whole area will soon grind to a halt. So please for the sake of us and our responsibility as guardians of the land for future generations delete these two sites from the Worthing Plan.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

RICHARD GILES

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

The green spaces are absolutely critical for the borough's future as a tourist destination. If they are not preserved, then eventually Worthing will lose its unique scenic qualities and once this happens, then it will end up being just a suburb of Brighton if nothing is done to stop the urban sprawl. If Worthing loses its character, then tourism and the local economy will suffer. Although the green spaces do not in themselves create income, they create areas for tourists and locals alike to engage in leisure activities. These then create jobs and a better quality of life. Worthing's local economy is increasingly dependant upon day trippers, both local and outside the borough. There will be no incentive to come if the borough is no longer an attractive place to visit. The Council should consider ways of making the green spaces pay for themselves by increasing the availability of environmentally friendly leisure activities and opportunities for small businesses to make a living out of them. Improving the number of cycle ways would help and improving the existing ones would help, with emphasis on keeping cycles and motor vehicles separate. Would it be possible for example to extend the cycle route along the Prom westward towards Ferring!? It is often used now as a cycle route by those who ignore the no cycling signs! What about allowing a small business to hire out cycles at the Pier. What about encouraging endangered wildlife and then using their existence as a reason for people to visit Worthing. Such animals as large flocks of Starlings roosting, owls, bats would all be popular. Such schemes could be sponsored by local business, or even the likes of Tesco.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

GORING GAO SOUTH SIDE AND CHATSMORE FARM

I and my wife who is the Treasurer of the Ilex Conservation Group, agree with the plan to protect the Gap. This is one of the last remaining green lungs within the Worthing/Ferring developed land, a site of outstanding natural beauty with uninterrupted views of the Downs, and the scenic nature of this area attracts many tourists as well as locals, for leisure, walking, cycling and other activities. If developed, it would be lost forever. It needs to be protected for future generations. The land is grade 1 agricultural land unsuitable for development because of flooding risks and a lack of services such as water, drainage, and other utilities. In addition, it helps in protecting the important adjacent sites of the Ilex Way and the Plantation. Any development of the Gap is bound to have negative impacts on these areas. Then there is the wildlife including protected birds and animals. This is an important habitat for sea birds, skylarks, rodents and mammals, and also some reptiles. These would all suffer as a consequence of any development. The various wildlife in the Plantation and along the Ilex Way also rely on the Gap for food. Lastly, any development would undoubtedly increase traffic along either the Marine Drive and Sea Lane Ferring. These are scenic roads used by locals and visitors. Any development would surely adversely affect these roads especially during the building stages and the result will be fewer tourists as people are put off by heavy traffic and pollution.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

The Gap should be fully protected in whatever way can be achieved.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

Yes

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Terence Flower

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Whilst I sympathise with people struggling for housing,I do feel that ,as a "seaside town"there is a need to balance the attraction of a town with the necessities of a town.I feel the beauty and openness of Goring Gap Southside and Chatsmore farm,giving such wonderful views between sea and SDNP,are few and far between and should be retained as a visitors attraction.

Both sites also act as part of the "dividing line"between Goring and Ferring,helping both to retain their individuality.

To lose such an attraction would have a detrimental effect on the local area with the loss of such natural things as farmland and habitat for birds and animals.

And of course,what about the flood risk?

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

With regard to Goring Gap South Side and Chatsmore Farm sites,leave them alone to pursue their current usage.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

Surely this would make sense.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Brian Hagan
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
I would like The Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm listed sites to be protected.
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
No residential or commercial properties to be built. Possibly developed as landscaped park or recreation areas.
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
As per Q11b.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Stephen Hunt

Your general comments:

I agree with the council that the protection of The Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm areas is vital to our community.

We cannot let the beauty of this area to be erode by development

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Simon Walcott

Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?

Yes, however the plan mentions briefly the polluted areas along the A27 and then talks of creating a dual carriageway along these sections -'Surely this adds to pollution? The plan talks about sustainable travel use in town and yet is looking to increase the flow through residential areas. I'm not sure other than haulage and commuters who this will really help. These areas are filled with family homes. Over 700 households may have to be evicted; with the recognised limited development space for new homes there doesn't seem to be enough housing to relocate these people to within Worthing. Worthing has grown since the original proposal to create a dual carriage way, the town is growing more and becoming more vibrant and could really benefit from a more imagination and positive solution which won't cut off everything north of A27. Why can't the people in such a hurry to bypass Worthing do so further away from our children's family homes and walks to schools and college. Worthing needs a new bypass, we are worth investing in and shouldn't be slashed in half to save 20 mins on a journey to Brighton. Long Furlong could be linked to Stenying bypass and provide quick links up to London and Brighton and beyond. I wish our elected members would consider local resident opinions more than the pushy members of trade and commerce committees. There can be a mutually beneficial outcome. I hope!

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

housing is a real issue and is only set to get worse if A27 dualling goes ahead

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Peter Parish

Your general comments:

I feel that we need to be much more flexible with empty retail space - allowing the use of much of it for other forms of employment and for residences.

I support a move towards more sustainable forms of transport.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Philip Rowett

Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?

Be flexible. Nothing worse than factories and offices that have fallen into disuse.

Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?

See below

Q6b - Do you have suggestions for how the Local Plan could resolve these?

See below

Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?

The need for a multi-screen cinema for the use and enjoyment of residents of all ages. Teville Gate or HMRC are ideal.

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

Absolutely essential for all of us. The Ferring-Goring Gap is most important of all being the only place for very many miles around where the countryside meets the sea. It is a beautiful and relaxing area which is enjoyed by countless people of all ages. It is a nature reserve too. It is unique and, if lost to development, will never be replaced.

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

Teville Gate needs to be redeveloped and include a multi-screen cinema, with good parking, as the town lacks this essential entertainment facility for residents of all ages. The existing cinemas are a joke compared to what is offered by Chichester, Crawley and Brighton, but all of which involve unnecessary travel. Alternatively, use the HMRC site.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Alan Turley

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

The Goring gap south side and Chatsmore Farm need to be protected against developement.
The gap offers an ubinterrupted view from the sea to the sourh downs and separates the two communities of Ferring and Goring.
The Gap is a wonderful habitat for sea birds and wading birds - just roosting or resting during migration time.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

No developement

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

Just leave them alone.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Caroline Stride

Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?

I agree with the vision regarding attracting economic investment and cultivating sustainable growth.

Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?

It talks a lot about investment and strengthening the economy.

Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?

I think we should have at the heart of the vision statements that relate to the inhabitants of Worthing's sustained health, wellbeing and prosperity using sustainability as a core foundation for successful environmental, economic and community stability. You have said something about wellbeing in strategic objectives and that's great but the vision is the 'soundbite' as it were so I think it should be prominent there.

Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?

I agree with the proposed objectives.

Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?

I don't think the objectives as they stand mark out Worthing as being something special. It has a very different, more laid back and down to earth feel to it than Brighton which is a good thing that should be celebrated!

Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?

Yes thanks for a thorough analysis of this area. I believe that as a large proportion of employment aged people are working outside the borough the council should make it attractive for us to spend our money inside the borough to promote the economy. This should be a key challenge. At the moment shops close before 6pm when a lot of us are travelling home from work. The only options are Saturday and Sunday but to protect family time and encourage more spending and use in leisure facilities maybe there could be some encouragement to employers to extend opening hours and employ more local people to accommodate demand. Why not have late night Thursdays with half price parking after 5.30pm to promote this?

Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?

I think we should be more flexible in our approach especially as employment in certain skilled sectors can take place in co-working spaces or at home.

Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?

It's not quite retail but what about organisations that encourage low environmental impact or that provide support to locals with being 'greener'. A lot of consumers base their loyalty to brands (and politicians) not just on products (policies) but because they show a real identity and care for the local surroundings and the planet. I would like to see local voluntary groups represented on the high street to make it a real one-stop-shop for everything people care about.

Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?

Rowlands Road is becoming more creative and that's lovely to see. I think it could do with a lot more promotion and signage guiding people from both ends of Worthing to walk down it as a means to both enter and leave the shopping areas in the Centre. So the signage as you walk or drive from Goring along the coastal road guides you to park up and walk to the Centre from Rowlands Road. The Guildbourne Centre is in such a great location and I would like to know what's happening with the plans for redevelopment.

Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?

I often wonder what tourists do after 5.30pm after a day at the beach. The only places that seem to open are pubs and bars. St Paul's Arts Centre has had some wonderful music but it would be great if they could stay open to serve food and live music/poetry/arts events more informally until 10pm Thursday to Sunday. It would be income

generation. Similarly with the Pavillion, a lot of their ticket events are pricey and they seem to close early. Denton's has issued a statement saying it might stop serving food - why when it's right on the pier and an amazing venue?!?

Why not have late opening nights for retail and eating/relaxing so that people can combine the two twin pleasures. The establishments that open for food and drink should be a mixture of places that singletons like to frequent and some that families can frequent. The council could make it attractive to retailers to do this and employ local people on part time contracts by decreasing tax or rates by a percentage that makes it economical to extend opening hours.

Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?

The issue of rough sleepers and/or people indulging in illegal substances - I found a used syringe between Heene Road and the Kingsway only last night - and/or occupying benches by the sea is off putting to locals and tourists alike.

One other challenge is the length of time it takes the builders to carry out the work. Montague Place leading to the Town Centre where the new covered area is should not still be a building site in peak tourist season. It detracts and looks unsightly. It's also difficult to get around.

Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?

I absolutely agree that the night time tourist economy needs to be developed. I often wonder what tourists do after 5.30pm after a day at the beach. The only places that seem to open are pubs and bars. Why not have late opening nights for retail and eating/relaxing so that people can combine the two twin pleasures. The establishments that open for food and drink should be a mixture of places that singletons like to frequent and some that families can frequent. The council could make it attractive to retailers to do this and employ local people on part time contracts by decreasing tax or rates by a percentage that makes it economical to extend opening hours.

Where can tourists with camper vans park and stay for the night now there are laws prohibiting them from certain places. Is there a caravan/campsite that's in Worthing to promote this?

Why don't we encourage 'green' tourism with lots of recycling facilities close by or notices encouraging people to drop off bottles etc, at a local defined place e.g. supermarkets etc,. ?

Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?

Absolutely.

Q6b - Do you have suggestions for how the Local Plan could resolve these?

I believe it would encourage more walking and cycling facilities so that clear and accessible walking and cycling routes are identified and publicised on the borough's website, voluntary organisations and on social media.

Walking along the sea front would become more popular if there were not drug taking, drinking and rough sleeping populating areas of the seafront in the evening.

How about adventure playgrounds and indoor baby gyms if these are not already provided by the main fitness and leisure centres?

Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?

I am shocked that there are no free tennis courts available - the next Wimbledon Champion could come from Worthing if there were but as it stands now, she would have to pay to play so her family would require a certain level of affluence. My previous borough had free outdoor gyms and tennis courts in 3 main parks available all year round for everyone. It really helped the borough maintain fitness and reduce obesity related illness.

Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?

I agree that there needs to be more emphasis on different types of transport e.g. cycle routes etc,.

I am concerned about the detrimental effects on traders' business of having large parts of the roads closed whilst works take place. Also will widening the road not cause more traffic congestion and therefore increase air pollution?

Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?

Make evening journeys by public transport attractive by having frequent services on different routes. We need to do this now in order to meet the needs of the younger generations who are going to be cycling/long boarding/streetboarding/skateboarding/bus travellers in the main before they drive.

Work with primary and secondary schools to promote sustainable travel. Have days out at bus garages, workshops on fuel and transport as part of science and society week.

Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?

Really glad that the council has identified the negative impact of climate change on the borough.

Q8b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could reach a balance between competing needs?

Always consider the health of the population first as this has a detrimental impact on all other services in the borough including investment and development.

Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?

It seems logical that if flood risk increases then development will stall as businesses do not want to have to pay extortionate insurance to mitigate against flooding.

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

A very high value, its been proven that if people have access to safe green spaces in everyday life they are healthier and contribute more to their communities in a variety of ways.

Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

Not sure if you already do this but what if you provide funding to local young working single people and young working couples to enter short life tenancy agreements in unoccupied council stock. Provide them with financial support to get the council stock back into habitable conditions through the council directly paying approved contractors for specified heating, electrical, roofing and plumbing work. Make it the tenants' responsibility to decorate and furnish the place and keep it to a high standard. Or invite the younger generation to live in affordable work/life 'pods'. Please ensure the 'pods' would be no smaller than 28sq metres though and double height for the mezzanine sleeping space. Don't allow them to be sold off!

I started out this way 30 years ago in short life housing and have passed on the DIY skills and the ethos around caretaking of housing to my daughter.

Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?

Will the council be safeguarding against second home buyers purchasing through private development companies that have bought up the land?

Unfortunately a number of architects do not even consider the environmental and sustainable aspects of housing design. So they produce buildings that I wouldn't put livestock in. It's not rocket science that if we live in cleaner aesthetically pleasing sustainable environments then we will generally be healthier.

With new housing stock, when the council goes through tendering highlight that the bids must have environmental impact and sustainability at it's core as well as provide value for money. Be brave and employ environmental architects and landscape architects to draw up the plans so that the hard work the council is doing regarding environmental care is not diluted by ineffectual and potentially damaging building development.

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Yes absolutely.

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

It's exciting to have a plan that has looked at several sites across the borough.

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

Out of the ten sites, four are on contaminated land. Can there be a study on how the contaminated land can be de-contaminated to further aid the use of the land? How long would that take?

Q10c - Are there any other potential development sites within the current built up area that should be assessed?

What's happening with the Guildbourne Centre?

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

It depends upon what is meant by 'significant detrimental effect' and how that is quantified and qualified. I would ideally like the council to give more specific information on this please.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

If any sites have to be developed there is a responsibility on the part of the council to put sustainability and environmental landscaping and architecture at the heart of the planning and delivery to lessen the negative impact and sustain/regenerate over time.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be

protected, enhanced or used?

If it's not private agricultural land maybe develop local produce farming and making to support the local economy.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

Only the less constrained parts of both sites that will not have significant environmental and detrimental effects on heritage, landscape and open spaces. Keep the site currently in use for agriculture.

Q12a - Do you have any views on how any of the listed policies should be worded?

Continue to use the Clear English Standard and provide a detailed glossary please.

Q12b - Are there any policies missing from the list?

Is rough sleeping and anti-social behaviour included in any of these policies?

Q12c - Are all of the listed policies required?

Yes.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Amanda Warr

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Goring and Ferring Gap 32ha and Chatsmore Farm 28.1ha : This is a strategic gap of natural beauty which should be protected on the grounds of the Heritage attached to this land which had a covenant on to protect this land. The demise of the natural boundaries between Goring and Ferring which a naturally blended together and have been for many years if this were to be built on. The use of agricultural land would be lost if this were to be built on. The playing fields which give great enjoyment to many young clubs throughout the winter and summer with the use of cricket pitches and football pitches as well as general playing fields would then be lost. The risk of flooding if this land should be built on as now the sea defences have deteriorated over the past 20 years and are still slipping away and water lays for some time on the fields during the winter as the sea level is lower now than this land.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Antony Hart

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

No I don't. No green area should be allowed for development until brown sites have been regenerated. Further no development should be allowed until the road infrastructure in the Worthing area radically improved. Currently all in/out routes A24,A27 and A259 are bottlenecks in all directions particularly during rush hours but also throughout the day. The best solution would be a Long Furlong, Washington and Staying bypass with appropriate flyovers. Costly yes, but how much is wasted daily in jams and the historic mistakes of house purchases/resales on the A27 for a totally unsuitable road plan. No further development in Titnore lane should be allowed regardless of any lane improvements which only get you to the daily traffic jam a bit quicker and to make the jam worse. Totally ridiculous!!

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I don't believe Worthing population needs the Titnore area development which serves more to resolve other areas problems.

Specifically the proposals damage the environment, destroys grade 1 agricultural land, threatens sea bird and wading bird habitats, increase flood risk, destroys the unique character of the gap in 'South coast city's and in general is detrimental to the area.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

None!

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

It isn't broken, don't fix it

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Carol Bargery

Your general comments:

Reference the goring gap and Chatsmore farm report

I feel very strongly about the proposals and object to them. There is implications relating to flood risk, impact to the landscape and the natural habitat for wildlife. Agricultural land will be lost along with the natural boundaries of goring and ferring. I trust this will be considered favourably.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Patricia Thornton

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

The Goring Gap Southside and Chatsworth Farm should be protected and remain as they are. These areas function to separate and protect the individuality of Goring and Ferring and two local councils, Worthing and Arun. They offer an uninterrupted and unique view from the sea side to the South Downs. Any building would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape. Any development would destroy Grade 1 agricultural land. These areas are a habitat for sea birds and wading birds who are roosting or nesting during migration.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

There should be no development of these areas

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

They should remain in their existing condition

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Miranda Webster
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
Yes
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
Yes
Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?
Continuous cycle path along the sea front from Shoreham through to Littlehampton. More activities for teenagers to stop anti-social behaviour.
Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?
Yes it should be more flexible. Employment buildings are often not utilised to their full potential, and these could be more of an answer to the housing needs.
Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?
The amount of money wasted on Splashpoint was a disaster. We now have a swimming pool much smaller than the Aquarena, and does not meet the needs of the community. My children don't like swimming there, and neither do I. There are not enough affordable leisure facilities in the town considering you are catering for an increasing population.
Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?
A bigger swimming pool, a new bowling alley. Social clubs for teenagers.
Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?
The council is appalling at protecting the environment. I see council workers hedge trimming and tree cutting in bird nesting season, which it is illegal to disturb nesting birds. They also do grass cutting on strips of road (Titnore Lane) that is full of wild flowers and orchids. There are no signposts or visibility issues that warrant this.
Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?
Yes, we have a growing population, increased housing and shrinking outdoor spaces. We value our greenfield spaces for dog walking, nature watching, etc. The sites on the Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm are so well used by the whole community, these would be a particular loss to the community and for the diverse species of birds, bats and insects that use it.
Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?
Green spaces are very valuable to the community. It's a way of de-stressing, by going for a walk, therefore keeping us all healthier which probably saves the NHS a fortune! Without them I think there would be a lot more problems in the community.
Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

If housing needs are going to spill into greenfield sites, then yes they should have priority.

Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

I think the planning laws should be more open minded. For example if all the bungalows in the area were allowed to be developed into family homes, this would accommodate more people.

Also allowing new builds to be built higher (within reason), this would increase numbers without spilling out into the environment.

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Absolutely. Garden grabbing is a potential disaster for the neighbours and nature. Our hedgehogs are already in danger of disappearing.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I think the greenfield sites should be protected. In particular Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm. These are used widely by the community and it is crucial for what's left of our birds and bats. I also worry that if these sites were developed it would increase the flood risk.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

The houses that have been built at Goring station are a complete eyesore and I have no idea how they are meant to be in keeping with the area. However the buildings at Durrington are much nicer and in keeping with the area. I think the houses should be allowed to maybe be 3 or 4 storey high, thereby increasing the number of people housed.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

Yes please protect Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm as an open space for the communities.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Michael Wright

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

It is essential that both the Goring Gap South side and Chatsmore Farm remain protected. Otherwise there will be no gap in the development along this stretch of coast at all. Goring Gap South is very popular with holiday makers because of the lack of development. It also provides space for dog walkers, ordinary walkers, footballers and cricketers, wildlife, and fresh air. In other words it is essential to retain this space for recreation, and its view of the Downs. Chatsmore Farm is also popular with dog walkers and provides a welcome break from development on both sides. Both these areas should be for agricultural use in the main.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

Both Goring Gap South and Chatsmore farm should be designated for agricultural use. If all else fails could both plots be annexed to the South Downs National Park?

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Gerald Connolly
Your general comments:
we need more housing, schools and doctors. I do not object to this land being used. Too many NIMBY here... selfish individuals e.g., Goring Res Assoc.
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
overall could do better
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
in part
Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?
YES
Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?
No
Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?
local medical care center
Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?
yes
Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?
reduce rates for local shop owners leaseholders
Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?
YES
Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?
Stop spending money on advertising waste of time money. all on web for free
Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?
YES
Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?
YES
Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?
Medical needs then housing
Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

in cities such as Brighton and Worthing

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

yes

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

YES

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

local medical care center

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

NO PROTECTION

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

local medical care center

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

NO

Q12b - Are there any policies missing from the list?

local medical care center

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Daniela Gargiulo

Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?

Broadly agree, but development of land resources should be tackled in an environmentally sensitive and sympathetic way, with a view to the long-term future of the town. This should be done not by building further new retail developments but by improving and maximising current potential. There are still too many empty shop sites and uninviting areas in the town centre's main shopping streets which could be improved. The type of business coming into the town also needs careful consideration.

Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?

Fair enough. It is of utmost important that the historic buildings in the town are invested in and maintained and that the unique charms of Worthing from the local fishermen's kiosks, to the resident's beach huts and our marvellous Pier are protected and valued. The seafront and its historic and idiosyncratic buildings are the town's greatest asset.

Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?

The vision should have a clear, strong environmental focus and should combine preserving the town's heritage with making the town a green, clean, healthy place to live and visit. Worthing should take a lead on promoting green and sustainable transport. It should become a cycling, pedestrian and public transport friendly town above all, with cars exiled to the outskirts. The plan should take into account the emerging demographic of young single professionals moving from Brighton and London who are public transport savvy and cycle friendly; growing families priced out of Brighton who want a healthy, safe place for their children to grow up (who will want to cycle and play in the street); as well as the existing older residents who can no longer drive and need to use public transport. Worthing is flat making it the ideal town in Sussex for cycling and it should model itself on similar sized European towns where cycling for people of all ages is the norm.

Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?

Community objectives are good.
Economic objectives good but the town centre should also be a site for housing and new homes. Bringing residential areas back into the town centre will make the town an attractive place to live, will improve street safety and strengthen community in the heart of the town. It will also mean that there are no longer 'dead' areas of the town when shops close after 5pm, which currently can become a magnet for delinquency and petty crime. Homes above shops would be great instead of empty office spaces.
Environment objectives good but NOT all the undeveloped areas of coastline should be enhanced. Improvements should proceed with balance. Worthing needs stretches of undeveloped, unenhanced coastline to retain authenticity and for environmental relief.

coastline and the quality of the natural environment.

Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?

The objectives must be more locally specific bearing in mind the historic and natural assets of the town. Worthing must not be overdeveloped.

Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?

Worthing needs to think more broadly in terms of the global economy and emerging markets, not just focus on the existing forms of employment in the town as they currently are.

Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?

The Local Plan should be flexible in its approach as the nature of employment will continue to change as it has already done massively in the past 20 years. Worthing needs to be mindful of the global economy and have a worldwide, not provincial outlook. It is therefore not sensible to improve qualification and skills attainment to focus on suiting the needs of local businesses as they currently are. Worthing should focus

instead on becoming a centre of academic excellence, instead of preparing bright young minds for existing local jobs.

Q3c - In addition to the sites already identified as having the potential to deliver employment land are there any other sites that could accommodate employment growth?

Teville Gate must be a priority for development. Building work must be done inland and avoid seafront sites as building there compromises the assets of the town.

Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?

The town centre should seek to compete with excellent shopping areas like the centre of Chichester which has high quality shops and is pedestrian friendly or Brighton's Laines with their speciality shops making it a charming and bustling destination.

Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?

No. Guildbourne Centre is a tragic building, always empty or with poor quality shops (excluding Wilco) and an unpleasantly dingy, desolate place to walk through. Heading west on Montague Street the shops become more pitiful and the are less attractive. Bath Place off Montague Street should be made to look more inviting with high quality street cafes and the seedy looking Amusement Centre on the corner should be relocated, it makes Bognor Regis town centre look the height of sophistication.

Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?

There should be less development in the town centre and better use of existing buildings. Quality niche shops would attract more visitors. Less mobile phone shops, 99p stores, discount cheap lookin clothing stores all must go if you want to attract shoppers from outside Worthing.

Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?

More emphasis on culture!

Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?

In the first instance an easier, attractive route from the train station would help. Visitors currently get lost and confused navigating their way into town.

Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?

Broadly agree.

Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?

The 21% local obesity rate could be addressed by promoting cycling and walking and penalising driving. There needs to be a change of mindset towards walking and cycling being the default mode of transport and cars used only for longer journeys. This will make Worthing and its residents healthier. More frequent buses up to the Downs would be great. 700 buses are now promoting a £2 flat fare after 7pm with buses every 20 minutes to Brighton. More of this would be great.

Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?

Give Worthing a car-free town centre, making it a pleasant place to walk. Introduce 20mph speed limit on all residential roads making it a safe place for children to walk and everyone to cycle. Tougher penalties on antisocial driving and parking on the pavements. The streets and roads need to be safer and we should encourage a culture of primary school children walking to school instead of being driven by parents in a hurry. Walking buses for school children. Park and ride for visitors who cannot use the train or buses. Have a car free day in Worthing town centre once a month.

Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?

Yes, broadly agree.

Q8b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could reach a balance between competing needs?

Environment should be prioritised over development for business.

Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?

Development should not be at the cost of green space. Green space enables the town to breathe and improves quality of life. Banning cars from the centre of Worthing would be a radical and progressive solution to some of the current environmental problems.

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

The borough's green spaces are extremely important and enhance the town. They provide space and scale and should not be compromised at any cost.

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

No.

Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

Making Worthing car free would mean that the several central multi-storey car parks can be developed for housing.

Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?

More dense housing seems to bring with it multi-car households with two or three cars, sometimes more, per house. If not an outright ban on more than one car per house, there should be a tax.

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Yes.

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

Yes.

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

All seafront sites should not interfere with the low rise nature of Worthing's beautiful seafront. Any higher storey building should be done inland, especially at Teville Gate.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Goring Ferring Gap and Chatsmore Farm must be protected. Not developed.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Deirdre Austin

Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?

Yes, but I feel it is all things to all people. It is too generic. It doesn't identify what 'sort' of town Worthing is or what sort of town Worthing would like to be. The whole plan appears to dive straight into the specifics before deciding on the direction. What 'type' of town does Worthing want to be? And based on the answer to that will determine the direction to be pursued and which development sites would provide the best opportunity. What is the unique positioning that Worthing would like to create. Which segment of the market does Worthing want to appeal to in the future. Based on that it will become possible to decide on the relevant tourist, housing, industrial opportunities. Does Worthing want to be modelling itself on Blackpool (please no!), or Margate, or on Torquay or Bristol? Making comments about specific sites before deciding on the direction seems to be the wrong way round.

Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?

No. Until you have a clear vision of what you are trying to achieve, you cannot leap straight into disjointed development.

Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?

There is no longer a town centre. There are various shopping streets/areas but no sense of cohesion.

Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?

The retail outlets are becoming increasingly downmarket and lacking in choice resulting (I think) in the young gravitating towards Brighton and the older shopper heading towards Chichester especially with their retail parks on the edge of town.

Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?

What is the town's identity???????

From a purely logistical point of view it would be helpful to have more easily accessible and affordable car parks. Chichester has the most affordable parking in the south.

Brighton has amongst other attractions, The Laines and the Pavilion and amazing architecture.

Bournemouth has beautiful sandy beaches.

Chichester has carefully planned and developed its various retail elements (from retail parks to city centre shopping)

What is Worthing's identity? What is the image that Worthing wants to project?

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

One of the truly unique features in Worthing is the iconic greensward and Ferring/Goring Gap which attracts large numbers of visitors to Worthing and is used by both locals and people from further afield. It offers amazing opportunities to people pursuing a large number of water sports and other sports. It draws both the young and the old. The idea of developing this area would be a disaster. It is drawing increasing numbers of people to the area and should be protected and preserved to continue doing so. In addition development would destroy the uninterrupted views to the downs and would increase the flood risk and upset the natural habitat of many species of birds whether they be migrating or roosting.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Gillian and Roy Skelton

Your general comments:

The plan states that the number of households has already increased threefold over recent years and the current plan is looking at an even faster rate of building new homes. There seems a singular lack of comment on the resultant effects on traffic both on the roads feeding Worthing and on the number of cars trying to access the town centre from within the Worthing area itself. Even now any accident on the A27 or A24 or roadworks within Worthing results in gridlock. The town centre retail area, however beautiful, will only be successful if visitors can arrive and park easily and the residents who have to work outside the town will only stay if the resultant further congestion on the A27 through Arundel to Chichester and beyond west and to Shorham, Hove and Brighton east and A24 north to Horsham is not prevented by positive planning at this stage.

There is also a suggestion of water shortages in the summary. What plans are being made within the South East to provide adequate supplies?

We are delighted to see that the Goring Gap is being regarded as area to be preserved as an open space. It is a rare and delightful place to walk and enjoy the sea on one hand and views to Highdown on the other. Please continue to hold out against development and maintain the distinctive separation of Goring and Ferring. It is a unique asset for Worthing to have an unbuilt seaside space.

Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?

The Local Plan should definitely continue to protect key employment within the Worthing area. If there is still a demand for industrial units then these too should be provided for in the plan. The more employment in the area the less pressure on the major roads to and from the town and the more likely bus services can replace cars for transport with all the usual environmental benefits.

Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?

The main challenges are access to the town from the main roads and parking- see the general comment above.

Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?

More small boutiques needed. Now Country Casuals is going there are few upmarket dress shops.

Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?

See introductory comment

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

Value the Goring Gap very highly.

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

We feel employment should be given a higher priority than it appears to have in the plan. The more those in work can be employed locally the better for transport, the environment and the local economy.

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Agreed

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

Wonderful if Teville Gate were finally regenerated!! . Could the Bus Centre relocate onto the site? Agree a good idea to redevelop the seafront site with mixed use- some residential but boutiques, restaurants and linking in with Warwick Street .

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Christine Perry
Organisation (if applicable)
Goring Residents Association
Your general comments:
See Q11 - Edge of town development opportunities
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
<p>The Goring Gap south side and Chatsmore Farm</p> <p>This site should be protected because the gap offers the only uninterrupted views from the sea to the South Downs. Grade 1 agricultural land would be lost if developed and the gap is a habitat for many sea birds and wading birds for resting and roosting during migration times. If developed there would be a real Flood Risk which surely should be avoided at all costs.</p>
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
Perhaps the land should be taken over and managed by the Council which would save this precious land for future generations and wildlife.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Timothy Stewart

Your general comments:

I am most concerned that the long term future of the Goring Gap and The Chatsmore Farm area, could be subject to considerable changes in the landscape. Our countryside continues to be eroded away to build homes, that in an increasing number of cases remain empty, as they are bought as investments, or second properties. Due to the locations of these areas being near the coast, I can see the empty property scenario being a strong possibility. All this causes is a reduction in functionality of the local community.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Ian Houghton

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I think it is imperative that the Goring Gap space is left as 'green field' and not built upon.

I totally appreciate that housing needs to be built in the area but to build on this piece of land is wholly inappropriate. When you consider brown field sites such as Teville Gate - which could be utilised to provide a huge amount of housing, both social and private, in easy walking distance to the Town you have to strongly question why one of the last remaining elements of green is being considered for development - frankly it's crazy.

We should take the lead from what is happening with the old Lloyds TSB building in Goring, which is being converted into accommodation and do something similar and on a larger scale with Teville Gate and NOT with Goring Gap.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

Goring Gap must be left as it is, or given protected status. Perhaps made into a nature reserve

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

Yes

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Brian Thorpe

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I am particularly concerned about the need for protection of the Goring Gap (South Side) and Chatsmore Farm. To destroy this facility by developing it for housing would have a permanent adverse effect on the community. It is an irreplaceable leisure resource, not only for local residents, but for visitors throughout the south-east. It is the only place between Peacehaven and the far side of Littlehampton where the Downs can be seen from the sea without buildings blocking the view. It is a valuable haven for wildlife, not least passage migrants arriving from and leaving for the continent. I have myself seen warblers, wheatears and whitethroats on their way through. Building would surely provide a flood risk and put even more pressure on educational and medical resources which, particularly in the latter case, are falling apart even now..

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

Any development would be a retrograde step.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

The sites could well be absorbed into the South Downs National Park and would provide a logical extension to the sea in the middle of its extent.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

Probably a very wise move to relieve pressure for the development of the Goring Gap (South Side) and Chatsmore Farm.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

John Coote

Organisation (if applicable)

Sustrans

Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?

Sustrans challenges the assertion that “there are limited sites where sustainable modes of transport are most suited”. As the West Sussex Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 (p66) states, the problem is that the capacity of the road network in Worthing is unable to absorb more traffic: “Due to the geography and density of the developed area, physical improvements to the highway network, which require space outside the existing highway boundary, are challenging to deliver.” Moreover, we have yet to see any modelling of the impact of the planned increases in traffic flows into Worthing from the A259 and A27. Cycling, walking and public transport make by far the most efficient use of limited road space. The work that Sustrans has done recently with West Sussex County Council has identified many potential cycle routes into and around Worthing and are documented in the county’s draft Walking and Cycling Strategy.

A significant current challenge is that the number of cyclists killed and seriously injured on the roads in West Sussex has more than doubled in the last 5 years. Work done by the West Sussex Cycle Forum in relation to proposals for the A259 show that 60 (sixty) per cent of people killed and seriously injured on the A259 from Goring Crossways westwards are cyclists. The Cycle Forum has argued that the proposals are likely to make those figures worse, not better. There is plenty of evidence to suggest that the real and perceived dangers of cycling on the roads is the most significant barrier that stops people cycling.

A further challenge is that road traffic accounts for a significant part of Worthing’s carbon footprint. Both the West Sussex Local Transport Plan and the draft Cycling and Walking Strategy recognise the need to reduce emissions from transport linked to climate change. If the targets in the Climate Change Act are to be met, Sustrans argues that the challenge is to achieve a significant modal shift away from the private car to sustainable modes of transport.

Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?

The Local Plan needs to show that sustainable transport is not just a theoretical national priority, but a local priority in Worthing. As a minimum, the Local Plan needs to support the objectives of the West Sussex Walking and Cycling Strategy to:

- Double levels of cycling by 2025 (or better – the All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group has urged a national target to increase cycle usage to 10% of all trips by 2025).
- Reduce each year the rate of cyclists killed or injured on the roads
- Reverse the decline in walking activity, and
- Increase the percentage of children aged 5-10 that usually walk to school.

To achieve this the Local Plan needs to move away from “promoting” sustainable transport, and “mitigating” the impact of development. What is needed is long-term, coherent investment in sustainable transport. There is a wealth of evidence to show the benefits to the community of such a strategy, with benefit cost ratios between 2:1 and 32:1, typically in the region of 5:1 and 6:1.

In the draft Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, the Department for Transport claims that nationally the spend on cycling more than doubled between 2010 and 2015 from £2 per person per year to £6 per person in England in 2015-16. If the Local Plan is to be effective it must enable funding to reach and grow from this level, for it is clear from the Investment Strategy that most of the funding for Cycling and Walking is local - from the Community Infrastructure Levy; from Section 106 planning obligations; through Local Enterprise Partnerships - as well as from local authority budgets.

The All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group has urged a minimum investment of £10 per person per year rising to £20 per person. The evidence suggests that towns that achieve that level of investment will gain a significant economic advantage because they are creating the healthiest and most liveable environments that will attract both people and business.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Alison Chapman
Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?
Yes, but impact assessments should be required to evaluate effect on local community and infrastructure. Any development projects should incorporate additional funding to deal with infrastructure and provision of services: schools, GP's, jobcentre etc. Any development should count towards the Council quota for housing
Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?
There should be recreational provision for the community and green spaces, to create small neighbourhood units. The residents should be of mixed backgrounds, ethnic, economic, cultural, age. Ghettos should not be created. Consideration should be given to extend the provision of dementia care services/facilities.
Q10c - Are there any other potential development sites within the current built up area that should be assessed?
Maximum use should be made of existing derelict properties and the council should be proactive in buying up derelict properties which offer scope for development
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
I support the Council view to protect Goring Gap(S) and Chatsmore Farm. Provides much needed green space and recreational facility on the edge of town and enjoyed by thousands of people a year visiting and local. Promotes well being and health. provides wonderful uninterrupted views. It provides separation between 2 communities of Ferring and Goring. Habitat for wildlife and rich agricultural land, although subject to flooding. Building would have severe detrimental effect on local community, Sussex as a tourist area, and well being and health. Greenspace cannot be recovered for future generations, once it is lost.
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
he only option I could envisage for Chatsmore Farm would be Football/rugby pitches or a small childrens play area
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
The only option I could envisage for Chatsmore Farm would be Football/rugby pitches or a small childrens play area. The Goring Gap should be protected
Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?
If required for development strict controls should be applied regarding effects on infrastructure, and infrastructure funding should be a condition of development. It should still be incorporated into local plan and count towards any housing quotas imposed on the Council.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
JUNE DOWDING
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
<p>The Goring Gap south side and north side, known as Chatsmore Farm, should be protected and remain as they are and be protected from building on for the following reasons:</p> <p>Separating and protecting the individuality of two communities (Goring and Ferring) and two councils (Adur and Worthing)</p> <p>The gap offers an uninterrupted and unique views from the sea to the South Downs</p> <p>Building would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape</p> <p>Grade 1 agricultural land will be destroyed if developed</p> <p>Flood risk</p> <p>The gap is a habitat for sea birds and wading birds who are roosting or resting during migration times</p> <p>Rural environment with an easy urban access</p>
Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?
<p>I do not think any further houses can be built in this locality as already Durrington north and Durrington south as well as Angmering is saturated with new builds and the roads are grid locked now.</p>

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Niall Gavin
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
Yes
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
Yes
Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?
It's missing specific mention of underpinning and sustainable infrastructures
Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?
Yes
Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?
Yes. There are immediately identifiable areas where these objectives can be achieved. However, climate change may need to be highlighted in particular relation to more extreme and unpredictable weather conditions, tidal surges, floodplain etc.
Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?
Agreed.
Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?
It depends on the nature of the employment area, if industrial, light industrial or commercial/office based.
Q3c - In addition to the sites already identified as having the potential to deliver employment land are there any other sites that could accommodate employment growth?
The gateway area around Worthing Railway Station is in dire need of redevelopment. The current office blocks could form the basis of a new digital hub for digital businesses migrating Westward from Brighton/Hove and the area in general could be enhanced with supporting retail and leisure provision. An alternative solution could be to convert the existing redundant offices to residential.
Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?
Yes.
Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?
Worthing Town Centre suffers from earlier unsympathetic redevelopment and supporting, unattractive and brutalist infrastructure (car parks etc) between Montague Street and the seafront. Every effort should be made to retain and increase the current retail provision, but redevelop the surrounding area in a more sustainable and eco-friendly manner.
Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?
Make the currently separate areas more joined up in look and feel with good connecting wayfinding and attractive facilities along the way.

Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?

Yes.

Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?

There's an opportunity to create a more attractive gateway route from Goring-by-Sea Railway Station to the South of the SDNP, at Highdown Hill. Currently the Littlehampton Road is a South-North barrier for pedestrians and cyclists, and Titnore Lane is a deathtrap for both. This could be enhanced very easily with a new overbridge or underpass and pedestrian walkways.

Worthing could make more of its flat coastal plan location to encourage more leisure and commuter cycling, with better segregated but integrated cycle routes and centre parking facilities or at surrounding railway stations to the East and the West.

Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?

Yes. But more attention needs to be paid to the growing aged population, currently 25%, which will grow considerably in the next 17 years. Some parts of the area are already 'grey ghettos' and this will continue.

Q6b - Do you have suggestions for how the Local Plan could resolve these?

Community care, more holistic hospice-type and home care provision must be factored into the plan.

Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?

See 6a and 6b above!

Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?

Agreed.

Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?

Lobby the rail operators to create and run more frequent 'shuttle' trains (e.g. Barnham-Worthing and Hove-Worthing) and increase car/bike/bicycle parking at those hubs.

Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?

Agreed.

Q8b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could reach a balance between competing needs?

By maintaining that Worthing has a distinctive character and setting and ensuring that the area does not become part of a homogeneous unbroken urban strip stretching from Brighton to Littlehampton.

Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?

See 8b above - where any development would contribute to the creation of a continuous urban strip along the coast.

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

High value, particularly along the South coastal plain

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

It would appear there is an obligation on the Council to do so.

Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

The potential to redevelop existing and unused office and commercial properties should be considered firstly for specialist and affordable housing need, over high-value private residential development (which developers will prefer to do instead).

Q9c - Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?

Failure to provide robust and sustainable supporting infrastructures.

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential

gardens?

Any residential garden development should meet rigorous environmental and neighbourhood impact criteria

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

Yes

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Those with least environmental and rural impact should be evaluated for development.

Areas 4 (Goring/Ferring Gap) and 5 (Chatsmore Farm) have significant and valuable rural barrier/agricultural/visual importance and contribute to the prevention of the creation of an 'urban coastal strip' and preservation of the relationship between the coast and the SDNP. I would not wish to see those areas developed beyond their current use and amenity value and should therefore be protected.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

Any development to be low-rise and low density, either for residential or commercial/employment opportunities

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

Maintain current use and amenity value.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

Yes.

Q12a - Do you have any views on how any of the listed policies should be worded?

See 12b

Q12b - Are there any policies missing from the list?

There needs to be Digital/Connectivity Policy either stand-alone or alongside the Telecommunications Policy, to ensure provision and maintenance of an adequate digital and wireless infrastructure to support both growing and future residential and business need.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
John Harrison
Your general comments:
The Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm must be protected from any planning applications which may be made now or in the future.
Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?
As above - I support the council's view on the protection of ALL open spaces in the borough

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Margaret Pannell
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
The gap offers an uninterrupted and unique views from the sea to the South Downs. Building would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape. Flood Risk. The gap is a habitat for sea birds and wading birds who are roosting or resting during migration times. Rural environment with an easy urban access.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Wilfred Rhodes
Organisation (if applicable)
Private resident
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
<p>PROTECTED: Goring Gap south side, and Chatsmore Farm. These sites should not be developed for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Separates and protects the individuality of Goring and Ferring (Worthing/Arun Councils)ii) Development would have a detrimental effect on the character of the landscape and destroy the unique views from the sea to the South Downs.iii) Grade 1 agricultural land would be destroyed if developed.iv) Flood risk if developed, as land drainage very important - e.g. Romany and Whitebeam Roads in 1980's when houses flooded as soon as built.v) Gaps are habitat for sea and wading birds and a corridor for resting birds during migration.vi) This is a delightful rural environment with an easy urban access.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Jason King

Q10c - Are there any other potential development sites within the current built up area that should be assessed?

Does worthing need two golf courses right next to each other!?The clubhouse at hillbarn could be moved redeveloped and the housing estate at hillbarn lane extended north.

Teville gate there could be two or more high rise blocks with leisure (cinema) and some retail units at ground level.this wouldn't really impact on anyone and at the same time removing one of the biggest scars from the town!

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Durrington /fulbeck avenue would be ideal candidates for development as there is/has been large scale development in the area already and i understand facilities such as a new doctors surgery are already in place.

Beeches avenue I don't feel is a suitable site on it's own to be developed,if the only access available was to be beeches avenue it would cause extreme congestion for existing residents exiting onto the A27(which can take as long as five minutes to get out!)if the same proposal as before was put forward,i.e 90 houses if we were conservative and assumed one car per household that would mean a que extending all the way up the road at peak times in turn affecting our air quality and wear and tear on the road!Also I have deep concerns regarding surface water drainage,Beeches avenue and charmandean lane already flood the eastbound A27 (I have photographic evidence but cannot attach to this form!)if the field at the top of the road is covered in tarmac I hate to think what the effect would be!

There is also the issue of the A27 itself,already running at over capacity how would a development onto a current dead end road help the situation!?Our doctors surgery is closing in July so we have to move to Broadwater surgery they have already indicated they are over subscribed let alone the 500 patients needing to find a doctor from our surgery,so introducing another 200-300 people to the area will not help an already dire situation.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

If the football club site was developed alongside beeches avenue bit closing the the top of Beeches avenue off completely (as pines avenue) with access through lyons way that would a better way around it if it had to happen,but that would still cause additional traffic to the already congested retail park which can at times become gridlocked,so whether that would be suitable or not i'm not sure,you also then have the issue of relocating the football club!The land to the east of lyons farm would be ideal if the A27 was for local traffic only but in it's present form i don't think that would be suitable.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

If Beeches avenue is not allocated for development i think it should be taken into to the south downs national park to protect it from future development,yes it it has a road to the south but if is a very quiet road (even with the businesses),the development at lyons farm isn't close enough to impact on it, to the west is charmandean lane which is a prehistoric trackway, to the north it is south downs national park.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

these sites should be included in the new local plan as the only real sites worthing has left for large scale development ,the town has grown as much as it can,someone needs to put a common sense hat on and realise we have run out of space for housing developments. we are between the downs and the sea there is nowhere else to go!

building 100 houses here and 40 houses there isn't going to help or meet the housing needs.the only way is up and as much as hi rise isn't popular with most people it is by far the easiest way to house lots of people

with a small footprint,teville gate would be perfect for high rise blocks with maybe a cinema and shops below.

**NOTE – SUPPORTING PHOTOGRAPHS WERE SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF
THIS REPRESENTATION (See WIO-E-73a)**

Your Town –Your Future Representation

jason king

17 Jun (4 days ago)

to me

Attached photos for my submitted form on 17th June 2016

- 1.Eastbound A27 bottom of Charmandean lane
- 2.Eastbound A27 between charmandean Lane and Beeches Avenue
- 3.Eastbound A27 corner of Beeches Avenue
- 4.Eastbound A27 bottom of Beeches Avenue
- 5.Beeches Avenue debris/mud washed down.
- 6.Beeches/A27 Debris washed down .

This is a regular occurrence and highways england have cleaned all the drains along the A27 in January 2016 ,this is surface water that washes down from Charmandean lane and Beeches avenue,if the field at the top of Beeches is developed more surface water will flow down both!













Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

David Linsell

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

GORING GAP - SOUTH SIDE AND CHATSMORE FARM.

My wife and I are local residents of Goring, and we believe strongly that this area should be preserved, as the location 'Goring Gap' is, in terms of the Structure Plan, the strategic gap between Goring and Ferring. Once a strategic gap has been defined, to accept development in it would require very special and exceptional justification.

Currently the open nature of the area (i.e. no buildings), and its general character, are unique to the South Coast in at least two respects. Heading west from the 'built-up areas' of Worthing and Goring and passing through 'The Plantation' one emerges to find a wide uninterrupted view from the coastline to the South Downs, and a complete absence of any commerce. This makes for a calm and tranquil outlook from all angles.

Any development, particularly one which resulted in the construction of buildings, would interrupt the currently-enjoyed views. It would constitute a major impact to the visual detriment of the area, and should be located in a more secluded and inconspicuous position.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Peter Hall
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
Mostly. See 1c
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
Yes
Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?
The need to retain and develop existing businesses should be included. The need to have high quality rail and road links to East, West and North should be included.
Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?
Provide adequate parking, not just legal minimums for new housing.
Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?
Yes
Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?
The plan must incorporate an organisation responsible for promoting the town to potential inward investors. How about a private/public sector partnership.
Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?
Flexibility is important
Q3c - In addition to the sites already identified as having the potential to deliver employment land are there any other sites that could accommodate employment growth?
The former railway sheds by West Worthing station lie idle and could provide land.
Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?
No more estate agents or charity shops. Encourage new private businesses through rent rebates
Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?
Cinema and better range of restaurants are needed.
Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?
Yes
Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?
Reopen the Tourist Information centre. Provide an online diary of what's on.
Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?

Yes
Q6b - Do you have suggestions for how the Local Plan could resolve these?
No
Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?
No
Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?
Yes
Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?
Encourage all transport operators to go green with electric buses and taxis.
Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?
The Goring Greens ward and Goring Gap should not be developed. They must be protected.
Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?
Great value . They should not be converted to housing use.
Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?
No
Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?
We do not want eyesore high rise development on the seafront.
Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?
What is inappropriate? Off street parking is better than on street.
Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?
Yes
Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?
Get on with Teville Gate as a priority.
Q10c - Are there any other potential development sites within the current built up area that should be assessed?
Land formerly used as railway sheds by West Worthing station.
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
Protect 4, 5 and 6. A gap is so important and we need a caravan park. Develop 7 and 8. Invest in improving Titnore Lane.
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
Imaginative developments with green space. Not rows of identical little boxes.
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
Leave Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm as current use.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

Yes get going ssap

Q12b - Are there any policies missing from the list?

Provide space for potential investors.

Policies that ban training elders from descending on any land in the Borough.

Q12c - Are all of the listed policies required?

Yes

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Margaret Pittham

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I believe the goring gap south side & Chatsmore farm should be protected at all costs . The gap offers uninterrupted views from the sea to the South Downs , it is essential this is protected . The gap is an essential environment for sea and wading birds who use this area to roost and rest during migration . I feel development would also pose an immediate flood risk to the area .

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

David and Anne Rolph

Your general comments:

We would like the gap protected for the following reasons. 1- Migratory birds rest there. 2- The view from the beach is outstanding with a variety of scenery.(greensward, farmland, Ilex woods, the downs.) 3- Once the use is changed or some building is allowed then it would be lost. 4- Flooding occurs. 5- This is a superb gap which seperates Ferring and Goring.
We have very little land left for development but this is the most important to keep. 6- People come from a distance to see the sea,greensward and the gap.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Philip BARCLAY

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

Goring Gap is the last vital open space between Brighton and Littlehampton

The Gap is an amenity countryside space that connects with the coast the landscape with character of coast and countryside that connects to the South Downs National Park

Any development of the The Gap would be contrary to Local Plan Policy –and would not be in keeping with the character of the area and would be grossly intrusive and out of character with the land which is currently used as agricultural land. –

Arun and Worthing Local Plans states that the location is unsuitable for development and development would have an adverse impact upon the landscape. It will be detrimental to the policy of keeping the separation between Goring and Ferring and have an adverse impact upon the view of the South Downs.

–The Gap is defined in the Core Strategy as ‘Land outside of the Built up Area Boundary’ and there is a strong sense of public amenity with high public usage including walking along informal routes across the area. The Gap is a valuable amenity for walkers and development would have an adverse impact habitat and wildlife.

The Gap is visual connection uninterrupted by development, between the undeveloped coastline and the South Downs National Park.

The Gap is one of the few remaining sections of undeveloped coast along the coastline locally, maintaining visual link uninterrupted by development between the coastline and South Downs National Park. It forms an effective gap that separates Goring –by– Sea and Ferring being visible from the National Park and is a visually sensitivity area.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
George Adams
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
The Goring Gap South Side and the Goring Gap North Side should be protected from any form of development. Building would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape and the environment. Roads in the area would become congested.
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
They should not be developed. Planning officials should be alert to innocuous looking applications for things such as croquet lawns, and camp sites which not needed or wanted and whose real purpose is to erode the status of the Gap and open it up for development.

George Adams

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

The Goring Gap South Side and the Goring Gap North Side should be protected from any form of development. Building would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape and the environment.
Roads in the area would become congested.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

They should not be developed. Planning officials should be alert to innocuous looking applications for things such as croquet lawns, and camp sites which not needed or wanted and whose real purpose is to erode the status of the Gap and open it up for development.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Christopher Gray

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

The Goring Gap South Side and Chatsmore Farm are greenfield sites and should be protected from any development for the following reasons:-

- Keeping and protecting the clear individuality of Goring and Ferring and the two councils. (Worthing /Arun)
- The gap offers an uninterrupted and unique view from sea to south downs
- Building houses would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape, especially if any high density building was not in tune with the type of properties either side of the gap.
- The destruction forever of the grade1 agricultural land
- Flood risk to any development and areas nearby
- The gap facilitates a habitat for sea and wading birds during resting and migration times
- Rural environment with an easy urban access

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

They should not be developed

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
John and Rosemary Petts
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
<p>Area 3 Upper Brighton Road. Concerned whether this is a field near to Bramber Primary School, which is supposed to be their Playing Field now the school is a Primary School.</p> <p>Area 1, North of Beeches Avenue. There have been plans in the past to build here which have been rejected because of A27 access problems. The Unknown plans for the A27 in Worthing will greatly affect all current and future developments north of the A27. Given the number of past plans that evaporated you cannot make reasonable planning decisions for this area until the A27 has actually been completed.</p>

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Graham Tuppen
Your general comments:
<p>I want areas within the built up area developed first, both for employment and housing, eg Martletts way, HMRC, Decoy farm, Teville Gate, British Gas, Union place.</p> <p>Green areas must be preserved as much as possible.</p> <p>Infrastructure improvements must be a key part, eg hospital and GP practice expansion, education. Also road improvements. Local shops should be included. We are currently quite well provided for with Parks, but more leisure facilities are also likely to be needed, though the priority must be to keep the areas we already have, such as the Goring/Ferring gap and the Greensward.</p> <p>Affordable housing must be included to try to assist LOCAL young people (not buy-to-let and other investors) to get onto the property ladder, ? housing association. The priority must be to give those WORKING in the area the chance to buy, these are the people who will contribute both skills and expenditure to the whole area, keeping it viable.</p> <p>I assume the 'West of Durrington' area being planned so far is the area North and West of Tesco, and West of Hobart Close/Brisbane Close/Canberra Road.</p>
Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?
Yes
Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?
Contaminated land eg Decoy farm, should be industrial not housing.
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
Protect Chatsmore Farm, it's valuable farming land, and it's loss would reduce the areas attraction for visitors.
Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?
Probably

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Damian Evans

Your general comments:

Goring - Ferring Gap.

I think this area should be protected and NEVER allowed to be developed. My reasons are:

It is a strategic gap separating the two villages.

Important agricultural land would be lost.

The gap offers unique, uninterrupted views from the Downs to the sea.

Building here would have a detrimental effect on the landscape.

The gap is habitat for an array of seabirds and other wildlife.

I feel strongly that this area should remain as is for future generations to enjoy. We, in Worthing, have enough buildings and development as it is, don't take the last little bits of open space we have left.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Clare England-Evans

Your general comments:

Goring - Ferring Gap.

I think this area should be protected and NEVER allowed to be developed. My reasons are:

It is a strategic gap separating the two villages.

Important agricultural land would be lost.

The gap offers unique, uninterrupted views from the Downs to the sea.

Building here would have a detrimental effect on the landscape.

The gap is habitat for an array of seabirds and other wildlife.

I feel strongly that this area should remain as is for future generations to enjoy. We, in Worthing, have enough buildings and development as it is, don't take the last little bits of open space we have left.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Karen Harvey

Your general comments:

THE GORING GAP SOUTH SIDE & CHATSMORE FARM DEVELOPMENT: Q11 Edge of town development

I feel it is inappropriate to build on any part of Goring Gap (North or South).It is this beautiful bit of green space that makes this quiet area attractive. Unique views of the sea, Highdown Hill and the South Downs. Lets keep it this way. Once that space is gone, it's gone for good.

There needs to be a definite gap between Goring-By-Sea and Ferring, protecting the individuality of the two communities. It would be ugly to see a sprawl of buildings, one town merging into the next.

Any development on Goring Gap would surely make it a less attractive place to live and visit. The roads in the area will become busier. The beautiful stretch along the seafront between Goring and Ferring feels safe and peaceful, this will be ruined if development is allowed.

Goring Gap is a habitat for our birds and wildlife, they are precious. We need to keep Goring Gap.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
JANET MUNFORD
Organisation (if applicable)
Goring Residents Association
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
Yes, the gap offers an uninterrupted and unique view of the sea from the South Downs
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
Yes
Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?
There are already 2 caravan sites in Ferring and another one off of Titnore Lane so I don't think another one is necessary

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Michael Hitchin

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

The goring gap/chatsmore farm should be protected from developement to maintain one of the few remaining rural areas with easy access to the town. Building in these areas could create a flood risk to the surrounding areas and significantly change the character of the area

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Anthony Bone

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I do not want any development of the "Ferring-Goring Gap". It should be left as it is in order to protect the distinctive character of Ferring and Goring. These are two separate parts of the south coast and should remain as such. There is also the wider aspect of the landscape to protect which would be abolished with development of this area. There is the wild life, the natural views to the sea from the National Park and possible environmental damage. Here am particularly concerned about the loss of land that helps with water drainage and thus prevents flooding. There would also be the loss of this environment to those living in Worthing. This is an enjoyable aspect for rest and play in the town.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

The Ferring-Goring Gap should be given special community status as an asset for all future generations. It should be given special and perpetual status for the benefit of all local people. It is a Town amenity for the local area but does serve to attach people to Worthing and is thus a commercial asset.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Peter Way

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I agree these greenfield sites must be protected, especially The Goring Gap South Side and Chatsmore Farm - pages 28-32 . These areas are vital to the separation of the Goring and Ferring communities and must be protected for future generations.

They provide unique and uninterrupted views of the sea from the South Downs, and any building work would have a significant and detrimental effect on the quality of the landscape. Also valued agricultural land would be lost and the flood risk enhanced. Local infrastructure cannot support further residential expansion in this area, one of the last seaside open spaces between Brighton and Portsmouth Once it's gone - it's gone.

I support W & A Council in their decision to protect these sites.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

David Clark

Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?

I think there should be more emphasis on providing sufficient high quality Educational facilities. This will not only attract people to Worthing from outside the borough but offer our young people more chance to enhance their knowledge and skills and hopefully their wellbeing through better paid jobs.

Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?

Jobs are vital to the population of Worthing so key employment areas should be protected although flexibility may be needed in some instances.

Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?

The Guildbourne Centre requires a complete revamp - it looks poor, the inside is unattractive and as a destination for shopping or leisure it fails.

Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?

As Above.

Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?

The statement that Worthing has "good rail links along the coast and to London" is incorrect. As someone who commuted to London for 10 years the service is too slow (1 hour 20 minutes). The council along with our MP's should be pressing for a higher speed rail link to London and improved services to other major towns and cities like Chichester/Winchester/Southampton to open up better employment and leisure opportunities for our population and reduce car use.

Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?

Improved rail links.

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

I have THREE points to make:

FIRSTLY the OAN maybe correct but given the constraints in our borough it is unachievable and therefore is not a figure we should accept. Whatever figure we agree there should be an element built in for 'windfall sites'. The building industry are very good at finding new plots and in my view whatever figure we eventually agree on as the housing target does not need to be planned to the last house - say 80% of it. Consulting with our neighbours to take some of our OAN by finding alternative sites in their areas will be very difficult and probably take years. We should therefore come up with a figure we think can be achieved in Worthing that can be used as an interim requirement.

SECONDLY the plan is not radical enough. If there is a chronic shortage of housing in the borough a new approach is needed. This means a more pro-active approach by the planning department on the larger sites with perhaps an internal design guidance panel working to some basic guidelines for our Borough. There should be more of a partnership approach between Builders, WBC and representatives of the Public in order to achieve greater density on the larger sites but also better quality housing for residents of Worthing

Builders should be required to build greater density on the bigger sites by doing more developments of 4 to 5 stories where appropriate including use of basements but these must be of high quality. Yes the only way is up BUT not high-rise. These developments would consist of apartments, maisonettes and terraced housing with a density of perhaps 20%+ more dwellings per hectare than we are currently seeing on for example the sites along the Littlehampton Road. There should be more communal space - gardens and allotments and the housing should be of better quality (there are many examples in London and other European cities of very good "apartment" buildings of up to 6 stories that look much better than those being built currently with a few honourable exceptions. Indeed Victorian period terrace developments that are very sought after today were I think are around 60 dwellings per hectare). We should be engaging with more progressive builders like Urban Splash, HAB Housing, Pocket Living in a fresh more innovative approach. If this is all about Housing Need rather than Housing Want then many house buyers need to understand that box like detached housing is not always the answer given the land shortage. Ideally landowners should be engaged in this process whereby in return for planning permission they receive say 80% of the land value (still substantially more than the value previously) which then allows good quality affordable homes to be built but I appreciate this is rather "blue sky"! There should also be discrimination in favour of those already living in the borough and where appropriate a bias in favour of low income buyers.

THIRDLY there appears to be a lack of a strategy as regards Conservation although perhaps this is going to be set out in another document linked to the new local plan? What is the strategy for our conservation areas and locally listed buildings under the new local plan and how is it to be enforced? What role does conservation have in future development. It should be much higher up the agenda for the sake of current and future residents of our town. Once again it may require more of a partnership with local residents to enhance our conservation areas and historic buildings and a more pro-active higher profile role for conservation within WBC. Do we need to review the Local Interest List? Does WBC need more powers of enforcement and a clearer policy on issues such as windows and when action is required to conserve a listed building.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

North of Beeches Avenue - Maybe
 Worthing United FC - Maybe
 Upper Brighton Road - Maybe
 Goring - Ferring gap - NO
 Chatsmore Farm - NO
 Caravan Club - NO (one of your stated aims is tourism so developing this site is not consistent with this objective)
 West of Fullback Avenue - Maybe
 North of West Durrington - Maybe

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

Please see earlier comments.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

It should be made clear within the plan that some key "green open space" areas like Goring-Ferring gap are protected and will not be developed. This will hopefully deter speculators who have little regard for local communities from buying up land in the hope of obtaining planning permission for commercial development (as we have seen recently with the application for a caravan site from a housing company). If these speculators are given tacit encouragement they will buy up land and leave it to deteriorate to the detriment of the local area.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

Not if it results in just more of the same housing estates we are currently building. It should be "fast tracked" but only if part of a new innovative partnership approach not more national builders rolling out more boxes.

Q12b - Are there any policies missing from the list?

The proposed planning policies appear watered down from what we have now as regards what good design looks like in terms of protecting the character of local areas and protecting the amenity of local residents (I cannot see a single policy on amenity). There are currently numerous policies concerned with this area in the Saved Local Policies from 2003, the Core Strategy 2011 and a number of Supplementary Planning Documents, many with slightly different emphasis which helps prevent poorly designed developments. These should be reviewed before any are discarded in favour of fewer more generally worded policies.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Pat Potts

Your general comments:

With regard to the Worthing Local Plan, the area included in this plan which concerns me most is the Goring Gap South and North sides. My reasons for concern are as follows :-

This area separates and protects the individuality of the two communities (namely Goring and Ferring) and the two Councils, namely Worthing and Arun.

The gap offers an interrupted and unique view from the sea to the South Downs which cannot be found elsewhere locally. Building on these particular plots of land would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the area and the landscape.

If this area is developed Grade 1 agricultural land will be destroyed forever.

There is a significant risk of flooding if development is allowed.

The gap is a habitat for sea birds and wading birds who roost there and also rest during migration times

Lastly this is an area with a rural environment but with an easy urban access.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Joy Moir

Organisation (if applicable)

Transition Town Worthing

Your general comments:

This submission is a collective response from members of Transition Town Worthing collated and coordinated over the preceding month. We welcome the opportunity to be a part of the consultation process for the future of Worthing and surrounding area. We believe the Council's approach is positive, progressive and wanting to enable a better and more sustainable future for the community.

We hope our comments are just the start of a strong dialogue between us and the Council to help shape the right WLP from here until 2033.

Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?

The vision is unimaginative and could be said of any South East coastal town. Although touched upon in other areas of the Local Plan. The vision takes no account of 3 key factors:

1. Continuing global economic instability
2. Accelerating climate change, resulting in continuing weather/environmental instability.
3. The fact that AWC has very little (if any) influence or control over infrastructure. Consequently, privatised services such as bus and rail services, roads and house building; public services such as local health and (increasingly) education provision are beyond local control. Hence many of the challenges highlighted in the Local Plan cannot be met locally and we are all subject to ever more centralised/privatised systems of control.

Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?

In some areas yes, but please see our comments in Q1a & Q1c for additions

Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?

The sustainability of all developments and every new development's resilience to economic and environmental turbulence should feature in every aspect of the local plan - this should be signposted within the Vision.

We have the opportunity to become a town which leads by example by facing up to huge challenges positively and creatively. So, a revised Local Plan could offer all residents of Worthing a hopeful future, where intelligent (sustainable) economic growth will not condemn anyone in our town to live/work in worsening conditions. Worthing should be recognised as a place where disabled visitors will have comfortable access to all its delights and wonders; where Fair Trade dominates; where the Town's commitment to supporting carbon neutral, energy efficient, buildings will be self-evident; a Town which all will admire for its commitment to significantly improve its air quality by protecting its trees, parks, gardens and other green spaces; by installing electric car charging points throughout the Town to encourage electric vehicle use – a town where AWC initiates and facilitates local enterprises and local community cooperative undertakings.

Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?

Q2a) And Q2b) the sentiments are excellent BUT most of this is outside AWC's control.

Even points 5 & 6 which AWC planners and Councillors may want and may try to ensure are subjugated to central government demands. AWC has insufficient funds to take on developers in appeal proceedings. Conditions attached to planning approvals are rarely enforced, for the same reason. What measures would be put in place, to ensure all elements of the Local Plan are adhered to?

Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?

Again, the sentiments expressed are excellent, but AWC has little/no power to deliver against each item outlined.

How can the status quo of how Worthing has developed over time be truly challenged? How can the current system of thinking, designing and decision making be changed to allow for different voices to be heard to encourage a new way of economic development for Worthing?

When balancing pressures between employment, housing, retail and leisure. Which takes the highest priority and Why? Likewise, there is no mention of community space/public services?

Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?

Flexibility in approach will allow adaptability and resilience in the face of change. Nothing in the future is certain, except change! This has to be a key element within the plan that works to Worthing's advantage.

AWC has no control over privatised public transport (i.e. buses and trains). It has no control over the entrance routes to Worthing (highways are under the remit of WSCC). AWC has not even been able to ensure the development of the eyesore in Worthing - Teville Gate, visible to everyone entering the town from Worthing train station.

The Local Plan makes no mention of the intention by central government to widen the A27, to accommodate 4 lanes of traffic through densely populated areas of North Worthing - from the Coach and Horses pub to Lyons Farm and beyond. This development will have a significant impact on most of the greenery along the route, resulting in ever worsening air quality and thus worsening health conditions associated with air pollution.

The northern entrance to the town, via the A24, will also need to be significantly altered to meet with the widened A27, should the plans go ahead. It is not clear how this will impact upon the crematorium, amongst other local services, not to mention the adverse impact to Worthing's economy during the demolition and construction phases of the development, in addition to the consequent displacement of commuter traffic during this period onto the A259 and other smaller residential roads.

To add to the aforementioned A27 development, there is no sign that rail links will improve in the near future (or ever) and bus services will be severely disrupted for months (or even years). All of this will be occurring during the first few years of the new Local Plan being implemented, yet no suggestions are made about how to mitigate the worst impacts of the A27 widening.

Q3c - In addition to the sites already identified as having the potential to deliver employment land are there any other sites that could accommodate employment growth?

What research and data analysis has been carried out to review the many SME businesses that are set up in Worthing? The churn rate must be quite significant as the footfall in many areas is very low and not sustainable for the very small business.... What can be done to look at the spread of the many parades of business's... Can they be 'incubated' somewhere first or can there be a review of which areas are vital and what could be categorised for residential use and businesses helped to be in more central areas, with lower rates to grow the central town to give it a more localised feel and mix between high shop brands and local bespoke SMEs??

Would the plan consider people working from home as "employment land"? How is space for voluntary work categorised?

Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?

How are future needs to be identified and actioned?

How are "right time", "right size" and "right location" defined?

How are complementary needs prioritised and funded, if they will not directly generate profit?

Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?

Later opening hours in the evenings – at least during the summer months. Worthing center gets very quiet at around 5:30pm, with no option for late night shopping or café night life – there is only the option of pubs and restaurants.

Where retail space has not been occupied for a lengthy period of time (or is due to be refurbished, and thus no commercial entity would want to occupy the space), this should be advertised for community/voluntary/charity use at a subsidised rate. A great example of where this has worked in the past, in Worthing, is "Your Community Energy Shop" at Colonnade House.

Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?

Put the band stand back or something similar (as what is replacing it affords no shelter); install more seating and flower planters, add more shade by planting new trees (or retaining existing trees). Better street cleaning would inevitably help. A series of local community notice boards scattered across the town would really help to raise the profile of things going on in the town. AWC don't need to spend lots of money to improve the ambience in Worthing's centre

There has to be a very careful balance when bringing in new town centre development. It would be a travesty to lose the beautiful old buildings that give Worthing its unique character if new retail centres were to be built in their place.... In places such as Teville Gate, any sustainable development would be an advantage, but in the centre of Town would be more difficult. There is something about enhancing the buildings here (like Chichester & Lewes) that would give Worthing a charm to attract visitors rather than big, featureless shopping centres.

Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?

This is a really weak section. This requires much more thought around the vision..... Why would we want people to come to Worthing? What really sets it apart for other Coastal towns?

Worthing need not mimic on a small scale what other coastal towns do already. We cannot and should not try to outdo Chichester and Brighton.

Leafy Worthing has its own unique charm and can offer a range of family outdoor pursuits as well as cultural events. There is an opportunity here for a slightly calmer, friendlier and less frenetic seaside holiday centre as an alternative to Brighton. Worthing can become a place where people with disabilities of any kind know that they will be welcomed and able to take part in Worthing's rich natural and cultural heritage. Traditionally older people have moved to Worthing because the coastal area is flat and it's effortless to move around the town.

With regard to the above, there is no mention in this section of the Local Plan of improving the disabled facilities already available.

Make more/better use of the sea for tourism purposes; boat tours to the new off-shore wind farm would be great, to demonstrate how micro-ecosystems are created to enhance biodiversity and encourage smaller fishing vessels to operate around the turbines. We understand that this area will create a kind of reef which will act like marine conservation area.

Set up a maritime museum/education centre, emphasising the maritime history and fishing traditions.

Introduce small boat trips again to travel along this coastal region. Introduce small sea exploration trips.

Keep in mind the aim to reduce carbon footprint in all activities, which must inevitably be sustainable.

Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?

As above

Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?

Not only should infrastructure needs be identified; they also need to be funded and implemented!
This section cannot be considered in isolation from Environmental considerations.

Q6b - Do you have suggestions for how the Local Plan could resolve these?

Community energy should be an integral part of community and leisure facilities. Not only to reduce long term cost and carbon footprint, but also to provide an exemplar to the local community; to encourage other households to pursue sustainable energy sources/efficiency.

There is a move towards families with young children moving into Worthing, more/better facilities for children of all ages are needed to avoid the kinds of problems that occur when children become bored.

There needs to be an inclusion around what the Worthing society could look like in 10/15 years time and a flexible approach added here to enable change as needed. With the demographic changing and technology increasing this will lead to a very different look and feel as to how the generations will mix and live together and what their true future needs are.... Has any work been done to future proof this potential local societal change?

Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?

Infrastructure for disabled people, (to include visually impaired and special needs children and in particular much better motorised wheel chair access,) needs to be improved everywhere.

Consideration of Q6b

Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?

The key challenges appear to fly in the face of the proposed plan for widening the A27 i.e. this will affect an east-west cross-section of the town and (in the short-term, at least) increase congestion and lower air quality.

Great that "sustainable" and "alternative" forms of transport get a mention. Although there is no mention of "safe" or "affordable" forms of transport

Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?

Sustainable transport could be better promoted if there were clear safe and continuous cycle lanes, providing routes to all main locations within the town. Currently there are big gaps in cycle routes, making some particularly unsafe for cyclists

Locations of bus stops should be considered; to reduce congestion of cars queuing behind and to maximise the reach and efficiency of the service.

A huge way of promoting sustainable transport would be to get commuters out of their cars and on the trains! Can AWC have any impact on cost/reliability of trains?

Electric car charging stations should not just be limited to the multi-storey car parks. Car charging points should also be on the seafront and in residential areas, where need is identified and appropriate.

Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?

A) & B) this is an outstanding declaration of intent, but quite at odds with the very limited powers of AWC.

How is the value of undeveloped spaces to be weighed/measured?

With regard to the use of the phrase “environmental impact”, is this in relation to the human “built” environment, or closer to the natural environment of all types of living being?

How will levels of biodiversity be measured? What is the current level of biodiversity in Worthing? What action will be taken if there is indeed a net loss of biodiversity?

Q8b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could reach a balance between competing needs?

Only when specific competition arises. But all developments should include areas for trees; vegetation etc and all hard surfaces should be permeable. All new/refurbished buildings to be constructed with insulation, solar PV and/or solar thermal panels to reduce dependence on fossil fuel energy and centralised energy infrastructure.

Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?

Yes: areas of the South Downs National Park, but also Goring Gap & Titnore Lane woodland. For areas in flood risk areas; regardless of what flood defences are implemented, the flood water will need to disperse to another nearby area. Where will floodwater to Goring Gap (for example) drain to - the houses in adjacent areas?

Point 6 highlights the gap between AWC's fine aspirations and its incapacity to deliver them. For example, if the future development of the A27 goes ahead as planned, this will likely be at the detriment of air quality, and active travel (i.e. why would someone get the train to/from Worthing, when the access roads are much faster due to reduced congestion, cheaper and more reliable?)

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

We place immeasurable value on Worthing's remaining green spaces. They give Worthing distinctiveness, contribute towards health and well-being of everyone, regardless of age or income. They make Worthing a kind of oasis in the coastal concrete ribbon and the increasingly toxic road networks surrounding the area. These should be protected without a doubt.

Develop brown field sites, but DO NOT touch the few green spaces we have left. We need the greenery for our health and well being. To have a 100% built up area will be detrimental for all of us. Who would visit an area with no greenery? Who would want to live in a green-less area?

Yes we have the beach and yes we have the Downs, (as do the other coastal towns) but the green spaces help keep the balance and should be protected at all costs.

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

This is a difficult area.

If it is divorced from other infrastructure issues i.e. water stress, energy consumption, schools, healthcare, transport, parking, leisure opportunities and overarching environmental concerns, more social problems will inevitably follow. But of course, everyone needs and should have a home. AWC have the most difficult task of synchronising, as much as possible, house building with parallel infrastructure improvements. All of which needs to be done sustainably and in-keeping with Worthing's heritage and the local environment.

Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

There should be a variety of housing types available, to address needs. These needs will either have to be identified very early on in the build process, or the housing created needs to be flexible/adaptable enough to cope with varying needs i.e. multi-use and shared spaces, good access and low maintenance etc.

Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?

Population density should be no larger than what the infrastructure was designed to cope with. Thus, as per the above, infrastructure must be improved alongside any housing developments. However, regardless of how dense housing areas are, they should have access to green spaces, electric vehicle charging points and permeable hard surfaces.

Be brave and work towards a total upper limit of sustainable population.... We can't keep going just because.... We must enable other areas to reap the benefits of Worthing's continued growth...

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

Priority should be given to developing brown field sites, over green field sites. Worthing has no shortage of brown field sites, but is woefully lacking in green spaces relative to the built environment.

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

Mixed use should definitely include low cost/subsidised/free space for community use and business start ups.

Q10c - Are there any other potential development sites within the current built up area that should be assessed?

Other potential development sites could include retail units that have been vacant for long periods of time.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

No green spaces should be developed until all brownfield sites are exhausted. This will inevitably come at greater expense; however retaining green spaces into the long term would outweigh any additional short-term costs.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

Subject to A) above such sites should be developed for long-term cost effectiveness i.e. spend more in the short term on high quality, sustainable materials, invest in renewable infrastructure and architecture that integrates into the surroundings. Priority should be given to local residents and green sites, if used, should not be developed in order to attract new residents from out-of-town, but to house people that already reside in Worthing, either in rented accommodation or with parents/relatives/friends

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

Yes, plant more trees, maintain access for leisure use, perhaps allow volunteer groups to monitor the site and collect litter/enhance the site etc. Consider allowing community groups to grow edible plants and herbs in some areas. Otherwise, these sites should be left alone or maintained as they are currently. There should also be consideration given towards connecting each of the green field sites for better leisure access.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

Yes, subject to everything written above about infrastructure and environmental considerations i.e. develop brown field sites first.

Q12a - Do you have any views on how any of the listed policies should be worded?

A) B) & C) The item starting "Travellers and travelling show people" should be rephrased positively, as follows; "to consider favorably applications by Gypsies, travellers and travelling show people, provided they conform to established assessment criteria"
With regard to energy policy, what is meant by "low carbon" i.e. does this include nuclear and fracked gas? There is no mention of reducing energy consumption or energy efficiency, which is where the greatest (and cheapest) gains can be made.
In relation to "sustainable design" – all aspects (except water) are missing
Please define "affordable"
Pollution: what is an "acceptable" level of pollution?
Disabled access/facilities – not mentioned at all.

Q12b - Are there any policies missing from the list?

As per Q12a

Q12c - Are all of the listed policies required?

As per Q12a

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
ALAN BROWN
Your general comments:
I do agree with the Goring Residents Association that the Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm should be protected for the reasons given, i.e. Building would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape. The land at Goring Gap should be preserved (1) for agricultural use (2) as habitat for sea birds and wading birds and (3) flood risk. If consideration were to be given to housing it is essential that only high class development (i.e. 3/4 bedroomed houses) as was originally proposed for the Goring Hall Estate and even roads laid out which are still in existence but the development went no further than Aldsworth Avenue, Goring-by-Sea
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
Yes
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
Yes
Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?
No
Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?
Yes
Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?
Yes
Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?
Yes
Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?
More flexible in its approach
Q3c - In addition to the sites already identified as having the potential to deliver employment land are there any other sites that could accommodate employment growth?
No
Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?
Yes
Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?
As well as can be expected

Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?

Development of the Teville Gate Area is essential to the development of the Town Centre

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

Most important - we just do not have enough green spaces (for example, like Chichester)

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

No - community facilities important

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

Yes

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Melvyn Harvey

Your general comments:

I believe the time has come to say NO to any more building on green field sites apart from in exceptional cases. We have lost so much greenfield area in recent years and our town has become part of the sprawl along the South Coast. Visitor numbers will drop and it will no longer be the joy it has been to live here. With the help of our MP's and councillors we must say NO to quotas for new houses. It has got to come sometimes so why not now. I believe we are lucky to have the South Downs National Park so close to us.. We should embrace it and make it even better by not only not encroaching it but refusing to build any where near it, perhaps a two or three mile 'no more new buildings' from the boundary. Perhaps we could then keep Worthing a place for visitors to come and a place worth living in. I have lived in Worthing all my life and love it dearly, however I have seen this sprawl evolving. I do understand the need for housing as I have children however there is always a limit before a town is not worth living in.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Here I agree with the planning regarding the Goring-Ferring Gap and Chatsmore Farm. It is imperative that these areas should be protected just as much as the SDNP. We must stop the housing sprawl along the South Coast and also preserve the beautiful views of the sea, South Downs and wild life. It is this that makes Worthing worth living in and brings in visitors.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

This land should be protected in full. Already the building in this area has had a detrimental affect on wildlife and the visual appearance of Worthing. Titnore lane has always been a leafy entrance to parts of Worthing for visitors. It was not many years ago that I saw deer in north Titnore Lane, this is unlikely to happen now.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Clive Lacy
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
I strongly support protecting the Goring Gap both North & South from any development. These provide a unique unspoilt view between the South Downs National Park and the sea front, as well as protecting the individuality of Goring & Ferring. They also provide a valuable habitat for wildlife including sea birds & wading birds. It is a rural community amenity which is greatly appreciated & enjoyed by local residents.
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
I am firmly of the opinion that the Goring Gap both North & South should not be developed at all.
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
The Goring Gap both North & South should remain agricultural land as they are, a unique & valuable area of countryside which is readily accessible by the local community.

Clive Lacy

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I strongly support protecting the Goring Gap both North & South from any development. These provide a unique unspoilt view between the South Downs National Park and the sea front, as well as protecting the individuality of Goring & Ferring. They also provide a valuable habitat for wildlife including sea birds & wading birds. It is a rural community amenity which is greatly appreciated & enjoyed by local residents.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

I am firmly of the opinion that the Goring Gap both North & South should not be developed at all.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

The Goring Gap both North & South should remain agricultural land as they are, a unique & valuable area of countryside which is readily accessible by the local community.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Anthony Cartmell

Your general comments:

Worthing is slowly being strangled and poisoned by motor traffic. The problems caused by excessive motor car use are well-known and well documented, not least in this Plan. Yet the obvious solutions are completely missing from the plan: we are doomed to continue with motor traffic pollution, danger and congestion, to the detriment of local residents and the appeal of the town to visitors and tourists. This is very sad.

Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?

Yes, although it's rather vague and could cover almost anything.

Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?

Not really, it's a vague and generic: this Vision could apply to almost any town in the world.

Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?

Transport: a major and growing problem in the town.

Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?

Yes, in particular "Improve accessibility to services, local centres and the town by sustainable modes of transport, reducing the need to travel by car." is extremely important. Without that the town will continue to be dominated by motor traffic and congestion, especially if tourism, the local economy, and housing grow as planned.

Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?

No, they're generic and could apply equally to any town. There is no mention of Worthing's main distinctive assets, the good climate, flat terrain, proximity to the South Downs National Park, and, last but not least, the seafront, beaches and sea!

Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?

Transport has been missed. Worthing has limited space for car parking, and its roads are increasingly congested. This contrasts poorly with out-of-town developments which are easy to drive to and easy to park at. Worthing has attempted to increase motor trips into town by reducing car parking fees, but this has a maximum possible benefit limited by the number of parking spaces available, and could also back-fire by encouraging more people to park for longer, thus reducing the number of car trips made. There is no obvious solution to this motor-dependence, other than perhaps an expensive "park and ride" system - not usually very popular with people anyway.

A decent transport vision, to reduce motoring a little to increase the ability for people to use bicycles for local transport, would help a great deal. London is leading the way with Dutch-style cycleways which carry orders of magnitude more people per hour for a given amount of road space. Cycle parking is also much cheaper to provide, and significantly more space-efficient than car parking. Cycle parking can also be well distributed, so people can park right outside the shops they are visiting to save time and effort.

Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?

Worthing town centre is slow to reach by car, expensive to reach by bus, and unpleasant and dangerous to reach by bicycle. It would be relatively easy and highly cost-effective to make decent cycleways into, and across, town. At a stroke that would free up road space and parking space, as well as making it attractive for residents to cycle into town for shopping and leisure: more attractive than getting into a car and driving to out-of-town retail and entertainment. A Dutch-style town centre, dominated by people on foot and on bicycles instead of by motor cars, would make Worthing into a highly attractive seaside place to live, work and visit.

Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?

Emphasis small, local shops. Reduce emphasis on the same old national and international businesses that you can find anywhere in the UK. Make Worthing a seaside resort that's pleasant to visit and hang around in, and not yet another motor-infested slowly-dying standard town. We have the seaside, let's make full use of it!

Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?

No: there is a high demand for tourism by bicycle, both along the National Cycle Route along the south coast and for mountain bike access to the South Downs and the South Downs Way. Even with the current dangerous and unpleasant road conditions, many people choose to travel around Worthing on bicycles: there is huge suppressed demand from locals and visitors for safe cycleways for transport as well as leisure.

Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?

Invest heavily in the National Cycle Route 2 along the coast, widening it to conform to well-understood standards and providing multiple connecting cycleways between it and the town's various areas. People come from a long way to cycle along the coast between Worthing and Shoreham, and there is much potential for many more to do so. Studies have shown that cycle-based tourists spend more in total than those visiting in cars, and they tend to spend more in small local shops too.

Build a safe, wide, cycleway from Worthing to the South Downs Way above Washington, on the eastern verge of the A24. There is plenty of space, and only one very minor side road. Such a route would send a strong message that Worthing is a place to visit if you're wanting to mountain bike on the world-famous South Downs, and would also connect West Sussex's beautiful country lanes (the Beautiful Outdoors) to Worthing for leisure cyclists.

Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?

Yes, in general. "Community and leisure facilities are vital to supporting health and wellbeing" is very true, and one of the most-recommended leisure activity recommended by health professionals for fitness and mental health is cycling.

Again, while cycling has excellent and well-known health benefits, this form of leisure is not well catered for in Worthing. A relatively small investment in a network of safe and attractive cycleways could provide long-term revenue-spending-free leisure and health facilities for everyone.

Q6b - Do you have suggestions for how the Local Plan could resolve these?

A key local infrastructure need is for Worthing to catch up with, and hopefully overtake, the provision of safe attractive cycleways for people to use for both leisure and transport.

Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?

Safe and attractive cycleways - so desperately and obviously needed. Look at the investment London and Brighton are making, following the excellent examples and benefits seen in Denmark and the Netherlands. We can't afford not to invest in cycleways if we want Worthing to remain a pleasant and healthy town in future!

Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?

No, the plan says "There are a limited number of sites where sustainable modes of transport are most suited." which is wrong: there are a limited number of sites where non-sustainable modes of transport are most suited. Sustainable transport is most suited for all urban journeys, for all the good reasons stated in the plan.

The plan clearly states the obvious that Worthing is highly car-dependent and motor dominated, and that Worthing suffers from serious motor traffic congestion. The only way this dependency on motor transport, even for short local trips, is going to change is if road space is re-allocated away from motoring and towards sustainable modes of transport (e.g. bicycle, bus, rail). If there is currently enough space for motor traffic then there is plenty of space for cycleways. A classic example is the A24 between Broadwater (single-carriageway) and Worthing (single-carriageway) which is a needlessly-wide dual carriageway. It would be simple and highly cost-effective to remove one motor lane in each direction and convert to Dutch-style (or London-style) cycleways with kerbs to keep motor vehicles away from people on bicycles. This would, at a stroke, reduce motor traffic, reduce pollution and congestion in Worthing and in Broadwater, and help local residents to use bicycles for local transport with all the varied benefits that entails.

Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?

Yes, that's easy. Worthing and WSCC could invest in sustainable transport properly, instead of simply talking about it!

For a start, the mess on National Cycle Network Route 2 at the western end of the Prom could be fixed. Currently people using bicycles for transport are expected to stop and walk several hundred metres and re-

join the road network at a particularly unpleasant and dangerous location. WSCC appreciate this problem, and included plans to fix it in their last Local Transport Plan. The Worthing Cycle Forum has consistently placed this problem location as their top priority. There is S106 funding available and ready to spend. There is strong local support from the Goring Residents' Association. This is part of a highly popular nationally-important cycle route, that carries thousands of people, both locals and tourists, per day. Yet for some unknown reason progress on this project stalled a few years ago, and nothing has happened since. Come on, Worthing, this is an easy win-win for everyone!

To follow, the "Worthing Cycle Network" should be reviewed. It is still, after some decades, incomplete. Many sections of it are useless to cyclists, if not actually dangerous for anyone on a bicycle to follow. Worthing is twice as dangerous to cycle in than Chichester, Crawley or Horsham: this is a terrible situation for one of West Sussex's largest towns. Worthing completely missed out on any funding for cycleways from the last LTP award, while Chichester and Horsham had several million pounds spent on cycle schemes. East Sussex and Brighton are both authorities investing in cycleways, for the benefit of everyone whether cyclists or not. It is about time Worthing caught up!

Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?

Yes.

The environmental challenge of air pollution is clearly missing. With plans to more than double motor traffic on the A27, plans for thousands more homes, and no plans at all for sustainable transport, air pollution is a problem that will only increase.

Q8b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could reach a balance between competing needs?

Yes, sustainable transport needs to be considered at least as important, and invested in to at least the same level, as old-fashioned motor transport. We need actions, not just words.

Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?

Development should not be allowed, at all, on the South Downs. The Downs are one of Worthing's major assets, and building on them would kill this asset.

Development on green field sites should be resisted at all costs. We are slowly turning into one vast conurbation all the way along the south coast from Southampton to Brighton. If this continues then eventually "Worthing" will cease to have any real identity other than somewhere that once used to be an identifiable town.

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

Green spaces are massively important. It would be nice if some of them weren't so dominated and cut off by motor traffic.

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

No, housing fails if it does not come with employment, transport and community facilities. Housing must be considered as part of a complete package, and cannot be prioritised on its own.

Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

Reduce motor-dependency by providing cycleways, allowing for higher housing densities in the town that don't need car parking spaces included. Build housing near the railway station that explicitly does not provide car parking.

Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?

Motor traffic will increase as a problem, and congestion and pollution will worsen, unless we seriously provide for sustainable transport. The roads and streets of Worthing were not designed to allow every household to own a car.

As a side-effect, investing in cycleways and non-motor transport will benefit the many households in Worthing who currently do not have access to a car.

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Development should be allowed, in order to increase housing density, so long as the new developments are car-free. In this way more people can live in Worthing, housing can be more cost-effective and space-efficient, and the town will become more sociable as people walk and cycle and use buses to travel around.

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

Yes

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

We need social housing: council-owned stock for distribution to those who cannot afford to buy. We need dense, sustainable, housing, that works without every resident needing to own and use a car. Locations near the railway stations, and near the National Cycle Network along the coast, are clearly very suitable for such housing.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

None of these green-field sites should be developed, they should all be protected.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

They should not be developed.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

No, these sites are a long way from sustainable transport links, and will merely add to motor traffic congestion if developed. Remember: Worthing already has a significant motor traffic congestion and pollution problem. We need to avoid any development that will make this worse.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Pauline Fraser
Organisation (if applicable)
Worthing People's Assembly
Your general comments:
I have focused on examining the housing priorities of the plan. I have therefore restricted my comments to the sections on housing.
Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?
I concur with the proposal that there should be an increase of 636 homes per annum between now and 2031. There is a desperate need for more housing in Britain. Worthing needs to play its part. However, housing development needs to be part of an overall plan for employment and community facilities, including schools, health centres, leisure centres, etc. and the necessary infrastructure such as roads, street lighting, water and sewage. An integrated local public transport system of bus and rail should be prioritised, with a transport hub at rail stations, in order to lessen the impact of further car ownership and use, particularly in the town centre.
Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?
<p>I am most concerned about the delivery of new homes within the borough. I agree with the conclusion reached that 636 additional homes per annum should be made available. However, the focus seems to be on building new homes, both within the existing urban area and at edge of town, building a mix of affordable and market-price homes. I would like to ask:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * What consideration has been given to releasing further accommodation from the large number of unoccupied houses within Worthing? * What is the definition of affordable housing? * Are there plans for key worker accommodation schemes on a part-rent, part-buy basis, with the possibility of an initial 100% rent, increasing to purchasing a share of the property? * Given that there are many residents in private rented accommodation, including concealed households, who may not be able to afford an 'affordable home' of any kind, has thought been given to increasing the borough's stock of social housing, currently administered by Southern Housing Group? * What consideration has been given to increasing the type and quality of provision for the increasing number of homeless people in Worthing? At present services are coordinated by a consortium of voluntary groups under Worthing Churches Homeless Project. I think that the council itself should take more responsibility for tackling the needs of this group, which contains some of the most vulnerable people in Worthing.
Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?
<p>My first priority to mitigate the potential impacts of raised housing densities would be a restriction on the height of proposed sea-front developments. These should conform to the existing skyline.</p> <p>Clearly all new building needs to take account of added private car use and traffic density. An integrated plan to further encourage and promote public transport use, with transport hubs at local rail stations, should be part of the overall plan for additional housing. The necessary expansion /development of health centres, schools, leisure facilities, and so on, needs to be done in conjunction with new-build projects.</p>
Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?
I would like to see the maximum number of homes being created at the Teville Gate and the site between Union Place and Chatsworth Road.

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

I disagree with any plans for a multiplex cinema at Teville Gate, or anywhere else in the town centre. I think it would be detrimental to the local cultural centres at the Dome and Connaught.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I am a town centre resident so I think it would be inappropriate for me to comment in detail on proposals that will not directly affect me. However, I was interested to read, in particular, the detailed report from the Biodiversity, Environment, Green Infrastructure and Open Space consultants. In general I would prefer to see housing development taking place within the town, but if the proposed additional 636 homes per annum between now and 2031 cannot be accommodated within the already existing urban area, then I would put a high priority on respecting the conclusions of this particular report.

Q12a - Do you have any views on how any of the listed policies should be worded?

Clear, intelligible, accessible English please. If specific terms need to be used that may be familiar to town planners, but not to the rest of the community, and may be indispensable in a particular context, then a glossary should be provided.

Q12b - Are there any policies missing from the list?

A policy to address the need for social housing.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Patricia Farrell
Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?
There is a need to keep green spaces and gaps between housing. KEEP THE GORING/FERRING GAP FOR THE FUTURE.
Q8b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could reach a balance between competing needs?
Regenerate inside the town. Maybe use some of the proliferating charity shops for housing.
Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?
1 Flood risk areas and the remaining natural habitats for sea and wading birds. 2 Access to a rural environment for town dwellers during leisure time. 3 Destruction of grade 1 agricultural land.
Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?
Need to keep gaps between settlements like the GORING GAP for future generations to enjoy the views of downs and sea. Therefore no building should be allowed. Not even for leisure use. Green spaces are the lungs Worthing. The distinction between Goring (Worthing) and Ferring should be promoted not destroyed. Diversity and the opportunities to discover more about the environment are to be found instinctively by promoting these spaces and letting nature take over from the every increasing urban sprawl and sameness which is like a creeping plague ruining a good and healthy environment and thereby impacting on the health and well being of all present and future generations.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Miss M & Miss K Richards

Your general comments:

Question 11 Goring Gap South Side:

We understand that WBC have indicated that these Greenfield sites should be protected and remain as they are.

We heartily agree with this view. Having moved here less than 2 years ago for the peace and rural aspect of this residential area, we would not want to see this environment lost through development. The Gap affords local residents and visitors from further afield a tranquility and access to nature that cannot be found along much of our coastline due to over development.

With the sea to the south and the wonderful green scapes making up The Gap looking north to the Downs it would completely ruin the sense of space and nature.

Infrastructure, particularly roads and schools is sufficient for current local demands but would be insufficient in the case of development.

We clearly feel The Gap should remain as it is giving a distinct boundary between Goring by Sea and Ferring.

Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?

Current offer looks tired and unwelcoming.

Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?

Beat Brighton & Hove to building an ice rink as they have talked about building one for years. Build an outdoor swimming lido on the beach rather like Bude Sea Pool or Tinside Lido in Plymouth. With the increase of cycling, perhaps a cycling track for safer cycling a more modern version of B&H's Preston Park track.

Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?

Extend the cycle path along the seafront from West Worthing through to Ferring. There is ample space for a pedestrian path and cycle path. Assist with health and safe cycling.

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

The green spaces are crucial for locals as benefit well being and should be preserved.

Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

Build on brown field sites first. Some sites have been vacant and boarded with no signs of development.

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Yes

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Question 11 Goring Gap South Side:

We understand that WBC have indicated that these Greenfield sites should be protected and remain as they are.

We heartily agree with this view. Having moved here less than 2 years ago for the peace and rural aspect of this residential area, we would not want to see this environment lost through development. The Gap affords local residents and visitors from further afield a tranquility and access to nature that cannot be found along much of our coastline due to over development.

With the sea to the south and the wonderful green scapes making up The Gap looking north to the Downs it would completely ruin the sense of space and nature.

Infrastructure, particularly roads and schools is sufficient for current local demands but would be insufficient in the case of development.

We clearly feel The Gap should remain as it is giving a distinct boundary between Goring by Sea and Ferring.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Brian Hurd

Organisation (if applicable)

Resident, Worthing born

Your general comments:

The Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm give the people of Worthing and Ferring an important breathing space; the view from Highdown in the north right down to the sea is vital to keep. To develop this greenspace would deprive Worthing of one of its treasures!

Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm - It is imperative that we keep these greenfield sites in my opinion. It would be a grave mistake to develop them and deny the Worthing and Ferring residents this breathing space from Highdown in the north right down to the sea - vital and beautiful!

Please keep new Blocks of dwellings to an acceptable height. I would prefer to see new seaside residences to be no more than 8 storeys especially when building next to existing properties.

I read the Plan through at Goring Library and agreed with the column 'Landscape Study Findings' on pages 29 and 30.

Thank you.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Jane Coutts

Your general comments:

Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm are greenfield sites with views to Highdown and the sea, and any building will spoil the landscape. The A259 is already very busy and frequently congested, without the extra traffic from proposed new housing.

These areas are agricultural, but also prone to flooding, so not ideal for development. They are also important for wildlife that roosts and nests there.

Goring and Ferring are 2 independent communities but should these developments take place they will be merged and consequently lose their individuality.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Colin Willetts
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
I agree with the Vision outlined
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
Yes
Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?
Limited land means the surrounding countryside needs to be fully protected.
Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?
Yes
Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?
Yes
Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?
With little land available within the Borough that is not in the SDNP it is important to make the most efficient use of existing sites.
Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?
Employment areas should be protected.
Q3c - In addition to the sites already identified as having the potential to deliver employment land are there any other sites that could accommodate employment growth?
I am not aware of any other sites.
Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?
The key challenges have been identified.
Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?
Some retail centres are looking rather dated and could do with some modernisation.
Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?
Some parts of the town centre seem to be solely occupied by charity shops and estate agents, perhaps something could be done to encourage some diversity.
Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?
The key challenges for tourism have been identified.
Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?
Tourism could be improved by providing activities for a wider age group and improving the rather tired Lido area.
Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different

infrastructure needs? Are any missing?
The main challenges have been identified.
Q6b - Do you have suggestions for how the Local Plan could resolve these?
Not building on the few open spaces we have left.
Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?
Not that I am aware of.
Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?
The main challenges have been identified. Air quality along the A27 is unlikely to improve until the congestion caused by the through traffic is alleviated. This is not likely to be any time soon as the previously proposed bypass schemes to the North of the town are now within the SDMP. The A27 Worthing to Lancing is the least of the problem; more needs be done about the single carriageway section through the West and North of the town.
Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?
No
Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?
Yes
Q8b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could reach a balance between competing needs?
Make full use of existing brown field sites
Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?
Building on what is currently farm and open spaces on the edges of town will only exasperate the flooding problems, this can already be seen where culverting of the Teville stream causes flooding in parts of the town
Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?
Maintaining the borough's green spaces is vital to the natural environment and biodiversity.
Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?
Housing should not be given higher priority than all other development needs or Worthing could become a purely dormitory Borough.
Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?
All types of housing are necessary.
Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?
While efficient use of land will help to raise densities care should be taken to avoid overcrowding areas.
Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?
Garden development should be monitored to avoid changing the character of an area and increasing any flood risk
Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?
The brown field sites need to be fully utilised
Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?
The plan seems to provide a good mix of usage.

Q10c - Are there any other potential development sites within the current built up area that should be assessed?

Not aware of any other sites.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

All of these should be protected although some are within existing development areas, the sites are on the outer edges of the town that are countryside in nature should be protected.
The Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm should definitely be protected. To develop these sites may produce a short term solution to the housing problem but the loss of the natural environment would be permanent.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

I would be highly resistant to that development but if there is to be development it should be limited.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

The Goring Gap should not be developed; it is a valuable area of countryside and farmland. It is the only undeveloped stretch of coastline on the sea front within the Worthing Borough that provides an open vista between the sea and the SDNP.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

These areas are already adjacent to existing development so could be utilised if necessary.

Q12a - Do you have any views on how any of the listed policies should be worded?

The wording of the policies should be clear and unambiguous.

Q12b - Are there any policies missing from the list?

Not that I am aware of, the list appears to be very comprehensive.

Q12c - Are all of the listed policies required?

All of these policies are required; it is important to try and alleviate the flooding risk and maintain the green areas for future generations.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Geoffrey Trueman
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
The Goring Gap South side and Chatsmore Farm should be protected.
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
They should not be developed because they have an uninterrupted view from the sea to the South Downs. The building would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape and agricultural land will be destroyed. There would be a concern for flood risk.
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
They should be protected as they are and remain as Greenfield sites as at the present time.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Mr P E and Mrs P Y Croucher
Organisation (if applicable)
-
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
We have views on the following sites: Upper Brighton Road, Worthing United Football Club and the land North of Beeches Avenue.
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
Any development of these areas, particularly if for housing, will exacerbate the already desperate traffic situation on the A27 through Worthing which is at its worst at Lyons Farm interchange and Grove Lodge roundabout. The current proposals for the improvement of the A27 through Worthing following the existing route will not cope adequately with the current and future traffic flows even before any development of these sites occurred which generated significant traffic movement.
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
Open space/recreational use. Housing however would be the obvious and better use, provided the traffic problems (and the infrastructure requirements of more housing) can be properly addressed.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
David Lacy
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
I am writing to support the protection of Goring Gap both North & South. My reasons for this include: The Gap is unique to Sussex with unspoilt views between the sea & historic downland. This would be lost if the site remains unprotected. The Gap provides a link to our rural past by means of agriculture, and provides a valuable habitat for seabirds.
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
I believe most strongly that the Goring Gap both North & South should not be developed at all.
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
They should remain agricultural land & be protected from future development, and so continue to be an amenity enjoyed by local residents & visitors alike.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Phillip Ellis
Your general comments:
A reasonable document that is weak in part and must be strengthened to resist government ruling.
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
Yes
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
Yes especially comment on limited land resources, a huge challenge/
Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?
A fair vision for the town.
Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?
WE must ensure we protect the character of the town against government legislation.
Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?
Strengthen policy with tourism.
Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?
Yes
Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?
I do not believe we need so many shops as we all now buy on line a huge challenge.
Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?
Not entirely i.e. Beales that is clearly struggling.
Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?
No. We do not appear to encourage tourism.
Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?
Clear policies especially improving accommodation ie more new hotels.
Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?
I fear we have a shortage of leisure facilities for the future.
Q6b - Do you have suggestions for how the Local Plan could resolve these?
Strengthen policy to improve and match leisure facilities required for the future.
Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?
Swimming
Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?
ensure the A27 and A259 are improved and other roads to reduce traffic jams daily.

Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?

Better bus services and for schools to reduce parents school run.

Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?

Basically agree/Our greenspaces must be preserved and enhanced.

Q8b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could reach a balance between competing needs?

Retain greenspaces.

Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?

Taking up greenspaces around the town for development.

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

Our green spaces are very important as lungs for the town and areas for the community to enjoy. we must resist development of green spaces ie the two Goring gaps north and south of railway line. the edge of the borough should blend in with the South Downs National Park.

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

Housing and employment development should be balanced to meet needs of both.

Priority needs to be given to affordable and social housing of which there is a shortage. Housing for people wanting to move into area should be given a low priority.

The south east is already over populated and new housing should concentrate on less densely area of England. Holland is the most densely populated country in Europe, the south east of England has double the density of Holland.

A requirement to build 636 units per annum is far too high for a seaside town with only 180 degree opportunity to build.

There should certainly be a policy to resist inappropriate developments ie tower blocks.

Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

Housing should be firstly for people in Worthing without homes and not for those moving in from other areas ie Brighton and London. More affordable housing and fewer large houses.

Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?

not use up all our green spaces of which there are now few remaining.

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Yes most important to retain character of town. No sea front tall blocks

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

The HMRC site might be better retained for employment.

Care must be taken with decoy site in respect of flooding, remember there were watercress beds many years ago.

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

There has to be a balance with employment use of land.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

It is important to continue to use the Titnore site for caravans but needs urgent overall ie foul drainage. many people visit the town for holidays and to visit families an important facility.
The to strategic gaps north and south of railway between Goring and Ferring should be retained. However I am concerned that continual agricultural use is not sustainable. There has to be along term vision for these two areas to prevent development pressure.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

Open areas for sport and for biodiversity.

Q12a - Do you have any views on how any of the listed policies should be worded?

Housing mix and quality should match local demands and not profit for developers.

Water quality should consider reuse of grey water within any development.

strengthen policy on infrastructure so services functions and roads do not become clogged with traffic.

Visitor policy is weak making it appear that we do not want visitors.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Luke Angel

Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?

- Invest (or encourage investment) in sustainable green industries and local energy cooperatives. Increase in wind farms on the coast and on the downs.
- Drive for solar energy panels on communal/public buildings and homes. Drive for better heating insulation in homes- creating more employment.
- Encourage living wage (£10 per hour) from all employers in Worthing area given high property prices and living costs similar to London. As a consequence people will have more money to spend in the local economy

Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?

- Encourage diversity in local businesses – reduced rents for new businesses
- Pop up shops in derelict retail sites
- No more supermarket planning permission- Worthing has plenty
- Co-ordinated 'buy local' festivals- promotion of local businesses encouraged by Council

Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?

- Bring back tourist information centre to include historical look at the town and promote local businesses and attractions

Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?

- Commitment to protect and maintain recreation parks
- Use Lido stage for free outdoor performances
- Open Colonnade House as free cultural centre – art fairs and installations
- Properly protect NHS (including no more outsourcing) and schools from cuts – no more privatisation and academisation
- More investment in mental health and recovery services
- Community centre to educate residents on different issues, interest groups and have talks including regular question time for Council and local MP
- Community centre could also provide 'pay as you feel/can afford' café food from foodbanks and fairshare to help poorer residents of Worthing

Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?

- Better cycle routes all over Worthing
- Council work with charity Sustrans to extend sea front cycle coastal route from Worthing to Angmering
- 20s plenty speed limit or better signage/humps to reduce speeding/dangerous driving around Worthing
- Extra carriages on trains and more space for bicycles
- Reduced fares between Worthing and Brighton (extend flat rate £2 per fare after 7pm by Stagecoach to all fares for trains and buses)- to reduce car use and traffic congestion on A27 and other roads

Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?

- Commitment to protect Downs and wildlife conservation
- Commitment to ban pesticides (in public places) and fracking in West Sussex
- Diversity in flora to encourage bees
- Better education in recycling (what can be recycled)- leaflet campaign
- Public/street recycle bins

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

- Re-address balance between over surplus of luxury housing and need for more social housing
- Give priority and reserve land for social housing providers to put derelict spaces and building into use for social housing (including supported housing – adult mental health)

- Social housing would be better use of derelict sites at Grafton road car park, Teville Gate, Aquarena and area opposite Waitrose
- Any income generated from selling off of social housing should go 100% back into building more social housing
- Night shelters all year round (not just between Nov-March) so homeless have safe space to stay temporarily until space available at hostel
- Ban on property agency fees – fees should be covered by landlord not tenant
- Rights for tenants- open a register for all buy to let landlords in area or licensing system so they can be held accountable for not carrying out repairs, being disreputable and to stop revenge evictions of tenants who request repairs
- Rent cap proportionate to the Local Housing Allowance as defined by Council
- Stop discrimination against people on income support- Council could work with tenants/property agencies/landlords to provide assurance housing benefit can be paid directly for rent- No DSS rule causes/entrenches homelessness

Q12a - Do you have any views on how any of the listed policies should be worded?

- Re-address balance with derelict land given preference to housing associations over property investors. No more supermarket planning permission- Worthing has plenty

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Michael Robinson

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Goring Gap South Side should be protected. As agricultural land it is a key positive characteristic of the local and greater area and forms an essential part of a balanced economy which is attractive to tourism. It separates and protects the individual communities on either side and provides unique views of the sea and the South Downs. It provides a habitat for wildlife, including birds. Building would have a highly detrimental effect on the character of the landscape. The areas surrounding the Goring Gap South Side have limited access via residential roads and would not be able to cope with increased traffic associated with any development.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Penelope Robinson

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Goring Gap South Side should be protected. As agricultural land it is a key positive characteristic of the local and greater area and forms an essential part of a balanced economy which is attractive to tourism. It separates and protects the individual communities on either side and provides unique views of the sea and the South Downs. It provides a habitat for wildlife, including birds. Building would have a highly detrimental effect on the character of the landscape. The areas surrounding the Goring Gap South Side have limited access via residential roads and would not be able to cope with increased traffic associated with any development.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Miriam and Peter Webb

Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?

Yes, I agree with the vision of the Council

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

The Goring Gap South side and Chatsmore Farm are Greenfield sites and should be protected and remain as they are. We support the council in their decision to do so.
Our reasons for supporting the council are that the Gap offers uninterrupted views from the sea to the South Downs. We feel any building on this site would have a very significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape. Any building would cause a flood risk to the area.
As this is Grade 1 agricultural land it must be protected and not destroyed by any development as this area is an important habitat for sea birds and wading birds who are roosting or resting during migration times.
The individuality of the Goring/Ferring communities and council's, Worthing/Arun, must be protected and in their indication that this site should be protected the Council are wholeheartedly correct.
We support the Council 100% on their decision.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Karen Neal

Your general comments:

I have commented on Edge of Town Development Opportunities (Q11a).

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm should be protected. Goring Gap offers a remaining uninterrupted view from the beach to the South Downs. Any building on this land would be detrimental to the area and would destroy the current wildlife which thrives there. We need to keep this agricultural land. Worthing & Arun Councils have a responsibility to the community to keep this green belt land for enjoyment for not only the community but for the many visitors to the area. We have more than enough houses being built in the Worthing area and you only have to look at the current traffic jams almost everywhere in the area and at the busiest times of the day to see that we do not have the infrastructure to cope with any more. We must make sure that this area continues to be the attraction that it is and not destroy it by filling it with concrete and destroying the very essence of the lovely area that we are all able to enjoy.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Penelope Lacy
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
I strongly believe that the Goring Gap both North & South should be protected. The Goring gap offers splendid views from the sea to the downs and any building would have a significant & detrimental effect on the character of the landscape. The area is also a haven for wildlife such as wading & seabirds and should be preserved for future generations.
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
I firmly believe there should not be any development at all on the Goring Gap both North & South.
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
The Goring Gap both North & South should remain grade 1 agricultural land & continue to be used & enjoyed by the local community as it is today.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Nicholas Harvey

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

The Goring Gap and Chatsworth Farm should be protected and remain as they are.

I feel that this is a unique greenfield area on the South Coast which links the Downs with the Coast. In its current form, it offers important space for visitors and the local community to enjoy as well as being an important habitat for birds and wildlife.

Valuable farmland would be lost and the appeal for the area as a visitor attraction would be diminished.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

Any form of development would have a significant impact on the appeal of this area.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

To continue to make best use of the existing farm land, and to ensure proper controls on camping / litter etc. are enforced in the public spaces.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Vernon Kitch

Your general comments:

In the past preparations of Worthing Plans has been good, but implementation not so good. For the major proposals, like Teville Gate, I suggest that implementation would be achieved more rapidly if task forces were appointed to monitor their progress against set target dates.

Critical Success Factors should be determined, and the Chief Executive made responsible for their realisation. For example, several major proposals are dependent on transport links, particularly the A27, being improved to increase the popularity of Worthing.

Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?

What sectors of the tourist market is Worthing trying to attract?

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

Considerable value. One section of the Plan refers to review of green spaces, and enhancement if possible. Some Green Spaces are best left as they are. Enhancement in these cases will not be an improvement. I suggest that "if desirable" is added to the comment about enhancement.

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

They all have to be balanced.

Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?

High rise buildings are needed, but not close to the sea front.

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Most certainly, provided that one can agree what is "inappropriate"

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Until now, the Goring Gap has referred to land north and south of the railway line. Now the Council is splitting the area and introducing a new name, Chatsmore Farm, for the northern half.

The recognised policy has been to defend The Gap. By introducing a new name for part of The Gap, is the Council, despite its declared policy of protecting The Gap (North and South) proposing to allow building on "Chatsmore Farm", and still say it is defending The Gap. If not, then no reason to introduce a new name. Keep "The Gap" for the whole area, as in previous Plans.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

David Carless

Your general comments:

Hi,

I would like to object to the planned proposal to develop the land to the north of Beeches Avenue. We as a family live in this road and have done since 2002.

Currently the access into and out of Beeches Avenue is very problematic on all but the night-time. You can frequently wait several minutes just to pull out onto the extremely busy A27, therefore adding perhaps another 90 houses behind us, with the resultant increase in car use would exacerbate this still further.

In addition, the rain water that flows down our road from the South Downs National Park is frequently enough to flood the junction between Beeches Avenue and the A27. This results in a further slowdown in traffic on the main arterial road for East and West Sussex. The addition of any additional properties built on the edge of the SDNP will make this issue much, much worse in the future. Last Friday the 17th of June 2016, so much rain flowed down from the SDNP that it flooded right through Broadwater. Building over this natural drainage of the fields above Beeches Avenue would only cause further problems in the town.

I believe that everyone accepts the area above the A27 around the Lyons Farm area has mistakenly been overdeveloped over the years and has severely hampered the flow of traffic through the Sussex counties. Surely adding to this problem with extra properties is foolish beyond belief?

Regards,
David

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Michael Hall
Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?
I agree with the proposals for development within the town.
Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?
No
Q10c - Are there any other potential development sites within the current built up area that should be assessed?
I am not aware of any.
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
The current caravan site does provide facilities for visiting caravan owners and as such it may be prudent to retain this site but dependant on use reduce the area for caravans and develop the surplus. The Chatsmore Farm (site No5) and the Goring Gap (site No4) are extremely important as a natural break in the built up areas of the local and adjacent coastal strip. Loss of these two areas to any type of development would, as stated in the proposed Worthing Local Plan, have a detrimental effect on the character of the landscape and the visual aspect. In my opinion it is essential that the existing "Green Lung" that at present separates east and west is retained together with the view northwards to the National Park and southwards to the English Channel. Consequentially development of any kind should not be permitted and these two particular sites retained in their present natural state which includes agricultural use.
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
Retained as now.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Andrew Byford
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
I would like to see the areas of 4 & 5 protected, Goring and Ferring Gap . Building on that land would have a detrimental effect on the whole area. The housing that would fill that land would be enough for an entire village. The social infrastructure of the area, being that it is enclosed, would be crippling to the current community.
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
Please leave them clear and free. Open spaces free the mind wherever they are. We need a bit of rural landscape, it helps to keep the balance of wildlife in exsistance.

Andrew Byford

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I would like to see the areas of 4 & 5 protected, Goring and Ferring Gap . Building on that land would have a detrimental effect on the whole area. The housing that would fill that land would be enough for an entire village. The social infrastructure of the area, being that it is enclosed, would be crippling to the current community.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

Please leave them clear and free. Open spaces free the mind wherever they are. We need a bit of rural landscape, it helps to keep the balance of wildlife in exsistance.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Joan Saunders

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

I believe we should separate and protect the individuality of the two communities (Goring and Ferring).
The gap offers an uninterrupted and unique view from the sea to the South Downs.
Building would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape.
Grade 1 agricultural land will be destroyed if developed.
Flood Risk
The gap is a habitat for sea birds and wading birds who are roosting or resting during migration times
Rural environment with an easy urban access.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Michelle Furtado
Your general comments:
As a starting document I was pleased to see the inclusion of adaptation and mitigation for climate change. Ensuring any development achieves high levels of sustainability should be a given. I attended a conference once where developers stated that whatever the policies were in local areas they would deliver them - don't be scared of ensuring development is ambitious.
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
Yes - overall very good.
Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?
Sustainability should be included/mentioned - "land resources will have been developed in the most sustainable and efficient way..."
Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?
Under community - high quality, sustainable new homes Under environment - consider a green infrastructure plan to deliver environmental improvements Pleased to see climate change effects considered
Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?
Consider low cost office/studio/nuturing/incubator spaces for start ups
Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?
Opportunities for improved green infrastructure, pop-up shops, showcase venues
Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?
Map community organisations, networks and volunteers to define their needs. Consider dementia friendly public realm
Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?
Improve green infrastructure. Consider walking signage - think London style Ensure adequate seating is available for those walking - my Mum always has the problem of where to rest regularly
Q8b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could reach a balance between competing needs?
Ensure high quality developments included green infrastructure and sustainable urban drainage
Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?
Very high value - I'm a Mum to two young children and rely on the green spaces for leisure and play
Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?
Unsure - where appropriate development should be mixed
Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Yes predominantly, unless exceptional sustainable credentials

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Sally Byford
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
I believe The Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm sites should be protected as they separate and protect the individuality of the communities of Goring and Ferring. Any building would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape. Grade 1 agricultural land will be destroyed if developed. These areas provide a rural environment within easy reach of the urban regions.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Daryl Peters

Your general comments:

I would like to start by saying that unfortunately I was unaware of this particular consultation and have come to it late and some what unprepared. I currently live at home with my parents. I am one of those individuals in my 30's who is in the unenviable position of being unable to afford my own property in the Worthing area. I was born in Worthing and lived here my entire life (37 years). I currently commute to my place of employment in Brighton.

I accept that housing is a necessity for all people, do I agree with this constant desire to blame the 'lack' of housing on the lack of physical properties and this insistence on modern societies aim of one property for one person/generation not entirely. However it is a reality. But and this is a big but, we have an obligation to future generations to ensure the decisions we make now are not short sighted or based on short term targets at the expense of long term impacts.

With that in mind I have submitted the following comments regarding the Worthing Local Plan. As stated above there are some decisions that should not be taken lightly and some which as far as I am concerned are not to be made due to short term financial considerations and or the profiteering of potential developers. By this I mean important considerations related to environmental impacts, flood mitigation, long term food and energy security.

No development should be given permission without the provision of adequate water recycling, energy saving measures, self-sufficient power generation and inclusion of suitable community areas. We should be embracing modern environmental building practices; Worthing could be seen as the lead for environmental builds in the Country! This in itself could bring additional business and visitors to the local area. Furthermore the increase in housing and local population should be matched by suitable and effective sewage processing on top of household waste disposal aiming at exceeding nationally set recycling targets which should reach 50% by 2020.

All properties approved for development should achieve the highest standards of energy saving, water conservation and flood mitigation measures. We should aim to minimise the overall impact on surrounding habitats especially woodlands and others habitats of important biodiversity such as ponds and wetlands/floodplains. The former being recognised as important carbon sinks useful in reducing carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and the latter important in flood mitigation.

Adequate and effective local transport infrastructure is also vitally important for a number of important reasons not just in reducing environmental impacts and carbon footprints. Those requiring social housing may well need access to the transport infrastructure to allow integration within the local community and access to employment opportunities and adequate welfare facilities.

Another important consideration is long term use of Agricultural land and its effect on food security, as of 2015 around 70% of UK land area (down by 0.5% on 2014) was agricultural, this sounds like an enormous amount but when consideration is given to population numbers, future population growth and food consumption in line with our ecological footprint this will be put under severe pressure in the very near future.

Finally community based facilities and areas such as parks, community centres, sport facilities etc are essential for social cohesion and population health and welfare. The impact on the local population when increased housing built with little consideration to those facilities is clearly evident in socially deprived areas where levels of crime, poor life expectancy and mental health is measurably higher than in areas where those facilities are present.

We do as a society need to make some incredibly important but difficult decisions with consideration for our future and that of our children. However we need to look to our local government to listen to our views, make some of those difficult decisions and to some extent lead the way looking not just at the next 10 or 15 years but much longer.

I hope that these comments do not fall on deaf ears, many of the right decisions are definitely not the easiest but they are more often than not the correct ones. I certainly do not want the next generation living in a house surrounded by irrecoverable environmental damage, rationing food and energy and unable to insure for regular flooding damage!

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Kathryn Adderson
Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?
Huge value.
Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?
No
Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?
Use brown field sites. Convert the central post office and town hall into flats.
Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?
Yes
Q10c - Are there any other potential development sites within the current built up area that should be assessed?
Town Hall and Post Office - convert to flats if the housing need is so great.
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
Protect the Goring-Ferring Gap - it is the last undeveloped area along the coast and is unique and beautiful. Birds migrate here, people walk here and it provides a quiet area for well being.
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
The Goring-Ferring Gap could become a nature reserve.
Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?
Consider other options before building on green field sites.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
ROLAND BOXALL
Your general comments:
I would like to register my support for the Worthing Local Plan and make specific comment regarding edge of town development.
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
I support the councils view and feel that sites 4 and 5 should be protected.
Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?
Mixed development.
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
If possible under current planning legislation it would be very desirable to designate this land to give it added protection and reassure the community that these valuable unspoilt open spaces will not be threatened by development in the future.
Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?
As these sites are within the existing built up area boundary, I see no objection to bringing forward these sites.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Steve Limbrey
Your general comments:
I welcome the opportunity to contribute to the creation of the plan. In general the draft plan is going in the right direction and I pleased to see that climate change and the environment are given due consideration, though believe that more could be done in this respect.
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
In general as an over arching vision yes, but a balance needs to be achieved to ensure that significant inward investment does not lead to increased pressure on infrastructure due to more people moving to the town. Ideally any new employment would aim to reduce the proportion of the towns workforce that commute out of the Borough to work each day.
Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?
Housing should be sustainable as well as high quality. I would also like to see consideration given to housing designed for life - i.e. it is suitable for the different stages of residents lives, being easily adaptable as we grow older or if suffering from disability. I fully endorse anything that could help with sustainable travel but would question how much of that is within the remit of AWC. One suggestion would be for new residential development to include some commercial sites to reduce the need to travel to work.
Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?
With regard to tourism it would be nice to see the town build on the cultural improvements that have been made recently. Arts events such as WOW and artists open houses are more welcome than trying to compete with Brighton for traditional seaside entertainment. Worthing needs to have a distinctive niche of its own. With the advent of the Rampion wind farm and the South Downs behind us how about developing a niche around sustainability?
Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?
The plan does not include high tech industries as an employment growth area despite high profile companies such as B&W, Rayner, Lemo, ETI, etc being situated in the town.
Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?
Flexibility would help to intersperse employment and residential areas, riding travel to work
Q3c - In addition to the sites already identified as having the potential to deliver employment land are there any other sites that could accommodate employment growth?
Industrial parks such as Dominion Way do seem to be spread out. Would it be possible to infill some of the space these take up?
Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?
Worthing seems to have weathered changes in retail sector better than many comparable towns with the development of a thriving arts, cafe and restaurant scene over recent years. It would be nice if this could be kept distinctive rather than following every other town down the route of national chains.
Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?
The town centre does not seem to be much of a destination for food sales - there is no deli for instance and the farmers market died. How could we encourage more sustainable food shopping?
Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?

Tourism should be encouraged, but it must be the right type of tourism that does not impose on the residents amenity. In particular we should discourage noisy outdoor evening events.

Q6b - Do you have suggestions for how the Local Plan could resolve these?

Local residents associations need support to be able to serve their communities, including support / attendance by councillors.

Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?

The town needs a centre that offers community groups the facilities they need to operate, with meeting rooms, offices, shared printing facilities etc. In addition there needs to be central point where residents can find out what is on. One suggestion would be a network of community notice boards.

Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?

In general yes, but there will need to be a balance between making the town a destination for people living outside of it the ability of the transport infrastructure to handle that. Transport needs to be considered holistically with employment, housing etc. If we can reduce the need to travel outside of the borough for employment it would greatly reduce the current transport stresses.

Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?

An improved cycle network, including a quiet streets network away from the seafront to encourage cycling during inclement weather. A properly thought out speed reduction strategy for residential areas along the lines of 20's plenty. The previous consultation on this was unfortunately hijacked by misinformation leading to rejection of proposals which are being adopted in many other towns.

Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?

Climate change needs to be seen as a key challenge

Q8b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could reach a balance between competing needs?

New development can be encouraged to adopt sustainable building practices such as energy efficiency and reduced water use. Development on flood prone land can be done as long as it is designed properly. I would discourage further development over residential gardens to protect green spaces and bio-diversity.

Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?

Strategic gaps should be protected and no further development north the A27

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

Green spaces are very important to the town. As a climate change adaptation measure they help to reduce heat island effect. I would like to see more town centre and streetscape planting of trees.

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

The plan does not mention vacant housing stock being used as a resource which could be utilised before building new property. Has a study been carried out to ascertain the level of this?

AWC need to resist centrally imposed housing targets that take no account of the towns geographical or infrastructure situations

Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

We should encourage housing to be designed with lifetime occupation in mind so that it is easily adapted as our lives change.

Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?

Where possible green spaces including gardens must be protected

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Yes

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

Yes

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

Development must be kept in scale with surrounding area.

Q10c - Are there any other potential development sites within the current built up area that should be assessed?

Industrial estates appear to be sparsely developed and may offer some opportunities for development

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

Definitely not Goring Gap or any site which developed high quality agricultural land

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

7 yes, 8 no

Q12a - Do you have any views on how any of the listed policies should be worded?

Not at this stage

Q12c - Are all of the listed policies required?

Seems a fairly comprehensive list

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

David Lopez Aragon

Your general comments:

In general, it is important to recognise and preserve the coastal history of our area and not to build in such a manner that the emphasis is on style over both substance and appropriateness.

The space available here is extremely limited and being hemmed in by sea on one side and the South Downs on the other, we must ensure any redevelopment or new development is made with extreme care and with sustainability as a main factor.

More emphasis should be placed on "Eco" and "Green" technologies that already exist that should be implemented - solar and wind energy, for example.

Some type of shuttle train/tram connecting central Worthing to outlying areas should be considered. The buses are very polluting and expensive. There shouldn't really be any more car parking (unless underground). A futuristic small train/tram shuttle to help locals commute short distances would make Worthing unique.

Please do not follow the lead of Brighton - the 360 tower looks awful and is utterly pointless. This type of thing does not attract tourists - it would just be a waste of money to create an eyesore. Far better to develop indoor leisure and entertainment for those not so Sunny days, whilst also maintaining the beach as clean as possible.

Particular areas of concern regarding the Plan are the Goring Gap (both south side and north side).

This area helps separate and preserve the individuality of the two communities (Goring and Ferring).

The Goring Gap offers unique uninterrupted views from the sea all the way to the South Downs - this is an asset and should be preserved.

Any type of building on the Gap, or indeed, near the perimeter of it, would have a significant adverse effect on the character of the landscape.

Grade 1 agricultural land will be destroyed forever if developed.

The Goring Gap is in a flood risk area, which would make it unsuitable for building on anyway.

The Goring Gap is an important habitat for migrating birds.

The Goring Gap is a rural environment that can be enjoyed by all due to its easy urban access.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Stuart Elms
Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?
<p>Retail provision suffers from a short-sighted haphazard approach over the decades from the 60's, hence :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the Guildbourne Centre was always in the wrong place and should have been sited nearer to Montague Street and the Grafton area 2) Montage Street is unwelcoming and suffers from the adverse effects of the prevailing SW winds and rain with no shelter or respite 3) retail provision has gradually gone down market with Montague Street having become a clone of every other soulless concrete town centre with little real choice & variety 4) an area for the smaller independent artisan businesses should be a priority otherwise people will continue to shop in Chichester, Horsham, Lewes etc.
Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?
<p>The 'masterplan' suggestion of a new retail complex in the area south of Union Place to South Street had potential but that would have likely destroyed the viability of Montague Street at a stroke as would any other 'stand alone' scheme.</p> <p>Given the continuing decline in popularity of both town centre and retail park shopping, only a truly stunning and different offer - that connects to the seafront - has any chance of reviving shopping in Worthing</p>
Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?
See comments in Q 7
Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?
Encouraging public transport use with later local buses to all areas
Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?
<p>Many public cricket & football pitches are underutilised and poorly maintained. Investment in artificial (3G) surfaces would not only increase usage for those sports but allow for other recreational use. School sports facilities should likewise be improved and made available for public use and vice - versa !</p>
Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?
<p>The plan does not really address the fundamental issue of traffic congestion on both the main routes into town and the central seafront specifically, which is often gridlocked in the area from Brighton Road through Steyne Gardens and westwards to the Grafton area.</p>
Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?
<p>If the inevitable grid lock is to be avoided, then vehicle access to the town centre has to be controlled and reduced.</p> <p>Only a truly radical approach can fully address this issue ! Solutions might include :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) free public transport within the borough to reduce local car journeys 2) park & ride from the A24, A27 & A259; but finding sites would likely conflict with the need for housing 3) creating a network of totally separated cycle lanes to make access into and around Worthing safe and pleasurable for all, specifically by :- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. completing & widening the NCN 2 seafront cycle path from Shoreham through to the Goring / Ferring boundary together with a network of secure cycle storage hubs at strategic points along the route ii. utilising one lane of existing dual carriage roads into town to provide totally separated cycle lanes iii. creating a network of local cycle routes into and around town for both commuters, access to all business parks and leisure, <p>by utilising one way streets and contraflows that give cyclists the necessary priority and safety</p>

- iv. encourage cycle tourism by opening up access to the South Downs Way, and attractions to the north, with cycle paths alongside the A24 from Findon to Washington; from West Durrington up to Highdown and from Broadwater up through Sompting to Steyning
- v. by encouraging bus operators to provide late bus services to all areas

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

Whilst I believe that open green spaces are an important element in creating an environment that contributes to the health & well being of all, provision and maintenance of play areas for each locality and the provision of sports pitches are of equal importance.

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

There has to be a balanced approach

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Yes.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Elizabeth Ide
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
Yes, I think Worthing has come a long way in the past three years and to have a vision and strategic direction will give residents the confidence to stay living in the area and new people to move in to the area. Improving facilities has a direct link with quality of life.
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
Yes but I think the potential areas of development contradict the statement. You mention "Limited land resources will have been developed in the most efficient way to maximise the delivery of the widest range of identified needs, whilst at the same time ensuring that the Borough's intrinsic character and its beach and countryside setting have been protected and enhanced. High quality new development will have been integrated with existing communities and opportunities taken to deliver new and improved facilities and services." it therefore surprises me to see that key areas of development according to the map are south east of Lyons Farm and North West which is a small area of undeveloped green field adjacent to the National Park.
Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?
Nothing built on green field, stick to the brown field sites and tackle the challenges these sites present. Look at existing property developments that are in keeping with the area and use these as a model. E.G the waterfront in Goring or Ropetackle in Shoreham which will attract new residents to the area.
Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?
The objectives are not SMART so it's hard to tell.
Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?
Better bus links to Brighton would be good as many people have moved over to Worthing from there. The 700 bus along the seafront is great but it doesn't alleviate the pressure on the a27 for the residents north of the a259.
Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?
They are the most important thing to protect! Worthing is in a unique position being so close to the South Downs NP and the sea and we have to protect the green spaces for future generations with clever town planning.
Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?
Yes, but not knee jerk and if building houses you need to build schools and ensure there are GP facilities. The demographic of people moving to Worthing are young families and this must be reflected in the facilities available in close proximity to housing.
Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?
No, I don't see what effect this has on the community as it will be the odd dwelling.
Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?
Just keep them in keeping with the area, don't over develop and leave the green spaces.
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

They should be protected for the reasons I have given previously.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Jerry Le Sueur

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

There should be a balanced development approach to reflect the long-term needs of a sustainable community. Over development of housing will not provide this. It important to create a development mix which will support and sustain the development of strong local communities with appropriate infrastructure (community & leisure facilities, health services as well as proximity to employment and transport).

Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

Depending on scale it would be better to provide mixed developments again with a long-term focus on trying to support the creation of sustainable communities. Wherever possible it would be better to resist the conversion of larger older properties into HMO's particularly of the wholesale bedsit/studio flat variety. A mixed provision of bedsit/studio and 1-2 bed flat conversion would be preferable.

Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?

Very important to minimise the loss of greenspace and ensuring the provision of high quality local public space. Also important to ensure that appropriate provision is made for cycle lanes/pedestrians and that design and layout integrates well with local amenities and facilities.

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens?

Yes

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I am more familiar with the Goring/Ferring Gap and Chatsmore Farm sites which are close to where we live. I think any development of these sites would be extremely detrimental to valuable community greenspace. They are an attraction for both communities as well as visitors to the area. Both areas provide an important and historic space between two communities. They are important areas for wildlife with both areas (particularly the Goring/Ferring Gap) providing a habitat for sea birds and wading birds who are roosting or resting during migration times.

Any development would also result in the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land. There is also the impact that large developments on these sites would bring on local traffic and transport services, schooling and health services which are already stretched locally.

Overall, I think it is extremely important to resist any development on these areas. Sustainable communities need a balance of greenspace and public and private space. Urban sprawl across these sites will inevitably have a negative impact on the western part of Worthing (and for Ferring) and would not be in the interests of the town as a whole.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

Resist any development.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

If possible register as public greenspace or permanent agricultural land.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Virginia Le Sueur

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

We live close to the Goring/Ferring Gap and Chatsmore Farm sites. I think any development of these sites would be extremely detrimental to valuable community greenspace. They are an attraction for both communities as well as visitors to the area. Both areas provide an important and historic space between two communities. They are important areas for wildlife with both areas (particularly the Goring/Ferring Gap) providing a habitat for sea birds and wading birds who are roosting or resting during migration times.

Any development would also result in the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land. There is also the impact that large developments on these sites would bring on local traffic and transport services, schooling and health services which are already stretched locally.

Overall, I think it is extremely important to resist any development on these areas. Sustainable communities need a balance of greenspace and public and private space. Urban sprawl across these sites will inevitably have a negative impact on the western part of Worthing (and for Ferring) and would not be in the interests of the town as a whole.

Q11b - If any of these sites (in full or in part) are to be allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be developed?

Resist any development

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Ellie Henderson

Organisation (if applicable)

The Woodland Trust

Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?

We would like to see trees mentioned in the vision. Suggest adding the wording in caps:

Limited land resources will have been developed in the most efficient way to maximise the delivery of the widest range of identified needs, whilst at the same time ensuring that the Borough's intrinsic character and its beach and countryside setting have been protected and enhanced. High quality new development **INCORPORATING NEW AND EXISTING TREES** will have been integrated with existing communities and opportunities taken to deliver new and improved facilities and services.

Rationale:

Trees within our towns and cities provide a huge number of benefits and services as outlined in guidance produced by the Trees and Design Action Group - 'No Trees, No Future' (Trees and Design Action Group, 2010):

'There is a growing body of evidence that trees in urban areas bring a wide range of benefits.

Economic benefits of urban trees:

- Trees can increase property values by 7-15 per cent.
- As trees grow larger, the lift they give to property values grows proportionately.
- They can improve the environmental performance of buildings by reducing heating and cooling costs, thereby cutting bills.
- Mature landscapes with trees can be worth more as development sites.
- Trees create a positive perception of a place for potential property buyers.
- Urban trees improve the health of local populations, reducing healthcare costs.
- Trees can enhance the prospect of securing planning permission.
- They can provide a potential long-term renewable energy resource.

Social benefits of urban trees:

- Trees help create a sense of place and local identity.
- They benefit communities by increasing pride in the local area.
- They create focal points and landmarks.
- They have a positive impact on people's physical and mental health.
- They have a positive impact on crime reduction.

Environmental benefits of urban trees:

- Urban trees reduce the 'urban heat island effect' of localised temperature extremes.
- They provide shade, making streets and buildings cooler in summer.
- They help remove dust and particulates from the air.
- They help to reduce traffic noise by absorbing and deflecting sound.
- They help to reduce wind speeds.
- By providing food and shelter for wildlife they help increase biodiversity.
- They reduce the effects of flash flooding by slowing the rate at which rainfall reaches the ground.
- When planted on polluted ground they help improve its quality.

[For research references see the full report: www.forestry.gov.uk/tdag]

The Independent Panel on Forestry final report (2012) states:

"We believe there should be more, and better maintained trees, close to where people live. This means more trees on urban streets, more trees in town parks, and tree "corridors" from the centre of towns and cities out to local woods and forests with good access. We want people to enjoy the health benefits of access to trees

and woodlands, and we want our urban areas to have more natural shade and to be more resilient to climate change.”

Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?

We would suggest adding several points on the environment:

1. Protect remaining ancient woodland and ancient trees in Worthing.
2. Ensure that new development incorporates new and existing trees. Planting a range of suitable native tree species could help mitigate the possible impacts of tree disease as well as helping to improve air quality. Integrating trees into developments early on in the design process minimises costs and maximises the benefits they can provide.

Rationale:

Referring to point 1:

Ancient woods are irreplaceable. They are our richest terrestrial wildlife habitats, with complex ecological communities that have developed over centuries, and contain a high proportion of rare and threatened species, many of which are dependent on the particular conditions that this habitat affords. For this reason, ancient woods are reservoirs of biodiversity, but because the resource is limited and highly fragmented, they and their associated wildlife are particularly vulnerable.

Their long continuity and lack of disturbance means ancient woods are often also living history books, preserving archaeological features and evidence of past land use, from earthworks to charcoal pits. They are also places of great aesthetic appeal, making them attractive for recreation and the many benefits this can bring in terms of health and well being.

With only 2.4% of the land area in Great Britain covered by ancient woodland, it is essential that no more of this finite resource is lost. This means that ancient woodland must be protected absolutely from permanent clearance, but also that it must be protected from damaging effects of adjacent and nearby land-use that could threaten the integrity of the habitat and survival of its special characteristics.

It is not possible to replace ancient woodland by planting a new site, or attempting translocation. Every ancient wood is a unique habitat that has evolved over centuries, with a complex interdependency of geology, soils, hydrology, flora and fauna.

Referring to point 2:

The Case for Trees (Forestry Commission, July 2010) states:

‘There is no doubt that we need to encourage increased planting across the country – to help meet carbon targets – and every tree can count towards those targets as part of a renewed national effort to increase the country’s overall woodland canopy.

But it’s not all about carbon; there is a growing realisation among academics about the important role trees play in our urban as well as the rural environment. It has long been accepted and confirmed by numerous studies that trees absorb pollutants in our cities with measurable benefits to people’s health – such as reducing asthma levels. Yet trees also deliver a whole host of other extraordinary economic, environmental and social benefits.’

The report goes on to say:

‘The development of the space in which we live and work represents an opportunity for change that may not be repeated for many years. Making the right decisions at these pivotal moments can influence peoples’ sense of place, health and wellbeing for generations.’

The Woodland Trust believes that woodland creation is especially important for green infrastructure provision because of the unique ability of woodland to deliver across a wide range of benefits – see our publication Woodland Creation – why it matters (<http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/en/about-us/publications/Pages/ours.aspx>). These include for both landscape and biodiversity (helping habitats become more robust to adapt to climate change, buffering and extending fragmented ancient woodland), for quality of life and climate change (amenity & recreation, public health, flood amelioration, urban cooling) and for the local economy (timber and woodfuel markets).

Also see our report: Residential developments and trees - the importance of trees and green spaces. <https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/publications/2015/07/residential-developments-and-trees/>

Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?

We would like to see tree cover maintained or increased. We would also like to see new and existing trees planned into designs at an early stage. Integrating trees and green spaces into developments early on in the design process minimises costs and maximises the benefits they can provide.

Trees are an important part of our town - for example the street trees in Montague Centre. The threat to these trees has prompted a petition by local people: <http://www.thepetitionsite.com/585/562/626/save-our-trees/>

Trees within our towns and cities provide a huge number of benefits and services as outlined in guidance produced by the Trees and Design Action Group - 'No Trees, No Future' (Trees and Design Action Group, 2010):

'There is a growing body of evidence that trees in urban areas bring a wide range of benefits.'

Points from this document relevant to Worthing's town centre include:

- They can improve the environmental performance of buildings by reducing heating and cooling costs, thereby cutting bills.
- Trees help create a sense of place and local identity.
- They benefit communities by increasing pride in the local area.
- They create focal points and landmarks.
- They have a positive impact on people's physical and mental health.
- They have a positive impact on crime reduction.
- Urban trees reduce the 'urban heat island effect' of localised temperature extremes.
- They provide shade, making streets and buildings cooler in summer.
- They help remove dust and particulates from the air.
- They help to reduce traffic noise by absorbing and deflecting sound.
- They help to reduce wind speeds.
- They reduce the effects of flash flooding by slowing the rate at which rainfall reaches the ground.

For research references see the full report: www.forestry.gov.uk/tdag

Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?

We believe that ancient woodland needs absolute protection from development. Ancient woodland should be buffered from development.

Ancient woods are irreplaceable. They are our richest terrestrial wildlife habitats, with complex ecological communities that have developed over centuries, and contain a high proportion of rare and threatened species, many of which are dependent on the particular conditions that this habitat affords. For this reason, ancient woods are reservoirs of biodiversity, but because the resource is limited and highly fragmented, they and their associated wildlife are particularly vulnerable.

Their long continuity and lack of disturbance means ancient woods are often also living history books, preserving archaeological features and evidence of past land use, from earthworks to charcoal pits. They are also places of great aesthetic appeal, making them attractive for recreation and the many benefits this can bring in terms of health and well being.

With only 2.4% of the land area in Great Britain and 2%* of Worthing borough area covered by ancient woodland, it is essential that no more of this finite resource is lost. This means that ancient woodland must be protected absolutely from permanent clearance, but also that it must be protected from damaging effects of adjacent and nearby land-use that could threaten the integrity of the habitat and survival of its special characteristics.

It is not possible to replace ancient woodland by planting a new site, or attempting translocation. Every ancient wood is a unique habitat that has evolved over centuries, with a complex interdependency of geology, soils, hydrology, flora and fauna.

* Data from 2013 report <http://www.adur-worthing.gov.uk/media/media,120101,en.pdf>

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

We believe green spaces (including woodland) are extremely important in Worthing. We would like to see more small scale woodland creation.

The recent public health white paper (Healthy Lives, Healthy People; Nov 2010) states that: "Access to green spaces is associated with better mental and physical health across socioeconomic groups." and that "Defra will lead a national campaign to increase tree planting throughout England, particularly in areas where tree cover would help to improve residents' quality of life and reduce the negative effects of deprivation, including health inequalities."

The Woodland Trust believes that proximity and access to woodland is a key issue linking the environment with health and wellbeing provision

Recognising this, the Woodland Trust has researched and developed the Woodland Access Standard (WAS_t) for local authorities to aim for, encapsulated in our Space for People publication. We believe that the WAS_t can be an important policy tool complementing other access standards used in delivering green infrastructure for health benefits.

The WAS_t is complimentary to Natural England's ANGST+ and is endorsed by Natural England. The Woodland Trust Woodland Access Standard recommends:

- that no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size
- that there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round-trip) of people's homes.

Applying this standard in Worthing, with a comparison against West Sussex County Council and Arun District Council, gives the following figures (see table below). This presents an excellent opportunity for creating more accessible woodland to improve health & well being opportunities for sustainable communities and neighbourhoods. The data used can be supplied free of charge by the Woodland Trust both in map and in numerical/GIS form.

Accessible woodland (2ha within 500m) Worthing 0.1% WSCC 14.5% Arun 5.3%
Accessible woodland (20ha within 4km) Worthing 15.5% WSCC 51.8% Arun 41.2%

The Woodland Trust believes that woodland creation is especially important because of the unique ability of woodland to deliver across a wide range of benefits – see our publication Woodland Creation – why it matters (<http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/en/about-us/publications/Pages/ours.aspx>). These include for both landscape and biodiversity (helping habitats become more robust to adapt to climate change, buffering and extending fragmented ancient woodland), for quality of life and climate change (amenity & recreation, public health, flood amelioration, urban cooling) and for the local economy (timber and woodfuel markets).

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

We would wish to see the adjacent ancient semi natural woodland adjacent to Titnore Way Caravan Club Site buffered from the proposed development.

The UK Forestry Standard sets out the Government's approach to sustainable management of forests, and states that:

"Ancient semi-natural woodlands (ASNW) are derived from the original forest cover of the British Isles, and have had more or less continuously tree-covered use. They are especially significant for biodiversity, landscape and cultural heritage, and reflect centuries of interactions between human activities and the environment. ASNWs have a unique character and they support a high proportion of rare and threatened species. (Forestry Commission, 2011, pp 15-16).

Q12b - Are there any policies missing from the list?

Trees and woodlands policy.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Linda Park

Your general comments:

I believe that the Goring-Ferring gap should be protected from development and kept open, as agricultural land or alternatively as a nature reserve. It is such a unique asset with stunning views from the sea all the way to the downs and should be safeguarded for its landscape value, it's nature conservation interest and its public amenity value given that so many people enjoy walking along the many public footpaths around the gap. It also separates Goring from Ferring, retaining their separate identities. If the gap is developed, these assets would be lost forever as it is unlikely that the land would ever be returned to open countryside once developed.

I therefore believe that the Local Plan should have a strong policy to ensure the continued protection of the gap, making it clear to potential developers that it is a 'no go' area, rather than a broad policy which could be interpreted any way making the gap vulnerable to development.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Elly Davies
Your general comments:
<p>Please focus development on the brownfield sites, such as Teville Gate, which are magnets for crime and in desperate need of regeneration.</p> <p>Please protect our green and open spaces - with a growing population, these are more valuable than ever.</p>

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Jamie Home
Your general comments:
<p>Some good thoughts - would like to see some working parties / test groups / focus groups being used to focus this down and put some measurables in.</p> <p>On a negative side I feel trying to appease too many people, cover too many bases and need to decide what to focus energy on, what are the 3 or 5 key drivers, what are the pillars that really matter, get those right first.</p> <p>Thank you though for allowing us the opportunity to comment, much appreciated</p>
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
No - a vision needs to be punchy, to the point and memorable. No more than 20 words that are about a desired end-state, a concise statement describing the clear and inspirational long-term desired change. What you have is not a vision, therefore cannot agree with it.
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
No - you have provided management waffle, no true aspiration. Tried to cover every base to appease as wide and audience as possible.
Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?
I would like to see a Vision and then a Mission - what you have provided is not a vision.
Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?
Where is the measure, words like 'appropriate', 'sufficient' mean nothing. Some reasonable core objectives here but nothing with substance, where is this substance ?
Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?
Not in the slightest - I could read this waffle anywhere. Focus down, what is the over riding 20% or 3 to 5 things that must be implemented for Worthing to compete in the future. Stop trying to tick all the boxes, you do not have the budget, what is the essence, what is Worthing's unique position that must be built upon ?
Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?
Sorry, some good ideas but too vague again. What type of office space is required, do we want fast growing small business so flexibility short term leases are the key driver or is it long term large industrial with low £sqft rates. Focus down and deliver on one or two key areas, the rest is a bonus.
Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?
Yes, if Worthing wants to go after specific sectors it may well have to be flexible, but define those areas it wants to chase and excel in.
Q3c - In addition to the sites already identified as having the potential to deliver employment land are there any other sites that could accommodate employment growth?
What sites have already been identified - sorry have I missed this is the document ?
Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified, if not what has been missed?

Who has decided Worthing is the main destination ? Who are the competitors, Chichester ? Stop chasing occupancy rates, waste of time, it is quality not quantity. Temporary short term leases are not a measure of success. Numerous charity shops, betting shops and nail bars are not success. Define the desired experience, what the competition is and deliver something that will inspire people to come.

Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?

No, Worthing has got itself into a situation being repeated up and down the country. No control over landlords, retail rents far too high for an aspiring 'C' level town, footfall does not justify the rents, so what are the options. Forget retail create mixed environments where people want to spend a whole morning or afternoon, mix entertainment, restaurants, cafes and stores. Allow people to move back into the town to live, convert empty office space, spaces above stores, make the town centre live after 5pm

Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?

There is an opportunity to avoid the 90% example of what every other town in the UK is doing, boring, concentrations of anonymisation. Bland. How do we encourage the small retailer, the cafe, the pop up restaurant. There are retailers t now struggling in Brighton as rents creep from £10k pa to £17k pa on the outer fringes of the Lanes. Can we entice those start-ups to be alongside the key anchor stores in Worthing. Can we create start-up restaurants or regular food markets areas ?

Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?

Not enough focus on the promenade, this really is something that sets Worthing aside. How do we maximise, where is the cafe culture. What will make a family stay for the day

Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?

See above - focus on the promenade first and foremost and expand once delivering against that.

Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?

I would like to know figures on what % of the working population commute - this seems to be missing as an important factor. I appreciate the busses are run by profit making companies, but the price for using the bus compared to other cities such as Birmingham, Bristol, Manchester is eye watering. Moving people onto options such as busses does not seem to be included ?

Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?

Having seen the success of cycle lanes in Bristol and London, you do seem to have to make the investment before people use them, but it appears to pay off.

Q8a - Do you agree with the main environmental challenges identified? Are any missing?

Not sure if I have not understood - but when I looked through environmental I was also expecting to see something on waste management / recycling ?

Q8c - Are there any circumstances you consider where regardless of mitigation, development would be inappropriate?

Worthing's USP is the promenade, sea and beach, therefore I believe this is where I would draw a line.

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

Very high, you only have to go to a town where there are limited green spaces to appreciate what the Victorian legacy did and why we need to fight for it.

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

Yes

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

I believe that often with mix we forget about people living, so we need to create true mix which has life 24/7 for it to be a success.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

I struggle when I see the Goring / Ferring gap because of previous answer - Worthing's USP is the promenade, sea and beach, therefore I believe this is where I would draw a line.

Q12a - Do you have any views on how any of the listed policies should be worded?

Sorry, too many to mention. Too many are vague, could mean anything. Are other town / city plans this vague ?

Q12b - Are there any policies missing from the list?

Infrastructure is a very broad category - what is included, or rather should this not be broken down. Where is digital connectivity, could we not become a free wifi town as something of a USP? Waste management & recycling is missing

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Sam Ede

Your general comments:

Regarding the proposed development at the fields behind Beeches Avenue.

A few bullet points:

- road access around an already busy area despite any potential new plans to combat this
- disruption to the local community
- loss of further natural areas
- traffic around the area will become even more disruptive and dangerous
- local schooling is at maximum capacity already
- infrastructure around the area is not enough for further housing
- the roads around the area are dangerous enough already

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Ivor & Lesley Stepney
Your general comments:
<p>we would request that the goring gap and surrounding area is protected from any future development. The gap is unique in that it offers uninterrupted view from the sea to the south downs. it is agricultural land which will be destroyed also building would have a significant and detrimental effect on the character of the landscape and the community. The gap is a habitat for sea birds and wading birds who roost or nest during migration times. it is a rural environment with easy urban access. Goring and Ferring are two communities that are separated by the gap, if built on or changed it would change the individuality of these communities.</p>
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
see section B
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
see b
Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?
see B
Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?
see B
Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?
see B
Q3c - In addition to the sites already identified as having the potential to deliver employment land are there any other sites that could accommodate employment growth?
see B
Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?
see B general comments
Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?
see B general comments

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name

Frances Hirst

Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?

I agree with the first paragraph of the Vision. The second paragraph is not very clear - opportunities to deliver new and improved facilities and services - is pretty vague.

Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?

Some areas are not addressed.

Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?

There are two areas which the Vision does not address.
The first is protection of existing open space and sporting facilities and also the provision of additional open space/sports facilities. Over the past few years Worthing has lost several important open spaces and sports facilities. The ones that I have noticed are 1. the sports fields at the old Worthing College site, 2. boating lake, paddling pool and tennis courts (converted to a car park at Beach House gardens) 3. Northbrook college open space (now housing) and 4. housing on/next to Chatsmore school. Added to this primary and secondary schools in Worthing have had major building programs to accommodate pupils which has resulted in schools not having sufficient playing fields. This is putting additional pressure on open space in Worthing which is now used by schools such as Victoria Park (Heene Primary School and St Mary's Primary School), Manor Road Recreation Ground (Bohunt School) and Hillbarn Recreation Ground (Worthing College). There has been considerable building in Worthing but little open space for sport and recreation has been added. The second is protection of major roads/routes through the town. There are only a few east/west roads. Recent development in Mill Road has had inadequate parking resulting in on pavement parking reducing the width of the road to one lane at points. The Bohunt road crossing across the main A24 route in and out of the town may make this a new traffic jam point. Transport routes in and out of the town need to be improved especially as 43% of people living in Worthing commute out of the borough for work.

Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?

I agree with the proposed objectives but would like an additional one to increase the open space and sporting facilities available to residents especially as the town is growing with more young families and increased housing. Please see my note in the vision section. Accessibility to sport/open space for all should help reduce obesity in Worthing from its current level of 21%..

Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?

Objectives seem clear.

Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?

The one key challenge which affects all the others is transport. There are good rail links along the south coast but road links on the A24 are poor especially to the West. There are no rail links to the north and the A24 is becoming more and more clogged with traffic especially at Washington roundabout in the mornings (20 minute delay is usual at 8.10 am). People will not visit Worthing if they cannot get here! Businesses will not base themselves here if employees cannot get in and out of the town.

Q3b - Should the Local Plan continue to protect key employment areas or should it be more flexible in its approach?

Some protection is required otherwise Worthing will end up as a dormitory town.

Q3c - In addition to the sites already identified as having the potential to deliver employment land are there any other sites that could accommodate employment growth?

Not known. However, I note that one top quality office location in central Worthing (MGM) is to be lost to dense housing so not sure how well this policy will work.

Q4a - Have all the key challenges for retail areas and the Worthing town centre been identified if not

what has been missed?

One of the challenges is that Worthing town centre needs to provide a leisure and retail experience. It is unfortunate that the most recent addition to leisure facilities, Splashpoint, is only a small pool with limited leisure pool facility which is not as exciting or large as that provided by the Triangle at Burgess Hill, K2 at Crawley and the Pavilions at Horsham. Worthing residents visit these facilities but it is unlikely that people surrounding Worthing would come to Worthing for the pool above those at the locations mentioned. In developing Aqarena a second pool could be provided in the basement of any development. Also additional leisure facilities at Teville Gate or the old police station should be large enough for the town and attractive to outside visitors.

Q4b - Are retail centres functioning well - how can they be improved?

The Guildborne centre is not functioning well - suggest knocking it down and rebuilding.

Q4c - How could new development in the town centre enhance the town's identity and attract more visitors?

Better leisure facilities.

Q5a - Have the key challenges for tourism been addressed?

Transport is key.

Q5b - In what ways can the tourism offer be improved?

Improve road links on A24 and A27.

Q6a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified in planning for the provision of different infrastructure needs? Are any missing?

The main challenge is to protect existing provision and to provide additional open space and more sports facilities. Worthing leisure centre is not adequate. The athletics track is very important as it is the only one in the area and it should be protected.

Q6b - Do you have suggestions for how the Local Plan could resolve these?

More open space and sports facilities should be provided especially given the lack of sports facilities at some of the schools in Worthing. In East Worthing playing fields for Davison should be looked at as a matter of urgency. These could be used by the local community.

Q6c - Are you aware of any particular community and leisure needs?

School sports and additional playing fields are needed for Davison and Bohunt. Additional swimming provision is required as Splashpoint finds it difficult to provide public swimming sessions and enough teaching sessions.

Q7a - Do you agree with the main challenges identified? Are any missing?

The road network in Worthing is key. Development should not adversely affect car movement.

Q7b - Do you have any suggestions for how the Local Plan could better promote sustainable transport?

Make sure that any development has adequate parking.

Q8d - What value do you place on the borough's green spaces, particularly those around the town?

I place a very high value on the borough's green spaces as they are important for peoples physical health and wellbeing.

Q9a - Should housing delivery be given higher priority than other development needs (e.g. employment land, community facilities)?

No. Given the limited availability of land housing should not be given priority over open space/sports facilities.

Q9b - How should we best address specialist housing needs (e.g. affordable housing; family housing; self-build housing; sheltered & extra care; houses in multiple occupation)?

Do not know.

Q9c- Efficient use of land will help to raise densities and will contribute towards meeting development needs. What potential impacts of this should the Council try to mitigate?

Enough open space.

Q9d - Should the Council include a policy that would resist the inappropriate development of residential

gardens?

Yes.

Q10a - Do you agree that the sites listed provide the most significant redevelopment and regeneration opportunities to deliver housing, employment and leisure uses within the town?

Do not know.

Q10b - Do you have any particular comments on how any of the identified sites should be developed and for what mix of uses?

Goring gap should be protected.

Q10c - Are there any other potential development sites within the current built up area that should be assessed?

Do not know.

Q11a - Given the housing needs in the Borough do you have any views as to which of the listed sites should be developed or protected?

The Goring/Ferring gap should be protected. It is one of the few areas where there is significant open green space next to the sea. Could it be given to the National Trust so that it could be protected.

Q11c - If any of these sites are not allocated for development do you have any views on how they should be protected, enhanced or used?

Sports facilities and open spaces are important and additional ones should be considered.

Q11d - Land West of Fulbeck Avenue (site 7) and Land north of West Durrington (site 8) are already within the Built Up Area boundary. In light of significant housing needs should the Council take a positive approach and look to bring forward these sites in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan?

No.

Q12a - Do you have any views on how any of the listed policies should be worded?

No.

Q12b - Are there any policies missing from the list?

No.

Q12c - Are all of the listed policies required?

Yes.

Your Town –Your Future Representation

Name
Lorna Beaumont
Your general comments:
The comments form should be next to the proposals; it has been made fairly impenetrable and as such it is far from inclusive for all citizens of Worthing.
Q1a - Do you agree with the Vision we are aiming and aspiring to achieve?
a sense of community and space we can share together
Q1b - Does it provide a clear direction for the Worthing Local Plan?
Should be some mention of what the constituents want
Q1c - Is there anything you think we have missed which you would like to see incorporated in the Vision?
Important to mention protection in the vision of the wild/green spaces in Worthing
Q2a - Do you agree with the proposed objectives set out above? If not, what changes would you like to see?
We should be able to know what identified/appropriate equates to in percentage terms/. eg tenure- second homes should not have priority.
Q2b - Are the objectives sufficiently distinctive and locally specific?
Not really this could be anywhere on the south coast
Q3a - Do you agree with the key challenges identified for the economy? Are any missing?
-New development should not be considered without sensitivity to the environment -tourism should outweigh local services eg Brighton's i360 -why high value jobs, not all jobs?