

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Rita Lucas
------	------------

General comments

The plan talks about the developments being sustainable and encouraging use of public transport, walking and cycling but in the summer we have a lot of visitors who come by car. Quite a few of these developments, if they go ahead, are on existing car parks and the town would be left with very few places for people to park apart from residential roads. There is nothing that I can see in the plan about park and ride. It would make sense to follow other towns and put in park and ride to cut down the amount of traffic that comes into the town particularly in the summer

Comments: Part 2 - Spatial Strategy

I am pleased to see that Goring Gap will be maintained in this plan

Comments: Part 3 - Development Sites

I am concerned about the number of car parks that are earmarked for development. If they all go ahead we will only be left with Portland Road and the Guildbourne centre and these are not enough. I am also concerned about lack of parking in the early evening if the Civic Centre is redeveloped. This is well used by people going to events at the Assembly Rooms and there is nowhere else near that people can park. Since the buses are very few and far between in the evenings a car is often the only way to use the town centre in the evenings. I also use it to visit the library and will find that much harder if this disappears.

I am also concerned about congestion on Shaftesbury Avenue when the HMRC site is developed. We suffer in this town from the fact that there are few bridge crossings and Shaftesbury Avenue is already a very busy road. However it would be nice to see the Leisure Centre redeveloped but again this already causes a lot of traffic issues on that road as it is.

Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Transport and Connectivity (Policies CP24 - CP25)

I think it is important to include cycling needs to developments. This needs to be off road dedicated cycle paths

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Barry Squires
-------------	---------------

General comments

Whilst I fully appreciate the need to grow and develop etc what I cannot accept is that you think the traffic from another 4000 homes can be accommodated by a few tinkering issues with the roads!

It takes my son between 35 and 50 minutes every day to drive to and from Shoreham, it takes my wife between 35 and 60 minutes to drive to and from Horsham every day and until I recently retired I had to drive to Brighton or Crawley every day and lost the will to live most days!

Worthing needs a bypass more than ever but now we are a national park I cannot see any hope for the future.

I have lived all my life in Worthing and still love the town, sea and countryside but the over development and lack of a by pass make getting around harder and just adds to pollution.

WE NEED A BY PASS NOW !!!

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Steven Cooper
-------------	---------------

General comments

To help ensure an adequate supply of housing will the council consider ensuring that all new properties are sold as first or primary homes to avoid being purchased as second or holiday homes? Also, will the council consider compulsory purchase of derelict properties and the subsequent refurbishment for affordable housing?

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Brian Thorpe
-------------	--------------

**Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Homes and Neighbourhoods
(Policies CP1 - CP6)**

I would like to support strongly the proposal to designate and provide protection for the Goring gap South and North as well as Brooklands in the Plan.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Peter Hall
------	------------

Comments: Part 2 – Spatial Strategy

We welcome the protection of the two areas at the west of the Borough north and south of the railway (Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm).

Comments: Part 3 – Development Sites

In considering sites in Goring, please ensure that adequate residential parking is included (more than statutory requirement). that road access is upgraded and that sufficient school and doctors facilities are provided for increased number of residents.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Josh Fuller
------	-------------

Comments: Part 3 – Development Sites

I do not believe it is acceptable for Lyons way to be one of the proposed developments sites for housing. The site proposed to be developed on is a place that is very close to many people's hearts. It is a community that provides football for the young and old.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Stacey Farmer
------	---------------

Comments: Part 3 – Development Sites

I am extremal concerned about the proposed development of Lyons way. My son and many other children play football here and without the club would be spending their weekends out around the local streets rather than putting their talents to good use.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Ellie Sanderson
------	-----------------

Comments: Part 3 – Development Sites

In my opinion the site is unsuitable for development and we can't afford to lose a community football club (Worthing United FC).

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	James Sanderson
-------------	-----------------

General comments

Worthing United FC is an essential part of the community, and evicting them from their home ground would be devastating. Also, the additional strain on the A27 around Lyons Farm would push it past breaking point. There is simply no capacity for any more residents and associated vehicles in the area, regardless of any measures that may be put in place as part of the development.

Comments: Part 3 – Development Sites

Worthing United FC is an essential part of the community, and evicting them from their home ground would be devastating. Also, the additional strain on the A27 around Lyons Farm would push it past breaking point. There is simply no capacity for any more residents and associated vehicles in the area, regardless of any measures that may be put in place as part of the development.

**Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Transport and Connectivity
(Policies CP24 - CP25)**

The additional strain on the A27 around Lyons Farm would push it past breaking point. There is simply no capacity for any more residents and associated vehicles in the area, regardless of any measures that may be put in place as part of the development.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	James Humphrys
------	----------------

General comments

I think it is really good that planners are considering 'quality of life' aspects of Worthing, not just hard drivers like the business and housing pressures.

Part 2 – Spatial Strategy

I am encouraged that the importance (for numerous reasons) of the Goring Gap is recognised and its green status is to be preserved.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	James Sharp
-------------	-------------

General comments

Having played at Worthing United's ground on many occasions and having signed for them recently, I can say without doubt this club is etched in Worthing's community! The club aim to bring through young players and bring people to grass roots football! Losing one of the best grounds in the area would be a huge blow.

The club obviously has even tighter links with the community through the sad loss of two of its players in the tragic Shoreham airshow disaster! Having attended school with XXX personally I found it brilliant that the club rallied around and use their memories in a positive way. I doubt either of the players would support a move and neither would their families who will have vital memories of XXX and XXX competing at the current ground!

Comments: Part 3 - Development Sites

There are far more viable sites within Worthing which dont affect the community as hard as losing the Football Ground! The traffic in the area is already an issue anyway with access to the ground not always the greatest, this development will make things 100x worse

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Stuart Payne
------	--------------

General comments

I do hope many aspect of the Draft Plans, take into account the 'Bigger Picture' of the view of Local communities & people to understand the needs of these areas of outstanding natural beauty within Worthing and the surrounding area, leisure & open spaces for the well being of local communities, that work and live within the area that been listed for new development for the future. I also hope that Worthing becomes a place to visit and share with others the full enjoyment of what Worthing has to offer, whether it be shopping/leisure/eating out/work experiences. I wish everyone involved in these processes of planning, all the best in giving Worthing a 'Big' boost for the future!

**Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Homes and Neighbourhoods
(Policies CP1 - CP6)**

I do hope that thinking about parking vehicles/plugging EV is taken into account for these future development for homes & neighbourhoods.

Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Historic Environment (Policies CP15 - CP16)

I hope when developing new areas within an area of outstanding historic environment, will factor into the design of the development so, not to stand out like a 'sore thumb'!.

**Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Transport and Connectivity
(Policies CP24 - CP25)**

I would hope that before any further development is actioned, that major road are upgraded, ie. A27 & A259! otherwise, it will bring area to a stand still, also will put future investment from businesses a negative appraisal of the area and the surroundings, this will be not be good for Worthing in the long term goal.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Phil Shelley
------	--------------

Comments: Part 3 - Development Sites

Do not build on Worthing United FCs ground, ever. It's disgraceful that you are even considering it, build somewhere else.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Malcolm Gardiner
------	------------------

Comments: Part 2 - Spatial Strategy

agree with the Council, want no development in the important Goring gaps North and South. Vital green space for the wider community.

Comments: Part 3 - Development Sites

agree no development in Goring gaps,, sections SP5 and SP6

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Pauline Morris
-------------	----------------

Comments: Part 3 - Development Sites

SP5 & SP6-LP I very much welcome the decision to designate and provide protection to Goring South and Goring Gap North. These area vital green spaces and farmed areas which absolutely must remain that way.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Pauline Cory
------	--------------

Comments: Part 3 - Development Sites

I concerns me deeply that if you intend knocking down and/or building on various sites that are existing car parking areas in and around the town, what provision has been made for parking? Teville Gate has gone, The Aquarena too - both sites will not have anywhere near the parking that was allocated on those site previously and it looks like the same is planned for Grafton Road, the old gas works site and others.

It would be very naive to believe that people will use public transport instead. People are very attached to their cars and even if those who live in Worthing could be persuaded to use their cars less, the difficulties with rail travel, in particular, means that unless that changes dramatically people outside of Worthing will still drive here. I'm concerned that the town will end up with a load of empty shops if visitors to the town and workers from outside have a lot less choice in the town centre regarding parking.

I'm grateful that there are protected spaces, that is a relief but I hope that the omission sites won't be built on either as they are adjacent to very sensitive areas.

Any housing estates bordering the A27 and arterial roads will naturally produce more traffic and we are already drowning in cars, particularly in the rush hours, so I hope that any developers will have to come up with solutions to this before adding to the congestion. It's all very well for the government to say we have to build x no. of houses each year but the infrastructure to support all these extra homes is not in place or even seems to be likely to happen. How will you address this?

**Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Sustainable Communities
(Policies CP7 - CP10)**

If you want to build a sustainable community, you need to consult with organisations that are already working on this issue.

Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Transport and Connectivity (Policies CP24 - CP25)

..."public perception continues to be negative as it is viewed as unreliable" - that's because it is! It's not a perception! When trains are constantly cancelled, are overcrowded and expensive at peak times, do you honestly think people would rather use them than a car?!

There are a lot of elderly people in Worthing - you are not going to persuade them to cycle or walk. They also can't carry heavy bags of shopping on a bus. I don't think you have taken them into account very much at all.

If you travel at peak times in the school holidays, all the traffic in and around Worthing dramatically reduces. Could you not create a policy to encourage and support children to walk to school or have some kind of public transport system that they can realistically use? This would make a huge difference.

If you expect people to cycle you need to provide safe cycling routes. A lot of the roads in Worthing are not safe to cycle on. They are too narrow, have parked cars all the way down them (there will be even more if you close the car parks and people then park further out of town, Broadwater is a prime example already since Teville Gate closed) and are much too congested to be safe. The existing cycle lanes all have issues, accidents happen as people park where they shouldn't, they open car doors onto cyclists, drive too close to them etc. So cyclists have to cycle on the pavements, which is really dangerous. I can't tell you how many times I've almost been knocked off my feet by a cyclist and they cycle like bats out of hell along the prom - particularly along East Beach area - accidents are constantly waiting to happen by the splashpad and Coast and it's only a matter of time before a child gets killed.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Alan Wilcox
Organisation	Goring Residents Association

General comments

The main thrust of my comments is the continued protection of Green Spaces, Gaps, Greensward and Coastline. Using Government web sites it is clear that Worthing is already the most densely populated authority in the whole of West Sussex. e.g Worthing has a population density per sq km of 3,267 compared to, for example, Chichester which has 147, in other words 22.2 times less crowded. Worthing is constrained on all sides by either the sea, National Park and two much less densely crowded authorities. This makes it even more important for Worthing to protect it's Green spaces etc to retain any semblance of identity, local wildlife, leisure etc

Comments: Part 2 - Spatial Strategy

I welcome the stand of Worthing Borough Council in SP5 and SP6 to provide protection to the Goring Gap South and Goring Gap North as a Local Green Space and the continued Strategic Gap concept between Goring and Ferring. I also support the Council stand in keeping Brooklands (SP5 & 6) as a Local Green Gap.

Comments: Part 3 - Development Sites

With regard to AOC5 (HMRC Offices Barrington Road) and AOC 4 (Worthing Leisure Centre Shaftsbury Avenue) I am looking for a cohesive plan between these areas. No High rise that overshadows existing properties, appropriate junction improvements at the associated roads, on site parking for residents, workers and those using leisure facilities. Any employment units must not effect local residents with noise or pollution.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Ed Miller
Organisation	Ferring Conservation Group

Comments: Part 2 - Spatial Strategy

Ferring Conservation Group has over 950 members, the great majority of whom live in Ferring but a significant number of members live in Goring. It was founded in 1988 and its aim is to protect the character and beauty of Ferring and the open spaces within and around it. We have campaigned, ever since 1988 for the preservation of the Ferring-Goring Gap, as an area of valuable countryside, of important landscape value, of essential habitat for wild life (particularly, for the southern Gap for waders and other birds), and of tranquility for walking and quiet recreation, and as an essential gap between the settlements of Ferring and Worthing. We commend the Draft Plan for its recognition of the environmental and social significance of the Goring Gap north and south, and its proposed designation as 'Local Green Space'

We also campaigned for the preservation of the portions of the Goring Gap, north and south, that lie in Arun and were delighted that the Arun Local Plan, as submitted, approved and adopted, designated those areas as Countryside, within which development would be not normally be permitted. Arun DC has said the designation as 'Local Green Space' is a matter for the Ferring Neighbourhood Development Plan, and in the forthcoming revision of the Ferring NDP we shall, along with Ferring Parish Council, and other local organisations, be pressing for this designation.

The value of this Gap, north and south, is felt not only by those who live either side of the Gap, but by thousands of residents of the two authorities and by tourists and other visitors to our coast. It has been farmland for at least 1,000 years. It would be a crime to erase this heritage and its habitats, and fill it with houses. The northern gap, although less striking in landscape value is an essential setting for Highdown Hill and the outlier of the South Downs National Park.

In any event, the infrastructure of this corner of Worthing cannot possibly support a large housing development in the Goring Gap. The roads are operating at over-full capacity and schools and medical facilities are already over-subscribed. We warmly commend the Council's plan to preserve the Goring Gap - free from housing development and continuing as a wedge of countryside between Ferring and Goring - between Arun and Worthing.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Glen Childs
-------------	-------------

Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Historic Environment (Policies CP15 - CP16)

Impressed that Arun plan will safeguard our gaps, as it is vital to give the Worthing areas this protection for its landscape, wildlife, breaks between the built up areas along our coastline, and to give us humans a bit of greenery to breathe free and see the stars without the light pollution.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	David Boffee
-------------	--------------

General comments

ref. Goring Gap South and Goring Gap North (SP5 & SP6). I entirely support the decision made by Worthing Borough Council to designate and provide protection to the Goring Gap South and Goring Gap North as a local Green Space and a continued Strategic Gap between Goring and Ferring. It would be disastrous if the coastal strip between settlements were allowed to be joined together by development. These areas need to be kept as open spaces for us and future generations to enjoy.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Philip Barclay
------	----------------

General comments

I support the Worthing Local Plan & in particular the Goring Gap South & North inclusion covered by pages 25 - 37 of the draft.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Graeme Pidgeon
------	----------------

General comments

I support the confirmation and strengthening of The Goring Gap.

**Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Homes and Neighbourhoods
(Policies CP1 - CP6)**

Keep the Goring Gap clear of development and as a strategic clear area

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	S Jones
------	---------

General comments

I support the Arun Plan because it supports the parts of both parts of the gap that are within its borders and that it is vital to give the Worthing areas this protection- for its landscape, its wildlife , it's tranquility and it's clear break between the built up areas and along the coast

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Michael Pritchard
------	-------------------

Comments: Part 2 - Spatial Strategy

Goring-Ferring Gap 2.60--2.68 & Chatsmore Farm 2.69--2.73 I support the Worthing Local Plan comments regarding the open nature of these strategic gaps. These must be retained and remain as agricultural land. It would be a tragedy, if the policy in Worthing were to change and these open spaces from the coast northwards were ever built on despite the fact that Persimmon own at least the Goring-Ferring Gap and in their eyes must be a tempting site given its flat topography.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Barry Borrett
------	---------------

Comments: Part 3 - Development Sites

Site A3. Road access to Upper Brighton Road from Parcel A must be carefully located as Upper Brighton Road and West Street is a single lane carriageway due to parked vehicles. Its needs to be as close to Ardington Road as possible.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Tina Green
------	------------

Comments: Part 2 - Spatial Strategy

I feel it is very important to all residents that the local gap and local green space be preserved. Open space is so important for people to enjoy. It keeps mental health if you are able to enjoy the open green areas.

Comments: Part 3 - Development Sites

I realise change is inevitable but my concerns for areas such as Barrington road are that it will cause increase in traffic on roads that are unsuitable to take it. Also too many more patients at the already busy Drs surgeries. Also a large number of children at local schools. The leisure centre is in need of reconstruction but I have concerns over entry and exit onto Shaftesbury Avenue and of course parking.

**Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Homes and Neighbourhoods
(Policies CP1 - CP6)**

It is an excellent idea to provide housing for aging population. I do not believe it will be done. In South Africa and New Zealand they have retirement villages. They are pleasing on the eye and excellent for enabling people to feel safe and able to remain at home for longer.

**Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Sustainable Communities
(Policies CP7 - CP10)**

Totally agree that there should be access to high quality open space and sport and recreation. Important for mental and physical health.

Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Transport and Connectivity (Policies CP24 - CP25)

There are too many cars on the roads making short journeys. Buses should be cheaper to encourage people to use them over their car. More cycle lanes and more importance for the pedestrian. I have seen so many near misses at the mulberry Shops because car drivers feel pedestrians and cyclists are just a nuisance.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Linda and Paul Hanlan
-------------	-----------------------

General Comments:

The Arun Plan safeguards both parts of the Gap that are within its borders and it is vital to give the Worthing areas this protection to maintain its unique landscape, wildlife, tranquillity and, most importantly, its clear break between the built up areas along our coast.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Helen Attwood
-------------	---------------

General Comments:

As a Ferring resident I would like to support the councils plan to keep the Goring Gap a local green space.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Susan Jackson
Organisation	Norton Motorcycle Training

General Comments:

We have our training ground on part of the premises used by wufc so we will very much be effected by any changes through the ability not to run our training facility. Also traffic out on to the A27 is horrendous due to all the retail units that houses will make it Impossible.

Part 1 - Introduction and Context

I know we need housing but there are other sites available without moving an iconic fc

Comments: Part 3 – Development Sites:

Worthing United site is not suitable for housing.

Comments: Part 4 – Core Policies: Local Economy

Effect on one sports facility which there are not enough and a business

Comments: Part 4 – Core Policies: Environment and Climate Change

More pollution and severe congestion on an already congested area

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Sarah Foster
-------------	--------------

**Comments: Part 4 – Core Policies: Homes and Neighbourhoods
(Policies CP1 - CP6)**

I would like to see more sites developed for properly 'affordable' housing for persons trying to get onto the property ladder and more social housing for persons on the housing waiting list. I know of several individuals and families who are having to wait years on the list to obtain a decent home within the district which is completely unacceptable. Surely sites can be identified only for this purpose to include no private homes by encouraging developers with subsidies.

Currently sites come up and more often than not developers are permitted to have no more than 10 dwellings so there is no requirement for them to have to include 'affordable'. Or when they do propose more than 10, the 'affordable' is usually out of reach of first time buyers, eg £250-280K. Please toughen up the relevant policies so that this cannot happen.

Comments: Part 4 – Core Policies: Local Economy (Policies CP11 - CP14)

I am very concerned about the number of cafes and coffee shops that are opening in Worthing Town Centre and the future of the centre as a whole. Whilst I understand that this use is preferable to an empty unit, there is now a plethora of them which I believe cumulatively have a negative effect on the shopping environment. How many cafes does Worthing need? Often they open and then close within months through lack of custom.

Could we follow the example of Christchurch Borough Council who recently decided to take a stand against this onslaught by refusing permission for further cafes; perhaps no more than 2 within a certain stretch of frontage? Or make the relevant policies more specifically limiting new cafes/A3 uses which could only be allowed in existing A3 premises.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	David Burt
-------------	------------

Comments: Part 3 – Development Sites:

I totally support the policies SP5 & SP6 to retain the Goring Ferring gap & Chatsmore Farm as both Local Green Gaps and Local Green Space as I put great value on these sites for wildlife, informal recreation and tranquility.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Richard Giles
-------------	---------------

General Comments:

I support the local plan in relationship to the policies relating to the Goring-Ferring Gap and Chatsmore Farm as both a Local Green Gap (SP5) and the Local Green Space (SP6), thus conferring protection similar to the Green Space status. (Pages 25-37). I know that the majority of residents in the Goring/Ferring area support these Policies, and place great value on these areas as Local Green Spaces for wildlife, informal recreation, and views.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Lorraine Giles
-------------	----------------

General Comments:

I support the Council's Policy in relationship to SP5 and SP6, regarding the Green Spaces. The green spaces such as the Goring-Ferring Gap and Chatsmore Farm need protection for the enjoyment of residents and visitors alike, along with the wildlife, nature, and the environment. We all also have a duty to preserve these few remaining green spaces for future generations.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Peter Brereton
-------------	----------------

Comments: Part 2 – Spatial Strategy

We fully endorse the formation of green belt areas SP5 and SP6 to allow future generations to enjoy the unique and only views that link the Downs to the coastal strip in the Adur Worthing areas. To secure the unique wild life, especially the few remaining Skylarks over the Goring Gap and provide rural locations for walking and cycling.

Comments: Part 4 – Transport and Connectivity

Enough consideration of making accessible cycle routes all along the coastal strip and also provide north south corridors that allow family access to the Downs by bicycle have not been made. A sustainable form of transport that promotes health and wellbeing in a safe environment must be put at the heart of the plan.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	David Bettiss
-------------	---------------

Comments: Part 2 – Spatial Strategy

As a resident of the east side of Ferring, I would like to support and commend the part of the Draft Local Plan that seeks to designate both the Ferring-Goring Gap and the Chatsmore Farm Gap as Local Green Gaps (SP5) and as Local Green Spaces (SP6). I live overlooking the Ferring-Goring Gap so I know and understand these very special places and just how importantly local residents value them. Arun DC have of course already given both Gaps protection in their recent Local Plan, and it would be absolutely right and appropriate for Worthing to do the same, as any degradation of part of the Gaps will affect the whole of them. The Gaps are a really important habitat for wildlife, especially bird roosts, they add significantly to the local landscape with their proximity to the sea and Highdown and the National Park, they are important places of peace and tranquility and used for a variety of recreation purposes and they are very rare in this stretch of coast in providing a welcome break between areas of housing and development. They need protection and the Local Plan performs a vital role in doing just this.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Jeff Odell
-------------	------------

Comments: Part 3 – Development Sites

Ref policies SP5 and SP6. I would like to offer my support to the council to protect the land known as Goring-Ferring Gap and Chatsmore Farm from any kind of development now or in the future and for it to remain as a Local Green Space for future generations. It is very important for the well being of the town that these relatively small areas of land are left for all to enjoy.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Simon Hulme
-------------	-------------

General Comments:

Concerns regarding the development of the Goring Gap

Comments: Part 3 – Development Sites

There is growing concern regarding the development of The Goring Gap area. This is an area of natural beauty which is frequently used by residents of Worthing, particularly in the summer for picnics and family get togethers and is quite unique in its attraction as no other adequate green space is available in the Worthing area. Also local residents use this area daily for dog walking and is incredibly tranquil in its nature.

I believe the developers, who own the land, would be looking to build up to 600 new properties on this space. Whilst this would be totally devastating to the beauty of this unique area we have major concerns about how the infrastructure for the area would cope. 600 properties would potentially bring 1000+ additional cars to the area. With the Sea on the south side, this results in the direction of travel for these vehicles being concentrated in a Northerly direction. The current road network in the area is already under a lot of pressure leading to the A259 with the Northbrook roundabout particularly busy in a morning.

Additionally the local job market is under enough pressure, meaning that for work, the vast majority of these residents would have to travel north to places like Crawley etc. The feeder roads to the A24 and A23 are completely inadequate and would struggle to cope with the additional traffic. Travelling West towards Chichester is already a major gridlocked area at peak times, and during most of the day in recent years, in the Arundel area. Travelling east towards Brighton is already a hopeless task time wise at peak hours.

I feel anywhere south of the A259 would struggle to accomodate more people and to stop the loss, forever, of such a beautiful area, is something we have a duty to protect for the next generation to enjoy.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Vernon Kitch
-------------	--------------

General Comments:

Worthing needs to improve considerably its systems and organisation for implementation of key developments. In the past one has seen only too often long delays in implementing key developments. Individuals should be made responsible, and accountable, with target dates.

Comments: Part 2 – Spatial Strategy

It is very reassuring that the Local Plan provides for the protection of the valued open spaces and landscapes, namely the areas defined in the Plan as "Goring-Ferring Gap, Chatsmore Farm and Brooklands Recreation area".

Apart from the benefits of its natural habitats the Goring-Ferring Gap, which I know well, not only provides a breathing space between Goring and Ferring but also an area for recreational use. I, along with many others, used to walk my dog along the footpaths and I still continue to exercise there.

The views from the Coastal Path towards Highdown Hill are attractive at any time of year. In 2018 there was a consultation on the Coastal Path which runs south of this Gap being included as part of the National Footpath project. It would be disappointing, and verging on vandalism, for walkers on the path to have their view north blocked by housing, just as it would be for them to have their view south over the sea blocked by beach huts.

I noted recently a report of a Government Inspector who some 60 years ago recommended preserving the view across the Gap towards Highdown Hill. The reciprocal view south across the Gap towards the sea from Highdown is also an asset worth preserving.

As the Plan recognises, (P.24. 2.11) Worthing is tightly constrained. Despite the need for housing, there must be a balance between town and country. London has its Hyde Parks and Green Parks and St.Jame's Parks, as well as all its Squares. Let Worthing keep its breathing spaces

Comments: Part 4 – Historic Environment

Sections 4.207 and 4.208 are very important. Worthing has lost too much its "historic environment", particularly in the 1960s and 1970s. Worthing needs to attract tourists, as reported elsewhere in the Plan, and many tourists are attracted to a town by the interesting streets and buildings it has to offer. Although Worthing cannot be another Chester, it needs to preserve its current assets.

Comments: Part 4 – Transport & Connectivity

Section 4.283 I hope that the focus on reducing congestion on the A27 will be to improve the flow of cars, bringing more shoppers into Worthing. Not to make it more difficult for cars to come into Worthing.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Niall Gavin
------	-------------

General Comments:

Fully support the pragmatic approach to sustainability & retention of local character, whilst addressing equality of opportunity for housing and employment in the town. Disappointing lack of discussion around benefits & opportunities which could be achieved by leveraging/developing technology to promote more homeworking, digital hubs etc.

Comments: Part 2 – Spatial Strategy

Fully support redevelopment of urban and brownfield sites but caution against overcrowding onto those spaces. Real concerns about road/infrastructure capacity to support this. Equally fully support the protected status of the identified Gap & Green Spaces to prevent linear urbanisation along the coastal strip.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Suzanne Turner
-------------	----------------

General Comments:

I strongly object to any developments being considered on areas currently proposed as protected. The intrinsic value of these green spaces and their protection by the guardians of the area – i.e. the council and its residents is indisputable. To simply question whether it should be sacrificed for more housing shows a sad disconnect from the very place you are seeking to develop and protect. We should be building Worthing and surround in a way that showcases and encourages all the town has to offer. It's past, it's culture, it's environment. Not allow development to rage unchecked with infrastructure lagging behind.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Andy Cobby
------	------------

General Comments:

I would like to see the goring gap afforded special status.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Heather Soulsby
-------------	-----------------

General Comments:

I have been resident in Worthing for 45 years. During this time I have seen the development of many green spaces. They have now become a college, Caffyns showroom, business park, retail park, hospice and dementia care homes.

To build on Goring gap, Titnore area and the caravan club site would be a disaster, not only for local residents but for our already saturated roads.

Titnore lane/Way has become a very hazardous road with heavy goods lorries, cyclists and pedestrians travelling up and down. Numerous accidents at the junction of Titnore way have taken place this year alone, with no pavement I fear a pedestrian will be the next victim. Traffic travelling west on the A259 face long delays, which could be improved with road marking designating traffic going straight ahead or turn right only lanes.

The Angmering by pass junction at the roundabout to A259 could be improved by widening the near side lane by a couple of feet allowing traffic to flow and causing less build up behind traffic turning right.

I drive locally on these roads and have first hand experience of the misery these road conditions occur.

More houses will see more traffic on these inadequate roads and many others across Worthing. Developments are often advertised "with parking" but families live in these developments and own more than one car.

My daughter lives on the new Fulbeck estate, the roads in this development are too narrow for cars to pass each other, especially at junctions. Parking spaces come with most of the houses but nowhere for visitors to park!

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018

Representation

Name	Graham Elvey
Organisation	West Sussex Access Forum
Address	County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RH
Email	wslaf@westsussex.org.uk

Comments: Part 2 – Spatial Strategy

Land outside the Built Up Area

Para 2.7 & 2.38 – We support the commitment to protect and enhance parks and open spaces and to provide new green spaces within developments to benefit health & well-being. New housing development should not be designed in isolation causing a barrier to countryside access for residents. It should provide a 'gateway' from the urban environment to the greater countryside.

The Countryside

Para 2.42 – The commitment to protect and enhance countryside is supported. Green infrastructure should include public rights of way (PRoW) as green corridors. New development can provide a unique opportunity to improve connectivity through a network of PRoW which are the principal means to access the countryside. The lack of multi-use PRoW on the Coastal Plain is widely accepted and improvements and enhancements would benefit both new and existing residents. Whilst we are pleased to note the inclusion of 'horse related activity' in this paragraph, any references to informal recreation should include all Non-Motorised Users (NMUs) to maximise benefit & use. Increased traffic volumes have adversely affected local roads and lanes frequently used by NMUs, particularly equestrians, due to the limited bridleway provision.

SP4 Countryside and Undeveloped Coast

d) – is supported. The level of activity should not cause an unacceptable increase in traffic on local roads.

e) – is strongly supported

f) – we supported the aims of this paragraph. Currently the A27 forms a barrier to access to and from the SDNP and improvements would benefit residents and the local economy through tourism.

SP5 Local Green Gaps

We strongly support the designation and maintenance of the areas mentioned as Local Green Gaps. Any improvements to the connectivity of these areas to the wider RoW network would be welcomed.

Local Green Space

Para 2.66 – The Ilex Avenue bridleway is a valued multi-use recreational route. Historic paths such as this should be valued and seen as part of the greater RoW network. Any improvements or upgrading of paths to multi-user routes and improved connectivity to this wider network would be beneficial for all users. It is important to retain the rural character of paths of this type to provide a visual and wildlife link to green space and woodland.

SP6 Local Green Space

This Policy and the designation of the three areas is supported.

Comments: Part 3 – Development Sites

Para 3.10 – proposals for development should include NMU access through and around the perimeter of sites linked to the wider access network.

A4 Decoy Farm, East Worthing - Page 51 – the fifth bullet point is supported and in addition the creation of a PRoW linking RB 3733 to Loose Lane east is recommended.

Comments: Part 4 – Homes and Neighbourhoods

CP5 Quality of the Built Environment – all aims in this Policy are supported especially iv. This Policy should refer to all NMUs not solely walking & cycling.

CP6 – Public Realm – b) is supported. We reiterate that green infrastructure include PRow which provide good access and links for NMUs if multi-use.

Comments: Part 4 – Sustainable Communities

CP7 – Healthy Communities

Para 4.77 - 3rd bullet point – recommend 'use by all NMUs' in place of 'walking and cycling.

Para 4.81 – as above.

Para 4.87 – recommend use of 'multi-user routes' in place of 'walking and cycling.

Para 4.90 – recommend use of 'use of multi-user routes' in place of walking & cycling.

Page 102 –

a) i. - this policy is supported. In our view informal recreation is underestimated. Leisure routes are equally effective for walking, cycling, horse riding etc in keeping people active and for providing a 'gateway' for walking/cycling to work.

a)ii. - we support improving access to 'green infrastructure' for all NMUs.

CP8 Open Space, Recreation and Leisure

Supporting Text

Paras 4.95 to 4.98 – the overall aims and wording are supported. Informal recreation should have a higher profile and be specifically mentioned, not just as 'recreational facilities', which tend to be considered as built facilities. Communities value a connected network of PRow and access routes, as stated within NPPF paras 98 & 118 shown below-

NPPF para 98 states “Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks.”

NPPF para 118 states “Planning policies and decisions should encourage multiple benefits from both urban and rural land....taking opportunities to achieve net

environmental gains – such as developments that would enable new habitat creation or improve public access to the countryside.”

There is no mention of equestrian use in this Policy despite there being significant numbers of horse riders in the urban fringe of Worthing.

The Policy should require new development to connect to at least one multi-user route around its perimeter to allow access to the wider countryside.

Para 4.113 – it should be specifically stated the 'green infrastructure includes PRoW and it is recommended this is included within the brackets i.e. (open space and public rights of way).

CP10 Delivering Infrastructure

- a) – the wording is supported

Comments: Part 4 – Environment and Climate Change

CP20 Green Infrastructure

Para 4.251 – recommend including public rights of way as part of the 'network.

- a) to c) – the wording of the policy is supported.

Comments: Part 4 – Transport & Connectivity

CP24 Transport

All references to improving facilities and safety for walkers and cyclists are welcomed but it is disappointing that there is no mention of all vulnerable road users. References should be to all NMUs.

There is bridleway access to the northwest part of the Borough but this is hampered by the lack of safe crossings over the A27. A safe multi-use crossing would much improve access.

- b) iii – although the policy is supported the aim to provide a network of routes should where appropriate refer to all NMUs. This can best be facilitated by providing a network of off-road multi-use PRoW routes.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Paula Adams
------	-------------

General Comments:

I wish to oppose to any building on Goring Gap. It should remain as it is, or even get a "Protected area" on it. I strongly oppose and object this proposal!

I also disagree with the development of the car park near Marks and Spencers in Worthing Town centre. With little or no parking, would make shopping difficult.

I also disagree and oppose the development at Stok Abbot Road, where the plans are to develop and build on part of the car park at this site. This car park is full when a show is performing at either the Connaught and Assembly Hall, so where would the patrons Park? Developing this site would be at a cost of the Worthing Theatres!

Comments: Part 3 Development Sites

I oppose the developments to these areas

- 1) Goring Gap
- 2) The car park near Marks and Spencers
- 3) Stoke Abbot Road

Comments: Part 4 Local Economy

There won't be any economy if you close car parks. Where will people Park to go shopping in town plus visit the Theatres! They will go elsewhere.

Comments: Part 4 Environment and Climate Change

Building on green gap will be detrimental to the wildlife. We need our green spaces. Do not build at Goring Gap.

Comments: Part 4 Transport & Connectivity

Developments will cause more traffic on roads, plus losing valuable parking spaces will cause people to go elsewhere for shopping and theatres.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Bruce Martin
-------------	--------------

Comments: Part 2 - Spatial Strategy

SP5 We strongly support the inclusion in the Local Plan of the preservation of the Local Green Gaps between Worthing and Ferring, and between Worthing and Sompting/Lancing. It is very undesirable to have buildings on these Gaps and to have a solid line of concrete along miles of the south coast.

SP6 We are in total agreement with the comments on "Local Green Space" included in this section.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	David Daniels
------	---------------

Comments: Part 2 - Spatial Strategy

I strongly support the council's proposals listed on P30 SP5 Local Green Gap and P36 SP6 Local Green Space of the Worthing Draft Local Plan. The areas in question are wonderful open spaces and in my view, to develop them would be vandalism.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Patricia Daniels
------	------------------

Comments: Part 2 - Spatial Strategy

I strongly support the councils proposals listed on: Page 30 SP5 Local Green Gap and Page 36 SP6 Local Green Space of their Draft Worthing Local Plan The areas described are beautiful open spaces, future generations will look on us unkindly if we allow them to be developed.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	April Daniels
-------------	---------------

Comments: Part 2 - Spatial Strategy

I strongly support the council's proposals listed on; Page 30 SP% Local Green Gap and Page 36 Local Green Space of their Draft Local Plan It would be terrible to destroy the extremely rare tranquillity provided by these open spaces.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018

Representation

Name	Graham & Yvonne Instone
-------------	-------------------------

Comments: Part 3 - Development Sites

AOC4 It is a good plan to further develop the leisure centre for the use of the community but not erode playing fields for the use of further housing. We feel that this area is over populated for the facilities provided. e.g. schools, hospitals, doctors surgeries etc.

Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Homes and Neighbourhoods (Policies CP1 - CP6)

Beach Huts, Goring By Sea. The Council's proposal to locate 96 extra huts between George V Avenue . and Sea Lane Cafe is preposterous . At present it is a pleasure to walk along the promenade pathway in this area , being able to see the sea between the few gaps provided. However, with the addition of more beach huts walkers will feel completely penned in and may well decide to go elsewhere. Having moved to this area in the last year being close to the sea front was a big attraction. What a shame that more consideration is not being given to the local residents but for the Council's need to provide more beach huts to sell or rent to provide the Council with more income. Surely it should be a possibility to locate more huts on the sea front between George V Avenue and the pier at Worthing where there are in comparison only a few at present and the amount needed would not enforce a barrier between the promenade and the sea. It is hoped the Council will look with sympathy at the feelings of the local people and not take action regardless before they consider putting additional beach huts further along the promenade.

Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Transport and Connectivity (Policies CP24 - CP25)

Pavements in the Goring area need up grading .e.g.tarmac instead of uneven slabs.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Pauline Reymond
-------------	-----------------

Comments: Part 3 - Development Sites

Any development across the top of Beeches and Pines Avenue taller or north of the existing business development would destroy all views of green fields and the start of SDNP and should not be permitted as part of the future plan. This suggested development should not be considered even if access to the site were established.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Monika Szlenkier
-------------	------------------

Comments: Part 2 - Spatial Strategy

Please stick to your commitment to protect the Green Spaces from development - particularly Goring Gap which is such an important oasis - and also Chatsmore Farm and Brooklands.

Comments: Part 3 - Development Sites

I disagree with encroachment on greenfield sites. And it is vital to ensure that infrastructure can cope with any new development.

Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Homes and Neighbourhoods (Policies CP1 - CP6)

All sounds good on paper!

Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Sustainable Communities (Policies CP7 - CP10)

CP10 - infrastructure is vital! Particularly health services. Apart from physical structures there is a severe shortage of NHS staff - how will this be addressed?

CP7/8 - another reason to protect Goring Gap!

Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Local Economy (Policies CP11 - CP14)

CP13/14 - I would love to see Worthing become a vibrant shopping community, along the lines of Chichester!

Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Historic Environment (Policies CP15 - CP16)

Please do not sacrifice conservation areas in favour of development

Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Environment and Climate Change (Policies CP17 - CP23)

All vitally important, with special mention of Goring Gap in helping to conserve biodiversity.

Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Transport and Connectivity (Policies CP24 - CP25)

Please make no 8/8a bus service more frequent (ie twice per hour in the afternoon).
Extend cycle lane between Ferring and Worthing.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	David Hunt
-------------	------------

Comments: Part 1 - Introduction and Context

Just heard about the proposed redevelopment of the park at the rear of sports ground between shaftsbury avenue and bruce avenue as it concerns my property and my allotment. I would have thought that worthing council would have notified residents rather than letting them find out through a third party.

Comments: Part 3 - Development Sites

Date today 09/12/2018 last date to register 12 /12/2018 keeping it very quiet once again.

**Comments: Part 4 - Core Policies: Homes and Neighbourhoods
(Policies CP1 - CP6)**

I think its bad policy left alone bad manners not to advise residents as what is happening directly in their area unless its another cover up

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Jerry Le Sueur
------	----------------

Comments: Part 2 - Spatial Strategy

I wish to support your proposals regarding the Local Green Space/Gaps between Worthing & Ferring as well as the Brooklands area

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Donald Pedley
-------------	---------------

General Comments:

I have found it impossible to use the online documents as I cannot search for the one item I am concerned about, PDF documents not the best way to present this. I am therefore using this general comment section to stress my strong view to protect and preserve the Goring Gap as green space. I believed this was now secure after strong opposition from residents in Worthing to develop both north and south gaps for residential use. I understand that Arun Council have already had their protection for their part of the gap accepted as part of their local plan. I urge Worthing to ensure the protection of their part of the gap be included in the local plan.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018

Representation

Name	M Martin
------	----------

General Comments:

A lot of good intent I'm pleased to see. However, all depends on adequate resources. No indication of degree to which these aims/intent will be constrained by inadequate resources in the end is given. Left wondering if these are "in principle" aims/intent without adequate resources to deliver them, or if they are realistic and adequately resourced in terms of staff, budget etc.

Comments: Homes & Neighbourhoods

CP3 - Affordable Housing

Can the housing need really be addressed without direct Council construction (and ownership)? I don't think it can. The Council needs to move to get back to direct building – building for housing, protecting stock, providing for local community.

The Plan talks of the number of units needed and the number it hopes to see built. But if most in Worthing are built by private developers, there is no reason to think the units constructed/added will be purchased by local people who need housing. So the housing need might not be addressed at all in the way the Plan suggests it could.

"To achieve this aim the Council will continue to work with public bodies and Registered providers to maximise development of affordable housing on sites. What does this mean? Who are these bodies and providers and, realistically, how much can they provide on the Council's behalf in that time?

Didn't see a figure for the percentage of the planned housing construction to be done a) by public bodies and registered providers and b) by private developers? Likely to have a big effect on availability of affordable housing. Private developers have a tendency to want to avoid it or negotiate it to be off their site.

CP4 Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople

4.46 No information on consultation with them. Were they consulted?

CP5 Quality of Built Up Environment

4.52 "Council will seek to ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion."

Is the Council able to monitor this adequately? Do they have sufficient resources for that? What success in doing this? What sanctions/disincentives?

4.57 I am concerned about ever-increasing hard stand in gardens and elsewhere for parking. New ones don't always seem to be built with drains. Are resources adequate for monitoring? Run off to streets with inadequate drain capacity is an increasing problem, with flooding to ground floor residential properties and build up of large puddles especially at junctions.

CP6 Public Realm

Be careful to ensure fit for diverse population. Have more than the majority of people in mind. Ensure areas are accessible and appropriate for all ages and abilities. There is no access to the beach and the sea shallows for people with mobility restrictions. This is so disappointing and distressing for people who live by the coast and for visitors - to have to look at the sea but not get up close to it.

Comments: Sustainable Communities

CP8 – Open Spaces and Recreation Spaces

No specific paragraph on access and disability. What about access to the beach - not just the prom and the edge of the shingle, but down the slope on the shingle to get close to the water. The slope might be good for some issues and a defence, but it blocks people with mobility issues from getting lower onto the beach and to the sea shallows. I watch people unable to get down to the sea and I feel badly for them.

CP9 – Planning for Sustainable Communities/Community Facilities

What about schools? Are their enough for the children who will live in new housing developments? I didn't see any reference to that. Don't undermine current businesses with new businesses on new sites. Don't get rid of services at the same time as population in centre expands (e.g. post office. Both the post office and the library are important community services. They are part of life in the centre of Worthing, much used by the population, needed more and more as local post offices have been closed in many areas. WH Smith's is already very crowded on its ground floor and it is too congested to provide sufficient space for all the Centre of town post office services currently provided but it is important that all of those services continue, including parcel collection, photo booth, advice, help completing forms etc etc..

Similarly the Library and all its services. Using it also as a community hub is OK as long as Library services are not diminished and local authority office ambitions don't creep towards takeover of the building.

Comments: Local Economy

CP13 The Visitor Economy

Work to change the perspective that Worthing is still God's waiting room, but that doesn't mean try to emulate Brighton. Focus on what Worthing has here Live music, St. Paul's, cinemas, community centres, parks, watersports, sports.

Comments: Environment and Climate Change

CP19 – Much that sounds good but I worry about the exceptions that follow several intentions/commitments in the Summary, with the plan saying that if things cannot be avoided, they must be mitigated, and if they can't be adequately mitigated, such harm must be compensated for. I think this gives too much leeway for developers to push and push to the limit. And on SSIs similarly, it says where benefits of development outweigh impacts on features of SSI, could be exceptions. Give them an inch.....

Comments: Transport & Connectivity

Current Highways England proposals for the A27 changes in Worthing/Lancing could be very problematic for various aspects of the Local Plan. Worthing risks increasing "community severance" and isolation from areas to the north of the Borough and upward if Highway England's draft proposals go forward. I feel their desire is largely for a speedy, commercial route from Dorset to Kent rather than to meet the needs of the population for less congestion and pollution. The proposals still being considered were for a very expensive scheme which would only save 4-5 minutes on a rush hour journey (their figures), and that saving wouldn't last long as traffic will increase. In addition, it excludes encouraging traffic to filter off the A27 at points to go north-west on current roads, as some does already (on the A283 for example).

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Bill Clifford
Organisation	Worthing United FC

Comments: Spatial StrategyOmission Site - Worthing United Football Club (page 76)

This Club is integral to the local community providing a lot of pleasure to so many whether they be players, supporters or committee and helpers.

Furthermore it is one of the most picturesque settings in local football. Sitting in the main stand there is a wonderful view of the downs and watching from the other side a fantastic view of the sea.

Last, but by no means least, Worthing United holds a special place in many people's hearts further to the tragic Shoreham Air Disaster where two of our players (on the way to play a game at Lyons Way) were among those that lost their lives. Indeed, the main stand is named after them both.

If Housing is built next to the west side of the ground then a number of issues would arise for the Club. These would include, but not limited to, the need for new modern floodlighting in order to avoid light nuisance to residents, a new car park and higher netting behind the west goal.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Pauline Fraser
-------------	----------------

General Comments:

I am concerned that the Plan does not appear to take into account the needs of disabled people.

Comments: Spatial Strategy

I note that three of the developments currently in progress are in Central Worthing: Teville Gate, Union Place South and the Civic Centre Car Park. The plans so far for Union Place do not appear to include affordable housing and likewise with Teville Gate. It seems essential to me that all three should include affordable housing and housing available for key workers (NHS, council services, education). Central and Heene wards are two of the most deprived wards in Worthing and I would like to see residents relocated near to their current accommodation.

Comments: Development Sites

I believe I have already commented on Development Sites in my previous submission, which should be read to relate to this are.

Comments: Homes and Neighbourhoods

I am pleased to see there is an emphasis on the housing needs of disabled and/or elderly people's accommodation. I have concerns about HMO's. So many HMOs in central Worthing that I have visited appear to be unsafe, poorly maintained, in other words, sub-standard accommodation at unacceptably high rents. There is a need to sort out these problems by possibly employing more enforcement officers (I note that the Council Pest Control Service was recently disbanded) to improve properties and, in some cases, make them habitable. An expansion of the Council's legal services may be required here.

Comments: Sustainable Communities

I support the general ideas that underpin this section of the Plan. However, on the question of the promotion of healthy lifestyles and the reduction of mental illness, I would suggest that these are intimately bound up with material deprivation: low wages, leading to stress, or the introduction of Universal Credit for those on benefits; poor quality housing and high rents. People who are preoccupied with paying the rent or being able to afford the next meal, are more likely to suffer from mental health problems and will be less amenable to enjoying a good walk along the prom, a swim at Splashpoint, or a cycle ride to Lancing.

Comments: Local Economy

I support all the proposals in the summary to this section. I would like to see the Lido returned to its original use - as a sea-water swimming pool. Climate change is giving us more sunny, warm days than ever in Worthing, so this would be an added attraction. I am fully behind developing the Guildbourne Centre. It is an eyesore, and dangerous at night. A mix of residential, retail and small business would be appropriate here. Also, PLEASE DEMOLISH THE BRUTALIST STYLE CAR PARK ON THE SEA FRONT. I can't bear to look at it, especially now that it has been garishly over-painted. I want to see small retail units encouraged, especially those that can train and employ people with a range of disabilities and learning difficulties. The addition of Larder, a zero waste shop, is to be commended. While making Worthing a more attractive town centre for night-life, I would oppose bringing in large chains. We already have a number of small, independent restaurants offering a variety of attractive and reasonably-priced food, and I don't want to see a multiplex cinema appearing in central Worthing. Please refurbish our local theatres and cinemas and maintain them as a Council amenity just as they are.

Comments: Historic Environment

Many of our wonderful buildings were destroyed during the vandalism of the 1960's. I want to see Worthing treasure those jewels in our crown that still exist, such as St. Paul's, Beach House, and the fine municipal buildings of the 1930's. Development in surrounding areas should be appropriately and sensitively designed.

Comments: Environment & Climate Change

I support the general thrust of this part of the Plan. I assume the Council would work in collaboration with those local organisations that are particularly concerned with climate change and the environment: Sussex Wildlife Trust, Transition Town Worthing, Worthing Climate Action Network, and so on.

Comments: Transport and Connectivity

I support the general proposals in this part of the Plan. I am not sure what is meant by 'a suitable provision for parking'. Has thought been given to Park n Ride schemes to facilitate residents coming into the town centre without needing to bring their vehicles? With an increase in sustainable forms of transport: better bus services, integrated with train times, more cycleways and safe pedestrian access, in time car use should naturally decline. On the question of congestion on the A27 and A259, I think that the derisory amount of funding available for the A27 would be worse than useless. Sufficient funds should be made available to provide underpass or overpass routes to ease congestion, and so decrease municipal pollution.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Robert Adams
------	--------------

General Comments:

GORING STRATEGIC GAP – South and North (known as Chatsmore Farm)

I welcomes the Worthing Borough Council's decision to designate and provide protection to the Goring-Ferring strategic gap.

Green Space (2.60/2.69/2.73). The request for this was formally presented to WBC in June 2014.

I will gladly support WBC's belief that –

- These Local Gaps (SP5) are important in preserving Worthing's character and identity by preventing settlement coalescence
- These Local Gaps (SP5) are the only part of the undeveloped coastline between Littlehampton and Roedean which provides a visual connection between the undeveloped coastline and the South Downs National Park
- The Local Gap (North) (SP5) has substantial ecological value with rare and protected birds and bats
- These Local Gaps (SP5) offer people leisure activities which promote health and well-being in our community
- These Local Gaps (SP5) have informal footpaths that allow locals and visitors to walk and exercise their dogs.
- These Local Gaps become designated as a Local Green Space (SP6) which will help protect this area for future generations
- This Local Gap (SP5) and Local Green Space (SP6) is valued for it historic association, views, wildlife and bird-watching, black skies to enjoy stargazing and tranquillity which is not found in other parts of Worthing due to it being built up.
- This Local Green Space (SP6) is a valued place for relaxation and exercise

I would not support, at this time, approval for any structures associated with any informal or formal recreation activities which could damage qualities for which the Local Gap and Local Green Space is valued.

The Greensward – Village Green status (CP8)

I note the WBC recognises the demand for parks and open spaces. With reference to this commitment, I request that specific recognition of the Goring Greensward's Village Green status with its associated legal protection is identified in the plan

The Coastline (CP13)

I am concerned that the natural coastline with its associated vistas and access to views are protected for the enjoyment of Worthing Residents and visitors. This not only enhances the wellbeing of residents and visitors, it is also a causal factor in people choosing to live in and visit Worthing and a major contributor to the local economy.

I would definitely object should WBC continue with their plans on increasing the beach huts from George V to Sea Lane Café.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	David Lopez Aragon
-------------	--------------------

General Comments:

Would just like to ensure that it's clear to "the powers that be" that green space is extremely precious in this area. Over the last 10 years I have seen how quickly the A259 from Titnore Lane to Littlehampton has been developed and how so many new housing and commercial developments have sprung up, causing major traffic and therefore pollution issues. Expansion on this scale for our area would be horrific. I am concerned that squeezing in a few houses here, allowing a small commercial venture there, it all quickly connects up and within 15 years we will have virtually no green gaps, no spaces to breathe, no areas for wildlife... please explore the brownfield areas within our area which need development as fully as is possible before ceding any more green spaces and virgin land.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Phillip Ellis
-------------	---------------

General Comments:

I would wish to see SP5 & SP6 fully implemented and all green spaces within the borough fully protected as in my opinion do not have sufficient. Developing these area we would lose our areas enhancing the green aspects of the town.

Housing should always consider the local demand especially homeless first and not developers wanting to encourage immigration from other areas with locally unaffordable houses. Encourage social housing for those unable to purchase a home.

Comments: Development sites

Potential sites should provide employment or housing for local people.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Robert Niall
Organisation	Goring and Ilex Conservation Group

General Comments:

We are pleased that The Goring Gaps – South and Chatsmore Farm have been designated both as Local Green Spaces and as Local Gaps. These spaces are very special both to residents and visitors for the reasons more clearly defined in the evidence for the LGS applications and further evidenced by the public concern in 2014 following the first call for sites and the oversubscribed subsequent public meeting. Preservation of these Gaps for the enjoyment of all is also one of our Group's core objectives.

We are, however, concerned that the decisions being put upon the Council by Government policy to build ever more housing, whilst increasing the local population, also reduces the opportunities to maintain and develop facilities for these additional residents (such as re-designating the site of the Leisure Centre to be part residential) . Public parks are under pressure, land for new schools, doctor's surgeries etc. is increasingly being used for housing as are the former yards used for building and haulage trades, forcing them out of the borough boundaries. We do, however, recognise that the Plan attempts to balance all these requirements within the overarching presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Comments: Introduction and Context

The vision of Worthing in 15 years' time is one with which we concur but we note that in V3 "Limited land resources will have been developed" implying that, at that time, no further housing provision will be able to take place unless existing sites are re-developed. If there is still a pressure for further accommodation and the Gaps and Brooklands remain protected, this can only mean higher density and/or high rise housing which we believe will endanger that vision going forward from 2033.

Comments: Spatial Strategy

As noted in the general comments, one of our core objectives is the preservation of the beauty and present character of the Goring Gaps (including “Chatsmore Farm”). Paragraphs 2.60 to 2.73 detail many of the various activities and opportunities encouraged by these Gaps which with an increasing population will become even more special. Local residents and visitors alike cherish the views, space and bringing the countryside to the sea. We applaud the council for including these Gaps as Local Green Spaces and Local Gaps within the Plan and fully endorse SP5 and SP6.

We would point out an error in Paragraph 2.62, however, which in line 8 refers to Ilex Way (which is the road either side of the Ilex Avenue between Goring Church and Aldsworth Avenue). This should read “Ilex Avenue” which is the whole of the oak avenue to and beyond the border with Ferring.

Comments: Development sites

It is regrettable that the key site A1 – the Caravan Club – has been considered. Subject to upgrading of the current facilities, this could be a useful facility for visitors to the area. Although the Plan includes an upgrade after reduction of the site area by about a half, this would seem to be an opportunity missed. We are also concerned about potential flooding and the increased traffic flow to Titnore Lane, which are also our concerns for site A2 – Land west of Fulbeck Avenue.

We are supportive of the analysis of sites OS1-3 in the Plan view that they are not currently suitable for development.

Comments: Homes and Neighbourhoods

Paragraphs 4.25 and 4.26 refer to increasing densities – “significantly” in appropriate locations such as town centres and areas with good public transport connections. 4.26 infers checks and balances against significant increases in most parts of Worthing which we would endorse and urge caution against targets dictating housing conditions particularly when infrastructure such as medical facilities, schools and indeed rubbish collection are under current pressure only to be exacerbated at higher densities.

Regarding quality of design under para 4.52, we note that “Council will seek to ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion.” We are concerned regarding the word “materially” in that it suggests that a certain amount of diminishing of quality would be acceptable.

We broadly support the proposed improvements to the public realm although we feel that care should be taken not to drive visitors arriving by bus or coach from the sea front by vehicle restrictions nor inconvenience shoppers in a similar way.

Comments: Sustainable Communities

We support CP10 c) regarding the timing of infrastructure which in the past has not been in place at the right time of a development or even not at all.

Comments: Local Economy

Within CP14, we believe that District and Local Centres should have sufficient variety to dissuade residents local to those centres from opting for the main town centre for all their shopping and other needs. Specialist shops should be encouraged in these areas to provide variety and life to these centres.

Comments: Historic Environment

We support the proposals for a strategic approach to the historic environment in CPs 15 and 16.

Comments: Environment and Climate Change

Regarding Paragraph 4.230, we believe that the effectiveness of insulation and airtightness will require high quality standards of building and inspection together with education of the future occupants if the dwellings are not to suffer from rapid deterioration or condensation.

We support the biodiversity proposals under CP19 and those for green infrastructure under CP20, particularly CP19 c) - Proposals for Local Wildlife sites (including ancient woodlands, ancient/veteran trees, wildlife corridors and stepping stones) and CP19 g) – Tree Planting and protection of trees with Tree Preservation Orders.

Comments: Transport and Connectivity

In CP24, we believe that the needs of pedestrians should be prioritised over the needs of cyclists to safeguard the young and elderly and to reflect the balance in numbers between those walking and cycling. In general, we consider that cyclist and pedestrian routes should be separated to avoid accident.

Paragraph 4.290 refers to an increase in public transport capacity. Regrettably, West Sussex County Council are currently reviewing the subsidies to a number of local bus routes which may well reduce not increase the capacity.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Robert Niall
-------------	--------------

Comments: Spatial Strategy

As a Goring resident of 30 years and previously a Worthing resident of more than 30 further years, I greatly value the Goring Gap and Chatsmore Farm as welcome respite from the urban coastal sprawl. I am pleased that they are planned to gain a degree of preservation for current and future generations of residents and visitors to enjoy. In their character, they are unique in the area and provide the opportunity for different recreation as well as contemplation of the peace and views. It would be a tragedy if they were lost through development.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018

Representation

Name	John Holstrom
Organisation	Turning Tides
Address	Town Hall, Chapel Rd, Worthing, BN11 1HA
Email	John.holmstrom@turning-tides.org.uk

WLP Database	Yes
Newsletter	Yes

Comments: Homes and Neighbourhoods

I am writing from the perspective of a single homelessness charity, Turning Tides, based in Worthing that also reflects the views of others in our sector such as YMCA DLG and Worthing Homes. We would like the Local Plan to better reflect the needs of single people at risk of homelessness or moving on from supported housing. The Local Plan recognises the value of HMO accommodation. Bedsits with shared facilities may meet the needs of some single people but often this is provided by private sector landlords. However, at the cheaper end of the market and affordable at LHA levels the quality is very mixed. Our clients also invariably seek accommodation with self contained facilities - the privacy this affords is of great significance to their well being. There is hardly any supply of studio flats. We would like to see more studio flats developed but the current national space standards of 37m2 for the smallest one person flats makes this uneconomic to develop within LHA rent levels. We have financially modelled schemes and they only become viable at 28m2 to 30m2. This would be still double the size of 14m2 minimum for a bedsit. We note Worthing's 2012 space standard for studio flats was 32m2. We can understand for long term general needs housing why the national standard of 37m2 is desirable, however, we see a place for "transition housing" which falls between supported housing and general needs housing, for single people transition to full independence over a 2-4 year period. There is a huge move on need from supported housing. For example, Turning Tides has over hundred new cases of local rough sleepers presenting each year. Only a very small proportion will be rehoused through re lets of social housing. There is very limited availability of private rented accommodation within LHA levels. We estimate the need for a minimum of 50 studio flats a year to

meet our move on needs. Other supported housing providers such as YMCA DLG report similar problems. The Council has difficulty to find move on from the Temporary Accommodation for homeless applicants. There is positive experience of studio flats schemes around 28m² in other parts of the country such as the YMCA Y-Cube.

Smaller studio flats will allow higher density's to be achieved and help Worthing meet its OAN of 600 new homes a year.

We would propose that "transition housing" studio flats be permitted only for schemes designed to meet local housing need, and therefore should be limited to social and charitable housing providers in agreement with the Council over referral arrangements.

We believe that the CP2 Density on space standards therefore should be amended to provide flexibility for "transition housing" for studio flats schemes with space standard minimum of 28m². This would be an exception to the national space standard due to intense pressure to provide move on housing, which can be expected for the foreseeable future.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Rebecca McCardle
-------------	------------------

General Comments:

I support policies SP5 and SP6 for both the Goring-Ferring Gap and Chatsmore Farm in the draft local plan. I place great value on these areas as both Local Green Gaps and Local Green Space for wildlife, recreation, tranquillity and important views.

REG 18 CONSULTATION OCT 31st – 12th Dec 2018**Representation**

Name	Margaret Rowley
-------------	-----------------

General Comments:

Broadly supportive of the Plan, based on review of the topic summary leaflets, subject to the comments below:

- Important to retain the green gaps, especially Goring Gap and Brooklands.
- Brooklands Go Carts should be retained.
- Worthing FC ground should be retained unless a suitable alternative is identified.
- Retain parks and gardens, but are there enough staff to maintain them to a good standard?
- Need homes for local people to suit their requirements (small bungalows for the older generation, smaller start-up homes for first-time buyers) and budgets.
- Support higher density of good quality housing but there should be no more high-rise buildings – 6-8 floors should be the maximum.
- Where was the consultation advertised? Only alerted to this by a friend with little time to review and comment, hence only reviewing the summary leaflets.
- New developments (residential, commercial and industrial) should be designed for low energy consumption, renewable energy sources and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS).

Comments: Spatial Strategy

Based on review of the topic summary leaflets I have the following comments: Support the policies to protect the countryside and undeveloped coast, designated local green gaps and three local green spaces.

Comments: Development Sites

Based on review of the topic summary leaflets I have the following comments: Broadly supportive. Retain the protected areas.

Comments: Homes and Neighbourhoods

Based on review of the topic summary leaflets I have the following comments:

Broadly supportive, but ensure all new developments (residential, commercial and industrial) are designed for low energy consumption, renewable energy sources and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS).

Comments: Environment and Climate Change

Based on review of the topic summary leaflets I have the following comments: Broadly supportive. Ensure new developments are designed with SUDS and biodiversity enhancements (green roofs, retaining trees, planting new vegetation etc) and that lighting is designed to not disrupt wildlife. Require renewable energy to be installed on all new buildings.

Comments: Transport & Connectivity

Based on review of the topic summary leaflets I have the following comments:

Concerned re air quality impacts on health from transport emissions and there is no recognition of this. Broadly supportive but add policies to encourage more cycling.