Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 16/11/2025 6:05 PM from Mr Rob South.

Application Summary

Address:	Land South Of 108 To 126 Gordon Road Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex
Proposal:	Application to vary condition 13 (acoustic fencing) of approved AWDM/2128/21 to allow acoustic fence to be erected prior to occupation of the self storage units rather than prior to commencement of development.|cr|ORIGINAL DESCRIPTION: Proposed 53no. single storey Class B8 self storage units totalling 636 sqm with associated turning facilities (on land to west of 1-3 Eastern Road).
Case Officer:	Peter Barnett

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Rob South
Email:	
Address:	118 Gordon Road Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	Robert South 118 Gordon Road, BN436WG 16 November 2025 Subject: Objection to Planning Application AWDM/1315/25 Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to formally object to the proposed amendment in planning application AWDM/1315/25, which seeks to allow acoustic fencing to be erected before occupation rather than before construction of the approved self-storage units. Grounds for Objection 1. Unacceptable Noise Impact During Construction The construction will take place immediately adjacent to my property and many others, at the bottom of our gardens. Without acoustic fencing in place during the build, residents will be exposed to prolonged and significant noise disturbance. This is contrary to the principles of protecting residential amenity under the Adur Local Plan Policy 15 (Quality of the Built Environment) and the National Planning

Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 185, which require developments to mitigate adverse impacts on health and quality of life.

2. Failure to Provide Reasonable Mitigation

The original planning approval included acoustic fencing as a condition, acknowledging the need to protect residents from noise. Delaying its installation until after construction undermines this mitigation and appears motivated solely by cost-saving for the applicant, rather than safeguarding community wellbeing.

3. Conflict with Approved Conditions and Public Interest

The appeal decision that allowed the development did so on the basis of conditions designed to minimize harm. Altering these conditions now erodes trust in the planning process and sets a concerning precedent that developers can dilute agreed protections post-approval.

4. Impact on Residential Amenity and Enjoyment of Property
Construction noise without acoustic barriers will significantly affect our ability to enjoy our homes and gardens. This is a material planning consideration under NPPF Paragraph 130, which emphasizes creating places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

To summarise, the proposed change is not a minor technical adjustment but a substantive reduction in agreed protections for residents. I urge the Council to refuse this application and uphold the original condition requiring acoustic fencing prior to commencement of construction.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Yours faithfully,

Robert South