Objections to the Appeal against Land South of 108 to 126 Gordon Road, Shoreham by Sea - Ref: AWDM/2128/21

From Gudrun Hansen, [redacted]

I am writing to appeal against the proposal to erect 53 storage units on this site on the following grounds:

1. Green Space: My main objection is that this area of land is the only valuable green space in the centre of the town. Point 7.5 of the appeal document suggests that it is not overlooked by the public. This is incorrect. Although not accessible to the public, it provides a quiet, restful area for residents to enjoy nature in a part of town surrounded by commercial properties and new building developments. Point 5.3 suggests that the site is "tucked away" but this is not the case for the many houses, including mine, overlooking it. Apparently the Government would now like people to have access to green spaces within 15 minutes of their dwellings. Although this obviously refers to parks and play areas, the psychological effect of looking out onto a green area is, therefore, contrary to point 8.2 that states it is not a "public amenity space". It most certainly is.

2. Habitat: The site forms a natural corridor along the railway line that affords habitat to a variety of species. Point 8.13 admits there is a slow worm population on site. This is a protected species under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981. The buddleia bushes provide cover for hundreds of birds and butterflies and foxes and hedgehogs who live in the undergrowth.

3. Need: There are currently over 14 storage companies in the area. Surely this is enough to satisfy people's need to store stuff.



4. Flooding: Point 7.2 admits that the area falls within a flood zone and that this will be mitigated by flood barriers and the "elevation of the floor level of the units". Does this mean that the height of the units will be even more than that specified? Surely an area of natural, porous earth provided better protection against flooding than concrete?

5. Nuisance and Impact on Residents: Replacing an area of natural greenery with 53 storage units will obviously have a detrimental impact on residents. Removal of the protective barrier of trees and shrubs will ensure that noise and pollution from the main line railway will occur. The site will be open from 7.30 am to 8.00 on weekdays, 8.00 am to 6.00 pm on Saturdays and 10.00 am to 4.00 pm on Sundays and Bank Holidays with lighting turned on half an hour before opening and turned off half an hour afterwards. Light pollution from flood lights would be unbearable during the autumn and winter months and an acoustic fence would not completely blot out the noise from metal roller doors, cars and vans and the sound of goods being stored and removed – so no peace for the wicked.

6. Future development: Although it is stated in point 9.4 that over half of the land will remain undeveloped, this planning application could be the thin end of the wedge and the temptation to extend storage units in the future could be great.

7. House prices: This development will obviously lead to a lowering of prices of the neighbouring houses.

I do believe this is an important question to answer. Is the health and wellbeing of citizens and the protection of valuable green spaces within urban areas more important than the need for people to store more stuff when, in this case, there are many other storage facilities available?

Gudrun Hansen