

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 02/07/2026 5:16 PM from Mr Ben Parkinson.

Application Summary

Address:	Safestore Self Storage 41 Albion Street Southwick West Sussex BN42 4DN
Proposal:	Advertisement consent for 4no. internally illuminated signs on the south, east and west elevations, and 2no. non-illuminated signs on the east elevation
Case Officer:	Peter Barnett

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Ben Parkinson
Email:	
Address:	53 Victoria Road Southwick Brighton West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	I object to planning application AWDM/0776/26 for advertisement consent relating to the installation of four internally illuminated signs and two non-illuminated signs at Safestore Self Storage, Albion Street, Southwick. My objection is based on the following material planning considerations: 1. Harm to Visual Amenity and Street Scene The proposed illuminated signage is excessive in scale and number for the building elevations concerned. The largest sign is 24 metres square, the next largest is 13 metres square. The installation of multiple illuminated signs on the south, east and west elevations would introduce a prominent commercial appearance that is likely to detract from the character and visual quality of the

surrounding area having a significant detrimental impact on the adjacent residential development and residential streets as well as having a negative impact on the conservation areas of Kingston Buci and Southwick by introducing unnatural illumination visible from a great distance.

Advertisement consent should preserve visual amenity, and I am concerned that the cumulative impact of four illuminated signs and further non-illuminated signage would result in unnecessary visual clutter and an over-dominant presence within the local streetscape for a development that remains contentious, deeply unpopular with longstanding resident and commercial neighbours and was regrettably approved on appeal. The proposed signage over the railwaybank will face directly on to residential properties and be visible from a considerable distance in to the adjacent conservation areas - providing harm to the local community.

The application is also incorrect in that the proposal in no way reflects other commercial or residential buildings in the area, harming the visual amenity of the area through overdevelopment and massing far in excess of surrounding properties. No other properties have comparable internally illuminated signage or signage of this scale and this development should also remain without additional illumination and preferably no further signage at all.

2. Impact of Illumination

The application proposes internally illuminated signage. Without clear justification regarding brightness levels, hours of operation and light spill, it is difficult to conclude that the development would not adversely affect nearby residences, commercial occupiers or the wider environment including fauna.

The proposal provides no calculation of lux level impacts and there is a high risk of illumination creating excessive glare, light pollution and visual intrusion, particularly during evening and night-time hours. Conditions alone may not adequately address the cumulative effect of multiple illuminated advertisements on three elevations of the building and I urge for the planning application to be refused.

3. Highway Safety Concerns

Advertisement consent must consider impacts on public safety. The number and prominence of the proposed signs will create unnecessary distraction for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians using the surrounding highway network, particularly during hours of darkness when illuminated signage is most visually prominent. Furthermore the illuminated signage risks distracting maritime activities generally and maritime safety specifically at the adjacent Shoreham Port.

The applicant has not demonstrated that the proposal would not prejudice highway or maritime safety or reduce drivers' ability to observe traffic conditions and other road users. Furthermore the application provides no comparable other developments with comparable illumination specifically because they do not exist.

4. Lack of Evidence of Need for the Extent of Signage Proposed

While smaller signage may be appropriate to identify the business, I do not consider that six separate signs, including four illuminated signs across multiple elevations, have been justified. The application appears to go beyond what is reasonably necessary for identification purposes and risks creating an over-commercialised appearance.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that the Council refuses application AWDM/0776/26. Alternatively, if officers are minded to approve the proposal, I request that the number, size, brightness and hours of illumination be significantly restricted to minimise harm to visual amenity, public safety and minimise impact on the adjacent conservation areas.

Yours faithfully,
Ben Parkinson

Kind regards