101 Gordon Road
Shoreham by Sea
W Sussex
BN43 6WG

12 September 2018

Dear Sirs

Planning Application AWDM / 1272 /18

Application to vary condition 3 of previously approved AWDM / 1244 / 17. Amendment to operating hours to be between 7 am and 10 pm Monday to Friday and 7 am to 7 pm Saturday and 10 am to 4 pm Sunday and Bank Holidays for Allbox Services

1 – 3 Eastern Avenue Shoreham by Sea BN43 6PD

I object to the above planning application.

This factory unit is set in a residential area. Ready Steady Store bought this unit knowing it was in a residential area and with it inherited the condition giving working hours.

The use class of this building is B8 – Storage and Distribution.

This class can be, for example, Allbox Storage, a storage unit for the general public, or, for example, Palace Drinks, rattling crates and bottles indiscriminately, or any other builder or scaffolding company going about its business.

The first paragraph above, therefore, seems to establish that the operating hours are attached to the building, not the current occupant.

Para 1.4 of RBS Noise Management Plan states that the disturbance from Storage Solutiuons is minimal and does not impact on nearby residents.

I disagree with this statement. Perhaps RBS could visit the site out of Ready Steady Store's operating hours and witness the light pollution from the site (as has previously been reported to the Council but still occurs on a frequent basis), or the fly-tipping when potential customers change their mind, or indeed, someone perhaps doing a moonlight flit at 4 – 5 am on the very morning your consultation letter appeared, with the car leaving and pulling up three times to empty its overflowing contents, along with the associated slamming of doors, dropping of items and shouting of occupants who, I presume, are Ready Steady Store's customers. Please see the attached photo – A local cab firm [redacted] Mondeo Estate possible reg [redacted] orry it was too early and too dark to get the full number - perhaps carrying out these trips after its shift had ended.

At Para 1.5 RBS are happy to agree to the conditions knowing that they apply to the building, not the occupants. If Allbox sells the building, the conditions would still apply as per when Allbox purchased it. This warehouse's central location along with

extended opening hours would make it an attractive and viable site for many businesses including builders and scaffolders, or even, drinks distributors.

The Sharps Redmore report, at 1.4, quotes Joanne Lewis, the Council's Environmental Health Officer's objection to the previous application stating that the longer hours would "have the potential to give rise to the unacceptable detriment to the residential amenities of nearby dwellings, particularly at the start and end of days at more sensitive hours" and goes on at 1.5 that no technical information was provided and her comments appear to be a subjective view.

I live in a neighbouring property and agree with Joanne Lewis's objection. Her views are not subjective at all.

This report, at para 5.4 giving suggested conditions for any application approved, states HGV's could visit the site between 0700 and 2300 but recommends the Council restricts this by condition to 2000 hours. Para 5.5 then goes on to state that these hours are initially restricted to a temporary permission.

I question whether this is acceptable in any residential area, but shows they are seeking to yet again extend these hours in the future.

These two reports supporting the application have obviously been written in favour of the applicant and take no account of the adverse impact on neighbouring properties in this residential area.

Local residents fought hard against the original and previous applications to change operating hours and the Local Councillors, at Committee, heard our views and supported our objections. The Committee subsequently refused consent to change the hours.

I note in the previous application AWDM/1244/17, the approved hours do not concur with the hours noted in the original consultation letter (see attached).

It appears, therefore, this company is trying to continually and gradually erode the residential amenities of nearby properties as these extended hours will have a further detrimental impact on neighbours in the vicinity.

Given the above, I object to this application on grounds of possible loss of amenity of nearby residents and loss of reasonable enjoymment of my home and garden in this quiet residential area.

Yours faithfully

Diana Morgan

[redacted]

MRS JANE BRIND