

## Jessica Szollosi

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 February 2026 17:03  
**To:** Jessica Szollosi  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: Case DM/25/2612

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

[REDACTED]

Dear Ms Szollosi

Reference your letter dated 23<sup>rd</sup> Feb

The observations and points raised in my initial response still stand, but I will take the opportunity to add further comment as follows:

- the report goes to great lengths to compare / justify noise from the compressors relative to ambient background noise levels, proposing actions on the 'calculated' variance. In this respect I strongly challenge the 'experts' conclusions as presented. General traffic levels are nominal - it's a village not a main highway. And I fail to see how traffic noise from the 'Pond Road' can be an influence. And, perhaps, more significant, the report does NOT acknowledge that any ambient noise levels will be almost zero during the night/ early when residents are trying to sleep!
- The report claims to have taken readings from the 'nearest' window of the adjacent property. Firstly, using camera footage, we can find no evidence of this activity. Secondly, why is this window position relevant - it's a small window in the stair well, not a designated living space. Surely it would be more relevant to measure noise from the front bedroom or upper landing hallway. To me the report logic is highly questionable.

And, since submitting my initial response, the shop has installed more unsightly equipment. Again, no consideration for the neighbors or, indeed, the Council. Total disregard for legal planning obligations. It's disgraceful.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)