

Sarah Valentine

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 February 2026 23:27
To: planninginfo
Subject: Application no. DM/25/2612 Franklands Village Shop

[REDACTED]
Dear Jessica

Thank you for allowing me to express my opinions and lay out some facts on the installation of Air Conditioning units in the western flack wall of the shop, in breach of planning laws. Franklands Village is a lovely small village, which became a Conservation Area in 1989, with the aim to protect its charm and special character.

As residents we have worked hard to protect these unique characteristics and do our part to look after the place we call home.

For the record and to provide some context, it was established in Aug. 24 that planning permission would be needed for these 'industrial' units, of which there are more than one and it was my understanding that the shop would have until the 6 January 2025 ! to apply. I understand that enforcement action was started on 10 March 2025. It was in July 25 it came to my attention that Tom (planning representative for the Council) had left, and the process had to start all over again, and I was advised you were expecting an application in the week commencing the 10th October 2025. Not too sure how we got to Jan 2026 before we get the opportunity to highlight the unsightly and noisy units, which are quite literally destroying our quality of life, especially in the summer

As the resident nearest to the shop, we have tried all attempts to work with Mr Thangarajah to find an amicable solution, and indeed he offered to install more 'substantial' fencing to try and deal with the problem, with Mugun acknowledging there was a considerable noise problem which needed addressing.

So, firstly, there is the issue of noise, with the units running 24 hrs a day, with different units clicking on and off at various times, day and night. In the summer this issue is even more acute both because the units are working harder, and we have (or try to) open our windows for ventilation and fresh air.

No mention in the acoustic report acknowledges this, affecting the validity of their report. I would also like to note that at no point were reading taken at what ES Acoustics reference as the closest noise sensitive receptor (NSR) window. This is on my land, and no one asked if this was a possibility and my cameras clearly show no attempt to assess fairly. **Again this, for me, makes the report invalid.**

Indeed, I undertook my own independent queries, and was advised, and I quote 'For an acoustic barrier to have a notable effect, then generally it should break line-of-sight from source to receiver, yet I note you have first floor windows, so this doesn't appear practical'. Especially since the units are so close to your property, and may indeed be sited too close, although this is difficult to ascertain. (I can provide further evidence if required). **Therefore I would object to the Planning Application on the basis that they are simply in the wrong location** and maybe relocated to the opposite (East) Elevation, and where adequate (professional) noise barriers could mitigate the problem

I would also challenge the application on the basis that the acoustic reports it states 'background' noise from the road is an issue. I am happy to go on the record that the occasional car (on a private road) is nothing like the noise from these units. After all the acoustic agents are working on behalf of the client (the shop) and is biased (in my opinion). Surely impartial reports should be produced ?

I would also challenge the conditions of the noise assessment, and again happy to go on the record that, in my opinion, that during the measuring period, the noise emanating from the compressors was significantly reduced (and I work from home full time so made an effort to 'investigate' the assessment conditions)

Therefore I challenge the validity of the application and object to the Planning Application for the reasons of

- a. No mention of summer conditions (and warmer periods)

No reference to windows in the 'line of sight'

- c. Noise levels emitting from the units – which are questionable – during the assessment

- d. Level of background noise

- e. Will any 'enclosure' be of the quality to fix the problem ? Fixing DPC to a domestic fence (as referenced to) has had no impact and so any 'remedy' needs to be a professional solution.

Secondly, I would like to address the visual aspect of what has been done thus far. It's a complete eye saw, installed unprofessionally and for a Conservation Area, a complete embarrassment. I enclose some visual from my windows, and road, at the end of my email. Consideration needs to be given to the quality and professionalism of any remedy – a DIY approach won't solve the issues of noise and/or its appearance – and I'm afraid that the shop owner needs to take the necessary actions which we all do to look after the village. This needs to be enforced

Franklands Village used to be somewhere we were proud to call home, and well...we all need to follow the rules, whether that is Planning, Environmental Protection, Conservation Rules to name just some.

I appreciate you taking time to consider the issues I have raised, esp. the noise and harm to the local community. I mean Mr Thangarajah no harm, and respectfully request he, and Council, do what is necessary to protect Franklands Village and its residents.

Yours Sincerely


6 Franklands Village,



View from 6 Franklands Village



View from the street



View from side – note large holes and finish



View from upstairs window of 6 Franklands



DIY approach of cabling

