

Jessica Szollosi

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 January 2026 19:45
To: planninginfo
Cc: Steve Aylott
Subject: Application No. DM/25/2612. Franklands Village Shop

[REDACTED]
Dear Jessica Szollosi

The planning application submitted by the Franklands Village shop is not considered complete, appropriate or accurate. Firstly, there should be three issues addressed, not just noise.

1. Noise impact to the next-door residential property (the 'house') and general environment
2. Visual impact of installed equipment to the house and general neighborhood.
3. Illegal location of some elements of the installed equipment

These issues are addressed in detail below but first some general background comments.

- The equipment under contention by the house owner(a registered vulnerable resident) consists of a number of heat- exchanger units and associated power supply cables installed on the external wall of the shop, immediately adjacent to the house. The heat exchangers are within 1 meter of the party fence.
- Installation was carried out some 18 months ago, without any discussion or notice to the house owner and without planning approval.
- Early discussion took place with the shop owner (Leasee) and the CEO of the Franklands Village Association to reach an amicable solution to the intrusive noise pollution and unsightly installation. Indeed, an offer was made by the house owner to contribute to the erection of sound proof fencing. This proposal was initially accepted but later declined.
- At a later point the shop owner made some attempt to reduce the noise impact by lowering the heat exchangers. This made negligible difference to noise levels. Trunking was also added which if anything has served to make the visual impact worse
- Although the house owner has endeavored to maintain a neighborly relationship with the shop, there has sadly been a general lack of respect in the other direction. Work agreed and not carried out, work carried out without notice, access onto the house property without agreement and negative responses e.g. a written comment that the resident "doesn't use the shop" - suggesting that there is a vindictive element to the relationship.

Turning to the three (3) specific issues which should be taken into account in respect of the now submitted retrospective planning application (finally submitted some 18 months after the Council Planning Office requested the same, despite numerous follow ups)

1. Noise Impact

The planning application, in the view of the resident and the writer of this response, has not adequately considered the noise impact nor has an appropriate action plan been proposed.

- Ambient noise reading has been taken whilst the exchangers we're working. This invalidates the use of the reading as the base line for measurement of the noise excess impact and therefore the conclusions of the report.
- Irrespective of the above point, it was evident to the house owner that the units were noticeably quieter during the noise readings - suggestive that one or more units were switched off or running at a reduced level.
- The report also claims ambient noise level from traffic in a location (Pond Road) that is highly questionable. The equipment in question sits on the opposite side of the shop, well away and screened by the shop.
- The noise readings are reported as being taken to a 'target' window on the house. This is challenged on different levels:
 - At no point did the occupant witness microphones on his property. Microphones were only seen at the fence location
 - The window selected, whilst physically nearest to the noise source, is not adjacent to a living space. It is a window in a stairway. More appropriate measurement would have been to a bedroom or lounge window.
- - Noise levels would be higher in summer months (as the heat exchangers work harder). There is no attempt in the report to adjust for this.

2. visual impact

The planning application does not address the fact that the installation is unsightly, both from the house and the general public. These buildings are in a conservation area: the shop owner has shown a blatant disregard for this.

In seeking approval for a house extension, now granted, the house owner has been subject to strict conservation rules and has followed them to a tee. The shop owner on the other hand has shown scant regard for the aesthetics of the installations or indeed UK planning and local Council planning process or regulations. Evidenced by:

- installations without approval
- Delays in complying with requests to submit a planning application (3 failed deadlines) over a protracted period of 18 months
- Further installation work POST submission of the planning application!

3. Illegal siting of equipment

Part of the installation sits on the house property footprint - illegally (legal trespass)

Although I am advised by the planning office that it is not in their remit to address this situation, never the less I contend that it is an issue that should be taken into account when considering the application (at the very least under the general umbrella of conservation compliance).

The following comments are also made:

- the house owner is a listed vulnerable person and reacts in a stressful way to the noise Particularly as it's not a 'constant' background noise that some may tolerate, but one

that changes with demand- with individual heat units 'kicking in and out' as demand levels change.

- The impact of the noise and the unsightliness of the installation is anticipated as having a negative effect on property price. (installations are post purchase of the property)
- The shop owner is clearly trying to avoid the cost of mitigation action
- From the outset of the noise complaint, the shop owner has made little attempt to maintain a civil relationship with the resident and has shown an almost disregard for planning laws (and due and timely processes)

In conclusion, it is the opinion of this entry that the Retrospective Planning Application submitted by the shop is wholly incomplete and lacking in appropriate mitigation action.

The wither contends that the application should be rejected in favor of one of the following alternatives:

1. move the equipment to the other side of the shop premises with appropriate sound proofing
2. Move the equipment onto the roof with appropriate screening to stop noise transfer
3. Require more appropriate and improved sound proofing of party divider. Substantially improved over the higher fence backed with ply and 'bubble wrap' - maybe a suitable indoor solution but hardly one that will last the ravages of British weather.

Yours

