

Summary of objectors' written statements which collectively are over 500 words

- It is suggested these should be considered by committee as one item. There are documents on each application that refer to the other.
- The applications are retrospective in nature whereas permission should have been asked for first to avoid issues that have arisen.
- The Chiller units and AHU are in place, and whatever a noise impact survey says, they are having a detrimental impact on the local amenity causing loss of sleep, and a constant low level noise that grates when one is sat in our gardens enjoying our wonderful natural surroundings.
- A workable solution is possible in strict noise limits and operation times are put in place within a very short timescale if approval is given.
- These should be installed, enforced and monitored (possibly by a third party such as the Parish Council).
- Any approval requires strong conditions and fixed dates for removing the temporary items.
- These units were installed 2 years before the COVID19 pandemic hit, a fact missed off their supporting letter.
- Although it is commented upon within some of the correspondence that the noise issues have improved it is clarified by objectors that the noise nuisance has not gone away. It is not a loud noise but a low humming sound that is very intrusive
- The committee should be aware that Environmental Health Officer Tony McEvoy could hear the noise disturbance during a site visit on Friday 2nd October 2020
- Despite attempts by objectors it is still unclear when, and under what circumstance (such as weather conditions) the noise occurs or is most prominent. It was thought to be a result of warm calm days but the noise has occurred on colder days.
- It is postulated if the noise changes when deliveries occur or when certain products need to be chilled to a lower level.
- The noise survey does not seem to consider whether the cooling load at the time was a fair reflection of the loading that could be incurred
- The AHU on Unit 4/5/6 also seems to be a significant contributor but is not within the scope of this planning application.
- The quiet days and nights which we get in our rural setting have been most affected.
- It seems to me that the solution is to minimise the plant that is required on the site, both in terms of limiting it's on time and removing it if the function can be off site.
- The objector mentions that there is a possibility that the refrigerated units could be removed and these activates sourced elsewhere. TO which if possible should be condition that the containers are removed at this point.