

APPEAL STATEMENT

11 South Parade

Rochdale

OL16 1LR

Proposal

Retrospective application for the change of use of first and second floors into two self-contained flats above existing takeaway together with the provision of bin and cycle storage to rear.

Application Reference: 25/00013/FUL

Prepared by

Mubeen Patel BA (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

Planning Consultant



July 2025

Contents

	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. Application Refusal Details	4
3. Site and Surroundings	6
4. Proposed Development	7
5. Relevant Planning Policy	8
6. Assessment	12
7. Summary	17
8. Conclusion	19
9. Appendix	20

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Appeal Statement is submitted by Mubeen Patel, a Chartered Town Planner on behalf of the applicant 'ARI Brother Ltd' who own the appeal property at 11 South Parade in Rochdale Town Centre.
- 1.2 The building is three stories high with a large outrigger to the rear connecting Fleece Street. Currently the building is occupied at ground floor by a Takeaway. The upper floors of the building were used historically as storage for the ground floor use and were disused, and more recently have been partially converted to flats, the reasoning of this application.
- 1.3 Although described as a retrospective application, works to convert to flats is not fully complete and no person is residing on the upper floors of the building. Works have therefore halted and will recommence if/when planning permission/appeal is granted. The delivery of the scheme would make a positive change to the area and by providing much needed residential accommodation in the town centre.
- 1.4 The Councils Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) as of 1st April 2024 states at Paragraph 2.6 that the 'emerging master-planning work is looking at opportunities within the borough's town centres to increase the delivery of homes within these highly sustainable locations'. Whilst the conclusion of the same report goes on to state that 'A significant proportion of this supply (housing) has also been identified as part of wider regeneration proposals in sustainable locations within the urban area e.g. in town centres or close to railway stations'.
- 1.5 Further to the above, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that Planning policies and decisions should support the role that town centres play at the heart of local communities, by taking a positive approach to their growth, management and adaptation.

2.0 APPLICATION REFUSAL DETAILS

- 2.1 A retrospective full planning application was submitted to Rochdale Council to regularise the proposed flats. The proposal included the change the use of the first and second floors of the building from storage use to residential consisting of Two 1-bedroom self-contained flats (App Ref: 25/00013/FUL).
- 2.2 The application was submitted and validated by the Council on the 26th of February 2025 and refused permission on 12th June 2025. Proposed plans are provided below which show the internal layout of the flats.



- 2.3 **Above:** Plans showing the proposed layout of the flats at first and second floor levels.

2.4 Rochdale Council refused the retrospective application (19331/24) for following reason:

‘The proposed development is not acceptable in principle as it would not effectively integrate with the existing neighbouring businesses and night-time economy. When considered in the context of the well-established agent of change principle, the proposed development cannot be adequately mitigated for, and it would lead to significant adverse noise impacts on occupiers of the proposed development as well as forcing and creating unreasonable restrictions on existing businesses and facilities. For the above reasons it is considered that the proposal would be detrimental to both the residential and neighbouring amenity which would be contrary to the requirements of Core Strategy Policies DM1 and G9 and Paragraphs 198 and 200 of the NPPF’.

2.5 This appeal takes into consideration the above reason for refusal and provides an evidence-based justification for the acceptability of the development.

3.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 3.1 The application relates to a three storey terraced building located on South Parade within the Rochdale Town Centre. The ground floor section of the building is currently used as a hot food takeaway. The property has recently through the Heritage Action Zone (HAZ) undergone positive changes such as a new shopfront and window designs and alterations to the upper floors.
- 3.2 The property lies in a prominent location within the Town Centre Conservation Area. The adjoining buildings are occupied by retail at ground floor whilst the Post Office at No.12 South Parade is occupied by the Hoochi Koochi Bar on its upper floors. Similarly, these properties have also been refurbished externally as part of the HAZ.
- 3.3 The site is located in close proximity to the new transport bus interchange, Town Centre Metrolink Stop and new Number One Riverside Council offices building. 21 Butts Avenue (currently RBS Bank), which lies across an open area of public space to the north of the site, is a Grade II listed building. The former Oldham Joint Stock Bank (currently HSBC UK Bank), which also lies across the same area of public space to the west of the site, is a Grade II listed building. The Regal Moon Public House which lies opposite the site is a non-designated heritage asset.
- 3.4 The site is considered to be in a sustainable location being well served by public transport and well related to an adequate range of existing services, residential flats, and facilities within a short walking distance. The red edge location plan shows the building has some external curtilage to the rear.



3.4 Image shows the front elevation of the proposed building.

4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 4.1 This appeal is in relation to an application for full planning permission to change the use of the first and second floors of the building from office/storage use to residential consisting of Two 1-bedroom self-contained flats.
- 4.2 The flats would be accessed from the rear of the building from Fleece Street similar to existing. Each flat would consist of a kitchen/living room, bedrooms and separate bathroom. The yard area to the rear would be provided with dedicated bin storage and cycle storage for the flats.
- 4.3 No external alterations are proposed to the building.



Above: Arrow shows the location of the property adjacent to the Hoochi Koochi Bar.

5.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

- 5.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that decisions should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 5.2 Rochdale's Core Strategy was adopted in July 2016 and is the key Development Plan Document. It replaces significant elements of the existing Unitary Development Plan as the document that sets out the long-term strategic policies for Rochdale's future development and will form the framework that planning applications will be assessed against.
- 5.3 The Core Strategy seeks to deliver sustainable development and growth in accordance with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It aims to increase investment in the borough and to make it a more prosperous place by 2028. The Core Strategy will have a major role in guiding the regeneration of the borough, building on the investment that has already taken place in some areas and identifying where to focus on next.
- 5.4 It looks to build on the borough's assets, heritage and identity and on its connections and relationships with neighbouring towns. In particular, the borough needs.
- 5.5 The following Local Plan policies have relevance to the proposal:

DM1	GENERAL DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS
P3	IMPROVING DESIGN OF NEW DEVELOPMENT
E1	ESTABLISHING THRIVING TOWN, DISTRICT AND LOCAL CENTRES
C3	DELIVERING THE RIGHT TYPE OF HOUSING
G9	REDUCING THE IMPACT OF POLLUTION
T2	IMPROVING ACCESSIBILITY

Saved Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Policies:

G/D/1	DEFINED URBAN AREA
G/S/1	TOWN CENTRES

(R/3) PHYSICAL REGENERATION AREA

SPD

GUIDELINES & STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Places for Everyone (PfE)

PfE Policy JP-S 1 sets out that development should seek to maximise economic, social and environmental benefits. Preference should be given to previously-developed (brownfield) land.

PfE Policy JP-H2 states that there should be a significant increase in the supply of new housing, including, specifically, the supply of low-cost market housing

PfE Policy JP-H4 states that new housing should be delivered at a density appropriate for the location and taking into account the site's accessibility.

NPPF (2024)

5.6 The NPPF clearly states 'that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development' (paragraph 7). Paragraph 10 confirms that 'in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development'. Paragraph 11 states that a presumption in favour of sustainable development is at the heart of the NPPF. It goes on to say that 'for decision-taking this means:

c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

5.7 Paragraph 135 of the NPPF, advises that Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

5.8 Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

5.9 Paragraph 198 of the NPPF states that Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:

- a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life

5.10 Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states that ‘Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development can be integrated effectively with existing businesses and community facilities (such as places of worship, pubs, music venues and sports clubs). Existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. Where the operation of an existing business or community facility could have a significant adverse

effect on new development (including changes of use) in its vicinity, the applicant (or ‘agent of change’) should be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed’.

- 5.11 The general perspective of the NPPF is that planning should proactively drive growth and support sustainable economic development. It also states that planning should make effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed and sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth.

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

- 5.12 The government published its NPPG on 6 March 2014. This is intended to complement the NPPF and to provide a single resource for planning guidance, whilst rationalising and streamlining the material. Almost all previous planning Circulars and advice notes have been cancelled. Specific reference will be made to the NPPG or other national advice in the Analysis section of the report, where appropriate.

6.0 ASSESSMENT

Town Centre and Residential Uses

- 6.1 The site is located in the Defined Urban Area, Rochdale Town Centre and Rochdale Town Centre Conservation Area as defined in Rochdale Borough Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Proposals Map.
- 6.2 Policy E1 of the Core Strategy aims to 'support the expansion of the evening economy through a number of mixed uses such as restaurants/bars/theatres and quality housing on appropriate sites, or through conversion of upper floors, which will enhance the vitality of the centre'.
- 6.3 The Town Centre in particular, represents an appropriate location for such initiatives, offering the prospect of increased diversity, security and a general revitalisation, especially at nights and weekends. The Town Centre has the potential to provide unique housing opportunities which cannot easily be found elsewhere in the town, or indeed in the surrounding region. Such opportunities are likely to be particularly suitable for the young, couples and students. All represent groups whose housing needs are projected to expand considerably.
- 6.4 Residential uses within mixed use developments can introduce diversity, security and life especially at night and weekends. The proposed conversion of the upper floors of the building would help in providing much needed accommodation in the Town Centre.
- 6.5 The below section provides justified reasoning and evidence using local and national planning policy as to why the proposed development is acceptable and why the appeal should be allowed.

Acoustics Survey and Mitigation Measures

- 6.6 Core Strategy Policy C3 states that ‘amongst other things, that higher density development (residential) should be focused around Rochdale, Middleton and Heywood town centres’.
- 6.7 The officers report justifies the reason for refusal using Paragraph 198 of the NPPF which states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so, planning decisions should mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development and avoid giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life.
- 6.8 In addition to the above, Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states that “Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development can be integrated effectively with existing businesses and community facilities (such as places of worship, pubs, music venues and sports clubs). Existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. Where the operation of an existing business or community facility could have a significant adverse effect on new development (including changes of use) in its vicinity, the applicant (or ‘agent of change’) should be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed”.
- 6.9 It should be noted that a comprehensive Acoustic Survey (Report No: 2904-1) by an Environmental Health professional was submitted as part of this proposal. Full monitoring results were provided as part of this survey which considered the noise impact of neighbouring uses against the proposed development. This included external noise from surrounding uses and road noise, the impact of the existing ground floor use as a takeaway, and the impact of the neighbouring attached uses including the Hoochi

Koochi Bar above the Post Office adjacent. It is acknowledged that the Bar plays Live music some nights of the week.

- 6.10 The onsite monitoring has clearly identified that existing background sound levels will result in an adverse impact on the proposed development. Therefore, and as with many similar town centre residential uses suitable additional mitigation measures are required and which were identified as part of the planning application in accordance with Policies of the Local Plan and Paragraphs 198 and 200 of the NPPF mentioned above.

External Noise

- 6.11 In terms of the external noise a standard 6/12/6 double glazing unit with trickle vents that would provide a sound reduction was considered adequate to protect the future occupants of the apartments from the prevailing environmental sound levels. Therefore, it was recommended that all habitable rooms are fitted with the 6/12/6 standard double-glazing units.
- 6.12 However, an email from the Councils Planning Officer on the 14th of May 2025 (see appendix) stated that they were not happy with the use of trickle vents for background ventilation purposes when windows need to be kept closed. Therefore, a response was provided by the appellant after advice from their professional acoustician before the determination of the application which stated the following (full email provided in Appendix);

(From Neil Martin of Martin Environmental Solutions) 'I'm presuming this is due to the building regulation requirements around ventilation and overheating. This can be overcome through the use of a suitable mechanical ventilation system as outlined in my earlier e-mail. "Nuaire" among other companies produce a range of suitable systems including a Flatmaster PIV system, specification designed for flats. A suitable system will ensure adequate background ventilation of the property is achieved without need to open windows, thus this should satisfy the

EH concerns. Purge ventilation can be achieved through opening the windows or using a boost function on the installed system’.

- 6.13 Therefore, given the acoustic report and suggested mechanical ventilation, this would resolve the issues of the amenity of future occupiers and where existing businesses would not need to be restricted. As such, suitable mitigation measures can be achieved to significantly reduce noise from external sources in order to meet habitable noise regulations and also Building Control. This has been evidenced and can be achieved. The Details of the exact windows and ventilation system can be provided as part of a condition.

Internal Noise

- 6.14 In terms of internal noise, party walls to the neighbouring properties are solid brick walls of 225mm thickness, this provides a sound reduction far exceeding the Building Regulations requirements. Whilst the floor/ceiling between the ground and first floors require mitigation in the form of dividing structures, details of which are provided in ‘Appendix C’ of the Acoustics Survey.
- 6.15 Once the mitigation measures are in place, this would ensure that the internal recommended night-time sound level can be achieved even in the unlikely event that a level equivalent to a busy manufacturing site and the upper action level within the Control of Noise at Work Regulations, is generated in the neighbouring property (Hoochie Koochie Bar).
- 6.16 It should also be noted that the internal layout of the first floor flat has its bedroom positioned on the other side of the party wall with Hoochie Koochie Bar, and therefore this would reduce the impact of noise further during night time hours (when sleeping) for future occupiers of the first floor flat.

- 6.17 The inclusion of the above mitigation measures to all habitable rooms will ensure that the internal and external sound levels are acceptable and will result in a No Observe Effect on the future residents in line with the Noise Policy Statement for England.
- 6.18 As such the development will meet the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework in ensuring that no significant adverse impact is experienced by the future residents by the use of suitable mitigation measures. The development is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of noise.

7.0 SUMMARY

- 7.1 The Decision Notice states that “existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established”. While this is acknowledged no doubt, it emphasises the need for future development to consider the potential impact to or from existing activities and to take appropriate measures to ensure such impact is minimised.
- 7.2 The identified mitigation measures within the noise report (and email – 14th May) have been chosen following monitoring on site of the neighbouring businesses and have been specified to ensure that the future occupants are not significantly adversely affected by them, indeed the assessment shows no observed adverse effect on the residents taking into account the mitigation measures and where the proposed development can effectively integrate with the surrounding uses.
- 7.3 The amenity of the future occupiers would not therefore be adversely impacted by the night-time economy and likewise the neighbouring businesses would not result in any adverse impact on the future residents and there would not have any legitimate complaints made against them.
- 7.4 The proposed change of use of the upper floors of the building would reuse part of the property which has been empty and disused, and the site would contribute effectively to this prominent location. The site is in need of further investment to bring the whole building back to a suitable functional use and where it would play a positive role and have a positive impact on the surrounding area.
- 7.5 The proposal would provide good housing accommodation which is much needed in this inner urban area in this town centre. It would enhance the character of the area by bringing an existing portion of the site back into use, it would consider the needs of local and residing students, protect the surrounding built environment and provide the future occupiers with services close to the town centre within walking distance and reducing the need to travel.

- 7.6 The internal design provided and mitigation measures given the town centre location is considered to show that there would be no unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring users or adjacent land users, including by reason of overlooking or for the conditions for future users and occupiers of the development.
- 7.7 The NPPF (paragraph 125) states that 'Decisions should promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively (for example converting space above shops, and building on or above service yards, car parks, lock-ups and railway infrastructure)
- 7.8 From the Council's e-mail dated 14th May, the only reason for refusal is in relation to the impact on the amenity of future occupants and the need to ensure existing businesses are restricted. The acoustic report and suggested mechanical ventilation resolve these issues. There are no other reasons for refusal and evidence has been provided to show noise can be effectively mitigated against in line with and in full accordance with the requirements of Core Strategy Policies DM1 and G9 and Paragraphs 198 and 200 of the NPPF.

8.0 CONCLUSION

- 8.1 It has been demonstrated that the proposed development can be carried out in full compliance with the Council's policies in the adopted Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. The development would provide good quality residential accommodation which would bring a positive contribution into the town centre of Rochdale without creating a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the local and adjacent occupiers, businesses, residents and the night time economy. In addition, the development would bring a portion of an existing empty property back into an appropriate use.
- 8.2 For the reasons given above and evidence provided, it is considered that the appeal should be allowed.

APPENDNIX

Copy of Email from Planning officer - 14th May 2025

From: Nick Brookman <Nick.Brookman@Rochdale.Gov.UK>
Sent: 14 May 2025 15:26
To: bds2000@live.co.uk <bds2000@live.co.uk>
Subject: RE: 25/00013/FUL - 11 South Parade, Rochdale, OL16 1LR

Good afternoon Mr Farooq,

Thank you for your email and response.

I am aware of the submitted NIA and this assessment confirms that in order to achieve the internal noise levels windows will have to be closed. The Environmental Protection Team will not accept trickle vents or acoustic trickle vents as suitable ventilation in properties where the windows meet BS8233 with windows being closed. Given the proximity of the proposal to the commercial uses, and for reasons outlined below, Planning Officers and the Environmental Protection Team cannot support the residential development retrospectively proposed.

I take on board the points you have raised in your email below but irrespective of whether the proposal is retrospective or not, the same material planning considerations apply. In addition, whilst I agree with your comments on the need for new housing, there are other material considerations to determine such as the amenity of any future occupier of the proposed development which outweighs any need for housing in my assessment in this site specific circumstance.

As set out below, in accordance with national planning policy, existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. Introducing a residential use in such close proximity to the existing neighbouring commercial uses would impact existing businesses in the future as it would leave them susceptible to noise complaints which could unreasonably affect their licensing agreements. Additionally, the amenity enjoyed by the future occupiers of the development applied for would be inevitably impacted on by the night time economy in this location.

I am not sure which flats you refer to that already allegedly benefit from planning permission in the vicinity of the site but I can advise on the following:

23/00398/FUL (12 South Parade) – was approved with conditions for the Change of use from retail (Class E) to hot food takeaway and restaurant (Sui Generis) at ground and first floors, erection of first floor extension above existing single storey rear extension including installation of extraction flue and external staircase to provide access to proposed second floor staff accommodation – retrospective. This application was conditioned however that the second floor accommodation approved could only be used for ancillary purposes to the takeaway and not as permanent residential accommodation.

23/01171/FUL (8 South Parade) – was approved with conditions for the change of use of former nightclub to restaurant/takeaway at ground floor including installation of external flue and an access door to rear. Now I believe this scheme originally proposed the change of use to a dine in/takeaway fish and chip restaurant on the ground floor with three flats on the first and second floors. However, the Council's Environmental Health Officer objected to this proposal due to the close proximity of the proposed flats to the existing night club and the night time economy, which would expose future residents to noise nuisance and general disturbance. Environmental Health Officers advised there were no measures that could mitigate against this.

Following these comments, the application was amended to remove the residential element and comprise a fish and chip restaurant / takeaway to the ground floor only.

Accordingly, for the reasons explained, Officers cannot support the proposed development.

Welcome to the new Outlook (1/5)

Copy of Email from Appellant in response to above email - 29th May 2025

From: Muhammad Farooq <bds2000@live.co.uk>
Sent: 29 May 2025 11:20
To: Nick Brookman <Nick.Brookman@Rochdale.Gov.UK>
Subject: Re: 25/00013/FUL - 11 South Parade, Rochdale, OL16 1LR

Hi Nick,

Apologies for the delay.

As discussed the provision of closed windows and an alternative form of ventilation in order to achieve the requirements of Building Regulations (approved docs F & O) is a typical widely used method of protecting internal environments of dwellings, without which a large portion of the current developments across the country could not move forward.

The acoustic report does not prevent the opening of windows for short term purge ventilation, thus windows will be openable. However, in order to protect the future occupants the windows must be closed.

An alternative ventilation system is required to achieve the building regulations requirements. This would need to be specified for the building and the room sizes and something that could be completed as a condition given the time restraints. I would suggest a method utilising a Positive Input Ventilation (PIV) System. These are relatively cost efficient and helps to improve the internal environment by creating a positive pressure within the property forcing out stale air and moisture. Typically placed within attic areas the units can include filters and heaters along with heat recovery system. Link below .

<https://www.nuaire.co.uk/product-list-page/flatmaster>

On a side note refusing the application because the windows would need to be closed is not in line with many decisions the Council have made recently and I believe would not stand up in an appeal.

Kind Regards

M Farooq

Email: bds2000@live.co.uk
TEL: 01706 712231
MOB: 07967 605763
WEB: www.bdsfarooq.co.uk

**Advice from Appellants Environmental Health specialist (Martin Environmental Solutions)
detailing that noise impact can suitably be mitigated against – 29th May 2025.**

From: info@m-e-solutions.co.uk <info@m-e-solutions.co.uk>
Sent: 29 May 2025 18:01
To: 'Muhammad Farooq' <bds2000@live.co.uk>
Subject: 11 South Parade

Hi Shahida,
I've had another look over the e-mails from the planning officer.

From the e-mail of the 14th I understand that the current issues are:

1. The Councils EH team are not happy with the use of trickle vents for background ventilation purpose when windows need to be kept closed.
I'm presuming this is due to the building regulation requirements around ventilation and overheating. This can be overcome through the use of a suitable mechanical ventilation system as outlined in my earlier e-mail. "Nuair" among other companies produce a range of suitable systems including a Flatmaster PIV system, specification designed for flats. A suitable system will ensure adequate background ventilation of the property is achieved without need to open windows, thus this should satisfy the EH concerns. Purge ventilation can be achieved through opening the windows or using a boost function on the installed system.
2. I note the planning officer mentions that "existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established". While this makes complete sense, it emphasises the need for future development to consider the potential impact to or from existing activities and to take appropriate measures to ensure such impact is minimised.
The identified mitigation measures within the noise report have been chosen following monitoring on site of the neighbouring businesses and have been specified to ensure that the future occupants are not significantly adversely affected by them, indeed the assessment shows no observed adverse effect on the residents taking into account the mitigation measures.
The amenity of the future occupants would not therefore be adversely impacted by the night-time economy and likewise the neighbouring businesses would not result in any adverse impact on the future residents and there would not have any legitimate complaints made against them.

From the e-mail dated the 14th May the only reason for refusal I can see is the above impact on the amenity of future occupants and the need to ensure existing businesses are restricted. The acoustic report and suggested mechanical ventilation resolve these issues. No other reasons for refusal have been given in that e-mail.

Neil

Neil Martin
Martin Environmental Solutions Ltd,
Tel: 07976884154
www.m-e-solutions.co.uk

