

Central Printing Co.,
Deansgate,
Off Queen Street,
Morecambe.
LA4 5HD

Telephone & Fax: 01524 423531

Est. 1972
Printers & Stationers

CENTRAL

PRINTING COMPANY

Proprietors: R.D., S.J. & D.J. Coxhill

19th February, 2010

Planning Services
Development Control Team
PO Box 4 Town Hall
Lancaster LA1 1QR

Dear Sir/Madam

Re Planning Application No. 10/00108/FUL
at 6A Lines Street, Morecambe. LA4 5ES
Change of use of first floor warehouse/store-room into a self contained 2 bed apartment.

We wish to register concern regarding the above application.

We own the property directly below part of the property in question and for the last 28 years it has been a printing works, during this time the property above us has been a storeroom/warehouse, therefore the considerable noise and vibration generated by our printing presses and possible smells from the printing ink have not been a problem to anyone above us.

Our main concern is that should a dwelling be constructed adjoining our premises, the vibration or noise from our presses would be a serious nuisance to any residents and that any such planning application, if granted, would give the new owners of the flat rights against us. I am advised by solicitors that planning legislation requires that no dwelling be erected within thirty meters of a noisy business and it is quite clear to us that if planning permission was granted it would transgress that legislation.

On more than one previous occasion change of use has been refused for this particular warehouse for various reasons including the fact that the development would be contrary to central government advice as set out in PPG-24 (Planning Policy Guidance: Planning and noise).

I attended the meeting of the Planning Committee in May 2008, when this same application was rejected (15 votes against, none in favour) on the grounds that the warehouse was unsuitable as a dwelling, being in such close proximity to our printing works, and due to the vibration and noise that we generate.

I am aware that Mr. Hughes has recently carried out soundproofing works and that sound tests between separating floors are said to have passed the sound insulation standards of The Building Regulations. This may be the case but in these particular circumstances there can be no guarantee that the works carried out are sufficient to prevent our noise and vibration being noticed from above. Prior to commencement of the recent soundproofing works, we co-operated with sound engineers Martec Environmental Consultants by operating each of our machines as requested, while they monitored the sound/vibration as received at the warehouse above. Since the soundproofing has been completed, we have not been asked to participate in any further tests to establish its effectiveness.

Therefore before any planning permission is granted, I request a site visit by the planning committee (whilst our machinery is in production) to establish the effectiveness of Mr. Hughes' sound/vibration proofing.

I request this because at present in the print works we can hear noise coming from Mr. Hughes' property and therefore as we generate much more noise and vibration than he does, I think it reasonable to assume that our noise can be heard above.

My only concern is for the future of our business for as you are aware, if Mr. Hughes' warehouse becomes a dwelling then the whole responsibility of sound/vibration proofing is shifted from himself on to us and consequently, if we could not effectively stop the sound and vibration travelling upwards, as I believe to be the case, then we would have to close down our business after over 28 years here, putting three people out of work. This would not only be against natural justice but, in my opinion, morally wrong.

I have one question: Can we be assured absolutely that any soundproofing that has been carried out by Mr. Hughes is sufficient to stop any sound or vibration travelling from our machinery to his property and, if not, after planning permission has been granted, will HE have to remedy it or will the responsibility be shifted on to us?

In view of the above we would request that this application be heard by the Planning Committee and not delegated.

R. D. Coxhill, S.J. Coxhill, D.J. Coxhill.