

Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 7 December 2023

Site visit made on 7 December 2023

by David Wyborn BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/W/23/3315525

Land at Manor Farm, Old Burghclere, Newbury, Hampshire RG20 9NS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Lord Carnarvon T/A Porchester Farms against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00428/FUL, dated 9 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of steel portal framed building to be used as an on-floor grain dryer and store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was refused for two reasons. At the appeal stage the appellant has submitted further evidence on the biodiversity issues. As a consequence, the Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre (HBIC) has concluded that the substantive part of the appeal site should not be designated as part of the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and the boundary has been redrawn to reflect this. The Council has, subsequently, confirmed that the information and situation is such that it does not wish to defend the second reason for refusal in this case, regarding the effect of the development on the SINC. I will consider this matter later in this decision, but based on all the information, I am satisfied that the biodiversity issues should not form a main issue in this appeal.
3. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 19 December 2023. I gave the main parties the opportunity to comment on the revised Framework and whether there was any implications for this appeal. I have taken the comments into account in my decision.
4. I undertook an accompanied visit after the hearing closed and, as I explained at the hearing, the day before I also undertook an informal visit to the area which included viewing the site from locations in or around the Beacon Hill and Ladle Hill areas. I am satisfied that I saw everything I need to assess the impact of the development.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including having regard to its location within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty¹ (AONB).

Reasons

6. The appeal site and the surrounding countryside is located within the AONB. I am conscious of the Framework requirement that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty within AONBs, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
7. The Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Character Assessment (May 2021) (the LCA) identifies the area within Character Area 7: The Clere Scarp. The LCA explains that the key characteristics of this character area include the dramatic steep chalk scarp face, forming an impressive backdrop to the lowland landscapes to the north, and affording long views from points such as Beacon Hill. The land form consists of predominantly open pasture with small areas of encroaching scrub and occasional woodland blocks on the steep scarp slopes, with arable fields present on more shallow slopes. The LCA details that this part of the AONB generally possesses an unspoilt character and there is limited intrusion from people, traffic and noise, except in particular locations, for example Beacon Hill, and near the A34.
8. The LCA also explains that another of the key characteristics of The Clere Scarp Character Area is the generally high intervisibility within and outside the area, particularly from the top of the scarp and the open arable fields to the north of the area. The LCA references the Wayfarer's Walk Long Distance Path which, it is explained, runs along the top of the scarp and allows extensive views and a sense of exposure.
9. The LCA sets out guidance for each character area and, in terms of The Clere Scarp, one of the strategic aims includes maintaining the wide ranging views from viewpoints along the scarp and to preserve the sparsely settled nature of the area. In respect of built development this guidance includes conserving the sense of a rural, sparsely settled area with visible development limited to occasional traditional farmsteads.
10. This analysis of the area and key characteristics are reinforced in the North West Downs AONB – Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (March 2002) which identifies the location within the Walbury Hill - Watership Downs Scarp – 2D Character Area.
11. The Burghclere Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2029 (the Burghclere NP) also references the LCA and highlights the distinctive escarpment and that some of the key characteristics of the landscape in this area are its pastoral steep slopes, floristically rich grassland and ancient woodland, and visible archaeological remains. The Burghclere NP includes Policy B9 concerning Important Views within the parish, and which are considered to be especially important by local people in defining the relationship between the village and the surrounding countryside.

¹ I am aware that AONBs have been renamed as National Landscapes. However, as the revised Framework postdates this change and still refers to AONBs I have also done so in this decision.

12. These highlighted features of the character of the landscape are representative of the wider surroundings to the appeal site, especially with the views from elevated scarp slopes when looking out over the lowland areas.
13. The appeal site itself is a level area that previously formed a station yard for the now defunct Newbury, Didcot and Southampton Railway Line. It is laid to a compacted surface and is a fairly extensive area used for farm storage, including for substantial numbers of wrapped bales and stacked bales of haylage and straw. The evidence indicates the bales can be stacked quite high and there is related vehicle movements and activity in association with the use of the yard. The yard forms part of the operating area for this very sizeable farm holding with much of the holding in the general vicinity of the yard area. The yard has a vehicular access from the adjoining private drive. This private drive is also a public footpath.
14. The yard area on its west, drive side, and to the east adjoining the arable land, is bounded by mainly, medium height trees and informal lower level vegetation, although there are some gaps in the planting. The field to the east is about a couple of metres lower than the yard area. To the north is The Station House, a residential property, and there is an intervening section of some trees. To the south there are the terraces of Lime Kiln Cottages and, again, they are separated by a modest belt of trees from the yard area.
15. The appeal site lies within a lowland area between the scarp slopes. In particular, there are views across the plain, including towards the appeal site, down from Beacon Hill which lies to the west and from the Ladle Hill area to the broadly south east.
16. Beacon Hill is a publicly accessible and popular area of open and elevated grassland which forms part of the scarp slope. There are extensive and wide ranging views from this area. The A34 is also apparent and traffic noise is audible. The views from Beacon Hill includes panoramic views over and towards the appeal site. Beacon Hill is one of the locations of the Important Views identified in Policy B9 of the Burghclere NP.
17. In particular, when descending from the top of Beacon Hill towards the general east, the open section of grassed path allows walkers to look directly towards the appeal site. In these mid-distant views, while the wider landscape forms the extensive view, the appeal site with, at the time when I visited, the light colour wrapped bales and the haylage with the white sheeting cover, was a noticeable element within the landscape. Because of the gaps and height of the foliage around the appeal site, and the sight line for walkers descending from Beacon Hill, these features were apparent and draw the eye in this general area.
18. In these views from Beacon Hill, the appeal site appears to have generally lower boundary planting than the treed area to the south and north. To the south, parts of the terraces of Lime Kiln Cottages can be seen, some against the backdrop of trees. The staggered ridge lines and chimneys of the terraces break up the mass of the house roofs and these buildings are experienced as a minor component within the landscape. To the north, the buildings of The Station House and Burghclere Manor largely lie within and behind the trees such that they are largely obscured. The buildings of Manor Farm are apparent but are reasonably low lying, have a mix of ridge heights and are not especially

prominent to the north of the treed area. All these buildings appear to integrate within the landscape without being unduly prominent.

19. The proposed grain dryer and store building would be quite a bulky structure, in particular, because of its proportions with the overall height, fairly high eaves line, depth and length of ridge. While the reasonably muted colours of the roof and sections of olive green elevations would be helpful in reducing its visual impact, parts of the building would still appear to stand out amongst the existing boundary planting and be quite a visually prominent addition to the landscape when viewed from parts of Beacon Hill.
20. I have had regard to the photomontages which form part of the Landscape Appeal Statement (January 2023) presented as part of the appeal. Even after 15 years, when the additional landscaping has had the opportunity to develop, the upper section of the building would still be an imposing feature with its reasonably long ridge and height. The bulk and presence of the proposed grain dryer and store building would harmfully contrast with the existing fairly low presence of the existing structures in the wider surroundings and unduly draw the eye, despite it not breaking the skyline in these views.
21. From sections of Beacon Hill where walkers would be prone to pause and admire the view, the appeal building would be experienced as quite a conspicuous and intrusive addition to the landscape within this lowland area, even after the maturing of the proposed planting and the growth of the existing vegetation. Having regard to the characteristic surroundings of this part of The Clere Scarp Character Area in which the proposed grain dryer and store would be introduced, I consider the proposed building would have a significant adverse visual impact when seen from the surroundings to the Important View from Beacon Hill as identified in the Burghclere NP.
22. While agricultural buildings, some sizeable, may be a familiar feature in this agricultural landscape, in this case, the building, for the reasons explained, would be overly dominant and the bulk and form would detract from the landscape qualities of the AONB. Accordingly, the presence of the building would undermine key characteristics of the area as identified in the LCA, including that there is presently limited intrusion within the countryside to the general area to the east of the A34. The proposed building would not contribute to maintaining the rural, sparsely settled nature of the area when viewed from Beacon Hill.
23. The appeal site area is also visible from parts of the scarp slope to the generally south-east. Policy B9 of the Burghclere NP identifies two Important Views from this general location. This area includes Ladle Hill, nearby sections of the Wayfarer's Walk and the connecting bridleway that approaches and joins with the long distance footpath. From some of these elevated sections of the countryside, parts of the appeal building would be visible. From some of these locations there would be trees in the foreground and background of the appeal site, and they would assist with reducing the visual impact of the proposed grain dryer and store. However, because the building would be elevated above the field to the east, and with the height and length of ridge together with the height of the eaves line, the building would still appear to be overly prominent within the landscape. Again, the muted finish of the roof and the upper elevations would be visually beneficial, however, I am not satisfied that the impact of the building would be sympathetic to the local character of the

landscape when viewed from parts of Ladle Hill, sections of the Wayfarer's Walk and the elevated sections of the adjoining bridleway.

24. I appreciate that the building would form part of a wide panorama from the general Ladle Hill area, but the building would not nestle in the landscape like most of the other structures, even after the proposed, fairly extensive landscaping in the lower, adjoining field had matured. It follows that the scheme would not conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB when viewed from sections of the elevated land in the vicinity of Ladle Hill.
25. Another main viewpoint of the site is from the public footpath along the drive. This route is also used by the occupants and visitors to the dwellings of Lime Kiln Cottages. The appellant's photomontages show the building in its surroundings and after periods when the landscaping would have had time to grow. The yard is already a busy area with storage uses taking place and this is experienced by walkers using the right of way.
26. However, in terms of the proposed building, which would have reasonably high eaves and roller shutter doors, and even if the doors were to be finished in a darker colour than the proposed metal finish, the bulk and appearance of the structure would have a somewhat industrial form and not merge sympathetically with its surroundings. When seen in angled views through the access it would have an unduly imposing presence, and would also be visible, in all likelihood at some times of the year, through sections of the planting alongside the right of way. While lighting could be controlled by a suitable condition in any permission, and the gas tanks would not be prominent within the yard area, the bulk and appearance of the building would be overly dominant and would not conserve this part of the AONB, even taking into account the visual appearance and character of the existing yard.
27. Drawing all these matters together, the building has been designed as a fairly typical grain dryer and store and I appreciate that such buildings are a reasonably common occurrence in the countryside. However, in this case, the building would not be seen or experienced in conjunction with, for instance, an existing farm group where there are other buildings or within a dip in the land to help to minimise its effect, but as an overly prominent building which would be fairly separated from other structures. From the elevated land that I have highlighted, it would not sit comfortably within the landscape and would draw the eye detracting from the characteristic features of this part of the AONB. From the right of way adjoining the site, walkers and local residents would experience the building as an overly dominant feature that would unduly erode the rural qualities of the area. I have taken into account the detailed submissions from the appellant on landscape and have had particular regard to the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (April 2022) and the Landscape Appeal Statement (January 2023). However, for the reasons I have explained, I consider that these submissions underestimate the effect of the building in terms of the harm to the character of the area and its visual prominence. I give greater weight to the landscape evidence from the Council on this matter.
28. In the light of the above analysis, I conclude that the proposed building would cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would not conserve or enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB, a matter to which the Framework requires is attributed great weight. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policies EM1 and EM10 of the Basingstoke and

Deane Local Plan 2011-2029 (the Local Plan), Policies B8 and B9 of the Burghclere NP and Framework which require, amongst other things, that development should be sympathetic to the character and visual amenity of the area concerned.

29. Furthermore, because of the identified harm, the scheme would not meet with the landscape approach for development as set out in the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2019-2024 and, in particular, the key issue to conserve and enhance the remoteness and expansive open scale of the downland landscape.

Other Matters

30. *Biodiversity* – The application submissions, especially in the form of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (April 2022), concluded that there would be no adverse effect to the biodiversity of the site from the development. The building would be constructed on the hard surface of the yard and the existing boundary planting would be retained and enhanced. The scheme proposes additional planting, especially in the adjoining field to the east, together with a pond area. I am satisfied that there would be no material harm to existing biodiversity and there would be an appreciable net gain from the additional landscaping.
31. The amendment to the boundary of the SINC by the HBIC, which excluded the site for the appeal building, followed a process that was agreed with the HBIC. I consider that the survey that led to that conclusion was suitably robust and appropriate. Furthermore, the enhancement planting along the boundaries of the yard, which could be the subject of a condition in any approval, would maintain and improve the connectivity of this linear ecological habitat and benefit the SINC in this respect. In conclusion, the scheme would maintain and enhance biodiversity, and this would be a benefit of the development.
32. *Vehicle movements* – At the present time, there are no modern and suitable grain drying facilities within this section of this large farm holding at or near Manor Farm. When grain is harvested it is taken by tractor trailer to the buildings at Crux Easton, where temporary storage facilities are provided, and the grain can then be dried, after which the grain is brought back to Manor Farm for storage. Because of the limited storage facilities some of the grain has to be sold at that time and this is less profitable than if it could be stored and sold at other times of the year when demand was higher.
33. The transport of grain to and from Crux Easton is inefficient, costly and adds considerable traffic movements and carbon emissions to the process of the harvest. The provision of a modern and suitably sized and designed grain dryer and store within this part of the holding would remove the need for the traffic movements to and from Crux Easton and substantially improve the efficiency and productivity of the enterprise.
34. The evidence indicates that the disused railway line would be used by tractor trailers to transport harvested grain from some of the fields to the proposed building. This would reduce the need to use the drive, although some tractors would still use this route. Overall, the delivery of the grain from the fields to the dryer and store building would be spread along the various routes to the building and during the harvest I am satisfied that these movements would not materially affect the living conditions of local residents.

35. Once dried, the grain would be stored in the proposed building and, in time, transported out by lorries along the driveway. I appreciate that the road which the drive is accessed off is indicated as not suitable for HGVs. However, given the likely spread of the movements throughout parts of the year, the existing access to the working yard provided by the existing drive, the proposed improvements to the surface of the drive and the nature of this sizeable working farm around the yard, I do not consider that the use of the drive and adjoining roads by the grain lorries in this area would be unreasonable. The Highway Authority has not raised objection to this aspect of the scheme, or with any potential conflict with walkers on the right of way.
36. These vehicle movements would take place along the drive in front of The Station House. However, as this building is set back a little way from the drive, and with the number and frequency of the grain lorry movements throughout the year, these movements would not impact to such an extent on the living conditions of the occupants of this property that this should be considered unreasonable.
37. Taking all these transport issues together, the provision of the grain dryer and store building in this location would result in a substantial reduction in overall tractor trailer movements, and related vehicle miles, in the general area. This may have a localised effect of increasing some vehicle movements along the drive, principally from grain lorries picking up dried grain, however, this extent and impact would not be unreasonable. Other communities in the general area would benefit from the reduction in tractor trailer movements to and from Crux Easton. Overall, I consider that the location of the building within the yard would result in transport and related efficiency improvements to the business and a reduction in the effects on the communities in the wider area. These would be important and worthwhile benefits of the scheme.
38. *Noise* – The grain would be dried by a system of gas burners that would provide an air flow over the grain, together with mixers, that would ensure the moisture content in the grain was substantially reduced to a level for it to be stored. The equipment for the burners would be housed in the lean-to section at the rear of the proposed building.
39. An initial acoustic report² (First Revision dated 3 March 2022) was submitted to supplement the application and following the comments of the Council's Environmental Protection Team this was substantially updated in a Second Revision dated 14 June 2022. This Second Revision followed the approach of the Council's then Guidance Note – Noise Assessment and Reports for Planning Applications. I understand that this sought a 5dB reduction below background noise levels as the target noise level for the equipment at the nearest affected properties.
40. At the hearing I also received a copy of the email dated 8 June 2022 from the Senior Environmental Health Officer to the Planning Case Officer which indicated that the Second Revision should include the use of modal values for the noise assessment of the background levels. This approach was subsequently included in the report. Following the submission of the Second Revision, the Environmental Protection Team was satisfied that the survey information and report was acceptable and that no undue noise disturbance from the equipment would result at the nearest residential properties.

² Paragon Acoustic Consultants

41. Local representations, including detailed submissions from the owner of The Station House, set out a detailed critique of these reports. I understand the points and concerns that have been raised and I examined this matter at the hearing. In summary, having heard the expert information from Mr Sharland, who had reviewed the Paragon Acoustic Consultants reports, I am satisfied that the background noise level included in the Second Revision accords to a satisfactory extent with the approach in BS4142:2014+A1:2019³ and is representative of the times and days when the noise source would be operational. I also heard that the latest Guidance Note from the Council (2023) does not include or require the 5dB reduction from background noise levels to provide the target level for the equipment. This assists the appellant in demonstrating that the noise levels emanating from the building would meet with the Council's guidelines.
42. In general, having reviewed the evidence and heard the information at the hearing, I have found no reason to disagree with the conclusions of the Second Revision Noise Report, and the consequent judgement of the Council, that there should not be any unacceptable noise impacts on the living conditions of local residents which would result from the building.
43. Were I minded to allow the appeal, it would be necessary to revise the wording of the recommended noise conditions to ensure that the target noise levels were set and could be measured at fixed points at the boundary of the site, rather than at the nearest residential properties. This would allow the appellant to be able to undertake noise surveys to ensure the target noise levels were met, without the need to access private land.
44. I appreciate that there may be noise that would result from the movements of grain lorries and tractors within the yard in connection with the proposed building. However, the yard is already a reasonably busy area with related noise and activity. The construction of the building would reduce the size of the present yard area and potentially the extent of activity and noise from other vehicles and the wrapping of bales, for instance. I do not consider that the use of the yard for vehicles associated with the proposed building, which is likely to be most focused at harvest time, would be to such an extent to be considered unacceptable.
45. *Heritage assets*– There is a general grouping of listed buildings to the broadly north west of the proposed grain dryer and store. These include Burghclere Manor House (Grade II*), All Saints Church (Grade I) and the barn at Manor Farm (Grade I). However, there is separation in distance of the listed buildings from the proposed structure as well as with intervening vegetation. The layout of the buildings also results in a general lack of relationship between the appeal site and any of the listed buildings. I am satisfied that the appeal scheme would not affect the setting of any listed building or adversely affect their significance, either individually or collectively as a group.
46. *Other matters* – I have taken into account all the representations submitted both at the application and appeal stages. Whilst most of the submissions raise objection, I am also mindful that there are representations in support of the proposal. These include those from the Highclere Society on the basis of the reduction of vehicle movements in the area.

³ Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound.

47. I have noted the comments and objections of the Burghclere Parish Council and I heard from its Chairman at the hearing. The CPRE has also raised objections as well as Ecchinswell, Sydmonton and Bishops Green Parish Council, who note that while the planning application is not in its Parish, but within the Burghclere Parish, it objects on the basis of the increase in heavy goods vehicles the proposal would generate through its Parish.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

48. The provision of the grain dryer and store would make a valuable contribution to the efficiency and productivity of this substantial and long-established farm holding. The ability to store more grain in a purpose designed building would allow it to be sold at various times of the year when a better price could be achieved and would make the overall farming operation more viable both now and in the longer term. The purpose designed building would operate more efficiently than the existing grain drying facilities at Crux Easton, thereby reducing energy consumption and carbon emissions.
49. The location of the grain dryer and store on this part of the holding would not only increase storage capacity in an efficient and convenient location but would substantially reduce the number and length of tractor and trailer journeys which presently take place to and from Crux Easton. This would result in benefits to the living conditions of local residents along this extended route, would cause less inconvenience to other road users, lead to a reduction in carbon emissions and would reduce the wear and tear on equipment.
50. I am also conscious that the landscape has been shaped by farming in this area. The grain dryer and store building would assist the continuation of viable arable farming activities across this lowland area and, in turn, it would help to support the statutory purpose of AONB designation to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. The AONB Management Plan has a section on a working landscape and explains that land based enterprises play a significant role in acting as stewards of the landscape and contributing to economic balance. One of the key issues identified in the Management Plan is the need for viable agricultural and forestry to continue to contribute to AONB purposes.
51. More generally, the drying and storage of the grain in the proposed building would help to support national food security and the production on the scale achieved on this large holding would make a useful contribution.
52. Additionally, I have also found that the scheme would maintain and enhance biodiversity and I have taken into account the appellant's analysis which highlights the constraints to the provision of a grain drying and store building on other sites nearby.
53. Furthermore, the Framework confirms that decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. It is explained that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. To this end Policy EP4 of the Local Plan was highlighted which concerns the support for the rural economy. However, because of the harm to the landscape, the requirements of Policy EP4 would not be met in this case and, therefore, this particular policy conflict to some extent tempers the economic case made to support the building.

54. Nevertheless, taken together, the cumulative benefits of the proposed grain dryer and store would be very worthwhile, and I attribute those combined benefits substantial weight in favour of approval.
55. However, on the other hand, the proposed building would cause a significant adverse visual impact to this section of the countryside and would not conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of this part of the AONB. This harm would be experienced from parts in or around Beacon Hill and Ladle Hill, as well as from sections of the nearby footpath along the drive. This harm would be experienced by receptors who had, in all likelihood, chosen to walk in the countryside to experience the landscape. The building would be overly dominant and not respect the local character of the area contrary to key characteristics identified for The Clere Scarp Character Area in the LCA. I am not satisfied that an even more extensive landscaping scheme or other measures, that could form conditions as part of any approval, would overcome this harm.
56. The level of harm to the landscape and scenic beauty would be quite substantial when experienced from the locations that I have highlighted, and this harm is coupled with the Framework requirement that conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of AONBs should be given great weight. This identified harm results in conflict with the policies in the Local Plan and the Burghclere NP concerning the protection of the landscape. Indeed, the harm to the character and appearance of the area, including to the AONB, with the related policy conflicts is to such an extent that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole.
57. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise⁴.
58. In this case, I determine that the harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the AONB, and the related policy conflicts should be attributed great weight. The collective benefits of the scheme, which would be clearly worthwhile, should be afforded substantial weight. In the planning balance I consider that the harm and policy conflicts are such that they would outweigh the benefits in this case.
59. In conclusion, given the harm I have found and the conflict with the related planning policies in that regard, the scheme would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations of such weight which indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. Accordingly, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Wyborn

INSPECTOR

⁴ Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

Mr Richard Cosker	RCC Town Planning Consultancy
Mr Will Harley	WH Landscape Consultancy Ltd
Lord Carnarvon	Appellant/Porchester Farms sole trader
Lady Carnarvon	
Mr Simon Andrews	Farm Manager - Porchester Farms
Mr Bill Bird	B K Grain
Mr Simon Bird	B K Grain
Mr Alex Hannam	Pro Vision
Mr Adam Lewins	Kingfisher Ecology Ltd
Mr Nick Culhane	Nick Culhane Highway Consultant
Mr Richard Sharland	Ian Sharland Limited (Acoustic Consultant)

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Miss Jessica Sullivan	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
Mrs Catherine Daly	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

INTERESTED PARTIES

Cllr Richard Carrow	Chair of Burghclere Parish Council
Sir Charlie Mayfield	Local Resident
Mr Paul Lidgely	Local Resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

1. Email dated 8 June 2022 from Sonya Hildebrandt (Senior Environmental Health Officer) to Ruth Triebisch (Planning Officer).
2. Noise Assessment and Reports for Planning Applications – Guidance note for developers and consultants – Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council – 2023.