
Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 23 July 2025

Site visit made on 23 July 2025

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/W/25/3359082

Employment Land, East of Spratsgate Lane, Cirencester GL7 6DF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Carbide Properties against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02749/REM sought approval of details pursuant to condition No.1 of a planning permission, Ref 16/00054/OUT, granted on 3 April 2019.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 17 July 2024.
 - The development proposed is Outline application (with all matters except Access reserved for subsequent consideration) for a mixed use development comprising demolition of existing buildings (as detailed on the submitted demolition plan) and the erection of up to 2,350 residential dwellings (including up to 100 units of student accommodation and 60 homes for the elderly), 9.1 hectares of employment land (B1, B2 and B8 uses), a primary school, a neighbourhood centre including A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 uses as well as community facilities (including a health care facility D1), public open space, allotments, playing fields, pedestrian and cycle links (access points onto Tetbury Road, Somerford Road and Cranhams Lane) landscaping and associated supporting infrastructure to include vehicle access points from Tetbury Road, Spratsgate Lane, Wilkinson Road and Somerford Road at Land At Chesterton Farm Cranhams Lane Cirencester Gloucestershire GL7 6JP.
 - The details for which approval is sought are: appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the employment area to the east of Spratsgate Lane.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. Applications for an award of costs was made by Carbide Properties against Cotswold District Council and Gloucestershire County Council. These are the subject of separate decisions.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal proposal seeks approval of reserved matters in respect of an area allocated for employment use within a larger mixed-use development, named 'The Steadings', granted outline planning permission (OPP). The principle of the development of this parcel of land for employment uses has been established and the matter before me is how this is to be achieved. Matters in respect of access were approved as part of the OPP. The reserved matters for which approval is sought are appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.
4. In response to the Council's consultation on the reserved matters application (RMA), representations from interested parties were received with regards to

issues that lie outside the reserved matters and therefore the scope of this appeal. This included concerns in respect of construction noise. As these relate to matters that are not before me, I have not considered these further as part of this appeal.

5. Conditions were attached to the OPP in respect of each RMA relating to certain uses, including employment uses falling within Classes B2 and / or B8 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) (the UCO). Two conditions are relevant to this appeal.
6. Condition 65 requires the RMA to be accompanied by details of the proposed hours of operation including hours of delivery to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the operation is brought into use. This condition would need to be discharged in accordance with Article 27(1) of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (the DMPO). The discharge of this condition does not form part of this appeal although the details required by the condition are relevant to the appeal proposal. I have therefore considered these only insofar as they relate to the matters before me.
7. Condition 68 requires the RMA to be accompanied by a scheme for the control of noise emitted from the use. It sets out requirements for the scheme and standards that it needs to accord with. It requires the scheme to be implemented in full prior to the occupation of the development and retained and maintained as approved. There is no requirement for a separate approval or discharge of this condition under Article 27(1) of the DMPO.
8. Notwithstanding these procedural matters, the parties are in agreement that the proposed layout of the site has implications for noise and that the matters covered by both conditions are therefore relevant to the appeal proposals. Furthermore, caselaw¹ has established that there is a link between layout and noise. I have proceeded accordingly.
9. A Scheme of Noise Mitigation (SoNM) was submitted as part of the appeal. In advance of the Hearing, the appellant submitted a revision to the SoNM dated 16 July 2025, an amended drawing² in respect of boundary treatments (Revision L drawing) and a Design Note in respect of acoustic fencing on which the RMA had been determined. The Council provided written comments that agreed to these amendments, but not that it was in agreement with them. The Hearing proceeded on that basis.
10. Discussions at the Hearing narrowed the matters in dispute in respect of noise. A further revision to the SoNM³ was subsequently submitted after the Hearing. The Council has commented on this. I have accepted the revised SoNM and proceeded to determine the appeal based on this. For the avoidance of doubt, further references to the SoNM in my decision relate to this post-hearing version.
11. The Council's second reason for refusal related to the need for a unilateral undertaking under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (UU). This sought a financial contribution in respect of implementing parking restrictions and a means of securing tree planting between the development and Wilkinson Road and Spratsgate Lane.

¹ R (oao Ornua Ingredients Ltd) and Herefordshire Council [2018] EWHC 2239 (Admin)

² Drawing 2611 P406 Revision L

³ Scheme of Noise Mitigation, dated 25 July 2025, Pegasus Ref: P21-1684

12. Prior to the Hearing, Gloucestershire County Council as the local highway authority confirmed that the proposed car parking would accord with their standards and that they no longer object to the scheme. Consequently, the Council withdrew the part of its second reason for refusal in respect of the need for a UU to secure parking restrictions. I have proceeded on that basis.
13. The application for OPP was accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations), including technical appendices and a non-technical summary. The environmental information to support the ES has been updated where necessary. I am satisfied that the totality of the information provided is sufficient to meet the requirements of Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations and this information has been taken into account in reaching a decision.

Background and Main Issues

14. The employment area lies to the east of Spratsgate Lane and comprises some 2.9 hectares of land that would be developed with five units. These could operate as either Class B2 (general industrial) or Class B8 (storage or distribution) uses under the UCO.
15. The proposed use has the potential to give rise to adverse impacts through noise and disturbance to neighbouring residential occupants to the east at Orchard Field, to the west and north-west. Through the reserved matters, the parties have sought to achieve a satisfactory layout and landscaping measures to minimise any adverse impacts, but it is agreed that noise mitigation measures, including controls on the hours of operation, would nonetheless be required. The parties dispute the likely noise levels associated with the use of the site and therefore what is required as noise mitigation.
16. The parties are not in agreement about the nature of landscaping to be provided along the western site boundary, extending along Spratsgate Lane and Wilkinson Road. Consequently, the main issues are:
 - the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to noise arising from the layout of the employment area and whether the proposed mitigation would be effective; and
 - the effect of the landscaping proposals on the character and appearance of the area, having regard to tree planting along Wilkinson Road and Spratsgate Lane.

Reasons

Noise

17. There are three main areas of dispute in respect of noise arising from the proposed layout of the employment area and, where it causes unacceptable harm, how it should be mitigated. Firstly, whether the noise arising from the use of external service yards to Units 2 and 3, including HGV movements, loading and unloading activities, requires mitigation in the form of internal loading bays to avoid unacceptable harm through noise disturbance to the living conditions of residential occupiers to the east on Orchard Field. Secondly, whether HGV deliveries and the use of the service yards for each individual unit should be restricted to between

0700 and 2300 hours or whether this could commence from 0600 hours as sought by the appellant without causing harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Thirdly, whether the proposed SoNM would be effective in securing satisfactory noise mitigation so as to avoid harmful effects on neighbouring occupiers. I deal with each in turn.

18. A noise impact assessment was completed on behalf of the appellant by Hoare Lea Acoustics⁴ (the HLA Report). This established the background sound levels. Whilst the Council referred to taking sound measurements at additional receptors this additional requirement was not raised at the application stage and the parties agreed that the typical lowest background sound levels were $L_{A90,1\text{hour}}$ 37 dB during the day and $L_{A90,15\text{min}}$ 32 dB during the night. The night-time period is between 2300 and 0700 and follows the guidance set out in *BS4142:2014+A.1:2019 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound* (BS4142).
19. BS4142 provides guidance on the assessment of noise impacts. It explains that the significance of sound of an industrial and / or commercial nature depends upon both the margin by which the rating level of the specific sound source exceeds the background sound level and the context in which the sound occurs. It establishes that the lower the rating level is relative to the measured background sound level, the less likely it is that a specific sound source will have an adverse impact or significant adverse impact. These are defined as a difference of around +5dB and +10dB respectively.
20. Condition 68 of the OPP requires a SoNM in accordance with BS4142. It also sets out that the SoNM should ensure that noise levels in the nearest gardens and public open spaces as a result of the carrying out of the uses do not exceed 55 dB $L_{Aeq\ 1\text{ hour}}$ when measured in any period. This would be in accordance with the World Health Organisation (WHO) figure set out in *BS8233:2014: Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings*.
21. The evidence does not indicate that this WHO level would be exceeded. However, if I were to accept that noise generated from the site could be up to 55 dB $L_{Aeq\ 1\text{ hour}}$ in neighbouring gardens, this could lead to an exceedance of +18 dB for nearby occupiers above the agreed background level. Such an increase in noise levels would result in significant adverse impacts and would be unacceptable. For this reason, I find that the WHO noise threshold provides an appropriate backstop to prevent harm but does not set a suitable noise level for the development. This is more appropriately set by following the BS4142 methodology which is intended for rating and assessing sound of an industrial and/or commercial nature. My assessment of the SoNM is made on that basis.
22. The HLA Report assessed each noise source arising on the site individually, namely noise break-out from warehouse buildings, HGV impacts, mechanical services plant and the car park. Various assumptions were applied to the assessment including in respect of the building fabric, numbers of and duration of HGV trips including reversing alarms and numbers of delivery events and vehicle movements in respect of car parking. The only noise source it identified that would exceed the background sound level by +6dB, and therefore have an adverse impact according to a BS4142 assessment, would be HGV movements at night on properties to the north-west. Properties to the east would experience a +4dB

⁴ Hoare Lea Acoustics – Spratsgate Lane, Cirencester REP-10-14152-AM-20220505 -Environmental Noise Report Revision 6, dated 10 April 2024

exceedance of background sound levels, which is marginally below the adverse impact threshold set out in BS4142. The report concluded that an acoustic barrier would provide attenuation sufficient to bring this into the 'low impact' range.

23. The Council commissioned Nova Acoustics (NA) to undertake a technical review⁵ of the HLA Report and mitigation proposed by the appellant. Unlike the HLA assessment which considers each noise source individually, the NA assessment considered the impacts cumulatively. There were differences in noise modelling inputs, primarily in respect of assumptions about noise from HGV movements, the time taken to travel from the site entrance to the units, loading and unloading activities and reverse alarms, with the HLA Report applying a lower source noise level. The differences between the on-time assessments and overall number of deliveries throughout the day and night were fairly limited. The NA assessment determined that in order to achieve the lower source noise levels assumed by HLA, there would be a reliance on good management of the site and the use of newer or quieter plant, none of which could be guaranteed given the end users are unknown.
24. Neither HLA nor NA have provided conclusive evidence to support their noise level assumptions, drawing from archive data in HLA's case and NA applying experience and knowledge of values used in other speculative applications relating to developments involving HGV movements. In the absence of known occupants of the units, I consider a precautionary approach should be adopted and it is therefore appropriate to make an assessment on a worst-case scenario. This would accommodate a scenario in which noisier vehicles may be present or drivers and other site operatives do not adhere to noise management plans (NMP). I return to NMPs later in my decision.
25. Activities on the site are unlikely to occur in isolation, and it is therefore reasonable to consider the cumulative impacts of those noise sources. This is the approach taken in the NA assessment which identifies a sound level at each of the receptors. It does not provide a detailed breakdown of how the specific sound level (dB, L_{Aeq}) has been calculated but I was told it represents a cumulative figure based on all the different noise sources, with an adjustment to reflect that all delivery bays are unlikely to be in use simultaneously. I find NA's approach, which looks at the cumulative impacts arising from the site to be more persuasive.
26. With the site operational 24 hours a day 365 days a year, buildings constructed to a standard that limits noise breakout, acoustic fencing, as set out in the Revision L drawing and no deliveries between 2300 and 0700, the NA assessment identified a low impact at night on all the dwellings but an adverse impact on dwellings to the east during the daytime. Taking into account the taller acoustic fencing now proposed, that impact would be +8dB. This would adversely impact those occupants. I therefore find that the proposed layout would be unacceptable in terms of its impact on neighbouring occupiers, unless suitable mitigation is secured.
27. The Council considers that this adverse effect could be overcome by internal loading bays to both Units 2 and 3 and, in the event the appeal were to be allowed, a planning condition could be imposed to secure this. The appellant strongly opposes this, on the grounds that this would harmfully affect the commercial viability of the units by reducing their internal space, making them less attractive to potential future occupiers. This may be the case, but no firm evidence was

⁵ Nova Acoustics – Technical Memo, dated 08/05/24

presented to me to demonstrate this. In any event, whilst both positions are noted, I have some concerns about the effectiveness of internal loading bays in preventing noise breakout from the buildings which, to my mind, would only provide suitable mitigation if external doors were kept shut. This would need to be secured through robust management of operations within the unit in order to avoid adverse impacts on neighbouring occupiers, particularly given that the site would be operational throughout the entire evening when people are likely to be at home relaxing. A suitably detailed and enforceable NMP for each individual operator could secure this.

28. I turn now to the hours of operation of the site and whether the use of the external service yards and deliveries to the site should be allowed between 0600 and 0700 hours. This hour falls within the night-time period when people could reasonably be expecting peace and quiet.
29. The noise monitoring data indicates that background noise levels begin to increase from around 0445 hours. Noise from HGVs and use of the service yards would be experienced in the context of this. However, I have not been provided with an agreed figure for what the background sound level would be during this period nor what the rating level (dB, L_{Ar} , T_r) would be during this period and therefore what any exceedance of that level would be. I am also mindful that the noise monitoring was carried out over a relatively short period.
30. Furthermore, there is a risk that HGVs could arrive at the site prior to this period, waiting on Wilkinson Road or Spratsgate Lane until the site opens, potentially with engines running which could be disturbing to those residents to the west and north-west of the site. From what has been submitted, it is not clear how this could be prevented but it seems to me it would likely come down to individual operators and NMPs.
31. In the absence of firm evidence about the noise impact from use of the service yards and HGV movements arriving at and leaving the site before 0700 hours, I cannot be certain that harms to neighbouring occupiers would not occur. In coming to this conclusion, I am mindful that once the site is operational, more accurate monitoring of noise levels arising from the site could be undertaken to establish whether unacceptable harm through noise disturbance would arise. Whilst I am not reaching a firm conclusion in respect of condition 65, my decision will be relevant to any discharge of that condition which is in place to protect the amenity of the locality, especially for people living and working nearby. Without appropriate mitigation, I cannot be satisfied that such harms would not arise. I now turn to consider those matters covered by the SoNM and whether they would provide effective measures to avoid harmful noise impacts.
32. Conditions agreed by the parties at the Hearing would secure the construction of the building to ensure minimum sound insulation requirements are met, details of acoustic fencing and a requirement to obtain approval including details of noise mitigation, before any external plant or machinery is installed. The only noise mitigation measures now proposed to be included in the SoNM are those relating to hours of operation and securing a NMP for each new occupier. It is proposed that the SoNM would be approved through a condition attached to this appeal, making it an approved document. The Council does not support this approach.

33. The SoNM proposes to restrict HGV delivery times in accordance with Condition 65. It restricts the timing of deliveries and use of the service yards to between 0600 and 2300 hours unless, in this appeal decision, I determine deliveries should be restricted to only take place between 0700 and 2300 hours. It also sets out a requirement for NMPs for each new occupier.
34. In the event I were to allow the appeal but require deliveries between 0700 and 2300 hours, then the SoNM has been amended before it is approved, with a consequent paper trail comprising the SoNM, this appeal decision and whatever is approved by the Council in respect of Condition 65. This would be complex, potentially leading to misunderstandings for future occupants about what they are able to do or not. Adherence to the hours of operation could be enforced against because any discharge of Condition 65 would reflect the hours of operation the Council considers appropriate, having regard to my appeal decision. Nevertheless, should subsequent changes to hours of operation be approved through a variation of condition 65, for example in the event that onsite monitoring was to confirm activities during the night-time period would be acceptable, then there would be a mismatch between the approved SoNM and condition 65. To my mind, this would result in undue complexity and inconsistency, and I am unconvinced that it would be enforceable.
35. The NMPs are a critical aspect of noise mitigation measures for the site. The SoNM requires a NMP for each occupier of the site and for that to be submitted to the Council for its written approval prior to the occupation of any unit. Each unit is required to be occupied in accordance with the approved NMP. The minimum requirements of NMP are set out in an example attached to the SoNM.
36. The SoNM sets out the requirement for approval but lacks sufficient detail that properly explains the process. As such, it could make enforcement of this requirement difficult, potentially undermining this critical aspect of making the development a success.
37. The NMP is focussed on complying with planning conditions, awareness raising and requiring site operatives to keep noise levels down through turning engines off, completing noisy activities quickly, using banksmen as necessary and not shouting or playing radios in the service yards. It makes provision for recording of and handing of complaints and commits to review this and the NMP on an annual basis and update where appropriate. However, the level of detail is limited and fundamentally, it does not set out details of monitoring either of noise levels or adherence to measures within the NMP. For this reason, the NMP attached to the SoNM would not be effective.
38. It would be open to the Council to require additional detail which could address any shortcomings within the NMP as the appended version is an example. However, the NMP refers to the HLA Report and states that the assessments in that report do not indicate any specific adverse impacts that require noise control measures. As I have set out above, I have concluded that the HLA Report does not persuade me that there would not be adverse effects. However, since the example NMP provides this context, it would likely undermine the Council in seeking more effective noise management measures through the NMP.
39. The requirement for a NMP would be secured as part of the SoNM required by Condition 68 and, if I were to allow the appeal, as an approved document. Unlike

the hours of operation, I do not envisage any inconsistencies arising from this. Nevertheless, the NMP is not, as I have set out, even as an example, sufficiently robust to secure appropriate noise mitigation on the site.

40. Drawing together my conclusions on this first main issue. I have found that the proposed layout would give rise to unacceptable noise impacts for occupants living to the east of the site during the daytime hours of 0700 to 2300. This would occur even with the installation of acoustic fencing and standards of building construction to prevent noise breakout. Mitigation for this could potentially be achieved through the use of internal loading bays to Units 2 and 3 but this would require robust management of the site, such as could be secured through a NMP.
41. If deliveries and external service yards were permitted to be used during the nighttime hours of 2300 to 0700, noise impacts would be much greater and more widespread, leading to harm to neighbouring occupiers living to the west of the site. As such, external operations and deliveries should not occur during these hours in the absence of robust evidence to demonstrate harm would not occur. The proposed SoNM would not be effective in controlling activities and the NMPs it requires, would not be sufficiently robust to ensure no unacceptable adverse impacts on neighbouring occupants.
42. For these reasons, I conclude that the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers would be unacceptable, with particular regard to noise arising from the layout of the employment area and the proposed mitigation would not satisfactorily address this. The scheme therefore conflicts with Policy EN15 of the Cotswold District Local Plan 2011-2031 (2018) (the LP) which permits development that will not result in unacceptable risk to the amenity of existing land uses through the generation of noise.

Landscaping

43. A Detailed Design Code⁶ (DDC) for the area covering the appeal site was approved on 17 March 2021. This sets out the details in respect of the Wilkinson Road / Spratsgate Lane edge which runs along the west side of the appeal site. The DDC includes mandatory requirements for additional trees to be planted along this boundary to soften the edge and create a sense of landscape maturity from the start. It also requires tree planting to provide screening of the employment buildings from adjacent land uses and Spratsgate Lane and Wilkinson Road. Design guidance illustrations showing that existing hedgerow along this edge be retained and new planting provided.
44. There is no disagreement that tree planting is required, nor that it would be beneficial and in accordance with the DDC. However, the appellant has argued that since a sewer was installed on the site and an area of approximately 3 metres either side is required for easement, tree planting as sought by the Council cannot be achieved. At my site visit, I observed that the sewer pipe runs close to the boundary hedgerow and existing post and rail fence. I also saw that there is a ditch along the highway verge adjacent to the hedgerow but beyond the easement.
45. Nevertheless, the developers of the site, Bathurst Developments Ltd (BDL), produced tree planting plan⁷ showing planting along this boundary comprising 4

⁶ The Steadings Cirencester Phase 1 Detailed Design Code – Bathurst Development Ltd

⁷ Ref 1600/040 Wilkinson Road Tree Planting Option 1

hornbeams and 8 small-leaved lime trees. These would be planted on the site boundary and partially within the existing hedgerow, which would be impacted. Further south, along the Spratsgate Lane boundary, some of the proposed tree planting would potentially be outside the site boundary. The Council explained that these planting proposals were discussed with BDL at a meeting on site in January 2023, after the sewer had been installed. This indicates that DDC compliant planting could be achieved. Technical evidence that this is not the case has not been provided and I am therefore unable to conclude that it would not be feasible, although I acknowledge the site constraints which I observed.

46. The appellant submitted landscaping drawings with the RMA. These show some tree planting but not sufficient to meet the requirements of the DDC. The Council explained that it had concerns with other aspects of the landscaping proposals that went beyond the tree planting although it did not include these as a reason for refusal as it considered these could be remedied through a revised landscaping scheme. This related to some of the proposed non-acoustic boundary treatments, the proposed planting schedule, which included some unsuitable non-native invasive species and the landscape design of the sustainable drainage system pond.
47. The boundary hedgerow is relatively tall but there are gaps within it, providing views into the site. Without the tree planting, the hedgerow would not be sufficiently high or dense to provide the landscape quality the DDC seeks to achieve. Consequently, I find that the tree planting is a necessary part of the overall landscaping for this area, contributing to the overall quality of The Steadings development.
48. A condition requiring a revised landscaping scheme could be imposed should the RMA be approved. This could address most of the Council's landscaping concerns. However, in respect of tree planting, where some may fall outside the site boundary, this would not be suitable. To overcome this, the Council had agreed with BDL that they would submit a follow-on RMA for this additional tree planting. This follow on application would have been secured by the UU but this has not been completed.
49. In conclusion, the tree planting is an important element of the scheme that will contribute to the overall success of The Steadings. Without firm evidence to support the appellant's position that the required tree planting is not possible, my finding is that the scheme does not provide satisfactory landscaping, and in the absence of a mechanism to secure this, the scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy EN1 of the LP which requires new development to enhance the natural environment by contributing to green infrastructure and ensuring design standards that complement the character of the area. It would also not accord with the mandatory requirements of the DDC.

Other Matters

50. Employment Area A forms part of Phase 1 of The Steadings development and it is common ground that it needs to be brought forward quickly. Both parties agree that the appeal process has narrowed the noise-related issues in dispute. A revised RMA would only need to address a narrow range of issues as identified in this decision and as such, should be able to progress reasonably quickly. To that end, the Council has advised that it will offer the appellant a Planning Performance

Agreement to ensure that the determination of the revised RMA is dealt with in a timely fashion. It could also be determined alongside any necessary discharge of other conditions that are required before works commence on site. As such, dismissing this appeal will not result in undue delay to the development.

Conclusion

51. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Robert Walton KC	Landmark Chambers – Counsel
James Clark	Pegasus Group – Planning Consultant
Adrian McCordick	Hoare Lea – Acoustic Consultant
James Hicks	Pegasus Group – Planning Consultant
Jenny Clarke	Tungsten Properties – Appellant
Peter Cusdin	Bathurst Developments – Appellant

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Anthony Keown	Director - A K Urbanism
Sebastian Chesney	Director - Nova Acoustics

DOCUMENTS

Hearing Documents

HD1 R (oao Ornua Ingredients Ltd) and Herefordshire Council and Barrett Homes [2018] EWHC 2239 (Admin)

Post-hearing Documents

PHD1 Appellant's written costs application

PHD2 Council's costs response

PHD3 Email from appellant confirming no further comments in respect of LPA's costs response dated 28 July 2025

PHD4 Appellant's covering email dated 30 July 2025 enclosing documents and setting out suggested condition

PHD5 Appellant's position statement, dated 30 July 2025

PHD6 Appellant's Scheme of Noise Mitigation, dated 25 July 2025

PHD7 Appendix 1 – Example Noise Management Plan

PHD8 Council letter, dated 30 July 2025, responding to appellant's proposition

PHD9 Council Note for Inspector dated 30 July 2025 on Conditions 65 and 68

PHD10 Email from appellant dated 4 September 2025 commenting on the Council's post-hearing comments