



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 February 2026

by **M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 April 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/Y3940/W/25/3371476

Euridge Manor, Euridge, Wiltshire, Colerne SN14 8BJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Euridge Manor Weddings Ltd against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/2025/05324 sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 4 of planning permission, granted on 22 May 2025.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 13 August 2025.
 - The development proposed is discharge of condition 4 (Noise Management Plan) of APP/Y3940/W/23/3323464.
 - The details for which approval is sought is the Noise Management Plan.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Y3940/W/25/3371471

Euridge Manor, Euridge, Wiltshire, Colerne SN14 8BJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Euridge Manor Weddings Ltd. against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/2025/05323 sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 3 of planning permission, granted on 22 May 2025.
 - The development proposed is discharge of condition 3 (Noise Management Plan) of APP/Y3940/C/22/3306233.
 - The details for which approval is sought is the Noise Management Plan.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The original appeals referred to in the above banners relate to an approved wedding and events venue, trading as Euridge Manor Weddings Limited ('EMW') and were determined following a Public Inquiry, with Noise Management Plan Version 10, dated 25 October 2024 ('NMPv10') forming the basis of the Inspector's decision letter dated 22 May 2025 ('DL'). Under the appeal conditions, NMPv10 remains operative until a revised Noise Management Plan ('NMP') is approved.
4. Applications to discharge the relevant conditions (refs. PL/2025/05323 and PL/2025/05324) were submitted on 20 June 2025, and included a final revised NMP dated 30 July 2025.
5. As part of the appeals before me, the appellant has suggested a number of amendments to the NMP dated 30 July 2025. It is not my role to select, negotiate

or devise amendments to the Final NMP, but to determine the appeals on the basis of the evidence and submissions before me.

6. To that end, the amendments proposed by the appellant do not introduce new activities or relax existing restrictions in the NMP. They respond directly to matters raised in the evidence and are intended to align the Final NMP with the requirements of the DL. I have therefore accepted these amendments to the NMP dated 30 July 2025.
7. Accordingly, my assessment of the appeals proceeds on the basis of the NMP dated 30 July 2025, incorporating the appellant's amendments ('the Final NMP') which are as follows:
 - a) An alternative site plan to replace the existing one at Appendix A. This excludes the areas identified for gatherings and shading the remainder areas where gatherings are not permitted.
 - b) That the following brass instruments (and their derivatives) must not be played externally anywhere on the site: trumpet, French horn, trombone, tuba, cornet, euphonium and mellophone. The only exception is the saxophone, which may be played externally only within the Rose Lawn.
 - c) Replace paragraph 2.1.5, which says: 'There shall be no external music or speeches after 23:00 anywhere on the Site' is replaced with the following: 'There shall be no external speeches after 2100hrs and no external music after 2300hrs anywhere on the site'.
 - d) Replace paragraph 2.2.11, which says: 'Any external doors used for guest access to buildings where amplified music/entertainment will take place must be fitted with automatic door closers and an alarm system to indicate to the EMW staff that doors and windows that should be kept closed are open.' is replaced with: 'Any external doors and windows to buildings where amplified music/entertainment will take place will remain shut unless are doors used by guests/staff for access. External doors used for guest access to such buildings will be fitted with automatic closers and an alarm system to indicate to the EMW staff that doors and windows that should be kept shut are open.'
8. Both appeals relate to EMW and as they raise the same issues and to avoid duplication, I have dealt with them in a single decision letter.

Main Issue (Appeals A and B)

9. The main issue is whether the proposed Final NMP, is adequate and enforceable to safeguard the living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons (Appeals A and B)

10. In respect of definitions of bookings and attendee numbers, earlier versions of the NMP referred readers to appeal decision documents. The Final NMP now sets out the relevant definitions and limits directly within the document, addressing this concern.
11. Also, the Final NMP restricts deliveries and collections to daytime hours, and also limits waste-disposal activities to daytime hours. These measures meet the requirement of paragraph 150 of the DL.

12. Nonetheless, there remain several matters in dispute between the main parties, arising principally from the specific requirements for the NMP as identified by the Inspector in the DL. The Inspector accepted that events could continue at EMW, but subject to the operational safeguards they identified, as necessary. I am therefore obliged to ensure that the NMP accords with those safeguards in full unless the evidence suggests otherwise.
13. I address each of the matters in dispute, in turn below, broadly under the same headings used by the main parties.

Areas of the site where gatherings are not permitted

14. Paragraph 265 of the DL requires the NMP to identify all areas of the site where guest gatherings are not permitted, including the Tump. This is to prevent gatherings in locations where noise is more likely to propagate and cause disturbance to nearby sensitive receptors.
15. I acknowledge the appellant's point that the character of the venue relies on guests being able to enjoy the wider grounds and move between permitted gathering areas. However, paragraph 265 is directed at preventing gatherings in acoustically sensitive locations. The Tump, being elevated, is one such location, and the DL records a previous incident of shouting and cheering originating from this point.
16. The revised site plan includes shading to denote areas where gatherings are not permitted, including the Tump. However, the NMP defines 'the Site' as the land within the red line boundary 'excluding the red-hatched area'. However, as the revised site plan incorporates large areas hatched red, this wording creates an internal inconsistency: although these areas are intended to be subject to gathering restrictions, the definition would remove them from the scope of the Final NMP. If an area is excluded from 'the Site' the NMP cannot regulate activities within it, and the LPA would be unable to enforce the relevant restrictions.
17. The Final NMP states that all external areas, including temporary structures and marquees, are subject to the same controls on unamplified and amplified sound. However, the Final NMP says that permitted congregation areas are 'highlighted in magenta' on Appendix A, yet the revised plan contains no magenta shading. The Final NMP relies on the visual identification of these areas to distinguish permitted congregation from prohibited gathering. The absence of the referenced magenta shading raises a further significant enforceability concern.
18. In addition, the Final NMP seeks to distinguish between planned congregation and incidental guest movement. However, the terms 'transiting' and 'exploring' are vague and, when combined with the above identified shortcomings, do not provide a clear basis for determining when a gathering is occurring outside the permitted areas. As drafted, the Final NMP lacks the precision necessary for effective enforcement.

Use of musical instruments externally

19. The DL requires the NMP to include a list of musical instruments that are not permitted to be used in external areas, particularly given the evidence at paragraph 144 of the DL that certain instruments, such as saxophones and brass instruments, had previously caused disturbance when used externally.

20. The appellant has now provided a list of brass instruments that are not permitted externally. The Final NMP also prohibits the external use of drums and bagpipes, and restricts saxophones to indoor use or to the Rose Lawn only. The Rose Lawn exception is supported by its more enclosed form and by the absence of any history of complaints arising from saxophone use in that location. I have no substantive evidence to dispute this.
21. Given the wide range of musical instruments, a proportionate approach is to identify those instruments that, based on the evidence and typical use at tEMW, are most likely to generate disturbance when played externally. The list provided therefore focuses on brass instruments, drums, bagpipes and saxophones, types specifically referenced in the DL or inherently capable of producing high sound levels outdoors.
22. On a separate but related matter, the Final NMP says that processions involving 'significant noise generation' such as drumming or chanting, are not permitted anywhere within or beyond the venue. While the intention is clear, the term 'significant noise' is inherently subjective and provides no measurable threshold against which compliance can be assessed. EMWs noise-limiting equipment and sound-level monitoring are designed to control amplified sound and cannot reliably regulate unamplified activities such as chanting, cheering or drumming. Without an objective definition or measurable criterion, the provision remains vague and unenforceable.

Monitoring metrics

23. The LPA argues that the DL was flawed because the IOA Acoustics Bulletin does not prescribe a 15-minute averaging period and was not formally endorsed by the IOA. It relies on subsequent evidence explaining that the Bulletin was intended to stimulate debate rather than act as formal guidance.
24. However, the Inspector's findings in the DL did not depend entirely on the formal status of the Bulletin. The DL considered the full evidential context, including the LPAs concerns, the Addendum Sound Survey Report, the absence of updated IOA guidance, and the practical realities of assessing entertainment noise at EMW.
25. Paragraph 156 of the DL confirmed that the appellant's methodology was appropriate and that compliance with the LAeq,15min limits, together with the agreed mitigation, was unlikely to give rise to adverse effects above Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level ('LOAEL').
26. The LPA has not demonstrated that the calibration process or the use of LAeq,15min would result in exceedances of LOAEL or undermine the effectiveness of the NMP. The appellant's approach aligns with the findings of the DL.
27. The continued use of LAeq,15min is therefore consistent with the DL, technically justified, and proportionate.

Noise-limiting devices

28. The Final NMP refers to the use and calibration of the noise-limiting devices. The LPA questions whether the limiters were correctly set, noting the use of Pink Noise and highlighting inconsistencies in the certificates. However, there is insufficient technical evidence before me to substantiate these concerns.

29. The LPA also seeks an amendment requiring all limiters to be configured to the satisfaction of the LPA. No such requirement appears in the DL, and the previous Inspector identified no deficiency in the limiter-setting process.
30. The appellant explains that all limiter settings were derived using a systematic, evidence-based methodology designed to ensure that LOAEL is not exceeded. In the absence of contrary technical evidence, I have no basis to conclude that the methodology is inadequate.

Monitoring locations

31. The LPA argues that additional off-site monitoring locations are required, including at Bybrook View, noting that earlier drafts of the NMP included off-site monitoring positions that no longer appear.
32. In the Final NMP, the only monitoring location is MP3A, the closest noise-sensitive property and a position located on land within the appellant's control.
33. Paragraph 153 of the DL explains that the limits set at MP3A were modelled specifically to ensure that no adverse effects would occur at any noise-sensitive receptor. Paragraph 154 of the DL further confirms that monitoring on third-party land would not provide a more effective means of ensuring compliance.
34. Paragraph 151 of the DL requires that the sound level meter at MP3A be used throughout events, with appropriate calibration. The DL does not require monitoring at any additional locations.
35. Paragraph 146 of the DL confirms that the limiters installed at the Boathouse, Orangery and Ballroom are set so that their operation will not exceed the levels specified in the NMP. These settings ensure that compliance at MP3A is maintained, thereby preventing adverse effects at any receptor.
36. On the available evidence, taken together, these findings establish that MP3A is both a sufficient and appropriate monitoring location.

External amplification timings

37. Paragraph 143 of the DL records that past incidents of disturbance have included amplified speech and music in the late evening, and that background noise levels drop at this time. The Inspector concluded that allowing external amplified sources until as late as 23:00 would, in all likelihood, result in further incidents of the type previously experienced. This finding was based on the totality of the evidence before the Inquiry.
38. Paragraph 146 therefore requires not only the use of limiters but also a restriction on the duration of external amplification to a reasonable period during daytime hours. This was not an illustrative comment but a necessary control arising from the identified risk of late evening disturbance. It sits alongside the Inspector's broader approach: numerical limits at MP3A are necessary but not sufficient, as reflected in the emphasis on spatial controls, the treatment of marquees as external areas, and the need for clear management of unamplified noise sources.
39. Even with calibrated limiters and continuous monitoring, external amplified sound behaves differently from internal sound. It is less contained, more directional, and more readily perceived at distance once ambient levels fall. Compliance at MP3A

therefore does not eliminate the risk of perceptible and intrusive events during the late evening, particularly given the Inspector's finding that the area becomes more acoustically sensitive as background levels drop.

40. The absence of recent complaints does not displace the Inspector's findings. The DL was based on a full evidential assessment, including the nature of past incidents, the sensitivity of the late evening period, and the inherent limitations of external amplification. While some audio and video recordings may show no disturbance, they represent only a limited subset of the material considered at the Inquiry. They do not undermine the conclusion reached on the basis of the full evidential record that late evening external amplification presents a foreseeable and unacceptable risk of disturbance.
41. A proposal to cease external speeches at 21:00 while allowing external music until 23:00 does not reflect the DL's requirement that external amplification be limited to daytime hours. Allowing amplified music into the late evening would reintroduce the very risk the Inspector sought to avoid and would be inconsistent with the approach taken elsewhere in the NMP, where controls on external areas, temporary structures and unamplified noise all recognise the heightened sensitivity of the locality.
42. Reference to an industry definition of the early evening does not assist. The DL does not adopt industry terminology but requires external amplification to be confined to a reasonable period during daytime hours, reflecting the site specific acoustic context.
43. Similarly, reliance on the boathouse and terrace does not alter the position. The Inspector's treatment of these areas concerned spatial controls and the need to regard semi enclosed structures as external for noise purposes. It was not an endorsement of external amplified sound into the evening. Any use of external amplification remains subject to the temporal restriction required by paragraph 146 of the DL. That restriction was a deliberate and necessary safeguard, and on the evidence before me I cannot endorse any relaxation of it.
44. The position on portable amplification also requires clarity. The fact that such equipment is not presently used does not remove the need for defined and enforceable controls. The DL requires preventative measures, and without explicit regulation portable amplification could be introduced without oversight, undermining the effectiveness of the NMP.

Internal areas, door closers and ventilation

45. Paragraph 149 of the DL requires the inclusion of mechanical ventilation, automatic door closers and audio/visual alarms to minimise noise breakout from internal areas. These measures are necessary to minimise adverse noise incidents resulting from internal activity.
46. The main parties agree that the doors and windows to the ballroom and orangery should remain closed during events. As already stated, revised paragraph 2.2.11 of the Final NMP says that all external doors and windows will remain shut during events, except for access doors fitted with automatic closers and alarms. The appellant has also committed to fitting devices that issue an alert if there are unpermitted openings and to acting upon those alerts.

47. Notwithstanding the above and in the interests of health and safety, the requirement for ventilation in the ballroom and orangery is likely to result in noise breakout from these spaces, which the use of mechanical ventilation would minimise. The appellant asserts that such ventilation is not necessary for these spaces. However, there is limited technical evidence to support this or any assessment to demonstrate that the omission of mechanical ventilation would achieve the same level of control, nor that its absence would avoid increased noise escape.
48. Equally, there is no evidence before me that an appropriately specified mechanical ventilation system would generate harmful noise or conflict with sustainability objectives.
49. Therefore, on the information before me I am not persuaded that the omission of mechanical ventilation as a noise management measure has been suitably justified.

Monitoring arrangements during events

50. Paragraph 2.2.14 of the Final NMP says that real-time noise monitoring 'may' be undertaken. This is inconsistent with paragraph 151 of the DL, which requires the sound level meter to be used throughout events, with proper calibration before and after use.
51. To align the NMP with the DL, the former should impose a clear and mandatory requirement for continuous use of the MP3A sound level meter during events, while retaining supplementary qualitative monitoring.

Accessing event logs and responding to complaints

52. While the NMP is not required to prescribe responses for every scenario, it must provide a clear, timely and enforceable mechanism for responding to complaints and for addressing any exceedance of the agreed limits. The current drafting does not achieve this. It relies heavily on discretionary language, contains no defined escalation procedure, and provides only for an annual review cycle. The provisions in section 2.3 are largely administrative for logging complaints, keeping records and calibrating equipment, rather than setting out the steps that must be taken when noise levels approach or exceed the limits.
53. A more robust and structured complaints-handling process would not only improve enforceability but would also generate reliable evidence to inform the periodic review of the NMP and to support any future consideration of whether restrictions could be relaxed. As drafted, the monitoring, reporting and adaptation framework does not provide the level of certainty required by the DL.

External structures

54. Paragraph 147 of the DL makes clear that any activity taking place within marquees or other covered but non-permanent structures must be treated as external activity for noise-control purposes.
55. Paragraph 2.1.4 of the Final NMP identifies where external unamplified music and speeches may occur, but it does not expressly refer to temporary structures such as marquees or indicate where such structures may be positioned. This omission

creates uncertainty as to whether activities within marquees are captured by the external-activity controls required by the DL.

56. Although the DL does not require the NMP to map the precise locations of marquees, the Final NMP says that permitted congregation areas are “highlighted in magenta” on Appendix A. As no such magenta shading appears on the revised plan, the document does not clearly distinguish between permitted and prohibited areas. This lack of clarity is significant given the DL’s requirement to identify areas where gatherings are not permitted and the need to ensure that temporary structures are regulated as external spaces.

Performers and responsibility for compliance

57. Paragraph 145 of the DL says that performers cannot reasonably be expected to ensure that the noise they generate meets the specified levels at MP3A. That responsibility lies with the operator.
58. Paragraph 2.2.3 of the Final NMP places the onus on the appellant to ensure that limits are not breached during performances. Paragraphs 2.2.7 and 2.2.8 require performers to familiarise themselves with the in-house systems and set out punitive measures in the event of breaches. As such, the Final NMP places responsibility on EMW for noise management, in line with the DL.

Overall findings in respect of the Final NMP

59. The Final NMP contains a number of important measures that reflect the approach endorsed in the DL. It sets out defined numerical limits at MP3A, requires all amplified music to be routed through calibrated in-house systems, restricts the use of certain musical instruments externally, and includes controls on deliveries and collections. These elements provide a structured basis for managing noise and, where clearly expressed, offer a proportionate means of preventing adverse effects at nearby sensitive receptors.
60. However, several aspects of the Final NMP lack the clarity and precision necessary for effective implementation. The most significant deficiencies relate to the spatial controls governing external areas and congregation. The Final NMP also does not reflect the Inspector’s requirement that external amplification be limited to a reasonable period during daytime hours.
61. Certain terms used in the Final NMP, are insufficiently defined and do not provide a reliable basis for distinguishing permitted movement from prohibited gathering or for regulating unamplified noise sources. The procedures for responding to complaints and for addressing exceedances of the agreed limits also require greater specificity to ensure consistent and transparent management. In addition, the NMP needs to reflect the DLs requirement for continuous use of the MP3A sound level meter during events.
62. Also, insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that mechanical ventilation is unnecessary or that its omission would maintain equivalent control over internal noise escape.
63. Taken together, the Final NMP, falls short of the requirements set out in the DL. Therefore, in its present form the proposed Final NMP is not adequate or enforceable to safeguard the living conditions of neighbours. As such, I am unable

to conclude that condition 3 relating to decision APP/Y3940/C/22/3306233 and condition 4 relating to decision APP/Y3940/W/23/3323464 can be discharged.

Other Matters

64. The principle in *North Wiltshire DC v SSE* and the wider case law on consistency is fully acknowledged. Consistency in decision-making is important, and the DL is a material consideration of significant weight. However, that principle applies only where the subsequent proposal or submitted details are genuinely aligned with what the Inspector previously found acceptable. It does not require a decision-maker to approve details that fail to meet the specific requirements imposed by the earlier decision.
65. In this case, the Final NMP does not yet fully reflect the measures that the DL expressly requires. My dismissal of the appeals therefore does not conflict with the principle of consistency; rather, it reflects the proper application of the DL and the need to ensure that the approved details accord with its clear requirements.

Conclusion

66. For the above reasons, I conclude that Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR