



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 6 & 7 March 2012

Site visits made on 5 & 7 March 2012

by Katie Peerless Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 2 April 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/A/11/2159190

Redhatch Copse via Sibly Hall, Redhatch Drive, Earley, Reading RG6 5QW

- 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 University of Reading against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref F/2010/2777, dated 17 December 2010, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2011.
 - The development proposed is a 30m lattice mast and associated ground-based telecommunications equipment compound.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 30m lattice mast and associated ground-based telecommunications equipment compound at Redhatch Copse via Sibly Hall, Redhatch Drive, Earley, Reading RG6 5QW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref F/2019/2777, dated 17 December 2010, subject to the conditions attached as Annex 1 to this Decision.

Preliminary matters

2. The original reasons for refusal of the application included an objection on the grounds that, without a planning permission in place for the redevelopment of Sibly Hall, on which a number of telecommunications masts are presently located, there was no justification for the proposal. On 15 February 2012, outline planning permission¹ was granted for the residential redevelopment of the site to include 89 dwellings and associated infrastructure and this reason for refusal has now been withdrawn.
3. In the interval between the grant of outline planning permission for the residential development at Sibly Hall and the opening of the Inquiry, the Council and the appellants reached agreement over the extent of the measures required to mitigate against the harm to the ancient woodland that would be caused by the proposal and compensate for the area of woodland that would be lost. An agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (TCPA) was presented on the opening day of the Inquiry and this secures, amongst other things, the provision of these proposed measures, should planning permission be granted for the proposals. The Council therefore withdrew the second reason for refusal and offered no evidence to oppose the scheme.

¹ Ref: O/2011/2628

4. There remains, however, considerable public opposition to the proposals and the Inquiry heard evidence from the objectors on not only the matters raised in the original reasons for refusal but also on other concerns, including the adequacy of the search for alternative locations for the mast, its visual impact, planning restrictions on the use of the site and health concerns.

Main Issues

5. I consider that the main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed development on the habitat and diversity value of the area of Ancient Woodland and whether any loss or deterioration of this woodland caused by the mast would be offset by the need for, and benefits of, the development and, if so, whether the mitigation and compensation proposals offered are suitable.
6. I have also considered the objections raised by the local residents, as outlined above, and these matters will be addressed in the following paragraphs.

Site and surroundings

7. The site proposed for the telecommunications mast is located within Redhatch Copse, an area of Ancient Woodland that is also classified as a Local Wildlife Site, lying within the grounds of Sibly Hall, a 10 storey residential tower block owned by the University of Reading and used as student accommodation. The wider site also contains a number of lower buildings to the north east of the tower block, areas of open grass that are mown and used for informal recreation by the students, an uncultivated meadow area and areas given over to car parking. The general public have not been prevented from entering the site or using the copse for amenity purposes and there are several informal pathways wandering through the wood.
8. Sibly Hall presently houses 26 telecommunications antennae on its roof, together with the ancillary equipment needed for their operation. These belong to several commercial mobile phone network providers and Airwave, the company that provides the radio communications network for the emergency services.
9. The wider Sibly Hall site is roughly triangular and surrounded by residential development. The gardens of the properties on the western halves of the northern and south western boundaries, back directly onto Redhatch Copse.

Planning history

10. As noted above, outline planning permission for the demolition of Sibly Hall and the construction of 89 new dwelling has now been granted. The matter of access was not reserved for future determination and the approved plans show a 6m wide road, with 2m wide pavements on each side, entering the site from the point at which the existing driveway joins Redhatch Drive. The existing junction would be widened and larger radii applied to the kerbs.
11. The planning permission is subject to a S106 Agreement that provides, amongst other things, for Redhatch Copse (apart from the mast application site and the access to it) to be handed over to either Wokingham Borough Council or Earley Town Council, together with a commuted sum for its future maintenance. Prior to the handover, arboricultural works would be carried out to the copse, in line with a management plan for the grounds (including the copse) submitted with the application and secured by the S106 Agreement.

12. The local residents have drawn attention to a planning permission from 1977² for residential development around the Sibly Hall site to which conditions and a legal agreement are attached requiring Redhatch Copse to be used only for 'amenity purposes' by those occupying Sibly Hall and the surrounding properties. The extent of the development and the area to which the planning permission applied is not, however, completely clear as no record of the relevant plans appears to have been kept.

Reasons

Need for the development

13. The demolition of Sibly Hall will result in the loss of the telecommunications equipment on its roof. There was no serious suggestion that this would not result in a need to provide replacements for the antennae in another location, whether on or off the Sibly Hall site. In particular the need to replace the Airwave equipment is paramount, to maintain the provision to the emergency 'blue light' services.
14. The witness for the appellants who dealt with the technical considerations of the telecommunications equipment explained that the antennae at Sibly Hall not only provided coverage for the area immediately surrounding it but also relayed microwave signals to and from other sites, to support the coverage that they are able to provide. None of the operators with equipment on the tower block has indicated that they would no longer need their installations when the tower is demolished.
15. The operators have produced standard coverage plots to demonstrate the effect of the loss of the Sibly Hall antennae on the range capabilities of their networks and these indicate that there would be a substantial drop in the ability to access the services, particularly from within buildings. It is particularly critical for Airwave to be able to provide such a service to allow unbroken contact with members of the emergency services whilst they are inside buildings.
16. The Council has not queried the accuracy of these plots and it is common practice for such computer generated predictions to be used to support applications for telecommunications installations. The interpretation of the coverage plots provided by the expert witness in his proof of evidence is clear and detailed and I also find nothing to suggest that the plots are inaccurate. Consequently, I conclude that there is an established need for equipment to provide the coverage that will be lost once the Sibly Hall tower has been demolished.

Alternative locations

17. The thrust of the objectors' arguments are directed against the need to use the copse as the site for a mast. They suggest that there are alternatives that have not been fully explored, or given sufficient weight, and have raised concerns that the University is determined to continue to receive the revenue from the installation and has therefore discounted sites outside its control that would otherwise be suitable.

² Ref: 01945

18. Government policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does not materially alter the advice previously given in Planning Policy Guidance Note 8 - Telecommunications (now withdrawn). The NPPF also encourages mast sharing in order to reduce the proliferation of such sites and calls for sympathetic design and camouflage to minimise the impact of the development. It also notes that existing buildings, masts or other structures should be used unless the need for a new site has been justified.
19. There are a number of existing buildings suggested by the objectors on which equipment could be sited and all of these have been considered in the proof of evidence of the appellants' telecommunications witness. Some of the buildings such as Earley water tower and the drill tower at Reading Fire Service have antennae installations already and the witness points out that, in these cases, this equipment is owned by the same operators that have antennae at Sibly Hall. This demonstrates that both locations are needed to provide the coverage required.
20. Other suggested locations such as the AMS building at Reading University and Earley railway station are located outside the target coverage area. The roof of Lodden Valley police station, which would be a preferred location for Airwave, is unsuitable because it has exhaust vents on it that would pose a danger to service engineers. It also could not provide a full coverage to the required area.
21. The only other option would be for several street work installations to be used instead of a single mast. Objectors criticised the fact that some possible street locations initially appeared to have been discounted on the basis that they were too close to residential properties, when the proposed mast would also be within 30 - 45m of the closest houses in the recently approved residential application and the existing properties in Fulmer Close.
22. However, the proximity to dwellings, cited in the documents submitted with the planning application and the Site Specific Supplementary Information³, was not the only reason for discounting most of these options. A lack of screening was identified for sites 2 and 5 - 8 and site 2 was also adjacent to a school. Site 4 would require a substantial pole to clear nearby trees and there are already installations on the water tower at the site in use by the existing operators at Sibly Hall. (See paragraph 19).
23. In the most recent assessment⁴, it was explained that the street lamps near site 1 were only 5m high, so any taller installation would appear out of context and site 3 was too low to provide the required coverage and the Sibly Hall operators already use the site. In addition, this document notes that sites 5, 7 and 8 are too low to provide sufficient coverage for the whole area.
24. In any event, a street work solution would not be possible in the case of the Airwave installation, which has a confirmed need⁵ for equipment at a height of at least 30m. Therefore, using a greater number of street work installations would not remove the need for a 30m high mast which, at such a height, would appear very different from a standard street mast monopole such as those designed to replicate a lamp post. It would consequently be very dominant and unsuitable in a street location.

³ Core Document 13

⁴ Appendix 5 of Mr Williamson-Jones' proof of evidence

⁵ Appendix 9 of Mr Williamson-Jones' proof of evidence

25. It was also explained that there would need to be up to 9 different installations to provide the required coverage, in addition to the Airwave mast, and the proliferation of these installations would conflict with the requirement in the NPPF to share masts and provide screening for them where appropriate. Their visual impact would also be likely to affect a cumulatively wider area than the proposed mast at Sibly Hall. They would, as a last resort, theoretically be capable of providing some of the coverage, but when combined with the likely proximity to dwellings, the lack of screening and the remaining need for a mast for Airwave, I do not consider multi-site street work installations to be a practical or desirable alternative.
26. Consequently, for the reasons set out above and from a careful study of the evidence presented to the Inquiry, I am satisfied that a thorough search of alternative sites has been carried out and it has been demonstrated that no preferable location or solution to providing the required coverage has been identified outside the Sibly Hall site.
27. However, it has also been suggested that the mast could be located on the Sibly Hall site but outside the copse. Two alternative locations were explored by the appellants; one on the south eastern edge of the copse and the other on the north eastern side, in the uncultivated meadow area. Objectors also suggested that the brownfield land remaining after the tower block has been demolished could be utilised.
28. All these locations would be capable of providing the coverage required but would be more generally exposed to public viewpoints than the location proposed within the copse. The impact of this is considered in the following paragraphs.

Visual impact

29. If the mast were to be sited as proposed, the underside of the poles holding the Airwave antennae would be sited some 7.4m above the height of the tree canopy of the copse. These 3 poles would appear, from the submitted drawings, to be about 2.5m high. Below them would be 2 banks of antennae and microwave dishes at the top of the lattice support tower. There is no dispute that this equipment could be seen from some surrounding viewpoints as the antennae and dishes would have to project above the trees in order for them to function correctly.
30. The appellants have produced photomontages that they claim would demonstrate the extent to which the mast would be visible from various viewpoints around the copse. Local objectors have submitted their own versions of how they believe the mast would appear; however they were unable to provide confirmation of the accuracy of these images or an explanation of how they had been prepared.
31. Although I consider that the mast is shown rather faintly on the appellants' versions, the methodology by which they have been produced has been fully explained and I am satisfied that they give an accurate representation of the height of the mast and the extent to which the antennae would be visible. It is these images, as well as the views of the proposed site that I saw at my visits that have consequently informed my conclusions.

32. I accept that the top of the mast and the antennae would be visible from a number of dwellings, including some of those proposed under the residential development scheme for Sibly Hall. However, the rest of the tower would be well screened by the existing trees and, particularly in summer, it would be difficult to discern from outside the copse. It should also be noted that, outside the copse and due to the changing angle of vision, the closer the proximity of the viewpoint to the mast, the more it would be hidden by the trees in front of it and, from a greater distance, the mast would appear proportionately smaller.
33. This would not be the case for the alternative locations within the Sibly Hall site, as demonstrated on the photomontages and sections produced by the appellants. If the mast was to be erected on the old tower block site it would be surrounded by new housing in a central and very exposed situation. Any planting intended to provide a natural screen would take many years to grow to the height and thickness that would be provided by the established copse.
34. Therefore, if located outside the copse, the mast location would consequently fail to comply with the requirement in the NPPF to camouflage installations to minimise their impact. The Council has raised no objection on the grounds of visual impact and I consider that the location within the copse is the best location on the Sibly Hall site in terms of this factor. It must also be remembered that Sibly Hall is to be demolished and the current views of the telecommunications equipment on its roof will be removed. The mast would be far less visually prominent than the building and antennae as they exist at present.
35. One objector suggested that, instead of the lattice mast, a replica tree could be used to help to disguise the installation. However, it was explained that 2 such replica trees would be needed to carry the amount of equipment required, they would need to be set 30m apart and there would still be the need for a monopole for the Airwave equipment. The visual benefits of including fake conifer trees within deciduous ancient woodland would seem to me to be very questionable and, when combined with the need to lose an additional area of woodland, it would not, in my view, be preferable to the appeal proposal.
36. Consequently, I find that the need for a replacement installation within the Sibly Hall site has been established and the copse would provide the best location in terms of limiting the visual impact of the mast. This finding now needs to be considered in relation to the impact of the development on Redhatch Copse and this is addressed in the following paragraphs.

Loss of ancient woodland and ecological issues

37. There is no dispute that an area of ancient woodland would be lost through the construction of the proposed development. The telecommunications compound would be sited on a concrete base measuring 12m x 12m and would be accessed by a track running to it through Redhatch Copse. In total, some 259sqm would be lost, equating to about 0.7% of the total area of the copse. This could be reduced if a 'no dig' method was used for the access track.
38. As previously noted, the future maintenance of the woodland has been secured through S106 Agreements under the TCPA that have been signed by the appellants and the Council. One agreement relates to the residential permission and the other is specific to the appeal proposal.

39. Both agreements refer to an approved Management Plan⁶ that includes the copse. Works to improve the condition of the woodland, as set out in the Management Plan, would be implemented by the appellants before it was handed over to whichever Council would be taking over its ownership. These measures would take place whether or not the mast scheme was to be permitted.
40. Measures specific to the appeal proposals include the translocation of the soil in the areas affected by the development, to the area designated as a 'conservation margin' that is to be established under the terms of the residential planning permission. If planning permission for the appeal proposal is granted, additional tree planting would be undertaken in the conservation margin which would include transplanting some established trees from the area to the north of the copse.
41. Natural England⁷ notes that ancient semi-natural woodland such as this, once lost, cannot be replaced. However, when considering proposals that would lead to such a loss, the NPPF requires a consideration of whether the need for, and benefits of, development in that location clearly outweigh the loss.
42. Natural England's advice is that mitigation and compensation measures, such as minimising the area affected by the development, the translocation of soils as proposed in this instance and the additional planting proposed in the conservation zone, should not be seen as benefits weighing in favour of the scheme. These, it states, should only be considered once it has been established that the wider benefits of the scheme have been established. It advocates a 'twin track' approach in cases where it is possible that planning permission will be granted on the merits of the proposal. This approach allows objections to the loss of the woodland to be maintained whilst consideration of the potential merits of the mitigation and compensation proposals takes place.
43. The location of the compound would be within a part of the woodland that has largely been taken over by non-native sycamore trees that are gradually spreading through the rest of the copse and displacing native species such as silver birch, ash and hazel. Clearing the sycamore from this area is a scheduled part of the Management Plan in any event. Other than this, only two other native species trees (a gean and an ash) would be removed to facilitate the development; both of these are classified as grade C (of low quality and value). The proposal would not, therefore, be unacceptable in terms of the loss of any mature species of trees that presently contribute to the value and diversity of the ancient woodland. The area proposed for the development is small in comparison to the copse as a whole and further mitigation would be provided by the proposed translocation of the affected areas of soil.
44. Natural England has not commented on the application other than referring the local planning authority to its Standing Advice, making suggestions on further consultees and suggesting possible ways in which the biodiversity of the site could be enhanced. In terms of compensation, it expects that a 'very substantial' package of woodland planting would be expected as a condition of any permission.

⁶ Core Document 4

⁷ Standing Advice for Ancient Woodland V.2: Core Document 53

45. The S106 Agreement secures the planting or translocation of over 1000 woodland plant specimens into an area of about 1000sqm within the conservation margin. This planting is specifically related to the mast proposal and would not be provided in the event planning permission for it was refused. This seems to me to equate to the 'very substantial' package sought by Natural England. I also note that the recommended decision making flow chart from the Standing Advice and the Assessment Checklist included within the document have been followed and completed.
46. A report on the effects of the proposal on the wider ecology of the woodland has also been undertaken and has concluded that these would be very small indeed. Concern has been raised about disturbance to the fauna present in the woods, but the loss of such a small area is not likely to have any significant impact on the creatures presently living there, once construction of the mast has been completed. Given that the woodland is already accessed by walkers and their dogs, it seems unlikely that the presence of the mast would cause any undue additional disturbance that would cause species to vacate the wider area.
47. I have already concluded that there would be substantial benefits gained through locating the development in the copse, in terms of providing an essential service in the absence of other suitable sites and in camouflaging the mast. For all the reasons set out above I also consider that the loss of the area of ancient woodland and any subsequent disturbance to the ecology of the copse would be clearly outweighed by these benefits of the scheme. I also consider it has been demonstrated that mitigation measures would be put in place to ensure that the development would have the least possible impact. Similarly, the extent of the proposed planting would be sufficient to provide the compensation expected by Natural England.

Health concerns

48. I note the concern expressed by local residents over possible health risks from the installation. However, the NPPF reiterates the previous government guidance that, in such cases, local planning authorities should not determine health safeguards when considering an application for planning permission where the proposals would meet the ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure. The appellants have confirmed that the installation would meet these guidelines and this has not been disputed by the Council. I therefore have no evidence to support the proposition that the proposed installation would be a danger to health.
49. Nevertheless, public concerns about the perceived risk to health can be taken into account as a material consideration when determining planning applications and, due to the weight of public objection to the proposal, I have considered them as such in this case.
50. I acknowledge that many people have concerns about the health risks of telecommunications installations. However, these must be weighed against the Government's objective of encouraging telecommunications operators to provide a full coverage and service and the generally accepted findings of the Stewart Report that levels of risk can be sufficiently limited by taking a precautionary approach. In this case, and given that there are already a similar number of telecommunications antennae that are visually prominent on the existing building, I conclude that there is no reason to dismiss the appeal on grounds of public concerns of any perceived increased risk to health.

Previous planning permission

51. Whilst a condition and legal agreement attached to the 1977 planning permission required Redhatch Copse to be retained for an amenity use and made available to certain members of the public, these are specific to the particular scheme that was the subject of the application. The imposition of such conditions and the terms of a legal agreement can be varied through the grant of planning permission for an alternative application for a site, which will then be subject to whatever restrictions are deemed necessary to make that scheme acceptable.
52. The purpose of the restrictions imposed in 1977 was to limit the terms to which the residential development proposed at that time would be subject. They ensured that any variations from those terms could only be authorised through an application to the local planning authority. However, once a new proposal receives planning permission and is implemented, the former conditions relating to development on the site no longer apply. When making an assessment of the new proposals, the local planning authority will have had the opportunity to consider what conditions should be imposed, and whether a legal agreement is required, to secure certain aspects of the scheme.
53. For these reasons, the limitations attached to a previous planning permission can only be carried forward with a new proposal for the site if it is deemed necessary to do so because planning permission for it would otherwise be refused. In this case, public access to the copse, apart from the telecommunications compound, would be maintained and the amenity use would continue. The maintenance of the woodland has also been secured through the S106 Agreements. The existence of the conditions attached to the previous planning permission does not, therefore, prevent the approval, or implementation, of a different scheme.

Conditions

54. The Council and appellants have agreed a number of conditions that they consider should be imposed, should planning permission be granted for the proposal. I have considered these in accordance with the advice in Circular 11/95 and, in addition to the standard commencement condition, I will require the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted drawings and reports, for the avoidance of doubt.
55. A condition requiring the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been imposed on the planning permission for the residential scheme although the Heritage Assessment for the site, including the copse, concluded that there are unlikely to be any significant remains. However, this assessment assumed that the copse would not be disturbed so, as there will now be some disruption of the soils on the site of the compound and access track, I will impose the same condition to cover the appeal site as a precautionary measure.
56. To ensure minimal disruption to the ancient woodland, I will impose a condition requiring a detailed construction method statement to be submitted for approval before development commences and require the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved details. For the same reason, I shall require the development to be carried out in accordance with the tree retention and protection measures already submitted.

57. I shall impose a condition requiring details of the paint colour of the mast to be submitted for approval, to ensure a satisfactory appearance of the structure.
58. Local residents at the Inquiry were concerned about possible noise pollution from the cooling fans in the equipment compound. The appellants and the Council raised no objections on these grounds but I can understand the fear that, in the summer when residents would hope to enjoy the tranquillity of their gardens, there would be the possibility of disturbance from intermittent noise from the fans as they cut in and out. I shall therefore impose a condition to require that the noise from the fans does not exceed the existing background level by an amount that could disturb the nearest residents.
59. If, as submitted by the appellants, this noise level would not be exceeded at the nearest properties in any event, there could be no objection to the condition. However, it would ensure that, should the equipment become faulty or noisier over time, measures could then be required to be taken to rectify the problem.
60. I also consider that it is necessary to ensure that the fans are installed to be as quiet as possible to limit the introduction of additional noise into the copse itself. The area is to be maintained as a public amenity for informal outdoor enjoyment and I consider it important that the surroundings are not disturbed by any preventable noise intrusion.

Conclusions

61. I have found that there is an established need for the mast installation and that Redhatch Copse is the best available site for it in terms of coverage and visual impact. There will be some loss of ancient woodland but this has been kept to the minimum possible and this would be secured by conditions attached to the planning permission. The compensation measures provided would be satisfactory and have been secured through the S106 Agreement.
62. I acknowledge that the public will be able to see the top of the mast, including the antennae, from a number of locations, but the removal of the Sibly Hall tower block would be some compensation for the change in outlook. I consider that it has been demonstrated through the photomontages that the views of the mast would not be so oppressive or dominant so as to warrant refusal of the proposals.
63. The installation would comply with the requirements of the NPPF, which set the tests for such development. There would consequently be no conflict with the relevant saved policies of the Wokingham Borough Local Plan and the adopted policies of the Wokingham Local Development Framework Core Strategy⁸ that relate to design standards for new development and nature conservation and closely comply with the aims and objectives of the NPPF. Therefore, having taken account of all the representations made, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Katie Peerless

Inspector

⁸ As set out in the agreed Statement of Common Ground: Core Document 34

ANNEX 1

Conditions to be attached to planning permission F/2019/2777

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) This permission is in respect of the location plan (300. 61/32), elevations and drawings (01A, 02A, 03A, 04A and 05A) and Design and Access Statement and Ecology Report received by the local planning authority on 20/12/2010. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 3) No development shall take place within the site until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall only take place in accordance with the detailed scheme approved pursuant to this condition.
- 4) Prior to the commencement of construction, a construction method statement and soil handling strategy must be submitted and given prior approval in writing by the local planning authority in accordance with the following additional conditions.
 - (i) The soil handling strategy will include a detailed methodology for the stripping of soils from within the footprint of the proposed development, and their translocation into an appropriate location in the Conservation Margin surrounding Redhatch Copse, preserving insofar as is possible, their ecological value and integrity. The soil handling strategy will include the following key elements:
 - The methods that will be used to strip and translocate the soils, preserving the existing soil profile insofar as is appropriate to aid the effective establishment of the translocated material at the chosen receptor. This will be achieved through the sequential stripping of soil horizons from the donor site, insofar as is needed, and their subsequent reinstatement at the receptor location in the correct (original) order.
 - The methods to be used for handling and (if necessary) temporary storage of soils whilst in transit so as to minimise soil compaction and damage to soil structures.
 - The methods that will be used to protect the area of Redhatch Copse surrounding the development site, including the associated flora and fauna, from the effects of the construction work.
 - The methods that will be used to prepare the receptor site within the Conservation Margin to receive the translocated soils.
 - (ii) Site clearance and ground levelling must be overseen by a recognised ecological consultant to ensure minimal damage to the site.
 - (iii) Any dead wood removed from the works area must be moved to form habitat piles nearby, in appropriate locations.

- 5) The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved tree retention, removal and protection drawings refs: 29-1032.05D (Tree retention and removal) and 29-1032.10 (Protection measures for retained trees).
- 6) Details and samples of the paint colour for the mast must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before development commences. The development must then accord with these approved details.
- 7) The rating level of the noise emitted from the fixed plant and equipment on the site shall not exceed the existing background noise level at any time by more than 5dB(A) at any residential property when measured and corrected in accordance with BS 4142:1997 (or any British Standard amending or superseding that standard).
- 8) No cooling fan plant is to be used at the site compound, unless it has been fitted with noise attenuation baffles in a way which will minimise transmission of cooling fan plant noise, in accordance with a scheme to be approved in writing by the local planning authority. The fans shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.