Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Inquiry held 10-14 & 18 November 2025

Site visit made on 14 November 2025

by T Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/W/25/3369126
Garston Industrial Estate, Blackburne Street, Garston, Liverpool L19 8JB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by MREF V c/o Peloton Real Estate against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
- The application Ref is 22F/2806.
- The development proposed is change of use of existing employment site to use class B8 for open storge purposes.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use of existing employment site to use class B8 for open storge purposes at Garston Industrial Estate, Blackburne Street, Garston, Liverpool L19 8JB in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 22F/2806 and subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Application for costs

2. An application for a partial award of costs was made by MREF V c/o Peloton Real Estate against Liverpool City Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. At the time of refusing the original planning application the Council had concerns relating to both noise and air quality. However, the Council only chose to defend its position at the Inquiry with regard to noise and confirmed it had decided not to present any case with regard to air quality or transport[1]. The Council also confirmed that it did not advance a case in relation to noise from vehicle movements on the highway to and from the site[2]. The Rule 6 Party involved in the Inquiry, Garston Community United (GCU) retained concerns amongst other matters over air quality and transport matters.

4. Two site location plans accompanied the proposal. One site location plan includes the adjacent Brunswick Street within the application red line area, whilst site location plan GIS/SLP-001 excludes Brunswick Street from the application red line area whilst including it as land under the appellants control. This plan better

[1] CD 13.4 – Council Proof of Evidence on Planning Matters, Justin Paul.
[2] CD 16.10 – Council Closing Statement.

reflects the proposals for storage which relate to the body of the site itself and I have made my decision on the basis of this plan.

5. Following my site visit, it was confirmed to the Inquiry that works relating to the reinstatement and repair of the existing wall separating the site from York Street had already been undertaken.

Main Issues

6. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of nearby residential properties with regard to noise associated with the proposed use of the site. The second is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of nearby residential properties with regard to any air quality impacts.

Reasons

7. The appeal site is located within Garston Industrial Estate although has been vacant for a number of years having last been used for general industrial purposes. It extends to approximately 4.36ha is largely covered by hardstanding.

8. It is identified as a primarily industrial area under the Local Plan Policy Map[3]. Policy EC2 of the Liverpool Local Plan[4] (2022) (LLP) amongst other things states that new employment development will be directed towards land designated as Primarily Industrial Areas. Not only is this the case, the Policy also further seeks the protection of land within such areas for industrial and business uses.

9. Blackburne Street and Window Lane, with their associated commercial premises bound two sides of the site. The evidence indicates that the site forms part of a wider industrial area with nearby land uses including a scrap metal yard, packing warehouse, paint manufacturing, galvanising operations and an electrics workshop. There is an extensive history of commercial use of the site following on from the development of a Bobbin Works in the late 19th Century. There will therefore have to be some expectation of some noise in such a location.

10. York Street bounds another side of the site, where terraced residential properties are set back beyond the boundary wall and a partially planted grassed area. On the final boundary, terraced residential properties on Windfield Road back onto the site beyond Brunswick Street. Within the wider area there are other residential streets and schools, whilst Garston Docks and the Airport are a short distance away.

11. Given the necessarily flexible and fluid nature of open storage, the appellant presented a range of options for the potential composition of the site to the Council, with the aim of assisting them in their assessment of the proposal. The site would be open during the daytime hours only of 07:00 – 23:00 as defined in the WHO Guidance[5] and secured via condition.

12. The Inquiry heard from interested persons, mainly on the opening morning and the Inquiry heard from a resident living close to the site who already experienced high levels of noise during the hours of 07:30-19:00. It is also evidenced that the site

[3] CD 4.2 Liverpool City Council Liverpool Local Plan Policies Map 2013-2033 Adopted January 2022.
[4] CD 4.1 Liverpool City Council Liverpool Local Plan 2013-2033 Adopted January 2022.
[5] CD 8.2 – Guidelines for Community Noise, Word Health Organisation, Geneva.

has a history of association with industrial noise[6] and that residents that live close to the site experience noise associated with both Garston Docks and the Galvanising Steel Works[7]. Tonal noise is already likely to be emitted in association with other existing industrial and commercial uses in the area[8].

Noise

13. Much of the Inquiry focussed on the relative merits of British Standards (BS) 4142[9] and 8233[10] with the Council forming its position around the former. Neither standard is without merit to the case, although should be considered as guidance only.

14. Noise Modelling Evidence was before the Inquiry and the Council and Appellant accepted that the modelling contained within the Councils rebuttal proof of evidence[11] on noise should be taken forward for consideration. This is the modelling that I have considered when coming to my conclusions on this matter.

15. BS 4142[12] advises that the significance of sound of an industrial or commercial nature depends upon both the margin by which the rating level of a specific sound source exceeds the background sound level as well as the context. It advises that a difference of around +10 dB or more is likely to be an indication of a significant adverse impact and that a difference of around + 5dB is likely to be an indication of and adverse impact, depending on context.

16. Modelling relates to site layout options 2 and 4, as they better reflect the proposed arrangements since the omission of previously proposed container stacking. With this in mind and accounting for penalties added for tonality and intermittency across the site, the Council have identified levels (dBL_{Aeq}, 1h) which would exceed background sound levels of 42dBL_{A90} for York Street and 41dBL_{A90} for Brunswick Street by between 9dB and 16dB. These figures relate to locations at first floor level and above.

17. However, those figures represent the worst case scenarios at a limited number of identified receptor points. For example, even accounting for the +5dB penalty for intermittency and tonality, many receptor points would not see an increase of +10 dB or more. Accounting for the 4m fence that would be secured via condition adjacent to Brunswick Street and accounting for a 2 dB reduction in rating level, instances of increases of +10 dB or more would be further reduced.

18. Nonetheless, given that I have reservations over the effectiveness of a condition to ban reversing alarms and would therefore exercise caution over removing the penalties for tonality and intermittency, the modelling indicates that there would remain a limited number of receptor points adjacent to the site where there would be an increase of +10 dB.

[6] CD15.2 Witness Statement – Julie Fadden, p1.
[7] CD 16.5 GCU Opening Statement.
[8] CD 12.11 Proof of Evidence of Dani Fiumicelli (Noise) 04 November 2025.
[9] CD 8.1 BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 – BSI Standards Publication – Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound.
[10] CD 8.3 BS8233:2014 Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings.
[11] CD 13.6 Rebuttal Proof of Evidence on Noise, Dr Max De Salis – 4th November 2025.
[12] CD 8.1 BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 – BSI Standards Publication – Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound Part 11.

19. The appellant has drawn my attention to World Health Organisation Guidelines (WHO)[13] and the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE)[14]. The NPSE identifies the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) as the level above which adverse effects on health and quality of life can be detected. It identifies the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL) as the level above which significant adverse effects on health and quality of life can be detected.

20. Based upon the reasonable assumption that the noise reduction from outside to inside with the window partially open is 15 dB, and the WHO guideline values for community noise in specific environments it is concluded that 50dB$L_{Aeq,}$16h externally should be adopted as the LOAEL. The SOAEL adopted by the appellant under their approach is 60dB$L_{Aeq,}$16h.

21. I am more persuaded by this approach for these particular circumstances as it appears to relate more directly to what would be observed effect levels on and reaction to noise from residents near to the site. Further, this approach appears to be more reflective of the approach of the Councils Environmental Health Team. The Council originally recommended the application for approval to its planning committee[15] in conjunction with advice from that team. This is a matter that I afford significant weight.

22. The Council states that the agreed noise modelling data indicates that noise levels would not be contained to the levels set out within the fixed limit approach. However, those exceedances as identified by the Council within their closing submissions[16] which at their highest would be at 52.3 dBL_{Aeq}, 1h would be limited and at levels above the LOAEL but below the SOAEL. I also note that when comparing the modelling results to a 16 hour L_{Aeq} the modelling provides a 1hour L_{Aeq} for the busiest hour.

23. The impacts would be at a level where for example the PPG[17] notes that noise starts to cause small changes in behaviour and attitude, for example, having to turn up the volume on the television or needing to speak more loudly to be heard.

24. Planning practice guidance[18] advises that with regard to noise above the LOAEL but below the SOAEL, consideration needs to be given to mitigating and minimising those effects (taking account of the economic and social benefits being derived from the activity causing the noise). Conditions are included relating to noise.

25. Ambient noise levels can also be taken into account which reference the L_{Aeq} generally in the low to mid 50s dB(A) with regard to measurements taken in 2017[19] and 2025[20] near to the site.

26. There is nothing to indicate any significant adverse impact in relation to noise from vehicle movements on the highway to and from the site. To conclude on this issue, there would be some limited adverse impacts in terms of noise. There would however be no significant adverse impact on the living conditions of occupiers of

[13] CD 8.2 – Guidelines for Community Noise, Word Health Organisation, Geneva.
[14] CD 8.4 – Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) March 2010, DEFRA.
[15] CD 3.5 Council Committee Report.
[16] CD 16.10 Closing Submissions on behalf of Liverpool City Council paragraph 24.
[17] PPG – Noise - Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 30-005-20190722.
[18] PPG – Noise - Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 30-005-20190722.
[19] CD 1.14 p12 AEC – Noise Impact Assessment for Planning Purposes.
[20] CD 13.3 p62 Proof of Evidence on Noise, Dr Max De Salis – 10th October 2025.

nearby residential properties with regard to noise associated with the proposed use of the site. Subsequently, the proposal would not conflict with Policy R1 of the LLP which states amongst other things that development proposals which are likely to have a pollution impact should demonstrate that the impact of noise will not be significant.

Air quality

27. The evidence indicates that Liverpool as a whole is designated as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Given the nature of the proposal which relates to storage only where the proposal will be likely to increase levels of traffic from current levels to and from the site the focus of consideration of air quality has fallen on consideration of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2) and Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$ & PM_{10}).

28. The appellant has assessed the impact of the development on local air quality which principally focuses on the operational phase of the development using Institute of Air Quality Management Guidance. The traffic flows utilised focus on the worst case scenario.

29. The Air Quality Management area relates to NO_2 and the objective value is 40µg/m3. Modelling has been undertaken for nearby receptors[21]. That modelling indicates only limited predicted increases in levels of NO_2 that would be classed as slight or negligible with the predicted NO_2 levels at the receptors remaining well below the 40µg/m3 level and at many locations substantially below this.

30. The picture is similar with regard to modelling undertaken in relation to $PM_{2.5}$ & PM_{10}. Increases at receptors would be broadly of a negligible to slight significance with modelled levels remaining well below the objective criteria of $PM_{2.5}$ & PM_{10} of 20µg/m^3 and 40µg/m^3 respectively.

31. The best available evidence before me which includes the assessment of recent monitoring at nearby stations therefore neither suggests that the area currently suffers from poor air quality or would do so as a result of the proposed development.

32. GCU were concerned that the appellant had underestimated traffic movements associated with the expansion of operations at the nearby Veolia site. However, it is advised that the appellant has accounted for vehicle movements from Veolia that would be sufficient to account for the planned expansions.

33. GCU further raised concerns around emissions associated with the planned expansion of the Veolia operation close to the site. The appellant was concerned that it would be difficult to carry out dispersion modelling relating to the Veolia scheme given lack of detailed data relating to temperature and speed of emissions together with the height of the stack.

34. GCU also raised concern over dust within the area which it suggested was associated with blown dust from activities at Garston Docks and a galvanising steel plant on Blackburne Street. However, it is difficult to fully assess this information given the sample collection appears to relate to one day in July 2025[22].

[21] CD 12.4 Proof of Evidence Neil Martin & CD 12.8 Rebuttal Proof of Evidence.
[22] CD 15.3 Alan Boyle - Witness Statement.

GCU has not supplied any of its own modelling which attempts to take those sites into account.

35. I accept that the Framework[23] requires that amongst other things planning decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account including cumulative effects of pollution on health. Given the modelling results undertaken and the increases in pollutant levels predicted, the available evidence does not point towards an unacceptable cumulative effect.

36. To conclude on this matter, the proposal will not give rise to any significant harm to the living conditions of occupiers of nearby residential properties with regard to air quality impacts. The proposal would not conflict with Policy R1 of the LLP, which amongst other things states that development proposals which are likely to have a pollution impact should demonstrate that the proposal will not undermine the achievement of AQMA objectives; and it will not lead to a significant decline in air quality.

37. Air quality objectives set a maximum annual mean concentration target of 10 µg/m3 for PM2.5 - to be achieved by 2040 and the modelling indicates a number of locations where modelled figures would increase above or increase further above that level. However, the current targets for $PM_{2.5}$ would be met.

Other Matters

38. Concerns over the effect of the proposal on health in general have been raised by GCU and interested parties. I listened carefully at the Inquiry to the concerns which detailed the challenges that Garston as an area and its residents face.

39. The Inquiry heard[24] in a clear and measured manner from Dr Buroni that environmental factors do not primarily drive local health burdens which instead are more largely driven by socioeconomic circumstances, deprivation and lifestyle.

40. I have to consider that there is the potential that through the support that the site could make to local businesses that some positive contribution can be made by the proposal against the factors which have been shown to be those which are primarily behind local health burdens. Overall, there is not likely to be any significant adverse impact on health outcomes as a result of the proposal.

41. A significant level of concern with regard to the highways impacts of the proposal has been raised by GCU and interested parties which includes concerns with regard to the schools which are located on Banks Road and ‘lost’ traffic for the Industrial Estate.

42. With regard to this, a condition is included which requires the submission of a scheme for highways improvement works which would include a signage scheme to discourage HGV users from deviating from the junction at Banks Road / Blackburne Street onto Banks Road. This is required prior to the first use of the site for the proposed use. Further, I consider that adequate regard has been had to future traffic levels and standard TEMPro software has been utilised.

43. The proposal has also been subject to assessment by the Councils Highways Development Control Section. They concluded that the development would be

[23] National Planning Policy Framework 2024.
[24] CD 12.12 - Rebuttal Proof of Evidence: Human Health, Dr Andrew Buroni – October 2025.

unlikely to generate a level of traffic that would have a material impact on the safe and effective operation of the surrounding highway network. I afford this significant weight. The Council raised no substantive concern with regard to highways matters and have been involved in the formulation of conditions relating to such matters. There is no evidence before me which would lead me to any conclusion other than that reached by the Council on these matters.

44. The Council has raised no concerns with regard to Ecology and there are no concerns with regard to proximity to the Mersey Estuary SPA as no pathway is identified for the proposal to impact upon that site. I have no reason to come to any other conclusion.

45. The issue of impact on property values has also been raised. It is a well-founded principle that the planning system does not exist to protect private interests such as value of land or property. Container stacking which was the subject of significant objection no longer forms part of the proposals.

46. GCU contend that the site would be ideal for a social housing development. However, no such proposal is before me and I afford that matter limited weight.

47. I note the large number of objections received against the proposal and I have considered those representations and the points of concern contained within when coming to a recommendation.

48. Whilst noting other legislation, a condition is proposed which provides further certainty as to what could not be stored at the site, bearing in mind concerns within the local community.

Planning obligation

49. A completed planning obligation has been submitted. The obligation provides for a monetary contribution of £28,000 towards the planting and maintenance of street trees within the locality, along with the provision of a strategy to drive forward inclusive employment and improved skills pathways and to contribute to social value through new developments.

50. The evidence indicates that the provisions within the planning obligation are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. They are directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. They therefore meet the relevant tests[25].

Conditions

51. Conditions 1, 2 and 16 are necessary to define the development. Conditions 3 and 8 are necessary in the interests of highway safety. Conditions 4 and 10 are necessary in the interests of highway safety and encouraging the use of more sustainable modes of transport. Condition 5 is necessary in the interests of encouraging the use of more sustainable modes of transport. Conditions 6, 7, 11, 13 and 15 are necessary in the interests of the living conditions of nearby occupiers. Condition 9 is necessary in the interests of the promotion of public art as supported by Policy UD8 of the LLP. Condition 12 is necessary in the interests of the drainage of the site. Condition 14 is necessary in the interests of the living conditions of nearby occupiers and highway safety.

[25] Within Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024.

Planning Balance

52. There would be no conflict with Policy R1 of the LLP. Subsequently, there would be no conflict with Policy STP1 of the LLP which amongst other things states that development should ensure sustainable and attractive residential neighbourhoods across the city nor with Policy STP2 which amongst other things states that development proposals that minimise environmental impact will be supported. It is also important to note that in refusing the application the Council did not identify conflict with either Policy STP1 or STP2 in any event[26].

53. Further, there would be no conflict with Policies EC1 or EC2 of the LLP. The proposal would therefore accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with it.

Conclusion

54. The appeal should therefore be allowed.

T Burnham

INSPECTOR

[26] CD 3.11 Council Decision Notice.

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings: Garston Industrial Estate Site Location Plan - Plan Reference GIS/SLP-001 & Proposed Site Layout - 13615-AEW-SI-00-DR-A-0011 P01.

3. Prior to the first occupation/use of the development hereby approved a scheme for the design and construction of highway improvement works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All designs require technical approval. For avoidance of doubt, the works shall include:

    - The redundant vehicle access points at Window Lane and Blackburne Street shall be reinstated as level pedestrian footway;
    - The footways contiguous to the site boundary at Window Lane and Blackburne Street shall be resurfaced to provide a continuous pallet of material;
    - Existing/new vehicle access points at Blackburne Street shall have drop kerbs and tactile paving on both sides;
    - A new modal filter shall be installed between York Street and Window Lane, enabling pedestrian and cycle movements between the highways;
    - Drop kerbs and tactile paving shall be installed at the junctions of:

        - York Street/ Window Lane
        - Window Lane/Chesterton Street
        - Blackburne Street/Brunswick Street;

    - A scheme to upgrade the existing cycle route along Blackburne Street to link the development with cycle access onto Blackburne Street; and
    - A signage scheme to discourage HGV users from deviating from the junction at Banks Road / Blackburne Street onto Banks Road.

The approved scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the development first being occupied / brought into use.

4. Notwithstanding the approved plans, no part of the development shall be occupied or brought into use until a plan showing the areas to be set aside for car and cycle parking, servicing and EV charging has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The parking and servicing areas and EV charging points shall be demarcated in accordance with the approved details and provided prior to the first occupation/use of the development hereby approved and retained as such thereafter. For the avoidance of doubt, 35 parking spaces, including 2 accessible parking spaces (to be designed in accordance with BS8300) and 2 EV charging points (including one accessible designed as per PAS 1899:2022) as well as 16 cycle parking spaces shall be provided across the site.

5. The development shall not be occupied until a Travel Plan Co-ordinator has been appointed. The Travel Plan Co-ordinator shall be responsible for the implementation, delivery, monitoring and promotion of the Travel Plan, including the day-to-day management of the steps identified to secure the sustainable transport initiatives. The details (name, address, telephone number and email address) of the Travel Plan Co-ordinator shall be notified to the Local Planning Authority upon appointment and immediately upon any change.

6. Prior to the first occupation/use of the development hereby approved, a lux contour diagram shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted diagram shall extend to adjacent premises and demonstrate that external lighting fittings are orientated so that lux levels at any nearby habitable roomed windows do not exceed 6 lux. The scheme of external lighting shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied/brought into use. No floodlighting shall take place outside the hours of 07:00 and 23:00 on any day.

7. Notwithstanding the approved plans and prior to the first occupation/use of the development hereby approved, a scheme for a 4m high close-boarded fence (as measured from internal site surface levels) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The close-boarded fence shall be erected along the site boundary with Brunswick Street and as per the approved details prior to the first occupation of the site.

8. Prior to the first occupation/use of the development hereby approved, a site wide service and delivery management plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority providing details of the information that will direct users to the only proposed access points on Blackburne Street and Window Lane. For the avoidance of doubt, the site shall only be accessed from the three access points that are shown on the Proposed Site Layout - 13615-AEW-SI-00-DR-A-0011 P01.

9. Within 6 months of commencement of development, an Artworks Strategy for the repair of the mural along York Street, including timescales for its implementation, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The artwork elements identified within the approved Artworks Strategy shall be implemented in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

10. Within 6 months of the development being brought into use, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall include immediate, continuing and long-term measures to promote and encourage alternative modes of transport to the single-occupancy car. For the avoidance of doubt, the Travel Plan shall include, but not be limited to:

- Information on existing transport policies, services and facilities, travel behaviour and attitudes;
- Access for all modes of transport;

- Targets for mode share;
- Resource allocation including Travel Plan Co-ordinator and budget;
- A parking management strategy;
- A marketing and communications strategy;
- Appropriate measures and actions to reduce car dependence and encourage sustainable travel;
- An action plan including a timetable for the implementation of each such element above; and
- Mechanisms for monitoring, reviewing and implementing the travel plan.

The Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable contained therein and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied and in use. An annual report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority no later than 1 month following the anniversary of the first occupation of the development for a period of 5 years. The annual report shall include a review of the Travel Plan measures, monitoring data and an updated action plan.

11. No structures, machinery or materials to be stored within the site shall exceed a height of 5.5m within 25m from the application site's boundary with York Street and Brunswick Street or a height of 12m within any other part of the application site, as measured from existing site surface levels.

12. No re-surfacing works shall be undertaken within the site except for the localised repairing of potholes and the site surface shall be maintained pothole free for the lifetime of the development.

13. There shall be no stacking of containers within any part of the site.

14. The total floorspace used for fleet storage shall not exceed 16,187sqm and the total floorspace used for self-storage containers shall not exceed 13,172sqm.

15. The premises shall not operate outside the hours of 07:00 and 23:00 daily.

16. Notwithstanding the provisions of The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes Order) 1987 (as amended) or any statutory instrument revoking or amending that Order, the use of the site is not permitted for scrap metal recycling, waste management or the storage of hazardous substances.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Rueben Taylor KC instructed by Matthew Sobic

He called -

Anthony Morley

Neil Martin

Paul Knowles

Andrew Buroni

Dani Fiumicelli

Matthew Sobic

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Alan Evans instructed by the Director of City Law and Governance for Liverpool City Council

He called -

Max de Salis

Justin Paul

FOR GARSTON COMMUNITY UNITED

John Davies instructed by Garston Community United

He called -

Julie Fadden

Kit Oi Chung

Alan Boyle

Gary Woolam

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Cllr Sam Gorst

John Duffy

Sylvia McLeod

Nizar Babay

Cllr Lucy Williams

Corrina Douglas

Laura Johnson

Jonathan Shields

David Hamspon

Angela Davies

Mark Johnson

Irene Leonard

Andrew Johnson

Malcolm Kinney

Gail Reynolds

Ken Johnson

Sue Hunter

Denise McNeil

Edna Dillon

Darren Millea

Jenny Kirby

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT INQUIRY:

Opening Statements from Council, Appellant and Garston Community United

Veolia Boiler Commissioning Plan

Veolia Supporting Statement

PM 2.5 Graph submitted by GCU

Site Visit Route Plan

Submission from Matthew Sobic dated 12th November regarding noise modelling

Planning Conditions

Costs Application by Appellant against Liverpool City Council, Council response and Appellant final comments

Closing submissions from Council, Appellant and Garston Community United

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER CLOSE OF INQUIRY:

Completed Planning Obligation