

I have had a chance to look at the additional information provided by both the acoustic and lighting reports and would like to raise a number of concerns,

Firstly with regards to the noise report

- It has been commissioned by Seacourt without consultation so how can it be seen as independent, or fair.
- The time it was undertaken is a weekend in the middle of the summer holidays how can this be seen as average noise levels throughout the year? The fair and trains operate on completely different schedules throughout the summer holidays compared to the rest of the year and are much noisier for those 6 weeks than any other time in the year.
- Despite the best efforts of the report, it still fails to show that noise levels are below the maximum limits for the rear gardens and dwellings to the south of the proposed courts
- The reports views on noise levels generated by Padel seem to differ significantly from other pro Padel groups, reports and websites such as the one attached also a recent article in the spectator magazine confirms this viewpoint (also attached)
- In the executive summary the report make out that the club is small and that the courts will be easily monitored, how? They don't have any monitoring staff on the courts other than the professional when he/she is giving lessons (as and when they have one) and the courts will be at the back of two tennis courts well away from the club house. Also the proposal claims the aim to encourage the use of the courts by the general public and to allow spectators how will this be monitored and controlled?
- In section 7 the report recommends noise management measures such as not hitting the balls against the walls during warming up, how will they do this?, also if that is not acceptable and would create a nuisance how is that noise acceptable when they are playing ? (which seems fairly key to the game.) How can they ensure reasonable and responsible use of the courts when they want the general public to use them with no supervision?
- When estimating the noise levels (which they admit still exceed acceptable limits) they have put in place barriers to try (and fail) and get down to the limits required, they claim this will be 2m tall however there is a significant step down from the properties to the south to Seacourt which would mean that barrier would be much lower than they have estimated on the side of the effected properties. In addition the glass walls generating the noise by impact from balls is 4m high so the noise mitigation will have no effect on the majority of the walls area and hence the levels will be higher than those estimated. This also does not appear to have been considered by the Environmental Health officer when he/she assessed the proposal and I would ask that he/she re visits this, I believe the step in level would make the proposed acoustic barrier effectively 1.5m high
- With regards to the reports point that the noise levels of existing Tennis is already high and hence Padel will match the existing rather than add to it is completely wrong and contradicts accepted practice. They have assessed the Tennis noise at an absolute peak moment (which I suspect was generated as such) when in reality the use of the courts is spasmodic with many moments of limited or no use.
- From every article and professional assessment I have read on the game it is agreed that it is significantly noisier than tennis and is not appropriate for use in residential areas, This supposed independent report seems to make out the difference is minimal and acceptable yet Gardens will be within 2m of the proposed courts and dwellings with 15m of the same. How can it even be considered as being acceptable?
- Some of the properties (including a residential home for the elderly and number 202) are well away from the Tennis Courts but will be next to the Padel courts and thus the reports arguments regarding no significant increase in noise are again incorrect.
- This report makes out that our rear gardens are already noisy places and that this proposal would add little to this, this is simply not the case our gardens are generally peaceful quiet places and I welcome you to come and see this for yourself

With Regards to the lighting report

- This again has been commission by Seacourt and I would guess the potential supplier of the lighting systems and I again question its independence
- The lights on 6m poles will significantly increase the light pollution effecting the neighbouring properties as well as creating significant light points which would be detrimental to the peaceful enjoyment of neighbours gardens.
- I note the proposal is for the absolute minimum requirement for local competition and noting Seacourts desire with other sports to compete nationally I question whether they will try to increase this at a later date to the required 500lux

I believe both these reports need to be independently inspected by light and noise specialists as I believe they start out with the main intention of putting the proposal in the best light possible rather than fairly assessing the proposal. This proposal is completely inappropriate for its surroundings and will have significant impact on the residential properties that closely boarder the site and courts. This is confirmed by the sport specific information and knowledgeable opinion available on line.

2.1.2 of the The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the government's planning policies for England and how they are expected to be applied,

it states

*"Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:*

*a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life;*

*b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and*

*c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation."*

How can this application not be in complete and utter breach of this policy ? I would therefore ask you to refuse the proposal