

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/X1735/W/25/3359465

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/X1735/W/25/3359465

Appeal By MR NICK ATKINS

Site Address  
Seacourt Tennis Club  
20 Victoria Ave,  
Hayling Island  
PO11 9AJ

#### SENDER DETAILS

Name

Address

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Appellant
- ☐ Agent
- ☒ Interested Party / Person
- ☐ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☐ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☒ Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- ☐ Other

## YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

[REDACTED] we have objected to this proposal throughout the application process, we have undertaken extensive research to understand the noise created by Padel and would ask the inspector to look at the advice given by experts . A report written by a leading expert in the Padel community Mr Giles Verbraeken entitled Establishing Global noise regulations states that the minimum distance for two courts from residences should be 160m. This proposal is less than 2m from our garden and annex building and less than 18m from our main residence. The noise generated is described as 'being a gunfire like noise with balls constantly rebounding against court walls and is like being under constant gunfire'

We would also ask the inspector to consider the significant number of refusals and enforcement notices that have already occurred due to Padel courts being too close to residential properties and would make the point that this proposal is much closer than many of these refused applications these include applications and enforcements by local authorities in

Guildford

Bath and North Somerset

Brighton and Hove

Enfield

Winchester

Oxshott

and Peterborough

we would also like to raise some points regarding the appeal document

it states that the application is supported by a noise assessment, the reality is that this noise statement states that the proposal actually exceeds acceptable noise levels at first floor level but states that since the courts are only available in the day this wont matter as people live downstairs in the day. whilst we find this argument very unfair we also would point out that the houses on the Seafront side of the courts use their first floor for day to day living and ground floors for sleeping.

In terms of the proposal to erect an acoustic fence the applicants have totally ignore the fact that their site level is 400mm lower than the dwellings to the south and that the structure the Balls a hit against is 4m high so 1.4m of the noise generating structure would be above the acoustic fence anyway.

They also fail to mention that a second independent noise survey was done by another company who clearly identified errors and discrepancies in the noise survey provided and paid for by the applicant.

The appeal also suggest that the applicant could build tennis courts on the grass area without planning anyway, i assume they are thinking that we would also find that un acceptable, that is simply not the case,

[REDACTED] have never objected to the gentle sound of tennis heard [REDACTED] if the club wanted to add a lawn tennis court of the proposed site we would have no objection.

We would also ask that account is taken of the annex building in our garden [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The construction of this building commenced well before the application to build Padel courts and we believe should be considered [REDACTED]

Finally we would like to point out that despite Seacourts arguement of creating a facility for the wider benefit of the borough that would out way the impact on their neighbours , they are a fee paying private members club and not a public sports facility.