[redacted]

CAUTION: This email came from outside of the council - only open links and attachments that you're expecting.

Supplementary representation concerning the Noise Impact Assessment

Application No: APP/26/00391
Hayling Yacht Company, Mill Rythe Lane, Hayling Island
Proposal: Three covered and partially enclosed padel courts with associated lighting, noise and ecology mitigation

Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to make a further representation following my previous objection and, in particular, having now reviewed the applicant's Environmental Noise Impact Assessment, reference IMP8102-1, prepared by Impact Acoustics Ltd and dated May 2026.
I recognise that the report is a professional acoustic assessment and that it concludes that the proposed three padel courts would have a "Low Impact" at the residential receptors identified.
However, I do not consider that the report satisfactorily addresses all of the sensitive receptors and circumstances relevant to this particular site.
This is particularly important because the Council's Planning Policy comments dated 14 September 2026 specifically state that Environmental Health should be consulted regarding the noise and lighting impacts.
I therefore ask that Environmental Health considers the following matters before the application is determined.

1. The assessment is principally based upon residential receptors

The report expressly states that the nearest residential premises have been identified as the nearest noise-sensitive receptors and that the calculations and assessments are made to those positions.
The report also acknowledges that noise-sensitive premises are not restricted to residential dwellings.
I therefore ask the Council to clarify why the Mill Rythe schools and the Hayling Island Donkey Sanctuary have not been assessed as specific noise-sensitive receptors.

These are materially different receptors from residential properties and may have different sensitivities and operational requirements.

2. The Mill Rythe schools should be specifically assessed

The proposed courts are in the vicinity of the Mill Rythe schools.
The acoustic report does not appear to provide a specific assessment of noise levels at the schools or their external areas.
The Council should therefore establish:

- the predicted noise level at the school boundary;
- the predicted noise level within relevant outdoor areas;
- whether simultaneous operation of all three courts has been modelled;
- whether the assessment considers outdoor play and PE;
- whether the assessment considers school-day periods when background noise may be relatively low; and
- whether the repetitive and impulsive characteristics of padel noise have been appropriately considered.

The absence of an unacceptable impact at a residential bedroom window does not necessarily demonstrate the absence of an unacceptable impact upon a school environment.

3. The donkey sanctuary has not been specifically assessed

The report contains a separate section concerning the Brent Geese area.
However, I have been unable to identify an equivalent specific assessment of the Hayling Island Donkey Sanctuary.
This distinction is important.
The sanctuary is an established facility caring for animals, rather than simply an area of undeveloped land.
I therefore ask the Council to establish whether the applicant has assessed:

- the predicted noise level at the sanctuary;
- the frequency of impulsive racket and ball impacts;
- simultaneous operation of the three courts;
- player voices and other unpredictable recreational sounds;
- evening and weekend operation;
- lighting;
- increased human activity; and
- the cumulative effect of these factors.

If the applicant has not undertaken such an assessment, I ask the Council to obtain appropriate specialist advice before determining the application.

4. Impulsive noise requires particular scrutiny

The acoustic report itself recognises that BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 provides for a character correction of between 0 and 9 dB where a new source is expected to be impulsive, depending upon its perceptibility.

The report describes the padel source as being derived from measurements of a doubles game.
Padel racket and ball impacts are inherently repetitive and impulsive.
I therefore ask Environmental Health to explain whether the impulsive characteristics of the padel courts have been specifically assessed in the calculation of the environmental impact at the relevant receptors.
If no impulsivity correction or equivalent assessment has been applied to the padel source, I ask the Council to explain why.
I am not suggesting that a particular correction must automatically be applied. I am asking that the Council establishes that the distinctive acoustic characteristics of padel have been properly considered rather than relying principally upon an LAeq average.

5. Confirmation is required that three courts operating simultaneously have been modelled

The report states that the operation of the proposed three padel courts has been assessed. However, the underlying source measurements were obtained from a doubles game at a padel court in Winchester, and the report refers to a "Typical Padel Court".
I therefore ask Environmental Health to confirm that the acoustic model actually represents three independent courts operating simultaneously at the assumed maximum or reasonably foreseeable operating condition.
In particular, I ask the Council to establish:

- whether all three courts were modelled as simultaneously active sources;
- whether simultaneous racket/ball impacts were represented;
- whether player shouting and calls were included;
- what occupancy factor was assumed;
- what duration of activity was assumed within each assessment period; and
- whether the model represents a reasonably foreseeable busy period rather than an average or typical period.

This is important because the application is specifically for three courts.

6. The difference between source levels and receptor levels should be independently checked

The report records source noise from the padel court at levels considerably higher than the final calculated levels at the residential receptors.
For example, the reported open-side measurement at 1 metre is approximately 62 dB LAeq with an LAFmax of approximately 84 dB.
The calculated first-floor residential levels are subsequently reported as approximately 29 dB(A) and 33.1 dB(A) in the modelling section, while the assessment summary gives 21.8 dB and 27.5 dB.
I therefore ask Environmental Health to verify the acoustic modelling and, in particular, the apparent difference between the modelled façade levels and the levels ultimately used in the assessment conclusions.

I would also ask the Council to clarify which set of figures represents the final predicted operational noise level.

7. Background noise measurements

The survey was undertaken between 16 and 22 April 2026.
The report records a lowest LA90 of 41 dB for the padel assessment period.
I ask the Council to consider whether these measurements adequately represent the conditions during the periods when the proposed courts are likely to experience their greatest use, particularly:

- summer evenings;
- weekends;
- school holidays;
- periods of high visitor activity at the donkey sanctuary; and
- periods of relatively low background noise.

I appreciate that a six-day survey may be capable of being representative. However, given the particular sensitivity of the surrounding area, I ask Environmental Health to confirm that conclusion rather than simply adopting it from the applicant's report.

8. The covered but partially enclosed construction requires verification

The proposed courts are not ordinary open-air courts and are not fully enclosed indoor courts.
The acoustic report models the proposed construction, including side façades and the roof, and calculates radiating sound power through these elements.
I therefore ask the Council to ensure that the acoustic performance assumed by the model is secured through the planning permission.
If permission is granted, the precise construction specification relied upon in the acoustic assessment should be secured by condition, together with appropriate post-completion acoustic testing.
The Council should not rely upon a general commitment to provide acoustic mitigation if the mitigation is fundamental to the conclusions of the noise assessment.

9. The Brent Geese assessment should not be treated as an assessment of the donkey sanctuary

I note that the report separately considers the Brent Geese area and concludes that the risk of disturbance to the geese is low.
That is a useful assessment of that particular receptor.
However, it does not appear to constitute an assessment of the nearby donkey sanctuary.
The Council should therefore avoid treating the conclusion concerning the Brent Geese as demonstrating that all animal receptors have been adequately considered.
The welfare and sensitivity of the resident donkeys should be considered separately and, if necessary, through appropriate specialist advice.

Please note that the report mentions a weekly clay pigeon shoot, this is factually incorrect. There is a monthly clay pigeon shoot on a Sunday strictly between the hours of 10:00 and 13:00 and apparently careful consideration is given to the layout to minimise noise impact for the donkeys and other wildlife.

10. The applicant's conclusion of "Low Impact" should not be treated as determinative

The report concludes that the padel courts would have a "Low Impact" at the residential receptors.
I do not dispute that this is the conclusion reached by the applicant's acoustic consultant. However, the planning decision remains a matter for the Council.
The Council's own Planning Policy comments dated 14 September 2026 specifically state that Environmental Health comments should be sought regarding noise and light.
I therefore ask that the Council's Environmental Health officer independently considers whether the submitted assessment adequately addresses the particular characteristics and sensitive receptors associated with this site.

11. Request to Environmental Health

In light of the above, I respectfully request that Environmental Health is asked specifically to consider:

1. Whether the acoustic model genuinely represents three simultaneously operating courts.
2. Whether the source data used are representative of the proposed operation.
3. Whether the impulsive and repetitive characteristics of padel noise have been adequately assessed.
4. Whether the Mill Rythe schools should be treated as specific noise-sensitive receptors.
5. Whether the Hayling Island Donkey Sanctuary should be treated as a specific sensitive receptor requiring separate consideration.
6. Whether the April background-noise survey is sufficiently representative of likely operating conditions.
7. Whether the acoustic performance assumed for the covered and partially enclosed structures is sufficiently robust.
8. Whether post-completion acoustic testing should be required.
9. Whether the proposed operating hours are appropriate having regard to the surrounding sensitive uses.
10. Whether enforceable conditions can adequately control the resulting noise impact.

Conclusion

Having reviewed the applicant's Noise Impact Assessment, I do not consider that the report provides a sufficient basis for concluding that all relevant sensitive receptors have been adequately assessed.

In particular, the report's principal assessment is directed towards nearby residential properties, whereas the Council is also required to consider the particular circumstances of the Mill Rythe schools and the nearby donkey sanctuary.
I therefore respectfully request that Environmental Health provides specific comments on these matters before the application is determined.
If the Council is minded to approve the application, I ask that any acoustic mitigation relied upon by the applicant is secured through precise and enforceable planning conditions, including appropriate controls on operating hours, the acoustic construction of the courts and post-completion verification of noise performance.
Whilst of no consequence to this planning application as such, the Planning Officer must surely wonder why such a costly application has been submitted for just three padel courts which, on the surface, appears to be non viable in its suggested form and the real intent and future of the development is yet to become apparent.

Yours faithfully,