

**Our reference:** COM525506675

**Application number:** 2023/0866

**Application address:** St Georges Hill Lawn Tennis Club, Warreners Lane, Weybridge, KT13 0LL

**Name:** Mr Kripalani

**Address:** Markinch East Road, Weybridge, Surrey, KT13 0LD

**Comment type:** You object to the planning application

**Date of comment:** 20 Jun 2023

**Comment:** I write to formally lodge my strong objection to the application. My principal concerns relate to the impact upon the amenity that my family currently enjoy insofar as noise intrusion and the loss of visual amenity / visual impact of the proposed structures, which are set out below.

Policy DM2 of DMP states that 'all new development should achieve high quality design...Proposals should preserve or enhance the character of the area, taking account of design guidance detailed in the Design and Character SPD, with particular regard to the following attributes Appearance Scale Mass Height

Policy DM2 (e) requires all new development to protect the amenity of adjoining and potential occupiers and users. Given the siting of the proposal, there would be a significant harm to the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers by reason of overbearing, overlooking, loss of light, noise & increased traffic.

Local Plan Policy DM5 relates to pollution and this includes floodlighting and noise.

ENV 9 of the emerging Plan states that 'all new buildings and places are required to be of a high quality, beautiful and sustainable...

Impact on Amenity

The siting and appearance of the proposed 2 storey building and 3 padel courts will be detrimental to the outlook from my property. It is acknowledged that the proposed form follows function and the planning statement admits that these are utilitarian and dictated by the operational function. It is thus surprising that the DAS sets out that the driving design concept has been to provide an 'attractive development'.

With respect to the planning statement, no consideration has been given to the impact on the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of surrounding residential properties, with the focus reserved for the impact of noise. The statement merely setting out that 'there are no properties near the proposed courts'. While there is a degree of separation, this is not so great to justify the lack of commentary on this matter.

The padel guidance notes from the LTA state that 'if a residential property is within 30m of the padel court then it is likely that sound attenuation mitigation will be required as well as noise and light surveys being required as part of the planning application.'

The noise assessment (NA) states the character of Padel match noise is not significantly different to tennis match noise, which is an existing part of the prevailing noise climate.

Having experienced a padel court match, the frequency of noise, i.e. the raquet hitting the ball and hitting off of the screen is significantly more intense than a conventional tennis match.

The NA states that 'whilst the character of Padel court match noise is not generally significantly different to a tennis match, the overall noise levels are higher and the sound of solid perforated racquet hitting the ball is slightly different. However, the spectrum of the overall match noise levels is not significantly different.

From my experience, I would argue that the difference between padel tennis and traditional tennis is significant and not 'slightly' as stated.

The NA states that 'The proposals also include a fabric canopy over the Padel courts. Although this will have some acoustic benefit in terms of absorbing some acoustic energy, the sound insulating effects of the fabric canopy on the noise will be minimal. Thus, as a robust assumption we have not included for any effect of the canopy in our noise model.'

Given the limited properties of the fabric roof and partially opened areas of the court, this is of significant concern to me and requires more robust analysis. This is particularly so given the proposed use of the courts, all year round from 7.00-22.00.

The NA states that the level of noise was modelled on measurements of a match. It is not clear whether this particular match bore similar characteristics of the site and its surrounds and if a comparison was made on use of three courts simultaneously and in a situation where the access doors to the court were left open.

No consideration has been given to the level of activity between the courts and club house and parking areas. While it is accepted that this can happen around the tennis courts, the padel courts would result in a significant intensity compared to the one tennis court it seeks to replace.

In conclusion, the proximity of the buildings and associated activities therein, would result in a detrimental impact on the amenity I currently enjoy, through an unreasonable level of noise and disturbance (which is not sufficiently mitigated). Furthermore, the siting, design, materials, height and mass of the proposed buildings would result in harm to the visual amenities and outlook that I and neighbouring residential properties enjoy.

The proposal would thus conflict with the objectives of DM2 and DM5 of the Local Plan and ENV9 of the emerging Plan.

I respectfully request that this application be refused planning permission.