

Our reference: COM574869750

Application number: 2023/0866

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

Name: Mr Errington

Address: Clarington House East Road, Weybridge, Surrey, KT13 0LD

Comment type: You object to the planning application

Date of comment: 05 Jan 2024

Comment: We have recently moved into Markinch, now called Clarington House, and wish to object most strongly to the application for planning permission for three padel courts to be constructed and used within a few yards of our property.

The planning officer, at paragraph 39 of her report, suggests that Beaumont Lodge is the closest property, with the courts to be located at approximately 20 metres from their side boundary. She clearly does not know the extent or location of our garden.

By our reckoning, based on the Proposed Site Plan, the three courts are within only six or seven metres of the side boundary of the South East part of our garden! The noise will inevitably be intolerable. We cannot understand why the planning officer should take the distance to the side boundary of Beaumont Lodge, yet appears to take the distance to our house, not our side boundary.

One thing is clear. The several experts do not know, and cannot say with any certainty, just how noisy is the sound of three courts in use up to 15 hours every day and how far that noise will travel. It is not appropriate to grant planning permission based on such uncertainty.

The planning officer quotes (at paragraphs 37 and 38) from Policies DM2 and DM5, which we summarise by extract as requirements

“.....to protect the amenity of adjoining and potential occupiers....”

and, importantly,

“.....all development that may result in noise.....emission orlight pollution will be expected to incorporate appropriate attenuation measures to mitigate the effect on existing and future residents.”

The proposal is for incomplete acoustic panels and no proper roof structure. That will not contain sound, obviously. This application, particularly the location so close to neighbours, is ill conceived. An application for just one padel court at Oxshott was recently refused by the Planning Subcommittee, largely for noise and proximity to neighbours. How much worse would be the effect of three contiguous padel courts, in similar close proximity to our garden?

At paragraph 46 of her report, the planning officer refers to the conclusion in the applicant's own report “.....providing that these requirements [acoustic screening] are met, then the noise levels at the boundary of the nearby properties are UNLIKELY (!) to have an adverse noise impact on occupiers of the dwellings”. It is not clear if he is talking of the houses and ignoring the gardens, but it is clear that even the applicant (through this conclusion by its own expert) is unable to offer the guarantee that neighbouring properties will be appropriately safeguarded.

Further, the proposed courts are very close to our garden and only a very short distance from our house. In addition to noise pollution, for several months in each year there will be light pollution for many hours a day, as early as 7 a.m. during Winter mornings and every evening from dusk to 10 p.m.

For the reasons above and the reasonable protection of our property and neighbouring properties,

this application should be refused.