

ADDENDUM (08.04.22)

Application No: 21/01803/FUL
Date valid: 6 September 2021
Target decision date: 1 November 2021

Author: Julia Dawson
☎: 0191 643 6314
Ward: Monkseaton South

Application type: full planning application

**Location: Tennis Courts At Beverley Park Lawn Tennis Club Beverley Park
Whitley Bay Tyne And Wear**

Proposal: Installation of new low level LED floodlighting to two existing outdoor tennis court Numbers 2 and 3 via 9no. 6m high lighting columns with LED 'box' type fittings

Applicant: Beverley Park Lawn Tennis Club, Ms Lauri Chandler Beverley Road
Monkseaton Whitley Bay NE25 8JH

Agent: S.F.P.A.D. Limited, Mr Lee West 39 Hemwood Road Windsor SL4 4YX

RECOMMENDATION: Application Permitted

Additional Representations

An additional objection has been submitted by a local resident of Beverley Road; this is set out below:

The residents concerns centre around light pollution, noise, increased traffic, and the close proximity of the lighting columns, and the consequential detrimental impact on their health and wellbeing. The impact on the immediate residents far outweighs any positives suggested in this application as local amenity capacity is already underutilised.

To support this opinion, I can do no more than point to the “objection to the scheme” comments made by Councillor Davey Drummond which I wholeheartedly support. I have not met Mr Drummond but he strikes me as someone who has adopted an independent approach to the application, listening to both sides of the argument, and instead of fence-sitting has produced well-reasoned comments against the floodlights. Throughout the process Mr Drummond has been a credit to North Tyneside Council.

I am very confused by the listing of this case on the 12 April. The residents understood the Application had been adjourned until 30 April 2022 to allow the applicant to provide additional noise and lighting information. That information was only recently provided and without the residents having time to properly consider, the application has been listed at short notice on 12 April over the holiday period. Indeed, we will have to cut short our planned holiday to attend. I do not consider it fair for the Planning Committee to proceed on the 12 April and ask that the matter is postponed until next month.

I am still outraged by the way the tennis club committee went about this application. The application itself was deeply flawed and did not, for example, divulge the strong links between the club and Council. The application highlighted one resident who supported the scheme and totally ignored the more than 60 who signed a petition, at short notice,

opposing the proposals. The application was for the floodlights to be used to enable matches to be completed with a maximum of four players per court. This seems to have transformed during the process into a sort of regional coaching academy.

If permission is granted there should be a restriction in use to four players per court.

The Council have suggested that, because of noise from the courts, the use of floodlights should have a curfew end time, for example 9.00pm on weekdays in Summer. Apparently, this would also be beneficial for bats. This curfew will not apply to times of the year when floodlights are not required. The club should voluntarily, agree a 9.00pm curfew throughout the year. There should also be a total prohibition of music being played at the premises.

I am sorry to say that I see the Committee Report as deeply flawed and not giving a fair and balanced representation of the various views. To give just one example, reference is made to a comment made in support that Cullercoats Tennis Club have lights. This needs to be put in the context of the next door neighbour of that tennis club taking the time to submit a statement outlining the issues with floodlights. Nor does it mention that North Tyneside Council refused a planning application for floodlights at Collingwood (Tynemouth) tennis club. Rockcliffe does not have lights, nor do the Council owned facilities at Churchill Playing Fields.

Finally, I would like to comment on the applicant's noise survey. We are told this was carried out on the basis of match play with four people per court. It was a deeply flawed exercise but working proactively with the Club, North Tyneside Council Environmental Health have come up with two obscure noise tests from Solihull and Leatherhead. Very few details were provided, and we are not told if coaching was taking place. The Council cannot rely on these tests from far afield and the Club should be obliged to provide what they were asked to obtain: a realistic noise survey from this tennis club.