

Sarah Valentine

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 September 2025 18:53
To: planninginfo
Subject: Re: Planning Application DM/25/1185 Tennis Courts to Padel Courts

[REDACTED]

Sorry - I omitted our address when sending the original and now submit an objection with 'all' the required information.

Kind regards,
David G.Macmillan, 4.9.25.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent: 03 September 2025 22:03
To: Stefan Galyas MSDC Planning Dept.
Subject: Planning Application DM/25/1185 Tennis Courts to Padel Courts

As a St.Francis Bowls Club member of some 14 years I learn with dismay and disquiet of the Planning Application to install a Padel Court immediately adjacent to the Bowls Club and object to this Application in its current form.

Padel is a very active and noisy game both in terms of the play, the players and spectators, whereas Lawn Bowls is much quieter and demands both thought and concentration. These two games are incompatible neighbours unless adequate visual distraction and noise absorbing protective screening is installed separate them. This would need to be of a similar height to the existing Tennis Court Fencing for the full length of the common boundary from perimeter road to sports ground embankment. Furthermore it is noted that there does not appear to be any provision for changing rooms and toilets for games which are booked for hourly matches.

The St.Francis Bowls Club opened within the original hospital grounds in 1954 and on the present site since 1987 now with a membership of 70 and around 90 home match and competition fixtures each season. The Green, Clubhouse and facilities are maintained by the members with outside assistance limited to the application of any special green treatments required. Home fixtures are a vital income source for the Bowls Club and if visiting teams dislike the playing conditions caused by Padel then the Club will suffer and decline. Installation of a Padel Court could effectively reduce use of the Bowling Green by 50% by restricting play to rinks parallel to the Padel Courts and causing uneven green 'wear and tear'.

I have no wish to inhibit new sports but all due consideration must be given to existing sport 'neighbours' and it is therefore essential that acceptable protective measures are incorporated within any authorised scheme. I request that all the above aspects of incompatibility and consequences are taken into full consideration and this Planning Application rejected as it currently stands.

Kind regards,
David G.Macmillan, 4.9.25.

[REDACTED]

'The Gables', 66 Sunte Avenue,
Lindfield RH16 2AA.