

## emailed to Members, 18<sup>th</sup> November 2015

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 18 November 2015 21:50

**To:** Councillor Garth Barnes; Councillor Jacky Fletcher; Councillor Paul Baker; [cllr.diggoryseacome@cheltenham.gov.uk](mailto:cllr.diggoryseacome@cheltenham.gov.uk); Councillor Bernard Fisher; Councillor Colin Hay; Councillor Simon Wheeler; Councillor Klara Sudbury; Councillor Louis Savage; Councillor Pat Thornton; Councillor Helena McCloskey; Councillor Adam Lillywhite; Councillor Andrew McKinlay; [andrew4leckhampton@gmail.com](mailto:andrew4leckhampton@gmail.com); Councillor Malcolm Stennett; Councillor Chris Mason; Internet - Built Environment

**Subject:** CLC floodlights

Dear Councillor,

### **Re: CLC Sports Facilities**

May we apologise for this very late message, but our professional duties - as well as difficulties with IT - have not allowed us to review the latest submissions until now. We emphasise that we remain supportive of plans to redevelop the CLC sports facilities. However, we specifically object to the proposed floodlighting, which is not a reasonable compromise between the health and well-being of the school's pupils and that of the local community. We are especially opposed to the lighting because CLC could, with very minor modifications, realise all of its stated ambitions within the facilities that have already been granted planning permission.

To us, in the light of their most recent submissions, the applicant's plans remain unclear and, therefore, as the impact on the Conservation Area and this community still cannot be determined, according to the principles of the NPPF, we ask that permission is declined.

#### **1. Evans Jones letter of 5<sup>th</sup> November continues to lack clarity:**

It is stated that this application will conform to the England Hockey standard III (300 lux) which would allow training, but not anything other than the very lowest standard of match play. The lighting would exclude anything other than social tennis. Will substandard lighting really allow CLC to rival its commercial competitors?

The submission that the applicant can determine what lux level is appropriate is clearly ill-advised. The guidelines offered by sporting authorities are designed to minimise the risk of injury to players; we would submit that it would be irresponsible to the point of negligence to ignore them.

We live in an area designated as E2 because the community, including the school, enjoy a very low light level after dusk. Contrary to the principles of sustainable development endorsed by CLC, the Conservation Area would only become E3 after the installation of these lights.

## **2. The Principal's letter of 6<sup>th</sup> November questions our integrity:**

During September, we prospectively collated data on pitch usage and player numbers for a month prior to the last scheduled hearing regarding this application. Although we concede that, like school registers and timetables, there may be some discrepancies, we will affirm that this data corresponds closely with that given by our neighbours. The pitches are not fully utilised by day or night or from season to season. We have not noticed any increased use during October. For example, this evening the new pitch was illuminated until about 6pm and was used by only 9 girls and one coach.

## **3. Neil Johnson Impact Study:**

As amateurs we are uncertain of the technicalities of lighting design; this document has not enhanced our understanding. We are, therefore, thankful that CBC has commissioned an independent impact assessment.

We remain very grateful for your attention,

Yours sincerely,

