

From: [17 Christ Church Road]

Sent: 18 January 2017 09:39

To: Councillor Bernard Fisher; Councillor Karl Hobley; Internet - Built Environment; Councillor Simon Wheeler; chairman@cheltladiescollege.org; Councillor Paul Baker; Councillor Chris Nelson; Councillor Diggory Seacome; Councillor Klara Sudbury; Councillor Chris Mason; Councillor Colin Hay; Councillor Helena McCloskey; Councillor Garth Barnes; Councillor Pat Thornton; Councillor Adam Lillywhite; Councillor Tony Oliver

Cc:

Subject: Re: CLC floodlight proposal

Dear Councillor

Yesterday, I telephoned England Hockey to ask about their current recommendations for the lighting of hockey pitches. At present their old recommendations, used by the applicants, are obsolete and have not been published on England Hockey's website for at least two years. They were removed pending research at Loughborough University into the safe and adequate requirements for lighting hockey pitches. The research results have been finalised and have been accepted by England Hockey, and simply await ratification by the International Hockey Federation as the recommendations are to become the international standard.

Although not yet published, the results can be discussed with England Hockey, I made the phone call yesterday. There will be two levels of illumination: the higher is for international and national standard competition; the lower, which applies to all other hockey, including non-competitive ball-training, will apply to CLC's proposal for their fourth playing surface. This level requires a minimum light intensity of 350 lux and a variation of less than double the minimum lighting level. The current proposal by CLC therefore will fail to meet this minimum standard and so, the question arises as to why CLC would seek to install a lighting facility at enormous expense that will become obsolete even before the gantries are raised for the first time.

Is it to establish a facility that at a later date will need to be modified to meet safety standards?

I would be very grateful if you would consider whether an unusable facility should be allowed to proceed when its harm to the Conservation Area has already been accepted. Surely harm can only be acceptable if a significant balancing benefit can be demonstrated: an unsafe lighting proposal benefits no-one.

I would be very grateful if, on the basis of the potential for 'development creep' that permission is declined, or at least a decision is deferred until the imminent publication (a few weeks) of England Hockey's international standards.

Thank you for your attention,

Yours sincerely
[name supplied]