

As residents of Fauvel Road, we wish to make comments on this application. We also note that there are no public planning notices on lampposts surrounding the site and as such would highlight that the majority of neighbouring residents are not aware of this application, indeed we were not notified until 10 days into the 21 day consultation period, despite being immediate neighbours. As such, it is suggested that the consultation period is extended to allow time for residents to reply to the planning application.

Whilst we have no objection in principle to the proposals we would like more understanding of the purpose of this renewal. The tennis courts were historically associated with the former Glossopdale School site on Talbot Road, which has since been demolished and relocated to Hadfield. Whilst the courts have always been open and freely accessible to the public, as a result of their lack of enclosure/lack of restriction to access, their use is informal and comprises use by local residents in the area. Can the applicant advise if the intention is for the renewed courts to be formally used by clubs for example? Is there any intention to make the courts private or will they remain openly accessible for all, as is currently the case?

We are keen to understand whether there is likely to be any impact associated with parking? Will the renewed courts attract an intensification of use?

We would also suggest that there will need to be a robust maintenance programme in place once the work has been completed, not only for the court area but also for the surrounding trees and shrubbery. The current court is mossed over in places and overhung with trees. Also, the fencing is torn down around a lot of the court area. obviously without constant maintenance this is likely to be a reoccurring feature.

If the intention is that the new surface will be used in the evenings, possibly all year round, perhaps by local groups, then we think some consideration should be given to lighting. The area is quite dark due to its position. If indeed evening use is the intention, we would like to know the level of lighting proposed, including hours of illumination, in order to ensure residential amenity is protected.

It is encouraging that the applicant refers to the whole site as the “wider public recreational provision at Fauvel Road”. As residents we firmly wish that it stays that way.

We would be interested to know if there are any further improvements planned across the whole site, or is this timely and apparently urgent need to upgrade the tennis courts actually just as a result of the live planning appeal at the former Glossopdale School site and the appellants’ realisation that there is in fact a lack of play provision and sports facilities in the local area to support a residential redevelopment scheme of the scale proposed?

Nigel and Susan Sowerbutts