

From: Brown, Vicky <Vicky.Brown@wiltshire.gov.uk>

Sent: 08 September 2026 11:22

To: Hill, Sarah <Sarah.Hill@wiltshire.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Email response to EHO - Salisbury Golf Centre, Padel courts
PL/2026/00120

Dear Sarah,

Thank you for forwarding the below. I do not have a record of having seen this previously, please could you send a formal consultation through so I can record my time.

Having reviewed the applicant's response, I am satisfied with the explanation provided regarding the derivation of the source sound power levels and the measurement methodology adopted. Whilst the measurement distances initially appeared unusual, the clarification regarding the conversion of measured sound pressure levels to sound power levels, together with the comparison against available reference data and published guidance, satisfactorily addresses my concerns regarding the source noise assumptions used within the assessment.

I also accept that the source noise levels adopted within the assessment represent a robust worst-case scenario. The assessment assumes all four courts operating simultaneously and is based upon measurements taken from experienced players under representative worst-case playing conditions.

In respect of the BS 4142 assessment, I note that a 3 dB impulsivity correction has been applied. Whilst there is inevitably an element of professional judgement when assessing the audibility and prominence of impulsive characteristics, I accept that this is reasonable in the context of this particular site. The nearest residential properties are separated from the proposed courts by a some distance and are located within an acoustic environment influenced by established transport noise sources, including Wilton Road and the railway corridor. In these circumstances, the impulsive characteristics of padel noise are likely to be less perceptible than they would be at quieter residential locations. I therefore accept 3dB correction for impulsivity for this assessment.

I continue to consider that quieter evening and early morning periods are potentially the times when noise from the proposed courts would be most noticeable to nearby residents. Whilst BS 4142 defines the daytime period as 07:00 to 23:00 and the use of a representative daytime background sound level is consistent with the methodology of the standard, it remains important from an amenity perspective to consider circumstances where noise may become more audible as background sound levels reduce.

However, I note and accept the applicant's wider argument regarding the local acoustic context. The assessment demonstrates that the predicted padel noise levels remain below the measured ambient sound levels recorded during the evening period. Whilst this does not negate the potential audibility of the activity, it is a relevant consideration when assessing the likely significance of effects in this particular environment

I have also given weight to the fact that the nearest dwellings are approximately 70 metres from the proposed courts, that the assessment was undertaken using robust source assumptions, and that the predicted specific sound level at the nearest receptor remains relatively low despite the assumption that all four courts are in simultaneous operation.

Notwithstanding the above, I remain concerned about the proposed operating hours. The noise monitoring data shows that background and ambient sound levels reduce during the more sensitive periods at the start and end of the day, particularly on Sundays. The time-history data demonstrates that background sound levels remain relatively low during the Sunday morning period and reduce earlier on Sunday evenings than on other days. In addition, ambient and background sound levels appear to begin reducing during the course of Friday and Saturday evenings as activity levels within the surrounding area decline. Whilst I accept that the assessment has been undertaken using a representative daytime background sound level in accordance with BS 4142, these quieter periods are likely to be when noise from padel activity is most noticeable to nearby residents.

To mitigate the potential impact during these more sensitive periods, I recommend that the hours of operation are restricted to 07:00 to 21:00 Monday to Saturday and 08:00 to 20:00 on Sundays and Bank Holidays. I consider that these revised hours would better reflect the acoustic character of the surrounding area during the quieter periods identified within the monitoring data whilst still allowing extensive use of the facility.

On balance, whilst I maintain some reservations regarding the potential for increased audibility during quieter periods, I do not consider that the available evidence demonstrates that noise from the proposed development would result in a significant adverse impact on residential amenity, subject to the operating hours being restricted to 07:00 to 21:00 Monday to Saturday and 08:00 to 20:00 on Sundays and Bank Holidays. Accordingly, Environmental Protection recommends that should planning permission be granted the above operating hours are secured by condition.

Kind regards

Vicky

Mrs Vicky Brown MCIEH

Principal Environmental Health Officer