



## THE HARROW HILL TRUST

Caring for the heritage of the Hill and its future

Planning Department  
Harrow Council  
Civic Centre, Station Road  
Harrow HA1 2UY

Holm Oak  
Mount Park Avenue  
Harrow on the Hill  
HA1 3JN

Via email to: [planning.applications@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:planning.applications@harrow.gov.uk)

cc Ward councillors

**RE: PL/2415/25 Druries MUGA**

**19 December 2025**

Dear Agnes Wanja

We wish to bring to your attention the unusual and poor notifications for this application. For some reason the Harrow Hill Trust ('HHT') was notified via our generic planning email address unlike every other application for the past many years which are sent directly to myself. With our change of hosting partners at that time this caused severe delays. Also, HHT is represented on the Conservation Area Advisory Committee ('CAAC') hence this also meant that the apparent omission to inform the CAAC was not picked up until recently. As such I do not believe that the CAAC has had a chance to comment. Their next meeting is 19<sup>th</sup> January and we would be grateful if this application could be placed onto the agenda for that meeting via your colleague Lucy Haile.

The application was brought to our attention by local residents who also pointed out that affected properties in West Street were not notified in the original batch. Further, when I tried to see the complaints on the planning portal they had not been uploaded. Such delay in uploading comments does not assist us with understanding the issues of neighbours and our members.

The location of the MUGA is not ideal, with other MUGA's being long established, it was hoped that life would continue without the need for one at this tight location surround by residential properties, just as it had for decades. Indeed, the SPD for the applicant did not propose a MUGA for this location. We note that there are excellent leisure facilities within a closer distance (23m as opposed to 37m -source heritage statement) from Druries which could possibly provide not only a hard surface but a weather proof indoor facility which could readily be used just by boys from Druries having out of hours timed access. As such, we submit that there is actually no essential need for this MUGA here.

It is no surprise that the applicant's placed the MUGA away from their own premises, although Listed it is also most likely in no small part to the visual and noise disturbance, but is it reasonable to place it so far from their own building and so much closer to neighbours?

We do have issues with the noise report. As frequently occurs with this applicant, surveys are undertaken in non-typical usage times, such as in this case 23-29<sup>th</sup> July when the usual occupants were not present. Secondly, we understand the main noise impact is the hitting of the surrounding fencing and so sound measurements should respect that distance to be of relevance as opposed to the centre of the pitch. Even more so where noise nuisance thresholds are approached. Further, the cutting of a flat surface will cause sound to reflect towards neighbouring property and readings will be impacted and this should be addressed/anticipated. The impacts of metrological conditions been excluded (para 4.5 noise report) which renders the assessment extremely limited and unrealistic given that our weather is highly variable.

The extreme limitations in the noise report are of significant cause for concern and it would be reasonable to assume that had a full and far more realistic assessment be commissioned the noise levels would be shown to be higher than the already high 62dB even using heavy gauge mesh. The most obvious limitation being the use of a centre of court measurement where of course there is no fencing being hit! This makes the conclusions on para 5.14 and 6.4 unjustifiable as it is based on inaccurate and inappropriate data and plain wrong.

We would have expected to see in a full planning application for such a noise generator, clear restrictions of hours of usage, significant secondary sound mitigation structures, and visual softening by planting as a screening as a minimum. Coupled with the inadequate noise report the application falls short of what would be expected and as such cannot be supported by the Harrow Hill Trust. This view is expected to be supported by the CAAC had that committee been given the opportunity to comment on the application.

We understand that recently a Council as owners of an outdoor recreational facility was found by the High Court to be at fault for not fully assessing all nuisance situations. Given the clear deficiencies in this application there is an obvious danger a similar assessment being capable of being made. To be specific, the relying on the inappropriate date period for the assessment, also the noise evaluation being unreliable due to essential topography changes, plus the distance measurements being at fault, plus an incomplete noise type assessment would clearly make this application fall into that category of being an incomplete faulty assessment.

Yours sincerely

*Paul Catherall*

**Paul Catherall**

Chair, Harrow Hill Trust Planning Committee

[pcatherall@hotmail.com](mailto:pcatherall@hotmail.com)