

All minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the committee/panel. To find out the date of the next meeting please check the calendar of events at your local library or online at www.merton.gov.uk/committee.

DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

26 OCTOBER 2023

(7.18 pm - 0.14 am)

PRESENT Councillor Aidan Mundy (in the Chair), Councillor Sheri-Ann Bhim, Councillor Michael Butcher, Councillor Edward Foley, Councillor Kirsten Galea, Councillor Susie Hicks, Councillor Dan Johnston, Councillor Stephen Neaverson, Councillor Thomas Barlow, Councillor Billy Hayes

ALSO PRESENT Jonathan Berry (Head of Development Management and Building Control), Calum McCulloch (Planning Officer), Tim Bryson (Development Management Area Manager), Tara Butler (Programme Manager), Andrew Swaffer (Senior Associate, Sharpe Pritchard), Emily Knowles (Senior Associate, Sharpe Pritchard), Jayde Watts (Democratic Services Officer)

PRESENT ONLINE Amy Dumitrescu (Democratic Services Manager)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr McGrath with Cllr Hicks in attendance as substitute, Cllr Willis with Cllr Galea in attendance as substitute and Cllr Whelton with Cllr Neaverson in attendance as substitute.

2 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

Cllr Hicks declared the following declarations of interest in relation to application 21/P2900:

- Member of The Wimbledon Society since October 2022 and maintained regular contact with many resident associations including Wimbledon Union Residents Association. Cllr Hicks has been kept up to date with all their views, submissions and opposition to application 21/P2900.
- Ward Councillor for Hillside which is highlighted within the report as a potential beneficiary of the proposed scheme.
- Member of the Liberal Democrats, who as a group strongly opposed application 21/P2900. As a member of Development and Planning Applications Committee (DPAC), Cllr Hicks has not taken any part in campaigning or discussions on this application. There was however, before the elections last year and before becoming a member of DPAC, a mention of Cllr Hicks in a bio which described Cllr Hicks as supporting local Liberal Democrats campaigns to keep Wimbledon Park from being concreted over, get step free access installed at Raynes Park and prevent intrusive

inappropriate developments in the area. However, mindful of her position in DPAC, she has not engaged in campaigning against the proposal. Cllr Hicks has attended site visits and read the papers with an open mind.

Cllr Bhim declared the following in relation to application 21/P2900:

- For a period of time until August 2022, Cllr Bhim worked for Thorncliffe who were instructed on application 21/P2900. However, Cllr Bhims employment did not cross over with work on application 21/P2900. Legal officers have been informed of this prior to the meeting.

Andrew Swaffer (Senior Associate, Sharpe Pritchard) informed that as legal advisor for the meeting, he had carefully considered the information provided and was content for both Cllr Hicks and Cllr Bhim to continue to determine application 21/P2900.

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 September 2023 are agreed as an accurate record.

4 TOWN PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Agenda Item 4)

The Committee noted the amendments and modifications to the officer's report. The Chair advised that the agenda would be taken in the published agenda order.

Please note that members of the public, including the applicant or anyone speaking on their behalf, are expressing their own opinions and the Council does not take any responsibility for the accuracy of statements made by them.

5 WIMBLEDON PARK GOLF CLUB, HOME PARK ROAD, WIMBLEDON PARK, SW19 7HR (Agenda Item 5)

The Planning Officer presented the report.

The committee received presentations from two objectors, one in support and one in objection.

The presentation in support of the application raised points including:

- The All England Tennis Club had enough money to do the job properly and were experts at risk management.
- As they were a global brand, building houses was unlikely.
- They have a great social conscious.
- There would be great public benefits, particularly as the development would be done in phases and likely to be completed in three to four years' time.
- The current proposed location was the best place for the development.

- A local business which generates profit should be supported.
- Over 6000 people took part in the park tour, with the majority in support of the project.
- Challenges such as 10,000 lorries would occur, but over four years this would equate to 20 lorries per day.

The presentation in objection of the application raised points including:

- Supported by 15 societies and resident associations around Wimbledon as well as two local MP's, they cared about protecting the environment and green spaces from commercial developers.
- The development was aggressive and inappropriate.
- Merton Council and Wandsworth Council received over 2000 individually written letters of objection.
- Over the 8 years of development, landscape would be bulldozed and levelled, hundreds of trees felled, habitats for protected creatures would be destroyed and never return.
- 40,400 lorries would be used.
- All of the above would be for just 2-3 weeks of tennis per year. This would not be sport and recreation but would be commercial entertainment.
- Wimbledon was already the only grass court grand slam in the world, this expansion would not change this.
- No special circumstances could justify the destruction, the environment was much more important.
- Officers report overrules expert advice from Merton's own conservation officer and environmental consultant. The report also ignored expert submissions that biodiversity and urban greening had been grossly overclaimed by the developer. The harm would be substantial.
- As required by Merton's Design Review Panel and Local Planning Inspectors, the park needed a visionary and more sensitive approach.
- The developer could make promises as they did in 1993 to not develop but look at what was now happening.
- Loved the tennis and wanted it to succeed but this was not the way.
- The outcome of the application would have consequences for the preservation of green spaces across London and the country.

The committee received representation from Ward Councillor Jill Hall who raised points including:

- The application was detrimental to the community and the applicant did not make a clear case for the overdevelopment of the land.
- 38 grass courts, 28 meter tall 8000 seat stadium with new courts built with concrete base rims was out of keeping with the pastoral landscape.
- Green spaces were needed to allow residents and local wildlife to breath freely.
- Building on the land would be an environmental disaster.

- The environmental impact assessment failed to address reasonable alternatives as required by legislation and was contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The economic statement failed to address the economic benefits for the community and would only benefit All England Lawn Tennis Club (AELTC)
- The golf club was open to Merton residents, but AELTC were not transforming private land into public land.

The committee received representation from Ward Councillor Samantha MacArthur who raised points including:

- As a protected open metropolitan land, the applicant was required to show special circumstances for development.
- The benefits given failed to make such a case and the submission included misleading information.
- The officers report implausibly states that there are significant benefits to which substantial weight was given. The submission by the PRA also disagrees with the Officers.
- If granted, the future of metropolitan open land was on a slippery slope and not a green one.

The committee received representation from Ward Councillor Tony Reiss who raised points including:

- There were serious errors in the applicant's treatment of the environment.
- The London Plan sought to achieve an overall gain in biodiversity through urban greening, this application had an urban greening factor of 0.99.
- The applicant revised their claim of a near perfect factor of 0.95 to 0.9 but in fact was 0.8 based on Dr Dawsons paper, a massive 25% net loss in greening.
- Further flaws in the applicant's tree audit showed a failure to comply with the London Plan and Environmental Policies.
- The application should be refused, and the applicant told to reach a compromise which avoided harm to greening.

The committee received representation from Ward Councillor Max Austin who raised points including:

- Village residents were proud of the Wimbledon Championships, which attracted visitors and was set in an English country garden in a residential area.
- If the application was granted, extension of traffic management orders would be needed which would restrict property access and should be considered by the committee.
- Unless the committee were satisfied of very special circumstances to justify the application, they were bound to reject it.

- Qualifying tournaments needed playing courts, not show courts. No assessment was included in the planning officers report of alternative options.
- Surprised by the officer's recommendation that the Council should take a transactional approach to the very special circumstances for activities which the Council were responsible to discharge.
- Surprised by the officer's conclusion that substantial harm identified in the report could be mitigated through very special circumstances, none that were mentioned would justify this application and could therefore be applied to others who sought to build on Metropolitan Open Land.
- The Council should be conscious of setting a precedent which other developers may exploit.
- The application in its current form was incompatible with the collective duty and policy to protect metropolitan land.

The committee received representation from Stephen Hammond MP who raised points including:

- Received more correspondence on this application than any other during his time in parliament.
- Officers acknowledge there some impact on ecology and biodiversity but believed this would be outweighed by longer term ecology enhancement, however paragraph 6.14.25 stated the short-term impact would be major which was further supported by Merton's Environment Assessment Statement in paragraph 6.13.41.
- The Heritage section of the report identified that the development would cause less than substantial harm and also stated the application would give rise to conflict with heritage policies in the development plan, The London Plan Policy HC1 and Merton's SPP Policy DMD4.
- The Principles of Development section considered the development inappropriate and would result in definitional harm as per NPPF paragraph 147.
- The Parkland show court would not preserve the openness of MOL and was not compliant with MOL purpose.
- If the application was passed, a precedent to build on MOL, parks and other spaces in Merton and London would be set which would be inappropriate and why the application should be rejected.
- Would like to see a new application which would benefit both All England and the community.

The committee received representation from the applicants Sally Bolton and Jon Roshier who raised points including:

- Offered a unique opportunity to deliver one of the biggest sporting transformations for London since the 2012 Olympics.
- Wimbledon was one of UK's most significant sporting events, but this could not be taken for granted as it was a rapidly changing and competitive sporting

space. Without the Wimbledon Park Project there was a chance they would fall behind the other Grand Slams.

- They were the only Grand Slam who did not host qualifying events in the same site as the tournament. The qualifying event currently took place in Roehampton in a rented site which impacted player experience.
- There was need of a third court to mirror other Grand Slams, which included 8000 capacity and a roof to mitigate against weather.
- The limited space of the existing site, with expanded wheelchair and junior competitions, meant that the world's best tennis players had to share practice courts and spectators had limited opportunity to experience the competition.
- Will transform the land, which had been inaccessible to the public for over 100 years, into a new public park that would be free for everyone to enjoy all year round permanently.
- Offered to improve the biodiversity of the land and protect Wimbledon Park Lake to safeguard water sports.
- There would be increased tourism, hundreds of new jobs created and an improvement for Merton and London's economy each year.
- As a not-for-profit organisation, 90% of the money made from the Championships would go to the Lawn Tennis Association.
- A considerable amount of time was spent researching and understanding the site which was Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), part registered park and garden and a conservation area.
- The site was a private golf club for over 100 years with no general public access.
- The registered park and garden were identified by Historic England as being at risk.
- Wimbledon Park Lake required desilting to protect its long-term amenity, ecological and recreational value.
- Acknowledged that the development would give rise to change and impacted residents within the local area, particularly during construction, but believed the impacts would be outweighed by the public benefits included within the proposal.
- They believed there were very special circumstances which supported granting planning permission.
- Proposals included a 9.4 hectare public park, a heritage and Brownian approach to the parkland, a new boardwalk, biodiversity improvements, new tree planting, new bookable community space within the clubhouse and parkland show court, community access to new tennis courts after the championships, investment in Wimbledon Park to improve facilities, opportunities for residents to purchase tickets for the new parkland show courts during the championships, education programs in coordination with local schools and free tickets for school children to the qualifying events.

Andrew Swaffer informed the committee the following:

- A reminder that this application, as with all others heard by the committee, were determined by planning merits presented and the consequences of the proposal.
- The committee should not have regard or be influenced by the Councils interests as owner of the retained lands in Wimbledon Park.
- Developers would need to resolve private law matters between themselves before they could implement development. It was a trite matter of law that it was not in itself relevant to the assessment of the planning merits of the proposal.
- In relation to Shropshire vs Day, members of the committee and public were aware of two sets of opinions provided between the applicant and members of the public that opposed the scheme. One that there was a statutory trust in place which flowed certain requirements for local authority. The applicant took advice from Kings Counsel and concluded the opposite. As a result, they have instructed two leading counsels to look at the particular matter and their advice, which was made public, was that the golf course land was not and has at no point been subject to a statutory trust. Officers have accepted that advice in the report. In summary, there was no part of the golf course land which held as a statutory trust and as such was not a material consideration for this committee.

In response to questions raised by the committee, Planning Officers advised:

- Very special circumstances were determined by firstly identifying if there was any harm. This was done in relation to MOL which identified there would be harm because of impact on openness due to the Parkland show court. Officers also identified other harm in relation to heritage. Once these were accounted for, they looked at the public benefits of the proposal. As set out in the officer's report there were multiple public benefits, some which were negotiated through S106, such as the off-site benefits to Wimbledon Park which contributed to helping the Heritage at risk register and from being removed from the RPG. In light of all public benefits and whether they amounted to very special circumstances as a whole, they have concluded that they do.
- Planning balance was the balance at the end of the report which looked at all the identified harm and the benefits. Very special circumstances would come at the end of the planning balance exercise.
- In relation to whether a different type of development could deliver the same kind of benefits, officers must consider what was proposed and objectively look at the benefits on offer in light of the proposals put forward by AELTC. They have identified benefits to AELTC's commercial operation of the site related to the championships, which included economic employment benefits. The particular use proposed had been considered as well as the impact this would have. Whilst courts had an impact on the land, which was assessed, it also had a special link with what happened across the road on Church Road which was also considered. This formed part of the planning balance set against the public benefits as a collective which formed the very special circumstances.

- Officer discussed the number of courts made available to the public with the applicant and there was a detailed explanation put forward that explained the need to maintain a certain standard of courts.
- BREEAM standards were set out and categorised in the modification sheet. Merton's policy required buildings over 500 square meters to achieve a score of very good or higher. The proposal achieved an excellent BREEAM score. This did not mean that other buildings would not be designed to a high standard, particularly as the S106 heads of terms required that they showed how they have maximised carbon savings across the site.
- The northern gate area was not considered in detail, but it was important to note that the emphasis of the development as a whole, was to create continuous areas of public open space which was provided by the boardwalk and AELTC parkland which connected with Wimbledon Park. To open this area to the public, a hard boundary was needed but the emphasis of the design was to avoid hard boundaries in the registered park and garden.
- It would be a matter of planning judgement on whether certain land use fell within a certain definition. The alternative sports and recreation use fell under MOL and open space. The site contained a permissive park, a lake open for recreation and tennis facilities. As a whole, they felt this was within that definition.
- The golf course land had been a private members club with no access to the public, although it was available on a membership basis for those who paid to play. As a result of the proposed development, the 9.4 hectare parkland would provide public access for the majority of the year subject to agreed closure periods highlighted in the officer report. The boardwalk around the lake would also increase public access. In addition, Andrew Swaffer confirmed that the parkland was private land and wasn't publicly accessible. If resident were on the land, they were not given explicit permission to be on the site.
- The officers report included a detailed heritage assessment. Capability Brown was the former landscape designer who designed the historic landscape when there was a manor house on the hill to the south of the site. Certain design features were retained as part of the development, most noticeably the lake which was designed by Brown.
- Heritage sub section 6.4 included some of the remnant capability brown features which included some of the trees which matched the alignment that led to the manor house, succession planting which maintained capability brown's original design and the lake which was one of the pivotal features which remained.
- Officers had conversations with the applicant and agent in regard to their net zero ambition. There were existing and proposed energy centres with a network between the two.
- The site was a total of 39.7 hectares, of which approximately 20% was for the lake.
- The report outlined that during the existing championships 6,400 jobs were created to support the event. The proposal would increase the number of jobs required to host both the qualifying and championships by an additional 256. There would be an additional 18 seasonal staff employed for the maintenance and management of the parkland and wider qualifying court areas as well as

40 fulltime roles. The construction period was estimated to be 8 – 10 years and would create 300-400 construction jobs.

- The policy test was to provide biodiversity net gain and did not specify an amount, although forthcoming legislation of the environment act would ask for 10% which fell outside of the planning system. The proposed development provided over 10% in relation to habitat and there were other units being applied so the development exceeded the net gain target. Further figures could be found in paragraph 6.6.77 of the report. The BNG metric accounted for timescales for different habitats and species.
- Emily Knowles (Senior Associate, Sharpe Pritchard) informed the committee that the registered park and garden being on the Heritage England risk register did not provide any statutory protection or require the landowner to maintain the land to a particular standard. The only benefit from being on the at risk register and being an RPG was it being a planning consideration at committee.
- The tree consultant reviewed the scheme and were satisfied with the tree proposal in accordance with policy. For contingency, there was a condition for a tree health review.
- The northern gateway formed part of the AELTC private estate so would not be accessible to the public unless you were a spectator or entering the championships.
- The culvert fed the lake and was capability brown focussed. One of the benefits of opening it up was the ecology and aesthetics which added to the parkland setting.
- According to the Tennis in Merton website, Wimbledon Park offered free membership which allowed residents to book courts. The price was dependant on the court booked, with the astro turf courts costing £12 during peak times and £9.20 off peak. Tarmac courts were £9.20 at all times.
- Tours took place over the weekend and would be kept under review to adjust to demand.
- The MOL assessment identified the show court as one of the principal features which effected the openness of the site, so the harm would be less without the show court. However, the harm caused by the show court was less then substantial and without it the development would still result in less than substantial harm remaining in the same category, so the judgement would be the same.
- Discussions took place to explore an access tunnel but there were several reasons as to why it was discounted. As part of the pre planning application, highways team feasibility studies were done for over bridges which concluded this would urbanise Church Road unnecessarily. Studies were also done on tunnels but due to crowd management, size of tunnels, length and gradient of ramps needed it would undermine the character of Church Road and effect several trees, many of which would have been veteran trees.
- As part of the planning application there was a travel plan secured by a condition. They planned to move to more sustainable modes of transport and would reduce car parking when the championships ran. Church road closure was brought in during covid and was now formalised due to Met Police advice and counter terrorism reasons. This meant they now had a measure on traffic

since the Church Road closure, which was not part of the application, but was part of the traffic management order. Despite Church Road being closed, all residents had access to their homes.

- Carbon sequestration figures were not part of planning policy; however, 700 trees would be retained on site and up to 1500 tree planted. There would be some carbon loss from felling trees, but the hope was that this would be recuperated in the long term.
- Andrew Swaffer informed the committee that any objections or representations received from any member of the public was a material consideration for committee members. However, members should be very cautious of preferring conclusions of a member of the public to the careful and considered views of the professional and experienced practicing consultants who met national standards and who had considered the proposal in detail, taking into account other representations over a substantial amount of time. If planning permission was refused based on individual representation over those professionally instructed by the council, the council would be required to defend the decision if there was an appeal. During this process the council would be required to produce substantial evidence to demonstrate the reasons for refusal and justify that such reasons were lawful. The planning officers would not be able to do defend such position and so the council would have to instruct external consultants to do so. On occasion members may be required to explain to the inspector why they came to such a position.
- Constraints on the site dictated the location of the lake and boardwalk, particularly ecology, trees and where the Wimbledon Club was located.
- The boardwalk provided the same number of pontoons so there would be no loss in angling provisions. Water sports on the lake were at the discretion of the Council. Desilting the lake would improve recreational value and potentially enable other activities such as swimming.
- The design access statement included a proposal to have fence in proximity to the boardwalk to prevent geese and allow smaller species.
- The tree consultant reviewed the proposals and considered them acceptable. The number of trees calculated were based on the relevant British standard.
- There was clear emphasis for the development to provide suitable permanent accessible toilet facilities.
- The modification sheet included updates to the following:
 - Term 1 in relation to community access to the golf club house and parkland
 - Head of term in relation to community access to the grass courts was updated.
 - A business engagement term was added to ensure the development maximised the economic benefits to the surrounding area.
 - An additional head of term for AELTC to submit an annual report to the LPA on obligations discharged in the previous 12 months.
 - A condition was added for a defibrillator to be provided in the AELTC parkland.
- The construction environmental management plan required monitoring be reported from the first day of commencement up until the first occupation of the show court.

- Tickets available for residents met the tests of legal obligations but this would not be the case with retrospective proposals for a site that was outside of the red edge. Legally, there were reservations on whether specific tickets for local residents was something that the local authority could impose.
- The phasing process was conditioned so there would be an updated phasing plan which would address access to the parkland. One was submitted with the application, but the trigger points included in S106 aimed to frontend the benefits such as the lake, boardwalk and AELTC parkland.
- Part of the proposal aimed to reduce car journeys to the site which would have a beneficial impact on air quality.
- Local development working group was designed to address resident worries around long term construction. The option was there for Ward Councillors to be involved in this process.
- There would be no issue with the local liaison group continuing after the construction phase. Timescales and terms of reference should both be subject to review mechanisms, so they supported updated wording to reflect this.
- The art culture contribution was a requirement by Wandsworth Councils planning policy, but this was not required under Merton Councils planning policy. Emily Knowles confirmed that Wandsworth had their own local plan policies which they will consider when making their decision. As Merton did not have such a policy, requiring the developer to contribute would be unreasonable. Without a policy to back up the request, the contribution amount would be questionable. A strategy would be more rational and reasoned.
- The developer would have to submit a ticketing strategy for approval which planning would review to ensure the ticketing benefitted a wide range of schools.
- In relation to a financial contribution to arts and culture, Andrew Swaffer informed the committee that there was no policy justification to calculate a contribution amount and would recommend a strategy as opposed to agreeing a financial amount.
- Agreed that no less than half of the tickets would be available for Merton.
- Condition 64 was amended to say 'these restrictions shall not apply in the case of emergency access'.
- Condition 31 was amended to include the developer would comply with the plan once it was implemented.
- There was a temporary overlay condition which allowed securing all the temporary infrastructure which would be in place for the championships and qualifying events.

The Chair invited the applicant to respond to clarify details raised within questions from the committee.

The applicant informed the committee of the following:

- The number of courts made available to the public was largely driven by the need to maintain the standards of the championship courts throughout the year. The maintenance regime was intensive given the standard of play and the nature of the grass. The number of community courts stated would be the minimum and they expected that there would be a larger number available. A minimum of 7 courts was proposed as they needed to recycle, as after the Championships the courts would need time to recover.
- This would run as an extension of the All England Club Community Tennis Programme which currently had a pay and play facility in Raynes Park with 16 grass courts for anyone who signs up. School children along with others would be prioritised. The courts would be available in the southern part of the site, courts in the northern part were protected primarily due to the need of maintenance, although they may be used to host other tennis matches.
- Pay and Play rate would be compared to Raynes Park. Adults would pay £4, children would pay £2 which would then allow them to book available courts. The cost to book courts would be dependent on the season.
- All 38 courts on the site would be used during the championships, qualifiers, junior tennis events and wheelchair tennis.
- As a London Living wage employer, they insisted that all contractor groups received this throughout the development and operation of the new site.
- They aspired to achieve a BREEAM score of excellent. There were complications in relation to the show courts due to nature of it, but they committed to a minimum of excellent on all buildings, including small buildings which did not meet the BREEAM requirements. The club committed to be net zero by 2030 so every building needed to fit with that agenda.
- The players view, which were of the highest quality, was important to retain the position Wimbledon had. There was consistent feedback from players over many years about the site at Roehampton not meeting the same standards.
- Capability Brown was commissioned by the first Earl Spencer in the 1760's and 1780's. When Earl Spencer inherited the site, he was 11.5 years old, and his trustees brought additional land to expand the original manor estate to 390 hectares. Today they had 76 from the 390 hectares which included the public park, the All England Club owned land and the lake. The manor house was the focal point of the master plan. Capability Brown created the lake they have today due to the number of streams that ran across the site, which made the centre of the site marshy. The lake was one of the key 18th century remnant features of today's landscape and was grade 2 listed by Heritage England.
- Historic England classed the site as a highly degraded remnant piece of the former Capability Brown landscape and was classed as at risk on their register. Reasons why it was classed as at risk were the condition of the lake, the impact of views from recently planted trees, the fragmented land ownership and the lack of cohesion in terms of overall management of the site. At present the developer did not read the public park and former golf course and lake as one integral landscape.
- Net zero was for the entire operation including travel patterns, materials and how the whole site operated. For the proposed site they were looking at ground source heat pumps which fed into the energy centre sat beneath the parkland show court and then back into the main site.

- The ring beams sat around the grass courts would have low carbon technology and be prefabricated offsite before being brought on site which helped to reduce the amount of travel and trips to the site and reduce construction time. For the outbuildings, they were exploring ways to minimise carbon with construction materials such as laminated timber and other timber solutions. Specific information would form part of that specific planning application, so they were duty bound to submit a reserved matters application for each of the principal buildings, including the parkland show court. If concrete was used it would be underneath the building for stability.
- The biodiversity net gain calculator gave a time to achieve targets for different habitats. The biodiversity net gain would not be the only enhancement, there was also wildlife legislation which had to be complied, which fell outside of BNG calculations.
- A minimum of seven courts were available to allow for flexibility for maintenance. The seven courts would not be specific courts.
- The number of tours suggested were informed by the current volume of tours which took place. As the tours would run as part of the wider museum tours on the main site, if there was an increase in demand, they would increase the number of tours.
- There was more land to allow facilitating an increased attendance of 50,000, spectators would also be able to use both the northern and southern entrance.
- Implementing a tunnel from Church Road would take up a large parcel of land due to the depth needed and would impact the rest of the site. Safety for spectators was important and part of the reason why Church Road remained closed during the championship. They would also have to review how boundaries were set and may require more overt boundary treatment if Church Road remained open. On balance it would be less successful to include.
- The show court housed many of the facilities for spectators and players. If the show court was not there, qualifying would require a number of other buildings which they felt was a less successful option. One of the key drives was to provide a third show court which was an important requirement of the project. The removal of the show court would also impact the energy system which would sit underneath it.
- Pathways would be at least 1.8 meters and in most areas 3 metres to accommodate wheelchairs that are usually 1.2 meters wide. There would also be sports wheelchair accessible toilets.
- Parkland areas were less intensively managed and even less so than the golf course was. The maintenance hub was located in that area due to the topography of land which enabled the facility to be buried beneath the surface, which was an important consideration. The added benefit was that the routes in and out of the site were also below ground. Maintenance times were conditioned so would not be before 7am.
- Whole life carbon assessment was done on the site and included whole life carbon for the development. This was signed off by the Council and by the GLA. There was a commitment by the development for whole life carbon assessments to be prepared for the reserved matters application. Many trees were retained and planted on site with long term absorption of carbon benefits.

- The current golf course was maintained immunity grass which geese were attracted to. The new development would provide a variety of grass lengths making the courts less attractive to geese. Geese are non-native and currently dominated the hierarchy across the site. An additional fence line underneath the boardwalk would prevent them from getting to the native birds.
- Pricing would be addressed through reserved matters and the S106.
- Community use would be in the show court and the golf course clubhouse. As part of the S106, a community strategy plan would be submitted with further details.
- The southern playhouse included community use and toilets as part of the tennis program.
- British Standard 5837 measured trees by size and only trees larger than 75mm were counted. Smaller trees would be planted to better understand the site and soils. The design access statement showed the subsoils to be heavy in which case younger trees would be more successful.
- Permanent toilets would be provided through the various buildings on site.
- Tree planting over the last 40 years lined the fairways of the golf course. The statutory consultant pointed out that this degraded the heritage of the site and vision of the capability brown landscape. Heritage would be considered when planting trees, with a key focus to plant resilient long lived broadleaf trees.
- They were happy to keep dialogue open with residents and notify residents of events.
- Air quality would be addressed through transport as well as other means such as buildings and using greener energy. Air quality calculations were difficult due to not having a benchmark, but the intent was to have continued monitoring which would be made publicly available.
- They welcomed Ward Councillors to attend local development working group meetings.
- They intended to have continued neighbour liaising throughout the whole process and on an ongoing basis. There was no objection in establishing this for a 25 year period.
- Happy to implement a hotline for residents to raise issues.
- Applicant could agree to a head of term which included an arts and culture strategy of up to £52,000. As a principle, if it was agreed with Wandsworth to increase the figure from £52,000, the same would be done for Merton.
- Typically, there would be no construction during the championships. In the case of an exception, it would be dealt with via the construction management plan with resident group engagement.
- Agreed that notwithstanding the extra cost of maintaining grass courts, they would accept a heads of terms agreement to review the parity of cost in relation to membership.

AMENDMENTS TO HEADS OF TERMS TO THOSE SET OUT IN OFFICER'S REPORT: -

- Amendment to Head of Term 15 to require invitation of Ward Councillors to attend meetings. Amendment to include an annual review mechanism to determine the longevity and frequency of meetings.

- Amendment to Head of Term 16 to include a hotline (means of contacting the public liaison officer) for residents.
- An additional Head of term or amendment for an arts and culture strategy specific to Merton to provide a degree of parity with HOT 26 which applicable to Wandsworth.
- Amendment to Head of Term 28 to include Merton as receiving half of the available tickets.
- Amendment to Head of Term 2 to include a mechanism by which community access tennis courts is secured at a comparable cost to other community tennis facilities.

The Chair moved to the vote on the Officers' recommendation with the additional conditions and informatives: Votes For – 6, Against – 4, Abstentions – 0.

6 OUTSIDE 13 STATION BUILDINGS, COOMBE LANE, RAYNES PARK
(Agenda Item 6)

This item was deferred.

7 OUTSIDE 13 STATION BUILDINGS, COOMBE LANE, RAYNES PARK
(Agenda Item 7)

This item was deferred.

8 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 8)

This item was deferred.

9 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 9)

This item was deferred.

10 GLOSSARY OF TERMS (Agenda Item 10)

11 CHAIRS PROCEDURE GUIDE (Agenda Item 11)

12 MODIFICATION DOCUMENT (Agenda Item 12)

Please note that minutes of the meeting are not transcripts.

The meeting was livestreamed and recorded and are accessible via the following links:

Part 1 <https://www.youtube.com/live/HcRBmCJQpdo?feature=shared>

Part 2 <https://www.youtube.com/live/jwjqVLnJWn8?feature=shared>

Part 3 <https://www.youtube.com/live/fVCAXdKgx6E?feature=shared>

Part 4 <https://www.youtube.com/live/DYD4btjvrFw?feature=shared>

Part 5 <https://www.youtube.com/live/F5grkuVkpzw?feature=shared>