

Planning Applications Committee

26th October 2023

Supplementary Agenda

Modifications Sheet (Version 1) – 23/10/2023

ITEM 5 (Wimbledon Park Golf Club, Home Park Road, London, SW19 8HR)

Agenda page 131, officer report page 129

Insert the following below para 3.3.70 to account for Show Court Heights on both the western and eastern side of the building.

On the western side of the Show Court the approximate maximum heights would be:

- Primary frontage – 19.5m
- Secondary frontage (top of pitched roof element) – 22.5m
- Maximum roof height – 24m

Agenda page 88, officer report page 83

Additional representation received.

Save Wimbledon Park dated 10.10.2023

A response was received from 'Save Wimbledon Park' objecting to the proposed development. The response is available to view on the Merton Planning Explorer via [this link](#). Concerns set out include:

- Scale of Parkland Show Court
- Environmental Impact - concrete used, traffic disruption, construction noise and air pollution throughout the building phase
- Loss of trees
- Adverse impact of Church Road closure
- Concerns regarding breach of the 1993 covenant.
- The "public" park would be permissive only
- AELTC are offering to pay for the de-silting that the Council has failed to do itself.
- The offer of public access to tennis courts is for just 7 courts (max), post championships only (6-8 weeks), and by invitation not "book and play". They are also relocating existing Junior Tennis initiatives which are successfully operating elsewhere, so there is no additional support for community tennis.

- Concerns that there would be a net loss in biodiversity
- Concerns tree planting does not compensate for the loss.
- Concerns desilting the lake would release pollutants to the detriment of wildlife.
- Concerns regarding the use of fertilisers and biocides which would leach into the lake.
- Concerns of release of sequestered carbon from the felling of mature trees.
- Concerns regarding the relevance of Shropshire V Day supreme court decision.

The representation refers to maps of the existing and proposed development.

Agenda Page 77, (Officer report page 71)

Additional representations received.

Joint response from Fleur Anderson MP and Stephen Hammond MP dated 01.08.2022

Officers acknowledge the joint response written by Fleur Anderson and Stephen Hammond objecting to the proposed development. The response is available to view on the Merton Planning Explorer via [this link](#). The response outlines the following:

- We both agree on the importance of protecting our local green spaces, responding to the climate emergency, and carefully and rigorously scrutinising all proposed developments that will impact the communities we represent.
- We therefore jointly object to the AELTC planning application for building an 8,000 seater stadium and 38 temporary use grass courts on Metropolitan Open Land. Local residents appreciate the existing world class sports event in our area, however there is strong local opposition to these plans. The new area of Wimbledon Park is a small part of the development which will not have any protection against future development and will be mainly closed to the public for at least 5 weeks each summer. The size and mass of the new show court stadium is of an inappropriate scale to be built on Metropolitan Open Land.
- We therefore request that when Merton and Wandsworth Councils considers the application, they hold a special full planning committee to discuss only this issue, and we urge both Councils to reject the proposal.

Additional response from Councillor Jill Hall dated 13.10.2023

An additional representation was received from Cllr Jill Hall. The full response is available to view on the Merton Planning Explorer via [this link](#). The response outlines issues raised at a meeting on 27th June. Concerns include:

- Concern regarding AELTC requesting people sign letters of support for the proposals.
- Concerns that AELTC have been telling attendees to tours that residents of Home Park Road are in favour of the development.
- Concerns AELTC have been saying the Angling Club are in favour of the development.
- Concerns the boardwalk would not fulfil the 1993 covenant obligation.

- Concerns of environmental damage relating to de-silting
- The views of David Dawson should be listened to.
- Ecological concerns relating to the provision of acid grassland
- Concerns regarding loss of trees
- Concerns the Show Court would be multi-use facility.
- Concerns regarding the AELTC Parkland, including siting of Central Grounds Maintenance Hub, event car parking, lack of public right of way.
- Concerns of lack of flood relief measures
- Concerns regarding the use of concrete across the site.
- Concerns that trees are already being cut down outside the permission.
- Additional concerns on trees including:
 - Net loss of biodiversity
 - Felling of trees contrary to NPPF
 - Loss of carbon storage
 - Resource of future veterans diminished due to loss of trees
 - Tree proposals fail to conserve or enhance the Lancelot Brown landscape.

MEMBER QUESTIONS

Q: The report mentions new public toilets for guests. As those toilet facilities would be in the park would they also be accessible to the public?

A: As noted on para 6.12.11 of the committee report, the application secures funding towards enhanced toilet facilities Wimbledon Park. These toilets would be publicly accessible (also see Head of Term 6). The proposal would also deliver additional toilet facilities for those visiting the tournament, but these would not be accessible to the wider public.

Q: Do alterations to the golf clubhouse form part of the planning application?

A: The proposed development does not comprise alterations to the golf clubhouse. However, the Section 106 agreement would secure community uses in the Golf Club House in the future (see Head of Term 1, report page 289, agenda page 295). It is expected physical alterations to the golf clubhouse would be subject to a separate planning permission, at which point the proposals would be further assessed in respect adopted design policies. However, Officers note that condition 17 (report page 318, agenda page 324) secures details of how all publicly accessible areas of the clubhouse shall be in accordance with the Equality Act 2010, including access to and from Home Park.

Q: What's the difference between a veteran tree and the grading system?

A: A veteran tree is a particular category of tree which is identified because of its age, size and condition, is of exceptional biodiversity, cultural or heritage value. Separate from veteran tree identification is tree retention categorisation as dictated by relevant arboricultural guidance BS 5837 (2012). Tree surveys assess the quality of trees using different categories – A, B, C and U. It is likely that most veteran trees identified on-site are also category A trees.

Q: Could you confirm that the figure of 286 mature trees being felled is correct?

A: As set out on para 6.7.6 of the officer report, the number of trees being felled comprise 28 Category B trees, 252 Category C trees, and 16 Category U trees. In addition to the trees being removed, the proposals involve transplanting 18 existing trees within the site (these comprise of 2no A category, 5no B category, 11no C category).

Q: Would a changing places toilet be provided in the development?

A: As noted on para 6.14.25 of the officer report, under Building Regulations the development is required to provide a Changing Places facility. Changing places toilets are larger than standard accessible toilets with extra features and more space to meet these needs. They are generally designed for dependent use, for example with a carer. The Applicant's D&A statement notes the intention to provide this facility, but no specific location has been determined. As such Officers expect this would be provided in one of the Outline Development buildings to be assessed under Reserved Matters. It is reasonable to expect this would be provided in the Parkland Show Court.

In addition, as noted in para 6.12.11 of the officer report, the proposals would secure funding towards enhanced facilities in Wimbledon Park. This could comprise a changing places toilet.

Q: How has the contribution for off-site enhancements, such as toilets been calculated?

A: The contribution is based on estimated costs informed by consultation with Merton's Green Spaces team and informed by costings from the 2013 Wimbledon Park and Lake masterplan with inflation applied as appropriate.

Q: Has a balanced alternative been reviewed where the same benefits could be achieved with a smaller scale application?

A: The planning assessment is assessed on its merits based on that proposed. Alternatives have only been considered as necessary in relation to design policies and Environmental Impact Assessment. In terms of design, Officers outline the design options dismissed in on report page 127 (agenda page 132), para 6.3.75-6.3.60. In relation to Environmental Impact Assessment, reasonable alternatives considered by the Applicant are outlined on report page 254-255 (agenda page 260-261), paras 6.13.5-6.13.18.

Q: Did you assess alternative sites which let you to believe that this was the best site for development?

A: As noted above, the planning assessment includes consideration of design alternatives that were considered. Notably on report page 127 (agenda page 132), para 6.3.75-6.3.60, Officers outline reasons why particular alternative locations for the Parkland Show Court were dismissed.

Q: The report mentions tours for residents every 3 months. Is there a reason why they couldn't be more frequent?

A: As detailed on report page 289 (agenda page 295), the S106 would secure curated tours of the development site (see Head of Term 3). A tour strategy would be submitted to and approved by the Council detailing the frequency of tours. However, it has been agreed tours would run across one weekend every 3 months. Officers consider that this would allow for a reasonable number of tours to cater for demand in Boroughs of Wandsworth and Merton.

Q: The proposed AELTC Parkland will be 9.4 hectares in size which would be publicly accessible. How would the public accessibility compare to the existing site?

A: The existing site (excluding Wimbledon Park Lake and Church Road) has been used as private members golf course and therefore is not accessible to the public. When the golf course was in use, non-members were able to pay to play. Page 74 of the applicant's Planning Statement notes the green fee for Wimbledon Park Golf Club was £30-£40.

Q: The Merton Conservation Officer view is that the harm would be substantial, but the Planning Officers view is that it would be less than substantial. Is this a matter for committee member to consider?

A: The committee may consider this based on the information detailed in sub-section 6.4 of the Officer report. Officers have carefully considered the impact on heritage assets, including the impact on the Registered Park and Garden. Officers' judgement of less than substantial harm (upper half) takes into consideration all the relevant historic information, including statutory consultee feedback from Historic England, feedback from the Council's Conservation Officer and evidence within the applicant's Historic Environment Assessment.

Q: The public perception appears to be that there has always been access for the public and so there is a feeling that residents are losing access to what is considered a park, why is this?

A: Officers acknowledge there is concern regarding the principle of developing on designated open space and Metropolitan Open Land. However, in terms of public access, it is important to note that the existing site (excluding Wimbledon Park Lake and Church Road) has been used as private members golf course and therefore is not accessible to the public. It is important that a distinction is made between Wimbledon Park Registered Park and Garden and Council owned Wimbledon Park. The existing golf course does not form part of Wimbledon Park owned by the council but does form part of the Wimbledon Park Registered Park and Garden. The registered park and garden comprises area under both public and private ownership.

Q: In the Head of Terms and Conditions there are many examples of 'unless otherwise agreed with Merton'. What reassurances can we give residents that Merton and AELTC won't change their minds in the future?

A: Regarding Head of Terms, the caveat of unless otherwise agreed, is required in certain instances to allow flexibility to allow for actions to be, or not be, carried out in certain unforeseen circumstances. Regarding conditions, it should be noted that the

wording 'unless otherwise agreed' has been changed to "unless an appropriate application for alternative details is submitted to and approved by the local planning authority pursuant to this condition". Again this is to allow for flexibility should the applicant need to submit revised details in relation to a particular condition. This is common practice for a development of this complexity.

Q: The £8.6 million mentioned in the head of terms, does this have to be spent on Wimbledon Park?

A: The contribution would have to be sent on projects in council owned Wimbledon Park. As noted on report page 290 (agenda page 296), Head of Term 6 secures a contribution of **£8,620,440.88** to be used towards the delivery of a variety of works for the purpose of enhancing Wimbledon Park in heritage, recreational and amenity terms. These projects would be determined by the production of a plan for which is required under Head of Term 5. The projects identified are considered to pass the relevant legal tests for a section 106.

Q: Does the S106 agreement have to be the same for Merton and Wandsworth?

A: It is expected both London Borough of Wandsworth and London Borough of Merton will be a party to a joint Section 106 agreement. Within the Section 106 agreement, there can be obligations which apply specifically to a particular Borough and obligations which can apply to both.

Q: Has the proportion of jobs created locally been reviewed?

A: As noted on report page 296 (agenda page 302), the development would secure the submission of a local employment and training strategy (Head of Term 23) for the construction and operational phases of the development.

The strategy would need to be approved by the Council and would include a strategy for delivering jobs/training opportunities/apprenticeships to local people.

Q: Can you outline broadly the proposed open and close times every month of the year for the new park?

A: The daily opening and closing times for the AELTC Parkland would align with those in Council Owned Wimbledon Park. The agreed closure periods for AETLC Parkland are detailed on report page 298 (Agenda page 292) in Head of Term 8. This notes the AELTC Parkland shall be kept open for as much of the year as reasonably possible with access to parts of (or in some cases all of) the AELTC Parkland restricted during and for the purpose of The Championships and Qualifying Event in accordance with the following closure periods:

- Closure of parts of the AELTC Parkland from the date 4 weeks prior to the start of the Qualifying Event for a period of 3 weeks with an unobstructed public route for the general public across the AELTC Parkland from Church Road to Wimbledon Park.
- Full closure for a maximum of 1 week prior to the start of the Qualifying Event.
- Closure of parts of the AELTC Parkland during the Qualifying Event and The Championships, with an unobstructed access route for the general public across the AELTC Parkland from Church Road to Wimbledon Park.

- Full closure for a maximum period of 2 weeks following the conclusion of The Championship

Q: How will law and order be maintained in the new park?

A: The AELTC Parkland would be managed by AETLC, and it is reasonable to expect there would be informal day-to-day supervision by AELTC with criminal activity should it arise dealt with by the police. It is also reasonable to expect there would be coordination between Merton's Green Spaces team (and their contractors) and AELTC to deal with any incidents.

Q: The 2 months in which the public will be permitted to use 7 of the grass courts, what restrictions will there be on the use of these courts? Has the Community Use plan (6.12.15p243) yet been drafted or the contents agreed, and if so where do I find it? Will these courts be available to all the tennis playing public, or only those of a certain level of skill?

A: Please refer to para 6.12.14-15 on p.249 of the committee report and HOT 2 of the proposed S106 obligations at report page 289 (agenda page 295). Management and strategy for use of the courts to be set out in a plan for the Council to approve (prior to those courts coming into use). The courts will be available to community players of all standards as part of AELTC's community tennis programmes.

Q: The bookable space in the Golf Clubhouse, the AELTC curated space within the Golf Clubhouse and the additional bookable space in the Show Court (6.12.17, p243), is there agreement as to what the pricing/availability/booking arrangements will be, and if so where do I find this ? Is there anyway at this stage of ensuring wide public availability at a reasonable price, and that this would continue in perpetuity, or for at least 20 years from the site becoming operational?

A: Please refer to para 6.12.16 - 17 on p.243 (agenda page 249) of the committee report and HOT 1 of the proposed S106 obligations at p.289 (agenda page 295) of the committee report. HOT 1 explains that a strategy is to be submitted to and approved by the LPA which will set out the principles regarding booking, pricing, availability of spaces, who they will be available to and their management. Officers may refuse a submitted strategy should pricing and management of the space be unsuitable.

Q: The ticket revenue from the Qualifying matches being donated to the Wimbledon Foundation , this is described as "very likely to continue", (6.12.25, p244) is there anything that can be done to ensure that it does, or will this remain completely within the discretion of AELTC?

A: Please refer to para 6.12.22 to 6.12.23 on p.250 (agenda page 256) of the committee report HOT 28 on p.297 (agenda page 303) of the committee report. The commitment of donations from ticket proceeds from the Qualifying Competition does not form part of this planning application. It should be noted that any donation to the Wimbledon Foundation from Qualifying or Championships related activities are at the discretion of the AELTC and will change from year to year. Nevertheless, as part of the Qualifying Competition, the S106 obligations are proposed to include a commitment that the AELTC provides up to 1,000 tickets (free of charge) to local schools to come and enjoy the Qualifying Competition (see Head of Term 28).

Q: The “financial surplus” from the Championships (6.12.25, p244) donated to the LTA every year?

A: See the Economic, Social and Community Benefits Final Report (prepared by Quod) submitted in support of the application - [link](#). This notes that between 2015 and 2019 the LTA received £200 million as a result of The Championships.

Q: I do not understand the idea of AELTC being both the freeholder and the leaseholder of the land simultaneously, or have I misunderstood? Are there two different legal entities involved, or can a legal entity choose to own land in both capacities simultaneously?

A: The All England Lawn Tennis Ground Plc owns the freehold and leasehold of the site. In land law terms it is possible for the same entity to own the freehold and leasehold of the site. Please refer to paragraph para 1.4.2 of the Committee Report.

Q: Will the divided ownership (1.3.12, p20) referred to continue, or is that now at an end as the AELTC owns all the land both freehold and leasehold?

A: Case officers are not aware of The All England Lawn Tennis Ground Plc’s intentions as to its ownership of the site following the grant of permission. This is not considered by case officers to be relevant to the grant of planning permission. The divided ownership of the Registered Park and Garden as identified in para 1.3.12 of the Committee Report will continue following the grant of the permission.

Q: Re the issue over the covenants and the suggestion that it is likely that in this case that the interpretation and operation of the covenants as they affect the proposed development, would be resolved before the development proceeds (1.6.5, p23), could we require this? If not, is there not a real risk that deliverability will be thwarted or stopped part way?

A: It is not considered by officers to be appropriate or necessary in planning terms to require the covenant issue to be resolved prior to commencement of the development. Please refer to para 1.6.5 and 1.6.6 of the Committee Report.

Q: If full planning permission is granted in respect of the 38 courts, boardwalk, permissive park etc, is it possible to ensure that the ongoing commitments required under s.106 agreements remain enforceable in perpetuity, and if not, what is the maximum period during which AELTC can be held to their s.106 obligations?

A: The s.106 agreement will contain the relevant planning obligations and ensure that the obligations are suitably secured for the appropriate period in planning terms. Section 106 agreements run with the land and therefore will be enforceable against both the applicant as the current landowner and its successors in title. Please refer to the Heads of Terms: Summary of obligations for more detail as to obligations.

Q: Is there a way in which AELTC could be prevented from reducing public access to the permissive park in perpetuity, and if not what is the maximum period this can be protected and how? Would placing the land in trust to protect the public’s interest (if AELTC would agree to this) achieve this ? (6.4.186, p169)

A: The s.106 agreement will require The All England Lawn Tennis Ground Plc to deliver the AELTC Parkland (permissive park) prior to an agreed trigger and thereafter to maintain and manage the AELTC Parkland and provide public access in perpetuity (subject to some agreed exceptional circumstances in which access may be prevented in the short term). The All England Lawn Tennis Ground Plc will provide and implement a plan regarding this access to be agreed by the Council as local planning authority. Section 106 agreements run with the land and therefore will be enforceable against both the applicant as the current landowner and its successors in title. Officers have not explored placing the land in trust and this is not considered necessary or appropriate in planning terms.

Q: The Merton Conservation officer's view (6.4.40 p 145) is that the harm to the RPG would be "substantial". The officer's view (6.4.44p146 and throughout the reports) is that the harm would be "less than substantial, albeit in the upper half of the range". Is the level of harm a matter of judgment for the committee members?

A: The level of harm is a judgment for the decision maker acting in accordance with statutory and policy requirements. Officers have taken into account views of the Merton Conservation Officer and Historic England and the findings of the submitted Historic Environment Assessment in reaching the judgement of harm. Please refer to paragraphs sub-section 6.4 of the Committee Report for further detail on heritage.

Q: It is the officer's position (6.4.46 p146) that because the significance of the RPG has already been eroded significantly by landscaping associated with the golf course, that this makes further harm less significant rather than more. Is that the correct approach legally?

A: Paragraph 6.4.46 on of the Committee Report correctly applies the lawful approach with regards to the assessment of heritage harm.

Q: Is the officer correct that harm to heritage assets may be balanced against public benefits under the London Plan policy HC1 and Merton SPD DMD4 correct (6.4.133 p161)?

A: The Committee Report correctly applies the lawful approach with regards to the assessment of heritage harm and balancing public benefits against harm to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Please see paragraphs 6.4.133 and 6.17.50 on page 162-163 (agenda page 168-169). Please also refer to paras 6.17.44-6.17.51 on page 283 (agenda page 289).

Q: Is it possible to enforceably guarantee continuation of maintenance funding obligations under the s 106 agreement for as long as AELTC owns the site and if not how long would they be enforceable?

A: The s.106 agreement will contain maintenance and funding obligations where appropriate and ensure that they are suitably secured for the appropriate period in

planning terms. Section 106 agreements run with the land and therefore will be enforceable against both the applicant as the current landowner and its successors in title. Please refer to the Heads of Terms: Summary of obligations for more detail as to obligations.

Q: Looking at SPDM01 a)(p103) it is the view of the officer that exception b)(iii) applies, viz “the development is for alternative sports and recreational purposes, the need for which clearly outweigh the loss”. This is the replacement of active sporting opportunity (playing golf) available to the public, with spectator sport and supporting facilities. Is that a correct interpretation of SPDM01 a)?

A: Paragraphs 6.2.38 to 6.2.46 correctly apply the lawful approach with regards to the interpretation of SPDM01 and is supported by London Plan supporting paragraph 5.5.5 (see also the Merton Council Policy Officer’s consultation response at paragraph 6.2.65) on page 104-105 (agenda page 110-111).

Q: Looking at Merton’s SPP policy DM01 c)(iii) is the question as to whether the development meets the criteria that the character and function of leisure walks and green chains are preserved or enhanced, a matter of judgment for the committee?

A: The question as to whether the development meets the criteria that the character and function of leisure walks and green chains are preserved or enhanced is a judgment for the decision maker acting in accordance with statutory and policy requirements. Paragraphs 6.2.47 and 6.2.48 on page 105 (agenda page 111) set out the officer’s reasoning in this regard.

Q: Looking at Merton’s SPP DM01 c) (i) is it possible for the officer to say simultaneously that the proposals “do not harm the character, appearance or function of the open space” whilst at the same time conceding harm by loss of openness (as they do at 6.2.50, p104)?

A: Officers consider the proposal compliant with Merton SPP Policy DM01 (c) for the reasons set out in para 6.2.49 on page 105 (agenda page 111). Paragraphs 6.2.50 correctly applies the lawful approach with regards to the openness and harm of the MOL.

Q: The officer concedes that the Show Court will result in a loss of physical openness in contravention of London Plan G4 part B “Development should not result in the loss of protected open space”(6.2.50 p104). Is it permissible to give this little weight or ignore it on the basis that the proposed buildings are “ancillary to and intended to facilitate the proposed sporting and recreational use of the open space”? Is this a judgment for the committee to make ?

A: The question as to weight to be applied to the loss of protected open space is a judgment for the decision maker acting in accordance with statutory and policy requirements. Paragraphs 6.2.50 on page 105-106 (agenda page 111-112) sets out the officer’s reasoning in this regard. The impact on protected open space is not the same as loss as open space in planning terms.

Q: What is the approximate maturity, girth and size/height of the trees being felled?

A. Please refer to: 51365-TEP-XX-XX-RP-X-00001-S2-P01 Arboricultural Impact Assessment, where each tree is individually listed with the information requested. This is available to view on the Merton Planning Explorer via [this link](#).

Q: Of the replacement trees, how many of these will be “extra heavy, 14-16cm in girth”, and how many will be “heavy, 12-14cm” trees.

A: 500 trees will be planted as heavy standard or extra heavy standard throughout the parkland. The quantity of these trees that will be planted will be finalised at the detailed design in consultation with the Council (with details submitted to the Council under Conditions). This will be influenced by tree sourcing for the whole site - which can only commence post-planning.

Q: How mature are the proposed “heavy” and “extra heavy” trees, and how long will it take each to reach maturity and a comparable size and cover to those felled.

A: Different tree species grow at different speeds and all tree growth will be influenced by environmental conditions, for this reason it is not possible to provide a general average. However, the nursery industry average for a “heavy” or “extra heavy” standard ranges between 3.5m and 5m high. The age of these trees is likely to be 5 to 7 years. As an example, if a new “heavy standard” lime tree were planted it would probably take around 8-10 years to reach 9m.

Merton’s Tree Officer notes that:

“the design enables the vast majority of valuable trees to be retained unharmed”.
(Reference: Planning Committee report 6.7.14 p202 (agenda page208)).

“those trees offering the most habitat to a range of species (veterans, mature trees, native trees) are predominantly being retained, whilst those being removed are mostly trees offering the least habitat value (non natives and younger or semi-mature trees)”.
(Reference: Planning Committee report 6.7.15 p204 (agenda page 210)).

Q: What will be the approximate girth and height of the 1000 new two year old trees. How long will it take these trees to reach maturity and comparable size to those felled

A: They will be 0.8-1.5m high, depending on the species. At this size, the British Standard does not specify girth size. These will be planted at this size to create new woodland, according to best practice, as it is considered they will establish and mature more quickly. The time to reach maturity depends on the environmental conditions and species.

Q: Is the statement (6.3.55, p122) that the development has been designed to mainly remove elements that have poor value such as Leylandii hedging and U grade trees accurate, given the 286 Category B&C trees to be felled (and only 16 category U)?

A. Merton Tree Officer summary states:

“the design enables the vast majority of valuable trees to be retained unharmed”.
(Reference: Planning Committee report 6.7.13 p202 (agenda page 208)).

The scheme has sought to protect all veteran, ancient and A grade trees, most valuable on site, and minimise the removal of any B grade trees.

To clarify the definitions of the arboricultural gradings within the British Standard BS5837:2012 and NPPF, see below:

U grade: Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years.

C grade: Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm.

B grade: Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.

A grade: Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years.

Veteran: A tree which, because of its great age, size or condition is of exceptional value for wildlife, in the landscape, or culturally.

Q: How long will it take to achieve the “increase in canopy cover, amenity, tree species diversity and landscape quality” referred to at 6.7.19 (p205)

A: As part of the EIA/LVIA, this was considered at a point 15 years after completing the development (taking account of the establishment and maturation of any planting proposals).

By year 15 the residual landscape and visual effects of the scheme were all assessed by the applicant to be either neutral or beneficial (meaning this objective would have been achieved). Nevertheless, a number of visual benefits would be achieved prior to 15yrs, down to the retained trees and the rate of growth of certain trees/landscape elements.

The assessment findings are summarised in Chapter 11 of the ES (Table 11.6 and Table 11.7) and set out in full within the Detail Landscape Assessment Tables (Appendix 11.2) and Detailed Visual Assessment Tables (Appendix 11.3).

Q: Is there a calculation anywhere (and if so where) of the amount of carbon that will be released in consequence of the felling of the 296 trees and the amount of carbon absorption that will be lost in the time it takes the replacement trees to grow?

A: There is no policy requirement to provide this information as part of the planning application. The amount of carbon absorption can only be determined when the detailed planting age and species are known immediately prior to the implementation of each phase.

Q: How many vehicles will be housed in the Hub?

A: Officers are unable to confirm the exact number of vehicles at this stage. However, it's noted a Condition is proposed controlling times that vehicles can enter/exit the Grounds Maintenance Hub. See the Design & Access Statement and Updated Design Code – which explain the building design, size, and operation. The number of vehicles stored will depend upon the time of year, season, weather, and horticultural activities taking place on-site. Typically, activities are light from September/October onwards and will increase in the build up to The Championships.

Q: How often will maintenance vehicles leave and return to the hub each day?

A: A Condition is proposed controlling times that vehicles can enter/exit the Grounds Maintenance Hub and the access points are well screened (due to land level changes) from Home Park Road. The level of maintenance vehicle movements will depend upon the time of year, season, weather, and horticultural activities taking place on-site. Typically, activities are light from September/October onwards and will increase in the build up to The Championships.

Q: How much of an increase will this be on the level of activity from maintenance vehicles that has previously taken place for the Golf Club, and will there be a greater concentration of maintenance vehicles in the area of the CGMH than previously pertained, and if so by how much?

A: A Condition is proposed controlling times that vehicles can enter/exit the Grounds Maintenance Hub – please refer to proposed condition 64 on p 362 (agenda page 268) of the committee report. The golf course maintenance occurred throughout the year was more intensive. It is expected the most intensive horticultural activities in the future will take place during the grass court season (May until September), with some light maintenance to the parkland all year round. The existing golf course maintenance facility (located on the Lake edge) will be removed to enable the restoration and improvement of Wimbledon Park Lake.

Q: Re the future development of the main site (2.2.7, p29) how many courts will be removed and replaced by courts approved under this application, and where can I find this information?

A: Possible future works on the main site do not form part of the current planning application (see para 2.2.7, report page 29 (agenda page 35). However, the applicant have informed Officers that the previous AELTC Master Plan (2013) for the main site noted that the 18 Championships Courts on the main site was the minimum for accommodating The Championships. It also identified areas which experienced significant crowd congestion (particularly around the outside courts). The provision of additional Championships Courts would provide increased resilience and ease scheduling congestion (particularly during bad weather. It would also provide additional capacity to host (and expand) the junior and wheelchair tournaments. The proposed development would also allow the AELTC to consider options for improving spectator circulation on the main site (should this be required in the future).

Q: How much space will that free, and what will replace these courts?

A: This does not form part of this planning application. Please refer to see para 2.2.7, page 29 (agenda page 35) of the committee report, which explains that any alterations to facilities at the main grounds would be dealt with under separate planning permissions.

Q: What steps is AELTC intending to make to “improve circulation and spectator comfort” on the main site?

A: This does not form part of this planning application. Please refer to see para 2.2.7, page 29 (agenda page 35) of the committee report, which explains that any alterations to facilities at the main grounds would be dealt with under separate planning permissions.

Q: Do these involve increased hard standing or building, and if so has this been included in the analysis of the carbon and climate consequences of the scheme before the committee?

A: This does not form part of this planning application. Please refer to see para 2.2.7, page 29 (agenda page 35) of the committee report, which explains that any alterations to facilities at the main grounds would be dealt with under separate planning permissions.

Q: How long does the Roehampton Lease have to run, and how many courts does AELTC have use of there?

A: The Roehampton lease runs until 2036. There are currently 18 match courts and 8 practice courts at Roehampton. However, as noted on p 252 (agenda page 248), para 6.11.23-6.11.27 of the committee report, the Applicant's submissions outlines ways in which Roehampton does not provide adequate facilities for hosting the qualifying event.

Q: Has the AELTC discussed with the B of E extending the lease and entering into a co-maintenance agreement, or even taking control of the courts they currently use?

A: The applicant has informed Officers that the AELTC has no security of tenure beyond the current lease. However, in addition, as noted on p 252 (agenda page 248), para 6.11.23-6.11.27 of the committee report, the Applicant's submissions outlines ways in which Roehampton does not provide adequate facilities for hosting the qualifying event.

Q: How many years have the qualifying matches been held at Roehampton?

A: Since 1939 when the ladies' Qualifying matches were held there. After a pause during WWII, Qualifying resumed at Roehampton with both ladies' and gentlemen's matches played at the site.

Q: What protected species are there on site (pp5-9 Ch 12 ES).

A: The potential presence of protected species was considered as part of the baseline data collection and reporting, as part of the EIA. Protected species are discussed in detail in EIA Technical Appendix 12.1 Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey.

Where the potential for protected species to be present was identified, appropriate surveys were undertaken. These surveys are reported within the relevant EIA Technical Appendices 12.2-12.8.

Protected species confirmed within the Site are:

-various bat species

-various bird species

-badger

-European eel

Stag Beetles are also known to occur locally.

Q: What breeding, nesting and migratory birds are there on site (p188) Is it correct that there are 8 varieties of bat that live and feed on insects around the lake, and that the lake and environs attract a large number of bats.

A: Bird records and survey findings are detailed in EIA Technical Appendix 12.6: Breeding Birds Survey Baseline and EIA Technical Appendix 12.7: Wintering Birds Survey Baseline.

Bat survey findings are presented in detail in EIA Technical Appendix 12.2: Bat Survey Baseline. A total of 8 species of bat have been recorded within or close to the Site:

Common pipistrelle

Soprano pipistrelle

Nathusius' pipistrelle

Daubenton's bat

Noctule bat

Leisler's bat

Brown long-eared bat

Serotine (identified only through biological records search).

The lake and environs do provide optimal feeding habitat for several bat species. Bat survey findings are presented in detail in EIA Technical Appendix 12.2: Bat Survey Baseline.

Q: Has there been a bat survey, and if so where do I find it?

A: Bat survey methods and findings are detailed in the EIA Technical Appendix 12.2: Bat Survey Baseline.

Q: What will the effect be on the bat population of creating a boardwalk and reed beds where there is at present open water?

A: The boardwalk is not predicted to have any adverse effect on bats. Officers note the Applicant's submitted lighting strategy notes the boardwalk will remain unlit. As noted on page 195 (agenda page 201), para 6.6.49, the proposals are predicted to enhance the quality of habitats present for feeding and commuting bats. This includes creation of reedbed which is expected to increase the habitat niche diversity and associated invertebrate diversity of the lake. This will result in significant enhancements to the quality of foraging habitat for bat species.

Q: What estimate has been made (and where can I find it) of the impact of the boardwalk and human proximity to the bat community?

A: The proposed boardwalk and associated human use is not predicted to have an adverse impact on bats. It would not result in reductions in the extent and quality of foraging habitats (e.g., through lighting or loss of habitat), or through impacts to roosting sites.

Q: Given the propensity of Canada Geese to create guano in large quantities, and their presence in large numbers at the site, what steps would AELTC take to protect the manicured practice courts once operational?

A: Their presence is expected to reduce on site over time, due to the scheme creating a more structurally diverse habitat for a range of species. There is likely to be a reduction in geese numbers as the amount of mown grass within the scheme will be less, compared to the golf course layout, so in time, the site will become less attractive to them. A benefit will be improved water quality to the Lake through the release of less ammonia into the water system.

Q: So far as you are aware is it the intention of AELTC that these birds will be driven away, either through the construction process or, if necessary by other means? Could we condition specific protection measures to ensure that this does not happen (or include specific protection within the overarching CEMP-EMP)?

A: The proposals are not designed for the complete removal of Canada geese, nor is this intended. The proposals aim to provide a better balance at the Site to ensure that this non-native and (sometimes) problematic species does not continue to degrade habitats, which has been the case historically.

Q: I note that mitigation during the construction phase must ensure that no stage beetle habitats (eg dead wood stumps or log piles) are damaged during construction (p199). Given the amount of woodland which would be removed to permit the tennis courts to be built there is a real risk that stage beetle habitats would be damaged or destroyed in the process. In what way can this be mitigated against? If the builders encounter stag beetle habitats in their path, what will they do?

A: The presence of habitats of high value for stag beetle within the former golf course has been limited because golf course management has not retained the decaying deadwood that this species depends upon. Conversely, woodlands of value for this species are retained and protected through the proposed scheme design.

Q: At page 198 (6.6.67) the development is considered compliant with London Plan policy G6 “on the condition that bespoke agreements are put in place detailing how the proposed habitats will be managed to reach the target condition (over 30 years plus)”?

A: Correct, the management of habitats will be secured through the appropriate planning mechanisms. Please refer to conditions 28-32 on p. 333 (agenda p 339) which provide the principal mechanism for delivery and monitoring of ecology proposals.

Q: How long is the construction phase anticipated to last, and how long thereafter will it take to restore the damage done and achieve net BNG?

A: The applicant has submitted a [phasing diagram](#) with their proposals. However, final phasing would be determined once planning permission is granted (condition 3). However, the development will be phased so the majority of the landscape/ecology improvements would occur earlier (with the Parkland Show Court likely to be the final phase). The time taken to provide BNG is an inbuilt component of the Defra BNG Metric calculations – i.e. the DEFRA metric recognises that some habitats (i.e., woodland) will take longer to establish than others (e.g., grasslands).

Q: Somewhere I have heard the figure 60 years for the development to look like the CGIs presented. Is that realistic, and if not, what would be?

A: The Applicant has confirmed the proposed planting is shown at 20-30 years in the CGIs. However, it should be noted that proposals involve the retention and protection of

existing habitats of high value including woodlands and veteran trees (note: over 1,000 existing trees are retained within the site).

Q: There is mention more than once of intense landscape management by the Golf Club (p189 6.6.10) and elsewhere to the smooth topography. Would the officer agree that having been unused for 9 months the land is now fairly wild and very far from manicured?

A: The applicant has confirmed the Site remains a regularly managed landscape and the frequency of mowing has been relaxed to reflect that it is no longer in use as a golf course. However, many golf features (tees, bunkers, greens, undulating hazards) all remain and have not re-grown (due to the previous intensive management).

Q: How much permanent hard standing (6.3.57p122) will be added to the Permissive Park?

A: Officers advise to refer to agenda page 438-441 to see the general distribution of hard surfaces across the site. Officers also advise referring to the submitted Hard Landscape Plans submitted with the application for the general distribution of hard surfaces across the site. These are available to view via these links – [link 1](#), [link 2](#), [link 3](#), [link 4](#).

Q: What % of the 9.4 Ha of permissive park will be covered by hard standing, roads and paths, and maintenance buildings and Player Hubs?

A: Officers advise to refer to agenda page 438-441 to see the general distribution of hard surfaces across the site. Officers advise referring to the submitted Hard Landscape Plans submitted with the application for the general distribution of hard surfaces across the site. These are available to view via these links – [link 1](#), [link 2](#), [link 3](#), [link 4](#).

Q: Noting that the Northern Gateway will be closed to the public for 11 months of the year, what is the area of the Northern Gateway that will be closed?

A: To clarify, the northern gateway would not be accessible to the public.

Q: If it transpires that there are, or are likely to be archaeological remains under the site which would be substantially harmed or completely destroyed by the excavation work, what happens then?

A: As agreed with GLAAS/Historic England, the Applicant will maintain a watching brief during construction (which would include archaeological investigation works) and record any finds. This is secured via condition 18 (Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation). Condition 18 also secures details of public engagement to ensure any knowledge is appropriately shared with regard to archaeological findings of significance.

Q: How will construction, excavation and silt be transported from the site?

A: Construction logistics is considered in detail on report page 177 (agenda page 183), sub-section 6.5, paras 6.5.30 – 6.5.36. Officers note that Construction Traffic Routing is provided in the outline CLP. The primary route for construction vehicles is expected to be from the A3 in Wandsworth, following the A218 Buckhold Road, Granville Road and Wimbledon Park Road / Church Road. There would also be a secondary route via the

A219 and Wimbledon village which is expected to be used by a much smaller proportion of construction traffic.

The Council's Transport and Highways Officers consider the construction process can be managed effectively to avoid unacceptable or severe impacts on the highway network. This is subject to the development of a detailed Construction Logistics Plan for each phase, as well as a construction workforce travel plan which would be secured by condition (see conditions 20 and 21).

Construction vehicle routing will be agreed with the Council's and TfL and will prioritise the following:

- Using the Strategic Road Network and the TLRN as much as possible;
- Avoid using residential roads, particularly those with sensitive receptors such as schools, hospitals and community centres as far as practical; and
- Avoid school start/end times.

Q: Screening (p133) by vegetation. How many mature oaks would surround the Show Court, and how long after completion would it take for other "screening vegetation" to be planted and grow in situ?

A: Sub-section 6.3 of the committee report should be referred to for Officers consideration of the impacts on townscape and views. However, Officers note, the Show Court would be positioned within a ring of mature oak trees (all to be retained) with large canopies. These oak trees are shown on p 141 of the submitted arboricultural Impact Assessment which show the oak trees surrounding the Show Court. There are also other retained trees (and banks of trees) to the east and west of the proposed Show Court which provide additional screening. Please refer to the relevant soft landscaping plan ([link](#)) which shows the general distribution of trees surrounding the Show Court.

Q: If 14 tennis courts on the main site would be displaced by building the show court on the main site, could they be sited on the application site instead?

A: As noted above, the planning assessment includes consideration of design alternatives that were considered. Notably on report page 127 (agenda page 132), para 6.3.75-6.3.60, Officers outline reasons why particular alternative locations for the Parkland Show Court were dismissed. Notwithstanding this, Officer note it would not be possible to accommodate all displaced courts on the former golf course without significant (and in all likelihood unacceptable) impacts on trees, ecology and landscape features.

Q: How many tennis courts is the footprint of the Show Court equivalent to?

A: All courts on the former golf course have been spaced apart to provide appropriate space for trees, landscaping and to maintain the parkland setting. It is unlikely that more than 3 to 4 courts could be provided within the footprint of the Show Court having regard to these constraints. Officers note the Show Court provides other facilities so support the site (spectator/player facilities, toilets, food and drink, an energy centre, community space etc.) which need to be accommodated.

Q: Where do I find the October 2022 updates on Energy and Sustainability and Waste and Materials (no link on page 27)?

A: The ES addendum referred to in para 1.10.5 is uploaded to the Merton Planning Explorer and is available via [this link](#).

Q: Where do I find the Urban Greening update 22/9/23?

A: The update to Urban Greening Factor is referred to in the last bullet under para 1.10.7. It is available to view on the Merton Planning Explorer via [this link](#).

Q: Is the proposal for a Conservation Management Plan) (6.4.124, p159), which would be funded by AELTC and would establish “guidelines for any future development work within the RPG” an indication that AELTC consider there to be a possibility they will wish to develop the RPG further in the future?

A: The RPG includes Merton-owned Wimbledon Park and the Wimbledon Club (as well as the land owned by AELTC) – and this divided ownership has been identified by Historic England as one of the reasons for the At Risk status, as set out at para 6.4.18 on p.142 (agenda page 148) of the committee report. This plan will establish a set of principles to help ensure that any future works (including minor works and landscaping treatments) within the whole RPG follow a common set of design principles informed by the character/history of the site. This does not relate solely to the land owned by AELTC. As per paras 6.4.33 to 35 on p.145 of the committee report, Historic England has recognised that this plan (referred to as a landscape strategy in the Historic England response) would deliver heritage benefits that would meaningfully help to address the issues which have led to the RPG’s inclusion on the “Heritage at Risk” register.

Q: Is it correct that there will be a fence parallel to and beside the Ha-Ha, and if so what height will this be?

A: There would be a 1.2m high estate rail similar to that used in National Trust properties and typical of a historic ha-ha detail, located on top of the wall of the ha-ha. (Reference: to Design and Access Statement p341-344 for text and illustrations).

Q: Merton’s policy officer recommends that all the details pertaining to the new public park are confirmed through a formal agreement. Has this been done, even in outline, and if not can it be conditioned and be done before works begin?

A: Please refer to proposed HOT 8 for the S106 agreement on p.292 (agenda page 298) of the committee report, which states that a Public Access Plan will be submitted to Merton for its approval and, once approved, shall be implemented in perpetuity by AELTC subject to any subsequential changes which are approved by Merton. HOT 8 outline some matters which shall be detailed in the Public Access Plan. The reference to a “formal agreement” at para 6.2.64 on p.108 (agenda page 114) of the committee report is a reference to this “Public Access Plan”.

Q: Archaeological impact - What are the issues?

A: Please refer to sub-section 6.4 on heritage which covers Officer consideration of archaeological remains. The site overlaps with two designated Archaeological Priority Areas. These are defined areas by Historic England where evidence suggests there could be potential for new discoveries. The potential for archaeological remains does not

in itself prohibit development. However, planning policy (notably NPPF para 205) requires applicants to record the significance of any heritage assets that the development harms and make any evidence publicly accessible. For this application Officers have consulted Historic England's Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS). They have raised no objection to the proposed development subject to carrying out an appropriate Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation (WSI) and programme of public engagement. These requirements would be secured by condition - see condition 18.

Q: What buildings above 500m2 would be designed to BREEAM Excellent standard or higher?

A: Merton policy CS15 (f) requires all new non-domestic development over 500m2 to be built to BREEAM very good or higher. Exceeding, this policy requirement, the Parkland Show Court and Central Grounds Maintenance Hubs would be designed to BREEAM excellent or higher, each of which are over 500m2. This is secured by condition 43. It should be noted that does not mean the other buildings within the site would not be designed to high standards of sustainability. Indeed the S106 agreement (see Head of Term 21) to demonstrate by way of a final site wider energy strategy how the development as a whole has feasibly maximised carbon savings on-site.

Q: Who are the main users of the northern field in Wimbledon Park?

A: Officers have consulted Green Spaces to answer this question. The regular users of the northern playing field in Wimbledon Park include:

- Rugby Tots
- AFC Wimbledon
- PW Dons (football)
- Wimbledon Junior Park Run
- Little Kickers (football)
- LBM (Fireworks event; other events throughout the year)
- Hercules Wimbledon Athletics Club (road race events)
- The Oak Montessori (nursery)
- Ursuline Prep School
- St Cecilia's School

Officers note the proposals would secure money towards enhancing the Registered Park and Garden. An identified project includes improved drainage in the northern playing field estimated to cost £150,000.

Q: How will the ticketing work for the children community youth groups?

A: As set out on report page 297 (agenda page 303), Head of Term 28 sets out the principles for Qualifying tickets which would be secured through the Section 106.

- Not less than 1,000 tickets would be allocated to school children in Wandsworth and Merton.
- However, any residual tickets not taken up by schools would be made available to community youth groups with priority given to those in Merton in Wandsworth.

- A ticketing strategy would be secured by Section 106 Agreement which would set out further detail.

Q: Environmental statement sufficient - what does that mean? As in the word sufficient from the perspective of your report?

A: Report page 253 – page 263 (agenda page 259-263), sub-section 6.13 sets out Officers' consideration of the Environmental Impact Assessment.

The Environmental Statement is required under the Environmental the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011.

Under the EIA regulations, the planning authority should ensure when whether to grant planning permission for a project, which is likely to have significant effects on the environment, it does so in the full knowledge of the likely significant effects, and takes this into account in the decision making process.

Officers consider the Environmental Statement is suitably robust and acceptable to inform Officers decision making. Further the ES passes the legal tests for an ES.

Q: What inclusive design advice has the applicant received?

A: Inclusive design is considered on page 132 (agenda page 138), sub-section 6.3, para 6.3.100 in relation to design policies. Inclusive design is also considered on page 264-267 (agenda page 273), sub-section 6.14 in relation to the Equality Act 2010.

Officers have regard to feedback from the Council's Urban Design Officer who covers all design matters, and they raised no specific comment in respect of inclusive design. Notwithstanding, Officers have reviewed the proposals and consider them acceptable in respect of inclusive design in relation to design policies and in relation to the Equality Act 2010.

Please refer to the relevant sections of the report for detail. However, Officers note the vast majority of pathways would be wheelchair accessible. In a small number of locations, where changes in level are unable to meet the required accessible standards (due to site constraints), alternative access routes are offered in close proximity to these routes. The proposed satellite maintenance hubs all provide wheelchair accessible washrooms. Further, the player hubs, the Show Court and the Central Grounds Maintenance Hub (submitted in outline) would all be required to meet inclusive design policy under reserved matters applications.

Q: What is a green chain?

A: Merton Sites and Policies Plan defines Green Chains as areas of linked but separate open spaces and the footpaths between them. They are accessible to the public and provide way-marked paths and other pedestrian and cycle routes. Officers note that whilst the application site falls within an area designated as a green chain it does not align completely with this definition as the golf course is inaccessible to the public and does not provide way marked paths.

Q: Is the DRP advice worded correctly? Does the DRP designation come before or after the new grading? I think your quoting the new grading system. Did they really say go ahead - can you share their full advice please?

A: The DRP advice is worded correctly. It should be noted that DRP advice is carried out at pre-application stage. Therefore the DRP comments are made in respect of the information presented at DRP and not the full suite of information submitted under this planning application. Officers consulted the Urban Design Officer with regard to the definition of red, amber and green ratings. The Urban Design Officer informed that whilst there is no written criteria, DRP members tend to remind themselves of what they understand the criteria to be which is along the lines of that stated in the Officer report. The full DRP advice is available by the links provided in the Officer report. The DRPs carried out issued amber grading (i.e. issues remain to be addressed) on the basis of the concerns outlined in the summaries provided.

Q: What action has the applicant taken to address the DRP advice: 1 - justification of the show court, public access and activities outside and access to the part.

A: A key concern raised in the DRP was lack of clarity with regards to public access and access outside of the tournament period. DRP advice also noted that there needed to be a more thorough and balanced justification for the Show Court.

Officers consider that the planning application has provided an opportunity to provide clarity in respect of public access and uses outside the Championships, and justification for the Parkland Show Court. Clarity in terms of public access and uses outside the Championships are solidified through the Heads of Terms which have been agreed with the Applicant. The Heads of Terms establish the principles that would apply in respect of various community benefits, including the AELTC Parkland (i.e. publicly accessible park) and community access to grass tennis courts. With regard to justifying the need of the Parkland Show Court, and the development generally, this covered in more detail in sub-section 6.11 on Economy and Employment.

Q: What is the surface area taken up by difference surface materials e.g concrete etc?

A: The area covered different materials across the application site are set out in the Applicant's Urban Greening Factor calculations, which is available on the Merton Planning Explorer via [this link](#). Across the site there would be 67,600 m² of permeable paving, and 19,700 m² in relation to a total site area of 396,000 m². Officers advise referring to the submitted Hard Landscape Plans submitted with the application for the general distribution of hard surfaces across the site. These are available to view via these links – [link 1](#), [link 2](#), [link 3](#), [link 4](#).

Q: What is the process for informing the member of public regarding closures of the AELTC Parkland?

A: Officers consider it is reasonable to expect AELTC and/or Merton Council would advertise with signage at entrances to the AELTC Parkland in advance of closures. It is also expected that AELTC would advertise closures on the website, as they do so currently in respect of other works they carry out in the local area. Officers also note that AELTC update residents who are signed up to local updates through 'MyWimbledon'. Officers consider arrangements such as these would be dealt with outside the planning application.

Q: Why has the applicant not applied for full planning permission for the whole of the scheme?

A: Page 34 (agenda page 40), sub-section 2.3 of the committee report sets out the development proposals sought in outline.

Officers understand a key consideration in the applicant's decision to apply for certain elements of the proposed development in outline (i.e. Parkland Show Court, Player Hubs, and Central Grounds Maintenance Hub) is to allow detailed design to be finalised closer to the point of commencement. This allows the most up-to-date technologies to be integrated into the proposals.

As noted in para 2.3.3, although the application is in hybrid form, Officers are satisfied a robust assessment can be made as the Applicant has submitted a set of design guidelines and parameter plans which would need to be adhered to at Reserved Matters stage. This gives Officers a reasonable and acceptable level of certainty as to the final character of the outline proposals in terms of appearance, means of access, landscaping and scale.

Q: Where is in the plans any alterations to the club house and inclusive design/access?

A: The Section 106 agreement would secure community uses in the Golf Club House (see Head of Term 1, committee report page 289 (agenda page 295)), sub-section 7.2. It is expected that the physical alterations to the golf clubhouse would be subject to separate planning permission, at which point the proposals would be further assessed in respect of inclusive design. Nevertheless, for robustness, condition 17 (report page 318, agenda page 324) secures details of how all publicly accessible areas of the clubhouse shall be in accordance with the Equality Act 2010, including access to and from Home Park.

Q: Tunnelling used in the past (i.e. planning permission 11/p2864) what were the lessons and why discounted this time?

A: Officers note that a pedestrian tunnel was approved on AELTC's Main Grounds in 2012 between car park 3 and the millennium building beneath Somerset Road. Officers acknowledge there are some similarities in terms of rationale between this development and the tunnel proposed in respect of the Parkland Show Court. Notably, a tunnel would allow safe passage of staff, players and servicing without crossing the public highway (i.e. Church Road).

Details of the Parkland Show Court tunnel within the red line boundary would be provided under reserved matters applications for the Parkland Show Court. Details of the tunnel outside the red line i.e. within (AELTC's Main Grounds) would be subject to separate planning permissions.

As noted on page 133 (agenda page 133), sub-section 6.3, para 6.3.115, based on the findings of the submitted Basement Impact Assessment, Officers consider the principle of the proposed basements (including tunnel beneath Church Road) acceptable. Where potential impacts on surrounding structures and ground conditions are identified, there would be available means to mitigate impacts e.g. through appropriate excavation support and construction methodology. It's noted that further detailed basement impact assessment would be submitted at Reserved Matters stages at which point further assessment of impacts would be carried out by the Local Planning Authority.

Q: In respect of report Section 4 Consultation - What about individual consultations and right of responses? Has there not been more engagement that can be shared?

A: Officers consider Section 4 of the report provides a robust and proportionate overview of the consultation carried out by the Council, including outlining responses carried out in respect of the planning application, including responses. This section does not include consultation carried out by AELTC privately which falls outside the planning process, though AELTC's own consultation is acknowledged by Officers in sub-section 6.12, para 6.12.29 in relation to the Applicant's submitted Statement of Community Involvement.

Q: In respect of representations in respect of Environmental Impact Assessment on report page 55, has there been a breach?

A: Report page 253- 263 (agenda page 259-263), sub-section 6.13 sets out Officers' consideration of the Environmental Impact Assessment. Officers consider the submitted Environmental Statement acceptable and passes the relevant legal tests.

Q: In respect of representations relating to loss of golf course and loss of junior golf programme on report page 56, is this not a commercial decision? What powers do the Council have to compel land use if land is sold on?

A: Report page 56 (agenda page 62), para 4.5.142, Officers have acknowledged that some representations refer to a request to leave a piece of land available for the golf programme to continue.

The proposed development assessed does not involve retention of any golfing facility on-site and therefore no proposed golfing use is being considered by officers. The loss of the existing golfing use on-site is however considered in sub-section 6.2 and sub-section 6.17 of the officer report.

Q: What was the cost of the pay and play basis of membership at the existing Wimbledon Park Golf Club?

A: Page 74 of the applicant's Planning Statement sets out the green fees for Wimbledon Park Golf Club and other golf courses. The green fee is noted to be £30-£40.

Q: Are there any other examples of Very Special Circumstances in the Borough of Merton?

A: A good example of a planning application in the Borough involving Very Special Circumstances is planning application 16/P0882. This application was for a new leisure centre in Morden Park which would be inappropriate development in MOL. However, there were Very Special Circumstances to justify the development, which included economic, health, and social and cultural benefits relating to the provision of new leisure centre. Officers however caution against making comparisons with other developments given the unique nature of the proposals.

Q: What does restoration of veteran trees mean?

A: Report page 207, (agenda page 213), sub-section 6.7 covers Officers consideration of trees. Officers note 41 existing ancient and veteran trees on site would be retained. Further individual management plans and remediation work is proposed for each veteran tree (including ancient trees) to improve their long-term health. This would be

secured by condition by Officers (see condition 41 which secures a Veteran Tree Management Plan).

Q: What features have been made to make the Show Court discreet?

A: Sub-section 6.3 considers the impact of the Show Court in terms of Visual Impact and Townscape Character. In this assessment Officers note the Show Court has been designed to be as discreet as possible. In para 6.3.12, Officers note the Show Court would be positioned on a low point topographically helping to reduce its impact. Para 6.3.23 and Para 6.24 of the committee report goes into more detail on the impact of the development on views outlining holistically the impacts on views.

Q: What's the current plan for vehicle operations in respect of construction?

A: Construction logistics is considered in detail on report page 177 (agenda page 183), sub-section 6.5, paras 6.5.30 – 6.5.36. Officers note that Construction Traffic Routing is provided in the outline CLP. The primary route for construction vehicles is expected to be from the A3 in Wandsworth, following the A218 Buckhold Road, Granville Road and Wimbledon Park Road / Church Road. There would also be a secondary route via the A219 and Wimbledon village which is expected to be used by a much smaller proportion of construction traffic.

The Council's Transport and Highways Officers consider the construction process can be managed effectively to avoid unacceptable or severe impacts on the highway network. This is subject to the development of a detailed Construction Logistics Plan for each phase, as well as a construction workforce travel plan which would be secured by condition (see conditions 20 and 21).

Construction vehicle routing will be agreed with the Council's and TfL and will prioritise the following:

- Using the Strategic Road Network and the TLRN as much as possible;
- Avoid using residential roads, particularly those with sensitive receptors such as schools, hospitals and community centres as far as practical; and
- Avoid school start/end times.

Q: Why do officers feel construction noise is not an issue - what is the technical assessment?

A: Construction noise is a material planning consideration in the planning assessment.

As noted on report page 121 (agenda page 127), para 6.4.43, noise from construction is not considered to unacceptably impact neighbour amenity.

Construction noise and vibration is considered in detail in sub-section 6.10, para 6.10.19 - 6.10.22.

Sub-section 6.10 concludes that Officers consider the proposed development to be in accordance with relevant policies relating to noise and vibration subject to conditions and obligations.

Q: Do the proposals incorporate a Changing Places toilet? If so, where?

A: As noted in para 6.13.25, Officers expect a changing places toilet to be provided as part of the tournament facilities as is required under Building Regulations. The exact location of this facility would be confirmed under Reserved Matters, but it is likely that the facility would be provided in the Parkland Show Court.

Q: Wheelchair accessible - how compare existing site in Roehampton?

A: Officers are not able to comment on the existing accessibility provision at the Roehampton site as this information has not been provided as part of the planning submission.

Q: What has been the applicant response to the Urban Design Officers points of concern ?

A: The application proposals have not changed because of comments made by the Urban Design Officer. However, Officers have responded to the concerns raised by the Officer in Paras 6.3.127-6.3.132.

Q: How much of the park is mowed to unmowed compared with the golf club?

A: Officers do not have this information. However, the plan on agenda page 456 shows the intended distribution of where there will be longer grass across the development site. The plans show that there would be swathes of long meadow grass in northern parts of the site and areas of acid grassland in much of the AELTC Parkland to the south.

Q: Did Capability Brown intend a golf course on site?

A: The "Capability" Brown designed landscape pre-dates the use of the site as a golf course.

Q: How many EV car parking spaces are provided and what standard of charger.

A: Car Parking is detailed in sub-section 6.5. EV charging provision is set out in Para 6.5.52.

66 spaces are proposed to be retained in the golf clubhouse car park. Furthermore, 2 spaces would be provide in the Tea Lawn area.

It has been agreed with the Applicant that all retained parking spaces in the Home Park Road golf clubhouse car park shall provide active EV trickle charge point provision. The proposed bays close to the Tea Lawn and Parkland Show Court are also proposed to have EV provision. EV charging would be secured by Condition 27. Transport and Highway Officers raised the potential need for temporary EV infrastructure during the tournament period. Accordingly, details of temporary EV infrastructure would be secured by condition as necessary on annual basis (see condition 6).

Q: Has the applicant established a Geo fence to avoid issues of bikes being dumped in the area.

A: From on-site discussions with the Applicant, Officers understand that AELTC work with relevant e-bike providers such as Lime Bike during the Championships to ensure bikes are not left in unwanted locations. Officers note that during the Championships specific areas are allocated for cycle parking.

Q: Is there any mitigation to those paying for CPZ for a period?

A: Officers have considered the impact on nearby CPZs as a result of the development. Para 6.5.51 outlines the Council Transport and Highways Officers raised concern that there could be increased pressure on on-street car parking in the vicinity of the site. Therefore, an obligation is included within the Section 106 which requires the developer to fund a review of nearby CPZs and implementation of any further mitigation measures if required (see Head of Term 20). Mitigation could include increased restrictions to ensure pressure on parking is not increased.

Q: Examples of other cases or trees in the borough that have been removed.

A: Officers do not consider this question is relevant to the assessment of the planning application. However, it's noted that the policy tests set out in sub-section 6.7 may apply to other planning proposals in Merton which involve the loss of trees. However, Officers do not consider there to be another proposal in the Borough that is comparable to that proposed in respect of trees.

Q: What types of conditions are there to delivery ecological mitigation?

A: Please refer to sub-section 6.6, para 6.6.1 for conditions and obligations which would be imposed to deliver ecological mitigation and enhancement, including Biodiversity Net Gain

Q: How many trees are Brownian - how many of those being removed?

A: Officers do not have the exact number of trees of the site that are Brownian. Much of the designed landscape has been removed and replaced by planting associated with the golf course. However, Sub-section 6.4, para 6.4.27 outlines that there are 41 veteran and ancient trees, the majority are oak with several willow and one ash which are scattered to the south and west of the lake. Some of these trees match up with the alignment of the Great Avenue and appear to correspond to previous location of clumped trees planted by "Capability" Brown. All ancient and veteran trees would be retained as part of the proposals.

Q: What is BREEAM standard?

A: BREEAM stands for Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method. A BREEAM assessment uses recognised measures of performance, which are set against established benchmarks, to evaluate a building's specification, design, construction and use.

- Each BREEAM rating level broadly represents performance equivalent to:
- Outstanding: Less than top 1% of UK new non-domestic buildings (innovator)
- Excellent: Top 10% of UK new non-domestic buildings (best practice)
- Very Good: Top 25% of UK new non-domestic buildings (advanced good practice)
- Good: Top 50% of UK new non-domestic buildings (intermediate good practice)
- Pass: Top 75% of UK new non-domestic buildings (standard good practice).

Q: Estimated carbon of construction - what is being done to reduce this?

A: The applicant has submitted a Whole Life Carbon Assessment (WLCA) with their application - [link](#). The whole life carbon emissions of the development proposals are estimated to be ~148,106 t.CO_{2e}. 55% of these forecast emissions are attributed to

operational energy and water consumption, estimated over a 60-year period. The remaining 45% of emissions are attributable to embodied carbon. Of those embodied emissions, the Parkland Show Court is responsible for ~77% (50,540,422 kgCO_{2e}).

The WLCA outlines that a number of carbon reduction strategies have been integrated into the proposals such as:

- The design of the pathways were updated to save ~1,827 t.CO_{2e}.
- Rainwater will provide an average of 30%, 44% and 64% of the irrigation demands in the North, Central and Southern master plan zones respectively. An extensive sustainable urban drainage network will enable this. This will reduce demands on mains water networks and subsequently reduce carbon emissions by ~1,406kg.CO_{2e} over 60 years
- A feasibility study for a new heat network connecting the new Parkland Show Court to the existing AELTC site has been undertaken. The outcome of the study is a potential opportunity for a low-carbon heat network, using heat pumps, whilst phasing out the use of gas boilers, as detailed in the energy strategy. This will substantially reduce the demand for mains electricity or gas, resulting in reductions to overall site carbon emissions.

The WLCA notes that further opportunities to reduce carbon are being explored under detailed design stages in relation to key structures, such as reducing loads in the Parkland Show Court to require fewer materials and embodied carbon.

Separately, Officers note the concrete ring beams surrounding the courts have been reduced in size and would be pre-cast, which has reduced embodied carbon of the tennis courts.

Officers note condition 44 would require the applicant to submit updates to their whole life carbon assessment to demonstrate how they are adopting relevant carbon saving strategies within the outline structures, namely the Parkland Show Court, Player Hubs and Central Grounds Maintenance Hub.

Q: Why is no solar technology used in the development ?

A: Officers note solar technology was considered for the proposed satellite hubs (submitted in detail), however this technology was not deemed suitable due to the low energy demand of the hubs which is also seasonal and highly variable and they are physically remote from the main energy consuming centres of the AELTC. This assessment is set out in a design note submitted by the applicant – [see link](#). Outline structures (including the Parkland Show Court, player hubs and Central Grounds Maintenance Hubs) are still subject to detailed design under reserved matters and as such specific technologies would be confirmed for these buildings at a later stage.