Attachments

1. Attachment A: (Cost FOI)
2. Attachment B: TCMAC (Tooting Commons Management Advisory Committee) survey results full Nov 2021
3. Attachment C: Post Pandemic Green Urban Spaces
4. Attachment D: FOI regarding Flooding/Floodlights/Consultation
5. Attachment E: Wandsworth Times extract
6. Attachment F 2008 (Simon Grundy's extract re project first progressed)
7. Attachment G: 2008 local residents' objections
8. Attachment I: Lambeth Council letter and email thread.
9. Attachment K: Attachment K Map of Tooting Common and Car Parks
10. Attachment L: FOI regarding other areas considered
11. Attachment M: https://www.swlondoner.co.uk/news/24012022-putt-in-the-park-rejected-for-clapham-common web link
12. Attachment N: Reducing council tax
13. Attachment O: FOI developer engagement with community
14. Attachment P: Screenshot of objections

1. Introduction

1.1 My name is Simon King, and I am a Lambeth resident who lives within 0.1 mile of Tooting Common. I have lived here for over 7 years, and one of the best assets that we have in this area is our common. If you've never visited, you should. It's an absolutely wonderful open space that is enjoyed by residents, visitors, animals, wildlife and even migrating birds and geese.

1.2 I am saddened that we find ourselves here today. That elected representatives had so doggedly pushed a development that over 40 local residents have had to take this time to plead a case not to have a disruptive development put into an area where it is not supported. It's been a waste of Wandsworth Council's (WC) money, according to an FOI sent – 25k has been spent by Wandsworth Council on the promotion of this development – ***Attachment A,*** however, as I will demonstrate below, this information could well be incorrect as WC has not been completely forthcoming with providing accurate FOI information as required by law.

1.3 This obviously doesn't include the time and effort, mental stress and divisions this has caused in the community for over 15 years. There has been nothing spent on avoiding that by Wandsworth Council. There has been no meaningful engagement with Lambeth residents or Lambeth Council either. I wonder why, oh yes, they, along with a corporation, stand to profit from this quite handsomely for the next 25 years.

1.4 Over the past couple of years during the pandemic and associated lockdowns, all of us have re-evaluated what is important to us, and this includes an overwhelming support of having access to clean, open, outdoor green spaces. This can be confirmed by the Tooting Common Management (TCM) Survey which clearly demonstrates what local resident and users of the common value – which is the peace, tranquillity and green spaces of the common, not commercial ventures and the commercialisation of our beloved common, this has been included as '***Attachment B TCMAC survey results full Nov 2021'***. Also, '***Attachment C Post Pandemic Green Urban Spaces study'*** demonstrates the increased value placed on access to green space by residents.

1.5 The common, specifically the multi-use site which Wandsworth Council has mis-labelled as a football pitch is a valuable space to the community. During the winter months, when the entire area, including the field floods, this is the only dry area. We use this to bring our dogs to socialise with community members, children ride their bikes, people exercise and there are multitudes of other uses. However, this beneficial space to the community is being threatened, and has been for the best part of two decades. By what? Wandsworth Council. They are doggedly intent on selling this off to obtain profits for the council and a private company at any cost. This cannot happen. This cannot be the precedent set for all commons across London and the UK. That when a council gets a bad idea in its head, that staff will at any cost, pursue and effectively badger a community for decades to reach its goals of lining its bank account.

1.6 This space has become even more important during covid times and supports the publics' mental health and wellbeing.

1.7 This public space is extremely valuable to this community and this proposal will steal this way from public use. The local community, which is bounded on 2 of the 3 sides of the triangle is by Lambeth residents, have always voiced opposition to this project. They are trying to shoehorn in a commercial development in a small space that lacks clear facilities for parking and other infrastructure. It would also negatively affect the natural aesthetics of this part of common land. We need to be clear on this, it is common land, not WC's to do with what they want for a profit.

1.8 They are also distorting the facts within this application about the general flood mitigations and maintenance they should be undertaking each year to a commercial proposal. **Attachment D** is an FOI response to this question, and **Attachment E** is quotes from the Wandsworth Times from Cllr Steffi Sutters the spokesperson. They contradict each other. So, either the spokesperson got it wrong, or WC did not answer the FOI fully and truthfully and will need reported to ICO again. In effect, they are not fixing the flooding, but rather saying it'll be done once we get the profits for selling off the land for 25 years. This is outrageous. In fact, Wandsworth Council brags on their website – 'Attachment D Wandsworth Council web site link educing council tax: https://www.wandsworth.gov.uk/news/news-february-2022/wandsworth-residents-set-to-continue-to-pay-the-lowest-average-council-tax-in-the-country/ ', about them being them reducing council tax when most every other council raises it. That's fine. However, what is not fine is that if you reduce council tax, and then don't have money to fund your obligations as in performing the flood protection measures and mitigations on the entirety of this field, but rather linking it to a commercial proposal. The FOI response mentioned above, states that the last time maintenance and mitigations were performed was 2012/2013 - 10 years ago, 10 years! That correlates perfectly to the timeline in Simon Cooper Grundy's evidence that 2012 **(Attachment F)** was when this idea/project was first progressed which is also not true. Please see a link from 2008 **(Attachment G)** when local residents were trying to stop this development. This project has been wasting WC's staff's time and money since at least 2008. Where is that mentioned by WC in any of these applications? Where is mentioned that they have been trying to go against public opinion for that long? Where is it mentioned that they have never even considered another location on the common, ever. In over 15 years **(Attachment L)**? They don't. They also don't mention that in Simon Cooper Grundy's evidence, they cite the need for this facility from a 2013 survey and assessment, why aren't they using the most recent surveys that I've cited? The reason is, that people's views have changed, and it doesn't support their desired narrative, so they cite 10 year's old reports as their evidence. Where is the justification for that explained? It's not.

1.9 Consultation with Lambeth Residents and Council; In 2020 Lambeth Council wrote to Wandsworth Council to express their objection to the redevelopment of Tooting Triangle, included as **Attachment I Objection**

to_Tooting_Common_privatisation_to_planning_inspectorate_-7 Lambeth Council Attachment G Reference to 'upgrade of site' and email thread

1.10 Lambeth Council presented the results of the survey which was undertaken and only 3 were in favour of the redevelopment and 200 were against it, that's 98.5% opposed. A reasonable person would conclude that WC would then actively engage with Lambeth to understand the objections, and work to mitigate them. However, that didn't happen. WC did not even respond back to Lambeth Council. This is another clear demonstration of the public objecting to the development of Tooting Triangle, and WC ignoring contrary opinions.

1.11 I am also concerned about the misleading language that has been used in the application itself - https://www.wandsworth.gov.uk/tooting-triangle-sports-facilities/ – they refer to 'upgrading' a site, rather than 'redevelopment'. This implies that they are simply coming in and making everything nicer. This is a misrepresentation of the truth. They are planning a complete redevelopment of this area, commercialising it, not fully consulting upon the impacts with affected residents, and adding to noise/environment pollution, and all this against the backdrop of resident opposition. For what? MONEY.

1.12 There is also a misrepresentation of the common itself as a typical 'urban park'. This is also untrue, ask anyone who uses it.

1.13 There is a reference to 'not a blade of grass lost' inferring that there will be no impact. However, they do not reference the meters high fence, and daily floodlight use – which does not happen currently or for the past decades – or the fact the space that it inhabits will be inaccessible unless you pay. So, while the technicality of not losing green space, the public is losing the entire space currently free to use, that technically isn't green. This is phrased in this way to make people think nothing is lost, but that's simple a distortion of language.

1.14 This is just a few quick examples, but clearly demonstrates the lengths that this application has been 'massaged' to make it appear that it's harmless, that it won't disturb or hurt anything. That local residents that's been opposed to this for nearly 2 decades are just being NIMBYs. However, scratch the surface and the only thing that will rear its head is greed.

1.15 I asked myself, why would the council be doing this? Why would they be trying for nearly 2 decades to push this development in the Triangle without public support? I even thought, they must have fully considered all areas on Tooting Common, including the existing sports facilities and areas at the southern end of the common **(Attachment K).**

1.16 An FOI was requested **(Attachment L)** asking whether the existing sports sites, which includes 2 car parks, changing rooms, the lido, the tennis courts and the area of the common known for hosting weekend football games, was given consideration for the redevelopment. This could have plenty of space and is already in use. The answer was – no. They have not ever even considered a different site, even though this one has so much local opposition. They have instead doggedly pushed this application all the way to a public inquiry. They have inflicted this stress and division on our local community and didn't even think that they could have a site that would work better on the same common. The

question should be, why not? Anyone with even the most basic understanding of policy development or project management would know that you consider a variety of options, and you narrow your choices based on criteria that gives the best value for money, and the best outcomes overall. So, the question becomes why would they spend, by their own admission 25k to promote this one site, rather than trying to find an amicable solution or other suitable alternative on the same common? One could correlate, without any other evidence from WC to the contrary, that it could be that 2 sides of this disruptive venture will be Lambeth residents, not WC residents? Put the noise, disruption, pollution, and divisiveness into the area where the people don't vote for you, but where those people who do will benefit from the profits without having to suffer through this? Without an accurate explanation from them, this is a plausible conclusion, let's face it and be honest with everyone here today. Any type of project that an organisation, in this case WC, doggedly purse for 2 decades against public opinion and at their own constituent's expense, is a personal mission by someone in the council, and it's all political. Does this even need to happen? I say no, and I hope that this is the conclusion that you will also draw at the end of these proceedings.

I would like to outline some key objections in a little more detail:

2. Common Land and its potential commercialisation

2.1 To begin, I would like to start with something that is very important to me, and everyone here today. Regardless of if WC can lease off our common for their own profiteering, it's not right. Tooting Common is common land and it belongs to all the local residents and users of the common. This is not the property of Wandsworth Council, they manage it. It is not the property of this sports company that will profit for 25 years from it. It is not the property of any football team who has expressed interest in using the proposed facilities. It belongs to all of us. End of story. Therefore, they do not have the moral right to lease off our common as a commercial venture to simply profit from and subsidise their questionably low council tax rates.

2.2 The common is a public resource that must be managed in the interest of all its users and not as a financial asset for the council. WC are treating this as their property, and all of the local residents as an irritant to their plans. We are trying to protect our beautiful common, and WC don't care. They flippantly brush aside all of our concerns. What happens if we're right? Who will repair the detriment? Do we discuss it again in 25 years? This is completely unacceptable, and they should be ashamed for inflicting this emotional distress on the community for 15 years.

2.3 The proposed commercialisation of this part of the common will not financially benefit anyone in the borough of Lambeth which borders 2 of the 3 sides of Tooting Common Triangle. Lambeth residents will however feel the bulk of all the issues which will undoubtedly arise from this redevelopment.

2.4 The commercialisation of the Triangle, which is a large part of this part of the common, is not in keeping with the history and character of this area and its natural look and feel. This part of the common is quiet and is bordered very closely by houses and residential streets. However, all the issues we've highlighted are being brushed aside by WC and within Simon Cooper Grundy's evidence. They haven't even performed robust assessments, or fully answered concerns. It's appalling that a local council would be ignoring the wishes of a local community, so they can profit.

2.5 The granting of a 25-year lease to a private company sets a dangerous precedent. It will inevitably lead to further commercialisation of this and other commons across London and the whole of the UK. Who's to say that McDonalds shouldn't be put in the middle of the common? I mean, people get hungry, so why not? What's different from McDonalds and this facility? They both make profits, they both would be given a lease from WC, and they both don't belong on the common against public opinion.

2.6 The council are not only signing away access rights to this part of the common, but they are also signing away the rights of access for future generations with the first possible review date being October 1, 2038. Any issue, that was brushed aside with their paper-thin analysis, will also exist for 25 years for local residents. Oh well, it's mostly Lambeth, right?

2.7 Granting this 25-year lease leaves residents stuck with a commercial venture that doesn't have public support for a whole generation. Applying for a 25 lease is far too long and should be limited to a maximum of 1 year to start to review whether the effects on the community materialise. This could be extended to 5 years in order for the council and residents to further review any benefits and what negative impact this development has on local residents, taking into considering the impact on the environment, parking and loss of natural habitat. The council is applying for a 25-year lease because that provides them with money and the best return on investments for this corporation. They only view this proposal as a venture that will make them money. This is not in the public interest.

2.8 Put simply, this is common land, and it is not Wandsworth Council's to sell off, lease off or profit from in any way. They have the responsibility to look after this common land which should benefit every member of the public and local residents, providing them with unrestricted access to the whole common, whilst maintaining and enhancing its very natural feel and to help beautify its look and feel.

2.9 I do not believe that they can be trusted to do this with the evidence that they have been trying to push this forward since at least 2008. They are using council money to perpetuate a commercial venture against public opinion, and I think that this even should be escalated to the National Audit Office for a full investigation. Especially as they have given incomplete, and even distorted information to FOIs and having to be referred to ICO. Perhaps it's time to give Lambeth Council the responsibility to oversee Tooting Common as there are equal numbers of residents from each council bordering the common.

2.10 Lambeth Council recently relented to public opinion and rejected plans for commercialisation of Clapham Common. **Attachment M Lambeth reject Clapham Common crazy golf development: https://www.swlondoner.co.uk/news/24012022-putt-in-the-park-rejected-for-clapham-common**. This demonstrates that they listen to residents and wider public opinion and therefore, would be a better custodian for Tooting Common.

2.11 Why is Wandsworth Council pursuing this development in Tooting Common? Have they looked at alternative sites such as at Wandsworth Common for a huge floodlit football facility? There's plenty of space overlooking the common, just like Tooting Common. The answer is 'no'. Why? Could it be that Wandsworth Common is surrounded by Wandsworth residents who vote them in and out of office? You could draw this conclusion.

2.12 Would Wandsworth Council be fighting Wandsworth residents for 15 years to try and implement a development that doesn't have local public support? No, they wouldn't.

2.13 In my view, they have been relentlessly been trying to shoehorn this project into Tooting Common because it isn't surrounded by their residents and in their view won't affect them at the ballot box. However, they'll benefit from the profits, just not the headaches it'll cause.

2.14 Tooting Common is surrounded by at least 50% Lambeth residents and they want to dismiss our views and they certainly aren't interested in consulting with us to find mitigations.

2.15 However, our voices matter. We should have been robustly consulted and we object to this development. **Please see 'Attachment N Wandsworth Council web site link educing council tax: https://www.wandsworth.gov.uk/news/news-february-2022/wandsworth-residents-set-to-continue-to-pay-the-lowest-average-council-tax-in-the-country/**

3. Effect on natural environment

3.1 The common is a Site Of Importance for Nature Conservation. (SINC). https://enablelc.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/M124_TootingCommon.pdf

3.2 Four trees are to be felled North of the Boxing Club and the bushy area around them cleared. The mature oak trees along the edge of the pitch will be pruned and de-crowned because of the construction of the new fencing and lights. The value of mature trees and full crowns in terms of biodiversity habitat and carbon sequestration cannot be replaced by saplings (proposed mitigation by the developer) which currently struggle to survive in the drier seasons. New trees take decades to mature and we won't see the benefits of the replacement tree within our lifetime.

3.3 At a time of Climate Crisis and severe species loss this sort of intervention on free growing common land trees and tree groups is unjustifiable. We need to recreate more woodland area within Tooting Common. Why hasn't Wandsworth Council considered creating a new woodland area on this site, rather than developing is and barricading the public out of the area which is currently enjoyed freely?

3.4 How do these plans help to fulfil and further Net Zero objectives? There is no assessment of this within the application.

3.5 The floodlight assessment assumes the current floodlights are in constant use, as they would be under the developer, TFC's plans, every evening, 7 days a week.

3.6 I have personally only ever seen the lights on once in the last 7 years. They state in their evidence that they're on every Thursday. I can't say that's completely a distortion, but I can say that I walk my dog every day of the week, even at night, and I haven't noticed this taking place, if it does.

3.7 An FOI was sent to Wandsworth Council **Attachment D** regarding floodlighting' on 30 January 2022 asking them

"*when was the last time the floodlights were in use for the purpose of organised activity on the existing area? What was the purpose, and longevity of the lights being used? Where is the full explanation and impact assessment of light pollution on the common, given these floodlights have not been in use for years (probably close to a decade)? When did you consult Lambeth residents on this as we directly overlook this area? If you haven't, why not?".* WC missed the deadline which they are obliged to observe. When they did respond, the answer was not complete and a follow up FOI had to be sent.

3.8 The existing floodlights are not used and have not been for decades. Installing nine new floodlights that will be lit for approximately 35 hours a week after dusk will have a major impact on the environment for the users of Triangle Field, and for the wildlife in this area. Light and noise pollution from the floodlit pitches will adversely affect the whole of this unique area.

3.9 It is ludicrous to think that using floodlights in an area that has been dark for years will no affect wildlife or peoples enjoying of the area. This implies that light will not illuminate darkness, which we all know is ridiculous.

3.10 Has the applicant considered only operating in day light hours, or only between core hours to minimise the disruption to wildlife and the local residents? No, I am sure this isn't being considered as it affects profits.

3.11 Articles of effect to insects:
https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/nov/22/light-pollution-insect-apocalypse & https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/06/180619122456.htm

3.12 Bats are frequently seen in the area, but their habitat will not be compatible with new floodlights, which will be installed and in use seven nights a week for the majority of the year instead of the current one night. I have personally seen bats on a regular basis in the Tooting Common and adjoining areas.

3.13 The Bat Survey undertaken was conducted in March 2019, almost 20 months ago, and was only valid for 12 months, until March 2020. It was NOT valid when the application was passed by Wandsworth Planning committee. The Bat colonies will now be more established (possibly in trees earmarked for removal by TFC) and will certainly be affected by artificial light through the winter months, as will all the local wildlife.

3.14 Dark Skies: The Triangle Field is not bounded by roads and has very little light spill from artificial lights. After dusk it is so dark that you can barely see across it. This makes it a special area in London which ensures that it remains natural and safe for wildlife. This redevelopment will change this area for the next 25 years and beyond. It's a travesty that we're even having to debate such a clear point.

3.15 Instead of developing this area, has the council considered other options, such as creating a wildflower meadow? They've done this on Clapham Common. How about creating a woodland area, where children can go and learn about nature? Another option would be creating a wetland area to attract more wildlife (especially as they won't fix the flooding without the commercial venture attached)?

3.16 All this could be done which I am sure would have robust public support and would keep the common land common, with access to the public for free. It would also further Tooting Common's reputation as a special area full of woodland and wildlife.
This is how common land is intended. Their commercialising of common land only benefits the applicant and WC. It is not their land to profit from and fence off for their private gain.

Noise
3.17 The Triangle Field is the most quiet and secluded part of Tooting Bec Common. Honestly, if you haven't experienced this, you should go. It's special. It's why you have over 40 people here today trying to protect it. It's why 1000s of people have put in their opposition to this project on petitions and consultation responses.

3.18 The evidence from Simon Cooper Grundy has flippantly dismissed this in his evidence. The comments that train tracks run through the area is given as a reason to wave away the objections. The noise from several teams playing and training throughout the day and evening and constant changeovers will destroy the peace enjoyed and valued by residents and users of the common.

3.19 The applicant argues that there are trains running in this area already, so the noise from this development will not encroach on the residents. This is simply a ludicrous correlation. The trains do not run that frequently and they often run very slow as they are coming into and out of Balham train station, therefore not generating much noise at all. We should be looking at ways to reduce noise, not increase it under the guise of 'oh it won't matter that much'.

3.20 The impact of this development is not confined to the footprint but will affect the entire surrounding area. You can hear noise from the common many streets away. We are able to hear people having birthday parties and playing music. There has been no consultation with local Lambeth residents on how this noise would affect them. I live just off Sternhold Avenue, and every time there is an event on the common – even the touch rugby games that they allow to commercially pay to cordon off the entire triangle field for (separate issue) – we can hear it on our street. However, they seem to think that a commercial venture where all these footy pitches will be in constant use will have no impact. They didn't consult because they didn't want the answer.
Noise travels. Let's reduce it, not increase it.

3.21 The results of the TCMAC survey **'Attachment B TCMAC survey results full Nov 2021'** shows that the public love the open space, greenery and nature. Let's listen to the public and keep this area unfenced and free to use as common land, as it is intended.

3.22 Wandsworth Council by their own omission, recognise the special importance of Tooting Common: Description of Tooting Common by Wandsworth Borough Council: https://www.wandsworth.gov.uk/tootingcommon
"South-west London is well-provided with open common land dating back to mediaeval origins. The Commons today are protected by legislation over and above other public parks. They provide wide sweeps of natural landscape and amenity sports facilities. Tooting Common is a Site of Metropolitan Importance due to its stretches of acid grassland, and it is notable for the many large oak trees and historic avenues. Look for the London County Council boundary markers."

3.23This development goes against their own description and supposes belief.

https://www.wandsworth.gov.uk/tootingcommon/ "View the Tooting Common Management and Maintenance Plan"

"Wandsworth Council has won initial funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) for a project to explore the cultural and natural heritage of Tooting Common. The project – called the Tooting Common Heritage Project – involves restoring biodiversity and habitats, unravelling hidden history, conserving and restoring heritage features, teaching people

about the Common's rich past and biodiversity and providing new volunteering opportunities and skills that people can use in the future. Initial funding has been awarded to Wandsworth Council to develop these plans and to apply for a full grant in the coming years. The project is currently live and any thoughts and views regarding Tooting Common will be shared as new information becomes available”

4. Point three Failure to Adequately Consult the Public and Lambeth Residents

4.1 This development application is being made by WC on behalf of a large commercial operator of sports facilities whose identity is not revealed in the application. At every stage this developer has taken trouble to avoid engaging with the residents or the local community directly. Why is this? Why won't they ask the affected residents what they think directly? This was asked also in an FOI – **Attachment O** – and remains unanswered, it was also referred to ICO.

4.2 Just 34 households were notified in writing of the plans by Wandsworth Council when it considered the planning application - despite the fact that the scheme will impact upon tens of thousands of common users. Nb:
https://wandsworth.gov.uk/media/7672/appendix_4_1_planning_report.pdf

4.3 The council blatantly misled the Planning Inspectorate by vastly under-reporting the level of public concern. The hearing took place during the height of lock down. Its documents at the time stated there were only 172 objections against 252 supporting comments, however its own website recorded 1,033 objections against 419. This information was available on the website; however, it now cannot be located. **Attachment P** is an original screenshot that was taken from the website. The overwhelming majority of supportive comments coming as a result of two mass mailouts by the football club that stood to benefits, including instructions on how to make their comments. So why did it do this? Why does football team even get to have a say on what happens to our common? Much like WC, this land does not belong to them, it belongs to local residents and all users of the common. So why not ask everyone?

4.4 A letter was sent by Lambeth Council dated 13 December 2020 requesting that Wandsworth Council rejects the Tooting Common Triangle development. This letter states that out of 203 responses from a survey 200 residents objected to this development and only 3 supported it. As per the email thread between myself and Councillor Liz Atkins, Wandsworth Council did not respond to Lambeth Councils letter of objection.

4.5 Around 50% or more of Tooting Common is bordered by Lambeth Brough. The Lambeth residents have not been consulted. Why, when this development affects Lambeth residents too, we should be consulted, and our opinions should be valued and understood.
Why has Wandsworth Council failed to consult Lambeth residents? Well, they clearly aren't concerned because we don't elect their councillors and the only other reasons why you don't consult is perhaps they forgot (unlikely!!)? Or could it be you don't ask the questions which you don't want to hear the answers?

4.6 An FOI was sent to Wandsworth Council on 30 January 2022 asking them: *"What dates have you formally consulted Lambeth residents who live on 2 of the 3 sides of the top of the common and are affected by this proposal? If you haven't, why not? I request all associated documentation ".* We have still not received a full reply, this has been chased. Note in accordance with the ICO they have 30 days to reply, this has been breached (Attachment O). This matter is going to be reported to the ICO.

4.7 Why is WC having so much difficulty answering very clear questions? We know the answer, they haven't done it.

5. <u>Point four Parking in local area Wandsworth and Lambeth Boroughs</u>

5.1 Lambeth residents pay for controlled parking which only operates Monday-Friday between 10:00 – 12:00. This was implemented after years of campaigning and was ultimately approved to help with commuters parking in the neighbourhood to walk to Balham or Streatham Hill. What was not taken into account, as this is not a commercial area, the impact of having 100s of cars per day needing somewhere to park from this redevelopment of our common into a commercial venture for WC and the sports company. The redevelopment proposal will cause additional competition for parking in our area causing us direct and identifiable detriment.

5.2 An FOI was sent to Wandsworth Council on 30 January 2022, and they were asked: *"What formal impact assessment have you undertaken on pollution and parking effects on neighbouring Lambeth streets? When did you consult on this?"*

5.3 We have still not received a reply, this has been chased. The 30-day response timeframe has now been breached and will be reported to ICO.

5.4 On the application the applicant alludes to their potential customers using public transport; however, I do believe that many people, especially those taking children to the facility will end up driving. There is no assessment taking into account this outcome. Further, there is no assessment whatsoever to prove that their assumptions are valid, and the burden of proof lies with them. What happens if our streets are clogged? WC won't be bothered, it's Lambeth. WC residents won't be bothered, it's Lambeth. A very dismissive explanation was that our restrictions could be extended. Who pays for that? The applicant? Can we have that promise from WC and the corporate sports facility? All the signage will need changed, consultations ran and assessed.

5.5 For context, Cavendish, Fernlea and Sistova Roads have more robust parking restrictions (9-5:30) with paid tickets for parking – this is all WC. Or, people can turn the other direction which is all Lambeth, which have much less restrictions So where would you park? On the streets you pay? Or on the streets you don't? It's a justifiable conclusion that customers of the potential development will choose to park in the street adjacent to Tooting Common with lesser restrictions.

5.6 There has been no impact assessment on behalf of the residents who have less restrictive parking rules and there has been no provision being made for those residents to mitigate the increase traffic caused by this development.

6. Point five TCMAC Survey Results November 2021

6.1 In the absence of consultation made by the planning applicants – this survey is the only gauge of public opinion. The survey results demonstrates that in no way, local residents and users of the common support this redevelopment:

6.2 TCMAC have collated survey results and published them in November 2022. This was obtained by the via Facebook and also receive via email from one of their members.
Attachment B TCMAC survey results full Nov 2021

6.3 Key Findings:1005 responses received by 16 November

Positives

- ✓ 88% Desire for green and natural space
- ✓ 87% Like the peace and quiet

Negatives

- ✓ 59% Flooding
- ✓ 49% lack of toilets

What should be the top priority?

- ✓ Waterlogging of the common
- ✓ Improvement of paths
- ✓ Toilets

6.4. You can see by these results that people appreciate the natural open space and love the greenery. This development does not fit in with this feedback and does not consider recent public opinion. They are still citing a 2013 report.

6.5 Lambeth Council wrote to Wandsworth Council in November 2020 voicing their opposition to the redevelopment of Tooting Common **Attachment I Objection_to_Tooting_Common_privatisation_to_planning_inspectorate_- 7 Lambeth Council Attachment G Reference to 'upgrade of site' and email thread**

6.6 And again, to reiterate only 3 people who responded to their survey were in favour of this development and 200 stated that they were opposed.

6.7 Following an email to Councillor Liz Atkins she confirmed that she does not know of any response to these points made from Wandsworth Council **Attachment I Objection_to_Tooting_Common_privatisation_to_planning_inspectorate_-7 Lambeth Council Attachment G Reference to 'upgrade of site' and email thread**

6.8 At the bare minimum, a comprehensive survey should have been carried out by the applicants to gauge public opinion and understand the publics' recent opinions and priorities?

6.9 In my job, I run surveys and review the results. It is a fact that if you are undertaking a survey to gauge public opinion on a controversial topic, you need a wide-ranging survey with feedback from as many stakeholders as possible to get a clear view of opinion. Surely, a robust consultation like this should have taken place, to engage with all of the local residents, from the boroughs of both Wandsworth and Lambeth. To ensure you perform a robust consultation, the applicant should have consulted at least 5 roads deep on the whole circumference of Tooting Common. Why didn't they? They've known for 15 years that locals are opposed to this remember.

7. Concluding Remarks

7.1 I have discussed and raised a variety of issues here today. All of which have a common theme, this application has been progressed and constructed without due diligence. They have not consulted on the issues properly, they are relying on old surveys as current information, they are brushing aside very real and very concerning issues for local residents, and finally, they are doing this because of their own vested interests.

7.2 The common to me is beautiful. It's peaceful, it's green, there are birds of all sorts (including loads of parakeets) which I hear singing all day long when I walk my dog. I love sitting in the triangle field and admiring the beautiful trees, and watching all sorts of people using the common for whatever purpose serves them. It's truly special. And it's under threat.
The Parties – Wandsworth Council and Enable – who have brought us to this point today have the burden of proof on them to show that this proposal isn't damaging to our area – and they haven't. What has been shown is that even in Simon Cooper Grundy's evidence, they are touting this as no cost to their taxpayers, but they'll get a revenue stream for 25 years to subsidise their obligations. To these Parties I say, this is not your land! You administer it, that's it. You have no right, and it's despicable that you are trying to fence off part of a common for your own financial gain, and not the good of this community.

7.3 Finally, I implore you, reject this vitriolic, divisive proposal. Let our community heal and get on with our lives, and let us keep our common fully open to users. It would be an absolute travesty to set the precedent today that councils can sell off common land to fill their bank balances, and help themselves be re-elected.

7.4 Let's turn this into a woodland or wildflower meadow! Most importantly, they need to understand their place in the world, and realise OUR COMMON IS NOT FOR SALE!!!