2026 Tennis Annual General Meeting Minutes

Present
Ollie Golding (Tennis Chair)
John Sinik (Tennis Liaison Director)
Andy Gilbert
Emily Monson
Anastasia Rentouli
Jeorg Alting
Club Membership (full list at end of minutes)

In Attendance
Rhys Beecher (Chief Executive)
Micheal Hill (Chairman)
Dan Lott (Racquets Director)

1. Apologies
Bojan Jelovac

2. Tennis Committee update
OG welcomed newly elected Committee members Jorg and Bojan. He thanked Lorna and Mark for their contributions over the previous three years.

3. Reports

Tennis Chair's Report (OG)
OG reported an exceptionally successful year for tennis, with strong participation in junior and adult coaching and outstanding competitive results.

The men's and women's teams won their respective National League titles and National Premier League titles. Hosting the National Premier League Finals had showcased the Club's grass courts, and the Club hoped to host the event again in 2027. Success extended across the age groups, including national titles from under 8s through to over 40s, and the over 30s becoming European club champions.

Nik Snapes had received the LTA Paul Hutchins Award for Club league participation. Thanks were recorded to the captains, volunteers and parents supporting the teams.

Forty juniors had been selected for county squads, two programme graduates had moved to US tennis scholarships, three girls who began playing at the Club were ranked in the UK under 14 top ten, and two further players had achieved under 18 world rankings. Alison Taylor's LTA Performance Coach of the Year award was also recognised. OG highlighted the achievements of players with longstanding Club connections, including Hannah Klugman, Arthur, Henry Patten and Joe Salisbury. The opportunity for Members and juniors to train alongside and watch leading players remained a distinctive strength.

Growing demand, particularly at peak coaching times, continued to put pressure on court availability. New activities were increasingly being directed towards quieter periods, although this was more difficult for juniors.

The Committee supported the development of padel, while seeking evidence, consultation and a clear long-term strategy for significant changes to the estate. It wished to preserve premium grass courts wherever realistically possible and retain flexible groups of courts for member play, coaching, competition and major events. OG acknowledged that preserving the Club's heritage could also involve change.

Thanks were recorded to DL, the coaching team, team captains and Committee members.

Racquets Director's Report (DL)
The 125th anniversary programme had included an exhibition match, Pat Cash masterclass, LiveBall, Racquets Club Night and a Member guest day. DL reported strong Member involvement across the celebrations.
The Club hosted a Centenary Tennis Clubs international event in July for the over 40 and over 45 age groups. Barcelona narrowly defeated Roehampton 5–4.

LiveBall remained popular. A new 105 session, doubles clinics and flexible weekly coaching sessions had been introduced. Singles box leagues had been relaunched with clearer rules, alongside a new ladies' singles league. Club Championships, friendly fixtures and a new ball machine provided further playing opportunities.

The junior programme had added strength and conditioning, expanded match play and continued Thursday sessions, LTA competitions and performance camps. The one-day Junior Club Championships in June were a highlight. The longer-term ambition was to strengthen the beginner-to-performance pathway and achieve LTA under 10 performance recognition.

Repairs had been carried out to courts 7–10 and further work completed on the indoor courts. DL thanked Chris Hughes and the grounds team for the grass courts and their support for the anniversary events.

The winter airhalls were in place, providing ten indoor courts. A late cancellation and no-show fee had been introduced to encourage Members to release unused bookings. Its results would be reviewed at the end of the year.

Action - DL to review the late cancellation and no-show fee at the end of the year.
Priorities for 2027 were to develop the junior pathway, adult social and competitive tennis, and make the best use of the courts. DL thanked the staff, Committee, captains, grounds team and Members.

Chief Executive's Report (RB)
RB reported that the Indoor Golf Centre was due for handover in February 2027. Following his arrival in June, a new strategic planning cycle was being developed with the Board, sporting committees and Members.

The planning application for padel on tennis courts 4–6 had been submitted in August and remained under consideration. The Club's planning consultant was working with the Council's case officer.

The existing master plan was one option, rather than the only solution. The Board intended to address the consequences for tennis through a credible replacement plan within the Club's footprint. A Board working group had been established to assess financial, planning and operational feasibility and liaise with the sporting committees.

RB recognised Members' concerns about access, continuity of activity and the future of tennis. The process remained live, with further work required before developed proposals could be presented.

Action - RB / Board working group to continue assessing replacement tennis options and engage with the relevant sporting committees as the proposals develop.

Tennis Liaison Director's Report (JS)
JS acknowledged the strength of feeling about the future of tennis, padel and pickleball. He emphasised the Club's Member ownership and the need for the Board to listen to Members while balancing competing demands within a limited estate.

The Tennis Committee recognised demand for padel and pickleball but wished to understand both the financial cost and the effect on tennis provision. JS encouraged patience and constructive discussion.
Members were invited to contact JS directly, using the Membership directory, so he could represent their views to the Board.

4. Member questions and discussion

Heritage grass courts and year-round tennis provision
Members expressed strong concern about possible conversion of heritage grass courts 25–28. Their setting, history, character and value for major events were highlighted, together with the wider effect on the Club's green space and identity.

The Committee confirmed that an earlier Committee vote had unanimously opposed losing these courts. This represented the Committee's position; any estate decision remained for the Board.

Other Members prioritised year-round playing capacity, floodlit access and junior coaching. They supported replacing any lost all-weather courts and questioned whether the balance between seasonal grass and year-round provision remained appropriate.

The discussion recognised differing views within tennis itself. Annual utilisation figures alone would not capture the heritage and event value of grass courts, while seasonal access and court condition also needed consideration.
No decision was taken to convert the heritage grass courts. A suggested show of hands was challenged as unrepresentative of the wider membership; no formal vote result was recorded.

Padel demand, court numbers and utilisation data
Members asked what evidence supported five additional padel courts rather than a smaller or phased scheme. With the existing two courts retained, the proposal would provide seven in total.

Some Members reported being unable to book padel and playing elsewhere. It was noted that booking data might not capture unmet demand where Members had stopped trying to obtain courts. Members also asked about overlap between tennis and padel users, guest use, future growth and the effect of increased padel provision on tennis demand.

The Committee noted that DL and Nik had presented detailed MyCourts utilisation information. RB confirmed that utilisation data was discussed through the relevant sporting committees and forums. The numbers of unique tennis and padel players were not available at the meeting.

Members requested publication of current data and the assumptions informing the proposals. RB explained that financial, operational and planning feasibility needed to be developed alongside the data, with its interpretation explained transparently before further information was shared with Members.

Phasing was raised as a way of testing demand and limiting irreversible changes. RB said this also needed to be balanced against cost, repeated contractor access and prolonged disruption. No court number or phased approach was agreed.

Planning status, replacement courts and sequencing
RB clarified that the Board had authorised the padel planning application, rather than final implementation of the development. Planning consent would provide an option to proceed, without creating an obligation to build.

Members asked whether replacement courts would offer comparable all-weather and floodlit access. Courts 19–21 were discussed as a possible location. The feasibility of additional floodlights had not been established, and planning advice was being sought.

Members highlighted the risk of losing existing provision before replacement facilities were available. RB confirmed that operational impact, project sequencing, financial feasibility and planning constraints formed part of the work underway, including input from quantity surveying agencies and planning advisers.

No final replacement location, specification, cost or construction timetable was confirmed. No agreed alternative scheme was presented in the event that padel planning permission was refused.

Alternative locations and the wider estate
Members asked whether the whole estate was being assessed, including croquet lawns, the putting green, areas near the swimming pool, the Lime Tree Lawn, outdoor activity space and paved areas.

Suggestions included retaining one of tennis courts 4–6, relocating croquet to release existing floodlit space, and considering other locations for replacement all-weather courts. An airhall near the swimming pool was also raised. Planning restrictions mentioned during the discussion were not confirmed as definitive advice at the meeting.
The Committee stated that a broad range of options had been considered and that alternative locations remained under review. RB said the Property Development Committee would be involved in the wider estate strategy. Each option would need assessment for its impact on other sports and users.

The immediate task was to address tennis provision alongside the proposed padel development. A wider review over the following nine to twelve months would consider the Club's vision, identity and long-term use of the estate.
The existing padel courts were expected to remain in use for the foreseeable future, with no current plan to change them.

Rosslyn Park and neighbouring land
Members raised the possible opportunity presented by the marketing of the Bank of England sports ground and the Club's arrangements with Rosslyn Park. Additional land could ease pressure on existing facilities.

The Board acknowledged the potential opportunity, but explained that the arrangements were complex and the land was not currently available for the Club to use. No acquisition, release date or timetable was confirmed.

Member consultation, voting and communications
Members asked how views beyond those attending the AGM would be gathered. Several requested a membership vote on any proposal materially affecting the heritage courts or the Club's character and asked for online surveys and voting to support wider participation.

RB said that feasible options first needed to be developed with the sporting committees, supported by financial, operational and planning analysis. He acknowledged the case for consultation and a possible vote but did not commit to a particular process before that work was completed.

The discussion noted the Board's constitutional authority to make decisions and its responsibility to judge when to seek wider Member input. Previous consultation on the Indoor Golf Centre was cited. It was also stated that constitutional changes had enabled electronic voting and that a hybrid approach had already been used.

Any wider consultation would need to consider the whole membership, including Members using other sports and recreational facilities. The wording of any question would be important. Consultation and a formal vote were discussed, but no commitment to hold a vote, voting question or timetable was agreed.

RB supported greater digital participation while recognising the need to accommodate Members who preferred other methods.

Health Club and competing demands
Members asked whether future Health Club development, including outdoor pool and sunbathing space, would place further pressure on tennis facilities.

RB acknowledged that the Health Club required consideration within the long-term masterplan. Its use and development needs would be assessed alongside other sporting and recreational activities. The immediate focus remained tennis replacement provision associated with the proposed padel scheme. No Health Club expansion affecting tennis courts was approved at this meeting.

Padel and pickleball representation
RB confirmed that padel now had its own forum and no longer fell within the Tennis Committee's remit. Pickleball remained within the Committee's remit because it used tennis courts.

The pickleball representative highlighted the growing community, European and national success, and limited capacity. It was reported that pickleball often used quieter periods. The Committee recognised its growth and said it had accommodated requests for playing opportunities.

The long-term home of pickleball remained a question for the estate review. Members expressed differing views about the range of sports the Club could accommodate within its available space.

Grass-court events and member experience
Members suggested further elite tennis events to demonstrate the value of the grass courts and give Members opportunities to watch high-quality tennis.

The Committee supported exploring more events following the successful National Premier League Finals. It noted that the anniversary exhibition had originally been intended for grass before rain required an indoor move. Sponsorship and attendance were also raised as practical considerations.

No additional event or associated expenditure was approved.

Meeting ended at 8.34pm.

Pre meeting questions and comments

Questions from Teresa Orange:
Question 1:
'Re: Master Plan proposal to build over the grass courts next to the swimming pool. I would ask the Board to review this plan, and if they are set on pursuing it, please could they consult Members through a formal consultation, specifically referring to this issue? These iconic courts play an important part in maintaining The Roehampton Club as a centre of grass tennis excellence, and I believe that most Members would not want to lose them. It was interesting to see how popular they were during this hot summer, with players particularly appreciating the cool of the grass and the sun protection offered by the trees. They are also valued as a beautiful green space in an increasingly built up Club complex. It would be a great loss to the Club's landscape to lose them.'

The Master Plan is designed to consider the Club's long-term needs as a whole and provides a valuable framework for engaging the wider Membership in the discussion. While the current plan remains the latest version, it is appropriate to pause and review the options for the future.

At the same time, we need to address our existing commitments. The planning application for the proposed padel development has been submitted, and a Board working group has been established to consider the potential displacement of tennis from courts 4–6. The current Master Plan is one option, but not the only one. A full feasibility study will determine the most appropriate way forward, with the relevant Sporting Committees consulted to ensure full engagement.

Question 2:
'Re: the noise of the new Padel Tennis facility. I would like to know what they Board is doing to ensure that the sound of the new Padel Complex doesn't spread beyond it? Are we ensuring sufficient sound insulation? I would also like the Board to review whether we need five new courts? A smaller number would seem more proportionate. It would also

be quieter and take less space from the real tennis community. So I ask the Board to reconsider the number of Padel Courts being considered.'

The planning application has been submitted for five courts, but the feasibility of the development remains under review. While there is strong confidence that five courts is the right approach to future-proof the sport, the Board has not yet approved the development works.

To assess noise impact, the Club commissioned an independent specialist acoustic assessment of the proposed five-court scheme. This measured existing background noise at Roehampton Club, used recorded noise from padel play, and modelled all five courts operating simultaneously, with particular focus on the nearest noise-sensitive locations. The initial modelling showed that mitigation would be required. Acoustic barriers have therefore been incorporated into the proposal, and appropriate noise mitigation will form an integral part of the facility's design and operation.

Question 3:
'Re: a family / play facility alongside the pool. Please could the Board look to other locations to accommodate this? I am worried that increasing the facility for play and sunbathing, is going to make it impossible to swim in the outside pool. This was a problem this year. On hot days, there were so many people sunbathing by the pool, and just standing in it to cool off, that it was impossible to exercise in the pool. The pool staff often removed all lane swimming from the outside pool, and this was a problem for people who want to use the outdoor pool to swim. Above all, please could we develop the Club in a way that promotes sporting excellence, not our offering as a Club Med family resort?'

The purpose of considering improved family and play facilities is not to diminish the Club's sporting offer. Quite the opposite. An important part of the Master Plan is to consider how we can better organise the Club's facilities so that different types of member activity can coexist successfully, while protecting opportunities for Members who wish to train, exercise and participate in sport.

Our Health Club remains one of the most utilised facilities at the Club and therefore the proposed location of any enhanced family or play provision also needs to be considered carefully. This includes its relationship with the pool, the effect on surrounding sporting facilities and green space. These considerations will form part of the assessment before proposals are finalized.

Question from Hugo Orange:
'As a mid-twenty-year-old, there's no denying the rapid growth of padel as a sport, and it's a fun "leveller" for those new to racket sports. However, I think much of its rapid growth stems from its competitive socialising appeal which is a broader trend in society, and I suspect the novelty of the game may level off in the years ahead. By building only on courts 4 and 5, the club would retain the option to expand further if demand continues to grow.

*Are we sure there is sufficient **long-term demand** for seven padel courts at the club? Would it not be better to build two or three padel courts on courts 4 and 5 and retain tennis courts 6-10? With increasingly warm summers, this would also allow us to keep the grass courts and only lose two tennis courts.'*

We won't know the full extent of long-term demand until the additional padel courts are in place. However, we are aware that many Members are already playing padel elsewhere, having become frustrated with the difficulty of securing a court at Roehampton Club.

Looking at the current popularity and growth of padel in the surrounding area, we anticipate that all seven courts will be very busy during peak periods, much like our tennis courts.

While building fewer courts may appear to be a more cautious approach, the proposed development is designed to meet future demand and provide a long-term solution. From a planning and construction perspective, it also makes sense to deliver the additional courts and covered facilities as one project rather than potentially having to revisit the development in a few years' time.

We recognise the importance of retaining sufficient tennis provision, which is why finding an appropriate solution to replace the three all-weather tennis courts being lost remains a key priority.

Roehampton Club – Tennis Section Annual Meeting
Monday 11th November, 7pm – Garden Room

Attendees
Column 1

- Sunil Bhasin
- Stacey Pelley
- Rob Sadler
- Andrew Walley
- Charlie Classen
- Dan Pearson
- Frances Bowen-Rainer
- Andrew Monson
- Giles O'Flynn
- Ted Muxworthy
- Serena Norgren
- Harriet Jackson
- Lorna Bhasin
- Ruriah Fraser
- Anthea Sweet
- Rob Dickson
- David Struff
- Rob Leck
- Emma Harvey
- Tiff Fisher
- Huff Fisher
- Serna + Simon White
- Amber Dupont lion
- Chris Cowen
- Caroline Cramner
- Sarah Evans
- Nick Yates
- Richard Biem
- Paul and Irina Mattson
- Mikaela Parker
- Nicholas St John
- Dougall Williams
- Matthew Salisbury
- Patrick Evans
- Issy Orange