

To: Jill Kingaby

02/04/2019

From: Mark Henderson for the Mayfair Forum

Cc Sean Walsh – WCC

Dear Ms Kingaby

Many thanks for your letter 20 March 2019, and for the opportunity for the Forum to respond. We have met as a Steering Group and discussed the matters you raised. Thank you first of all for your detailed consideration of the plan, and the work that has already gone into its examination.

We understand that you have now reached a position on the issues raised, and we are therefore only responding in case it is helpful to clarify your thinking.

In relation to MGS1, we would just reiterate that in our view the NPPF tests are all met by the proposed designation. A careful balance has been struck between commercial and residential needs. The Council's Central Activity Zone policies strongly reiterate the importance of green space within the busy and crowded commercial activity, and that the preservation of those spaces as open supports rather than detracts from the functioning of the CAZ as a whole.

We are not clear what is intended by the amendment: "Policy MGS3 should be modified so that reference to "Local Community Use" is omitted so that the policy is appropriate for the Core CAZ." This definition (as per the glossary) is important to the way the policy works, the way it implements the additional consultation feedback, and the way it addresses the careful balance which has been struck between commercial and recreational use of the squares in order to be in general conformity with City and London-wide planning policy.

In relation to Park Lane, perhaps to clarify. The three options have been amended as per the track change version of the Plan you most recently received. There is now only one option which would have minimal if any impact on the road network, as it results in the loss of no lanes to the road. It is perfectly possible to conceive of highways construction solutions which would not involve the net closure of lanes. The way in which Park Lane conflicts with several local, regional and national policies (as set out in the Plan) is generative of the need for transformation. The feedback from consultation, and subsequent feedback with our membership, indicates that this policy, of all policies, is a 'signature policy' that people identify with, understand, and want. The response from WCC, whilst we understand and respect the shortage of resource in the Council, that, in summary, 'it is too challenging', is not the legal test, but rather whether the policy is in general conformity. The Plan is a 20-year plan, and we see no reason why the transformational change could not occur within that timeframe, given the extent of private commercial interest in the scheme.

We would be very happy to discuss anything further, particularly if there was further clarification to be sought in respect of MGS3.

Best wishes, yours sincerely

Mark Henderson, Chairman, MNF