[redacted]WCC

From: [redacted]Hamilton, Charles [redacted]
Sent: 16 May 2018 12:55
To: Neighbourhood, Planning: WCC
Subject: Mayfair Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Sir/Madam,

In general I believe the proposed Mayfair Plan is positive, however, greater protection for the historic character of the area is necessary and should be introduced.

Councillors such as Robert Davis and Daniel Astaire have been far too cosy to the development industry for a number of years, which has left many negative marks on the urban landscape.

In Mayfair, the following caused significant loss of community assets:

- The demolition of 4 Audley Square (**15/02197/FULL**) as part of the Audley Square Car Park development, was a travesty. The only reason that it could have been countenanced, was because of the existing aesthetically inappropriate consents, granted by the Planning Committee.
- The excessive height at Finchatton's Grosvenor Square (**14/07424/FULL**), which is out of proportion to the rest of the development, and overwhelms the area.
- The enforcement of "on-site" Affordable Housing at British Land's Clarges St development **(13/04041/FULL),** when a contribution towards "off-site" housing, would have resulted in significantly more than 6 social rented units and 5 intermediate. What a waste of resources, when an equivalent sum of money could have housed double that number of people elsewhere in the borough.

These are just a few examples from the Mayfair area, but wider examples abound:

- The latest consent for 'Park Modern' (15/10671/FULL), which was opposed by every heritage group consulted.
- The 'Paddington Cube' scheme, which is completely disproportionate and out of character.
- The consent for the Eruv (16/04837/FULL), which impacted negatively on the public realm, and was designed to cater to a tiny community within the city giving. The borough has a policy on reducing unnecessary street clutter, which this contravenes.

Altogether, it is reasonable to concede development is necessary, but not if it comes at the cost of our heritage. The decisions taken already are irreversible, and the loss of assets, irrecoverable.

Further protection is needed.

Yours faithfully,

Charlie Hamilton