

To: Jill Kingaby

14/02/2019

From: Mark Henderson for the Mayfair Forum

Cc Sean Walsh – WCC

Dear Ms Kingaby

I write further to your letter of 24 August 2018 to Josephine Gay (now replaced by Sean Walsh who is copied) and I, and my provisional response of 3 September (attached as an appendix to this).

This letter is being submitted simultaneously with the Statement of Common Ground reached between the MNF and WCC on the MNP. We, and I believe WCC, are delighted that so much common ground has been reached, and that only a few final sticking points remain as represented by the SoCG, and the full text itself.

I address first the outstanding areas of disagreement as briefly outline in the SoCG.

Green Spaces

MGS3 has been one of the policies most discussed with WCC over the several years of drafting of the MNP. Up until the regulation 16 response, WCC and MNF had been working on detailed wording amendments to MGS3(i). This is evidenced by the exchanges of correspondence of which you are in possession. Additionally, WCC had been entertaining a memorandum of understanding with the MNF in relation to the ongoing use of the Squares the subject of the policy. In their regulation 16 response, WCC's position has hardened somewhat to rejecting the entirety of the policy. Discussions on the MoU have not been continued by WCC.

The MNF's position has been guided by the thoroughness of consultation on this very point – being the subject of questions in the full consultation, and of its own subsequent consultation to provide more detailed feedback on the issue. The result has if anything moved MNF much closer to WCC's desired outcome – most importantly, as far as WCC are concerned, the timeframes set out in MGS3(i)(C). We are disappointed therefore that on this issue, as we have moved to compromise with WCC in line with local feedback, WCC have hardened in their attitude to the proposed wording. The justification for the policy is fully ventilated in the reasoned justification passages, and in the referred to appendices.

For clarity and, in laymans terms: broadly, residents of Mayfair would like to have very few commercial events in the Squares; local businesses would like to see a limited number of events that would be complementary to their businesses – for instance the Art and Antiques fairs in Sept/Oct that attract an international audience who will patronise hotels, restaurants and local galleries. The compromise that is suggested in the Mayfair Plan is a carefully worked through solution to which both parties have agreed – after lengthy discussions and well documented consultations – which would also allow for contributions

towards the upkeep of these beautiful squares; but it seems Westminster would have no such limitations. We would strongly urge you to support this pragmatic – and, we believe, correct approach.

Park Lane

These policies have again been the subject of much discussion and amendments with WCC over several years – not simply as a result of the regulation 16 response. In fact, as can be seen from the marked-up version of the MNP, even though WCC's new position is to disagree with the entirety of the proposals, MNF have made further amendments to the policy to seek to address the comments made.

In relation to your queries raised in August 2018, there is not much more to say than that expressed in our initial response of 3 September. Liam Hennessey's proposals for Park Lane are in the public domain. The diagrams in the full version of the Plan have been prepared by architects and transport engineers. A full map of heritage assets will be commissioned and included in the Plan.

In relation to SEA, we can confirm both that the legal advice which the Inspector has seen in the exchange of correspondence between MNF and HE is the correct position, and also that WCC agree. The Park Lane policies are preliminary – to do with the gathering of funding for different proposals to be drawn up, and there are no set features which would merit a SEA at this stage. It is a classic situation to which the Supreme Court ruled in the HS2 challenge as referred to in our response to HE's consultation response, and remains the current state of the law..

The justification for the policies in existing policy and public consultation, their emergence and development, and the way they will be taken forward, are all dealt with in the text of the Plan and the appendices. In particular we would just draw attention here to TfL's comments in relation to the policies in the formal consultation responses, which comments emerged from meetings we had with TfL, alongside other meetings with public stakeholders such as WCC and the Royal Parks.

Further, we believe that it would be quite wrong from the perspective, again of both residents and businesses – the whole Mayfair Community - and those that visit it that the carbuncle that is Park Lane should not merit a mention in the Mayfair Plan when it quite clearly falls within the remit of the Forum – see map with 2014 application at <https://www.westminster.gov.uk/neighbourhood-forums>.

CIL/106

We have had further discussions with the Council on this issue, and reached widespread agreement throughout the document, other than how funding is to be sought in relation to Park Lane, policies with which WCC disagree for other reasons in addition. This, similarly, has been the subject of much discussion over the past 3-4 years.

In simple terms we seek to be consulted and not simply advised of plans for CIL and S106 funds and to be able to put forward proposals.

Other issues

Through discussion with WCC, amendments have been made to the Air Quality chapter, and Grosvenor's comments in relation to MR1.3 have also been discussed and agreed position reached.

If it would be helpful to have a fully illustrated version of the Plan, as opposed to the text only (with track changes), then we will seek to commission this; if possible, however, our preference would be to await expending that resource, until if and when the final text has been settled post-examination.

We look forward to hearing from you further in relation to the next stages of the examination.

Best wishes,

Mark Henderson, Chairman, MNF