

## Survey:

What is your name? **Justin Mills**

What is your position (if applicable)? **Agent**

What is your organisation (if applicable)? **Amafhh Investments Limited (c/o Contour Planning)**

### 1. Which part of the Plan are you commenting on?

Policy:  Paragraph:  Table:  Map:

### 2. Do you consider the Plan is:

Legally compliant? Yes:  No:

Sound? Yes:  No:

### 3. If you believe the Plan to be unsound, is this because it is not:

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with national policy

### 4. Please give reasons for your objection or support:

- a) In relation to 'Intensifications and some co-location' the policy incorrectly uses the term 'employment floorspace' instead of 'industrial floorspace' (the latter being the terminology used in the draft London Plan). Accordingly, the policy is not in line with the draft London Plan's objectives (set out in Chapter 6, and in particular Policy E7). In this regard, the draft London Plan is very specific about what uses are considered to be 'industrial' (specified in Part A of Policy E4), whereas the introduction of the ambiguous term 'employment floorspace' (within draft Policy BEGA2) creates confusion in the policy framework.
- b) The policy incorrectly refers to the requirement for "a net increase in employment floorspace", which goes beyond the requirements of the draft London Plan (which seeks to ensure "no loss of industrial floorspace").
- c) The policy misses an opportunity to identify other uses which may be suitable in the Staples Corner SIL (as part of its mixed-use transformation).

5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound?

- a) The policy should be amended to replace reference to 'employment floorspace' with 'industrial floorspace'.
- b) Reference to "a net increase in employment floorspace" should be replaced with "no net loss of industrial floorspace".
- c) The list of suitable uses (as part of a mixed-use development) should be expanded beyond residential and employment uses to include religious and community uses, hotel and conference centre.

6. If your representation is seeking a change, do you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

7. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Since the Policy BE2 has a direct impact on the nature and scale of development which Amafhh Investments Ltd may be able to achieve at is Staples Corner site. Accordingly, the site owner wishes to orally present their case as to why the currently worded policy could affect the redevelopment potential of their property.

**If you would like to comment on additional policies, please fix another sheet to this.**

To ensure an effective and fair examination, it is important that the Inspector and all other participants in the examination process are able to know who has made representations on the plan. The LPA will therefore ensure that the names and addresses of those making representations can be made available and taken into account by the Inspector. The Council, its appointed Local Plan Programme Officer or the Planning Inspector appointed to undertake the Examination may also contact you regarding your response.

- Please indicate if you wish your personal data to be used for reasons other than identifying your representation and being contacted in relation to that representation.