



**Brent Local Plan**  
Examination Stage Proposed  
Modifications Representation Form

**Council  
Reference  
Number:  
38 a-b**

**Representations on the proposed modifications must be received by the Council by 5pm 19<sup>th</sup> August 2021.**

All the representations should be submitted to [planningstrategy@brent.gov.uk](mailto:planningstrategy@brent.gov.uk) or Paul Lewin, Planning Policy Team Leader, Brent Civic Centre, Engineer's Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ. Ideally provide your response in Word or similarly editable document formats. This will make it easier for us to summarise representations and speed up the process of reporting to the Inspectors.

**Data Protection**

The personal information you provide on this form will be processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and the Privacy and Electronic Communications (EC Directive) Regulations 2003. It may be used by the Council, the Planning Inspectors or the Local Plan Programme Officer to contact you, if necessary, regarding your submission. All representations including all accompanying personal data will be sent to the appointed Planning Inspectors undertaking the Local Plan examination. Please see the [Council's planning](#) and [Planning Inspectorate's](#) privacy notices

Your name, organisation name (if relevant) and comments will be made available for public inspection when displaying and reporting the outcome of the consultation. No other personal data will be displayed. No anonymous representations will be accepted.

If you consent the Council will place your details on our Planning Policy consultation database and inform you of any next stages in the Local Plan adoption process.

I wish / do not wish to be informed of the next stages, such as publication of the Inspectors recommendations or the adoption of the Local Plan - **delete as appropriate.**

If you consent, the Council will also retain your details to inform you of any further planning policy consultations, such as any review of the Local Plan, Community Infrastructure Levy, Supplementary Planning Documents, Article 4 Directions, conservation area/ other heritage asset reviews and neighbourhood planning.

I wish / do not wish to be informed of other planning policy consultations - **delete as appropriate.**

**Please sign and date this form.** Forms signed electronically or with typeset will be accepted.

**Declaration:**

**By completing and signing this form, I agree to the above use of data submitted in association with my representations.**

Signature:



Date:

12/08/2021

This form has two parts –

Part A – Personal Details: need only be completed once.

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

---

---

**Part A**

---

**1. Personal  
Details\***

*\*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation (if applicable) boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.*

**2. Agent's Details (if  
applicable)**

Title

First Name

Last

Job Title  
(where relevant)

Organisation  
(where relevant)

Address Line 1

Line 2

Line 3

Line 4

Post Code

Telephone  
Number

E-mail Address

(necessary to assist in communicating with you effectively and ensuring the examination process is not subject to delay)

---

---

**Part B 1 of 2 – Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

Name or Organisation:

3. To which proposed modification does this representation relate?

Modification Reference e.g. MM1

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.(2) Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please tick as appropriate

5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Please see supporting representation for full details.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

6. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 5 above. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

**“Local Employment Sites have an important role to play in ensuring that a range of employment premises are available to meet employment needs, including ensuring the need for additional industrial floorspace capacity is met in the borough. The council will require their retention and where possible their use for research and development, light industrial, general industrial or storage and distribution will be intensified. The Council will only allow the development of Local Employment Sites for non-employment uses where:**

**a) continued wholly employment use is unviable; or**

b) development increases the amount of workspace as well as retaining the existing employment use or provides that additional workspace as affordable studio, research and development, light industrial or general industrial workspace, with maker space in light industrial use prioritised to meet demand; or;

c) where the site has been allocated for residential or mixed-use development in the Local Plan.

Where criterion a) is being used to justify the release, the maximum viable replacement of the existing employment floorspace will be sought.

Where criterion b) applies, if within the existing or emerging creative clusters of Harlesden, Wembley Growth Area, Willesden Green, Alperton Growth Area, Kilburn, Kensal Green, Neasden, Queen's Park, Burnt Oak Colindale Growth Area, and Church End Growth Area, affordable workspace is to be provided on-site. Elsewhere, if affordable workspace is considered unlikely to successful, financial contributions will be secured to provide equivalent affordable workspace elsewhere."

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

**Please note** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions.

**After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspectors, based on the matters and issues they identify for examination.**

7. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.

8. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

In case the Local Planning Authority are unwilling to accept the suggested modification and raise issues in response that need to be addressed further.

**Please note** the Inspectors will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspectors have identified the matters and issues for examination.

**Part B 2 of 2 – Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

Name or Organisation:

3. To which proposed modification does this representation relate?

Modification Reference e.g. MM1

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.(2) Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please tick as appropriate

5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Please see supporting representation for full details.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

6. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 5 above. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

**“The premises west of Dalmeyer Road are a local employment site, and the east is designated as a Locally Significant Industrial Site (LSIS).**

**Redevelopment will be consistent with London Plan policy E7 and Brent Local Plan policy BE2 and BE3. It will be subject to a masterplan-led approach for the **whole Church End Growth Area.**”**

**(Deletion of the following text:**

**~~demonstrating comprehensive development overall industrial floorspace totalling the maximum viable that can be achieved from the existing local employment site, and from the LSIS a minimum 0.65 plot ratio or the existing industrial floorspace total, whichever is the greater.~~**

**“Piecemeal development which would prejudice the delivery of a comprehensive masterplan-led approach for the Church End Growth Area will not be permitted”**

(Deletion of the following text:

~~**Developments of non-industrial uses will not be permitted until the council has approved a masterplan, which shows how intensification / colocation will achieve an increase in industrial floorspace across the site.)**~~

***Please note*** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions.

***After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspectors, based on the matters and issues they identify for examination.***

7. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

**No**, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**Yes**, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.

8. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

In case the Local Planning Authority are unwilling to accept the suggested modification and raise issues in response that need to be addressed further.

***Please note*** the Inspectors will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspectors have identified the matters and issues for examination.



## **Guidance Note to Accompany Model Representation Form**

### **1. Introduction**

1.1. The Council has proposed modifications to the Brent Local Plan that it has been submitted for examination by the appointed Planning Inspectors. It is only the proposed modifications and associated documents that are subject to consultation. All previous representations received on the submitted Plan have been considered by the Inspectors as part of the examination process to date and do not need to be re-submitted, or additional points made on them. The *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004*, as amended, [PCPA] states that the purpose of the examination is to consider whether the plan complies with the relevant legal requirements, including the duty to co-operate, and is sound. The Inspectors will consider all representations on the plan that are made within specified consultation periods.

1.2. 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 of those making representations can be made available and taken into account by the Inspector.

### **2. Legal Compliance and Duty to Co-operate**

2.1. You should consider the following before making a representation on legal compliance:

- The plan should be included in the Council's current Local Development Scheme [LDS] and the key stages set out in the LDS should have been followed. The LDS is effectively a programme of work prepared by the Council, setting out the plans it proposes to produce. It will set out the key stages in the production of any plans which the Council proposes to bring forward for examination. If the plan is not in the current LDS it should not have been published for representations. The LDS should be on the Council's website and available at its main offices.
- The process of community involvement for the plan in question should be in general accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement [SCI]. The SCI sets out the Council's strategy for involving the community in the preparation and revision of plans and the consideration of planning applications.
- The Council is required to provide a Sustainability Appraisal [SA] report when it publishes a plan. This should identify the process by which SA has been carried out, and the baseline information used to inform the process and the outcomes of that process. SA is a tool for assessing the extent to which the plan, when judged against reasonable alternatives, will help to achieve relevant environmental, economic and social objectives.
- The plan should be in general conformity with the London Plan (formally known as the Spatial Development Strategy).
- The plan should comply with all other relevant requirements of the PCPA and the *Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012*, as amended [the Regulations].

2.3. You should consider the following before making a representation on compliance with the duty to co-operate:



- Section 33A of the PCPA requires the Council to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities and certain other bodies over strategic matters during the preparation of the plan. The Council will be expected to provide evidence of how they have complied with the duty.
- Non-compliance with the duty to co-operate cannot be rectified after the submission of the plan. Therefore, the Inspector has no power to recommend modifications in this regard. Where the duty has not been complied with, the Inspector cannot recommend adoption of the plan.

### 3. Soundness

3.1. The tests of soundness are set out in paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Plans are sound if they are:

- **Positively prepared** – providing a strategy which, as a minimum seeks to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs, and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring authorities is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- **Justified** – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;
- **Effective** - deliverable over the plan period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and
- **Consistent with national policy** – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF.

3.2. If you think the content of the plan is not sound because it does not include a policy on a particular issue, you should go through the following steps before making representations:

- Is the issue with which you are concerned already covered specifically by national planning policy or the London Plan?
- Is the issue with which you are concerned already covered by another policy in this plan?
- If the policy is not covered elsewhere, in what way is the plan unsound without the policy?
- If the plan is unsound without the policy, what should the policy say?

### 4. General advice

4.1. If you wish to make a representation seeking a modification to a plan or part of a plan you should set out clearly in what way you consider the plan or part of the plan is legally non-compliant or unsound, having regard as appropriate to the soundness criteria in paragraph 3.1 above. Your representation should be supported by evidence wherever possible. It will be helpful if you also say precisely how you think the plan should be modified.

4.2 You should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification. You

should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. Any further submissions after the plan has been submitted for examination may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies.

4.3. Where groups or individuals share a common view on the plan, it would be very helpful if they would make a single representation which represents that view, rather a large number of separate representations repeating the same points. In such cases the group should indicate how many people it is representing and how the representation has been authorised.

4.4. Please consider carefully how you would like your representation to be dealt with in the examination: whether you are content to rely on your written representation, or whether you wish to take part in hearing session(s). Only representors who are seeking a change to the plan have a right to be heard at the hearing session(s), if they so request. In considering this, please note that written and oral representations carry the same weight and will be given equal consideration in the examination process.

## Proposed Main Modifications Consultation

### Church End Growth Area Site Allocation BSSA1: Asiatic Carpets

### Statement on behalf of Kelaty Properties LLP

These Representations are submitted on behalf of Kelaty Properties LLP, freehold owners of a 2.3ha site (herein after referred to as the Asiatic Carpets site) that forms part of the BSSA1: Asiatic Carpets site allocation (which is the combination of the Asiatic Carpets and adjoining Cygnus Business Centre sites, hereinafter referred to as the Allocated Site).

This statement is submitted to directly address the Proposed Main Modifications and Additional Minor Modifications that were published by the Council on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2021.

We set out below the specific Proposed Main Modifications we consider to be unsound, the areas of conflict with the NPPF and our suggested further modifications below:

Modification	Chapter	Policy	Proposed Modification
MM109	6.4 Economy and Town Centre	BE3	<p>Amend and add new text to policy to read:</p> <p><u>Local Employment Sites have an important role to play in ensuring that a range of employment premises are available to meet employment needs, including ensuring the need for additional industrial floorspace capacity is met in the borough. The council will require their retention and where possible their use for research and development, light industrial, general industrial or storage and distribution will be intensified.</u> The Council will <u>only</u> allow the <del>release</del> <u>development of</u> Local Employment Sites <del>to</del> <u>for</u> non employment uses where:</p> <p>a) continued wholly employment use is unviable; or</p> <p>b) development increases the amount of workspace <u>as well as retaining the existing employment use or provides that additional workspace</u> as affordable <u>studio, research and development, light industrial or general industrial</u> workspace <del>in the B use class</del>, with maker space in light industrial use class B1(e) prioritised to meet demand.</p> <p><u>Where criterion a) is being used to justify the release, the maximum viable replacement of the existing employment floorspace will be sought.</u></p> <p><u>Where criterion b) applies, if within the existing or emerging creative clusters of Harlesden, Wembley Growth Area, Willesden Green, Alperton Growth Area, Kilburn, Kensal Green, Neasden, Queen’s Park, Burnt Oak Colindale Growth Area, and Church End Growth Area, affordable workspace is to be provided on-site. Elsewhere, if affordable workspace is considered unlikely to successful, financial contributions will be secured to provide equivalent affordable workspace elsewhere.</u></p> <p>Work-Live units will be acceptable where they are managed by an organisation committed to their use primarily for employment, as evidenced by a management plan. Loss of Work-Live units to residential will be resisted.</p>

The above modification is a substantial alteration to draft Policy BE3 contained within the regulation 19 draft Local Plan, in relation to the requirement for Local Employment Sites to retain existing industrial floorspace.

Whilst the explanatory text referenced the importance of retaining such sites, the Policy was clearly worded to allow the release of industrial floor space from the Asiatic Carpets Site where:

***“A development increases the amount of affordable workspace in the B use class, with maker space in use class B1(c) prioritised to meet demand.”***

In our previous representations to date, we have outlined our clients position relating to the use class of the Film Studios within their site and that this does not form an ‘industrial’ use. However the site also contains a number of B8 use elements that are approaching the end of their functional lifecycle and will require redevelopment in the near future.

Our representations to date have also addressed the deliverable development capacity for the Asiatic Carpets Site and how the proposed allocation BSSA1 in the draft Local Plan could be modified to further boost the supply of housing, in accordance with paragraph 60 of the NPPF.

In relation to the above modification MM109, we do not consider that this passes the test of soundness outlined in paragraph 35 of the NPPF for the following reasons:

- a) The modification is not justified, has not taken into account reasonable alternatives and is not based on proportionate evidence; and
- b) The modification is not consistent with national planning policy.

In summary, of our grounds for reaching the above conclusions, which are outlined in further detail below, are as follows:

- The draft Local Plan is committed to provide 0.6ha of employment land over the course of the next plan period;
- The Council’s submissions to date has advised that the designated employment sites can deliver up to approximately 50.5ha of employment land through Policy BE2, far exceeding the above Local Plan commitment;
- The Mayor was directed by the Secretary of State to remove the ‘no net loss’ policy relating to industrial floor space from the London Plan, before adoption;
- MM109 is not robustly evidenced or justified, as it is introducing a ‘no net loss’ policy to local employment sites, where the Council’s own evidence demonstrates it 0.6ha employment land commitment would be far exceeded through the designated industrial sites;
- An additional modification to MM109 is suggested to allow for the controlled release of Local Employment Sites through site allocations for residential and mixed-use development, so that this land can assist with significantly boosting housing land supply and meeting the Council’s identified housing need.

By way of brief background, modification MM108 states that the Council is committed to exceeding the additional 0.6 hectares of industrial floor space needed within the plan period.

In its response to the Inspectors' Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) for Matter 6, the Council outlined in detail in paragraphs 6.1.1 to 6.1.12 its grounds for concluding that the Local Plan needed to deliver only an additional 0.6ha of additional employment land over the plan period. This figure excludes the delivery of industrial floorspace within the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation boundaries, some of which forms part of LB Brent.

Therefore, the Council has identified that it only requires to add an additional 0.04ha of employment land to the supply for each year during the next 15 year plan period.

Paragraphs 6.2.4 to 6.2.6 of the Council's Matter 6 MIQ responses states that if all SIL and LSIS sites were intensified by the required plot ratio of 0.65, then this has the capacity to deliver up to approximately 49ha of additional industrial floorspace in the Borough. In addition, the review of the SIL and LSIS boundaries has resulted in an additional 1.49ha of industrial land. Therefore, through Policy BE2 alone, the Local Plan has as the capacity to deliver up to 50.5ha of additional industrial land within the plan period.

Whilst it is highly unlikely that all the designated industrial sites would come forward for redevelopment at a plot ratio of 0.65 (or the maximum viable, as the proposed modifications now require), the delivery of just 1.2% of the suggested capacity within the designated industrial sites over the 15 year plan period, it would provide in excess of the 0.6ha of industrial floor space required during the next plan period.

Based on the Council's own evidence, it is clear that even a pessimistic approach to the delivery of employment land and the effectiveness of Policy BE2, would ensure that well in excess of the Council's suggested employment land need could be accommodated within the designated employment sites. The quantity, size and range of these sites, would also provide a sufficient degree of choice and flexibility over unit sizes and rental prices.

Therefore, we consider that the evidence submitted to the examination in public has failed to justify MM109. This policy is now far more restrictive over the release of industrial floor space, than draft Policy BE3 from the regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.

Modification MM109 also has to be considered in the context of the London Plan. In his letter to the Mayor dated 13<sup>th</sup> March 2020, the Secretary of State directed that the London Plan be amended in relation to industrial land and noted the following:

***“Planning clearly requires a judgement to be made about how to use land most efficiently, enabling sufficient provision for housing, employment and amenity. The Inspectors considered your industrial land policies to be unrealistic; taking an over-restrictive stance to hinder Boroughs’ abilities to choose more optimal uses for industrial sites where housing is in high demand. I am directing you to take a more proportionate stance - removing the ‘no net loss’ requirement on existing industrial land sites whilst ensuring Boroughs bring new industrial land into the supply”***

MM109 is seeking for the Council to have the same ‘no net loss’ requirement to both designated industrial sites and also the non-designated industrial sites i.e. Local Employment Sites. The robust evidence submitted to the examination to date clearly demonstrates that the Council only needs to deliver an additional 0.6ha of employment land over the plan period. In addition, it considers that Policy BE2 has the capacity to deliver up to 50.5ha of employment land over the same plan period. Therefore, it cannot be justified to seek a

modification that introduces a 'no net loss' policy against all its non-designated industrial sites also, when the Secretary of State has already directed that such a policy should not be adopted across London in the London Plan, due to concerns about London meeting its housing need.

For the reasons outlined above, we consider that the proposed modification is not justified, is not based on proportionate evidence and has not considered reasonable alternatives. As such, the modification is not in accordance with paragraph 35 limb b) of the NPPF and cannot be considered sound.

As the Council will be required to achieve an increase of 0.6ha of employment floor space, we can understand that it might consider draft Policy BE3 from the Regulation 19 Local Plan to have a potential issue, due to the wide spread loss of employment floor space in Local Employment Sites, undermining the capacity gains made within the designated employment sites.

That said, we consider that it is a reasonable approach to allow for the selected redevelopment of employment land from proposed allocations, where this land could be put to more efficient use by significantly boosting the supply of housing in Brent, as required by Paragraph 60 of the NPPF.

Therefore, we would propose the following additional modification to MM109 as a reasonable alternative that should be taken into consideration, which would ensure a controlled release of some employment land within the Local Employment Sites for use as housing sites:

**“Local Employment Sites have an important role to play in ensuring that a range of employment premises are available to meet employment needs, including ensuring the need for additional industrial floorspace capacity is met in the borough. The council will require their retention and where possible their use for research and development, light industrial, general industrial or storage and distribution will be intensified. The Council will only allow the development of Local Employment Sites for non-employment uses where:**

**a) continued wholly employment use is unviable; or**

**b) development increases the amount of workspace as well as retaining the existing employment use or provides that additional workspace as affordable studio, research and development, light industrial or general industrial workspace, with maker space in light industrial use prioritised to meet demand; or;**

**c) where the site has been allocated for residential or mixed-use development in the Local Plan.**

**Where criterion a) is being used to justify the release, the maximum viable replacement of the existing employment floorspace will be sought.**

**Where criterion b) applies, if within the existing or emerging creative clusters of Harlesden, Wembley Growth Area, Willesden Green, Alperton Growth Area, Kilburn, Kensal Green, Neasden, Queen's Park, Burnt Oak Colindale Growth Area, and Church End Growth Area, affordable workspace is to be provided on-site. Elsewhere, if affordable workspace is considered unlikely to be successful, financial contributions will be secured to provide equivalent affordable workspace elsewhere.”**

Our previous representations have outlined our case in full as to how the existing plan is not sound in relation to allocation BSSA1 and proposed that a modification should be included to ensure best and most efficient use of the Asiatic Carpets site, which is the largest brownfield site within the Church End Growth Area.

Modification MM48 has also introduced additional modifications to Allocation BSSA1. We consider that elements of this modification are not sound, as they are either not justified, not clearly written or do not evidence how a decision maker should react to a development proposal.

The elements of MM48 that we do not consider to be sound, the suggested rectifying modification and the reason for our position on soundness are outlined in the table below:

Modification	Proposed Modification	Suggested Modification Amendment	Reason
MM48	<del>Whilst the west of the site was in 2011 allocated for mixed use light industrial/managed affordable workspace and residential, the e</del> <u>The premises west of Dalmeyer Road are a local employment site, and the east of this site all of this allocation is now designated as a Locally Significant Industrial Site (LSIS). Redevelopment will be consistent with London Plan policy E7 and Brent Local Plan policy BE2 and BE3. It will be subject to a masterplan-led approach, demonstrating comprehensive development will result in a net increase in employment overall industrial floorspace totalling the maximum viable that can be achieved from the existing local employment site, and from the LSIS a minimum 0.65 plot ratio or the existing industrial floorspace total, whichever is the greater.</u>	The premises west of Dalmeyer Road are a local employment site, and the east is designated as a Locally Significant Industrial Site (LSIS).  Redevelopment will be consistent with London Plan policy E7 and Brent Local Plan policy BE2 and BE3. It will be subject to a masterplan-led approach <b>for the whole Church End Growth Area.</b>	Our case above outlined an additional modification to MM109 to ensure that Policy BE3 can be considered sound.  The allocation wording through MM48 is not sufficiently precise to demonstrate how the proposals should be considered.  The wording does not clearly reflect how an application in the Asiatic Carpets site should be determined and the wording should merely refer the decision maker back to the relevant policies for consideration, rather than clumsily attempting to explain the requirements of these policies within the allocation text.  The allocation should also be clear that the masterplan refers to the masterplan for the Church End Growth Area, rather than an allocation wide masterplan.
MM48	<u>Developments of non-industrial uses will not be permitted until the council has approved a masterplan, which shows how intensification / colocation will achieve an increase in industrial floorspace across the site. Piecemeal development which would prejudice the delivery of a comprehensive masterplan will not be permitted</u>	Piecemeal development which would prejudice the delivery of a comprehensive masterplan- <b>led approach for the Church End Growth Area</b> will not be permitted	Without prejudice to our above comments as to the soundness of the MM109.  Policy BE3 as proposed by MM109, does not require the Asiatic Carpets Site to achieve an increase in industrial floor space. Therefore, the modification is not in accordance with MM109.  Furthermore, the modification prevents the mixed-use allocation from being delivered until the Council adopt a masterplan. Whilst our client has engaged and worked with the

Modification	Proposed Modification	Suggested Modification Amendment	Reason
			<p>Council on the masterplan to date, the publication of the masterplan falls beyond our client's ability to deliver.</p> <p>As such, it is unreasonable and un-evidenced for such wording to be included in the allocation, as it effectively prevents the site from boosting the housing supply, should a masterplan never be adopted by the Council.</p>