

Hyde Park Paddington

Note of Steering Group Meeting held on 3 December 2019, 8.30 – 10:00 a.m.

British Land; York House, 45 Seymour Street, London W1 6BD

Attendees:

Residential Members:

- Allen Zimble
- Sally Martin
- Bernadette McKernan
- Rev'd Stephen Mason

Business Members:

- Paul Charalambous (Stylotel)
- Ian Lush (Imperial Health Charity)
- Isabel Turner (British Land)
- Kay Buxton (The Paddington Partnership)
- Laura Whyte (Church Commissioners)
- Mike Fairmaner (Marble Arch London)

Apologies:

- Nikhil Shah
- Sarah Clifford
- Sergio Chiquetto
- Andy Beverley
- Will Clayton (PaddingtonNow BID)
- Vaughan Smith (Frontline Club)
- Andrew Scrivener (European Land)
- Mathew Lindsay
- Mark McKeown

	Actions
1. Introductions and Apologies These were duly made, and apologies noted.	
2. Matters arising from Steering Group held on 7 November The minutes were agreed and all the matters arising had been dealt with or were covered by the agenda items.	
3. Feedback from General Meeting The General Meeting held for all members of the forum on 27 November had been well attended and there was some good debate around the presentations on the City Plan, CIL and Praed Street. The point AZ had made about residents needing to	

<p>use local shops to keep them was acknowledged. The potential for Seymour Leisure Centre to include a library as part of its refurbishment by the City Council was noted, as this could provide a community facility for the area, but was felt by residents that a more local solution within the Forum area was desirable.</p>	
<p>4. Constitution Changes</p> <p>The current constitution allowed for no changes of representatives from the business organisations that meant on occasions businesses were not represented. KB proposed a change to the constitution to allow for alternates. This was welcomed, and it was agreed all members would be allowed to nominate one named alternate member. This would be proposed in time to be voted on at the next general meeting, scheduled for February, which would mean publicising the change at least 21 days before the meeting (i.e. by 15 January).</p>	KB
<p>5. Community Infrastructure Levy</p> <p>KB explained that she was due to meeting the City Council later that day to get information on progressing the CIL projects. KB noted that she and MF were due to attend a CIL session convened by WCC and the Planning Advisory Service whom had been commissioned by WCC to conduct a review into the Council’s expenditure of the Community Infrastructure Levy with a particular focus on transparency and the strategic nature of the approach adopted by the council. Both the strategic and neighbourhood portion of CIL are in scope of the review.</p>	
<p>6. Neighbourhood Planning Policy</p> <p>KB fed back from the walk about with WCC Neighbourhood Planning that had proved useful. The main focus of the plan on the three shopping streets was much better than trying to replicate the City Plan for the neighbourhood, and the specific policy areas for Praed Street flagged in the Colliers report was a very good starting point. However, we would need evidence to justify policies that were contrary to the approach of the City Plan.</p> <p>The Group discussed how the plan development could be resourced. KB reported that some neighbourhood CIL money would probably be available, and PBID and Marble Arch BID would both make some financial contributions, but other funding sources would be required. To begin with, Marble Arch BID would consider funding a study for Edgware Road similar to PBID’s Colliers study for Praed Street.</p> <p>SM welcomed the focus on the three shopping streets and stressed the importance of community engagement on the plan.</p> <p>Members of the Steering Group then reflected on ‘the goal’ for each of the areas. PC led the discussion on Praed Street, saying that we need to attract higher quality F&B operators to Praed Street. For Edgware Road the Forum felt the ‘vision’ has to be part of the brief for the evidence gathering study. KB added that this would need to be a cross-border CIL application, with Marylebone Forum.</p> <p>On Connaught Village, LW noted the success of Le Pain Quotidien that had required WCC to be flexible on its application of planning policy and there were instances of conservation policies inhibiting retail operations in a similar fashion to Praed Street. Links from CV to the Basin are not always evident, and people do not move naturally</p>	

<p>south from the Opportunity Area to Connaught Village. Further research into footfall and catchment area could be useful to form an evidence base.</p>	
<p>7. Priorities for future CIL applications</p> <p>There was debate over the need for a local community use and SM said that there might be scope at the Church given it had previously drawn up plans to create some useable space for a nursery school.</p> <p>KB stated how St Mary Magdalene church had been reinvented as a community hub but had taken several years. It was agreed that it might form a basis for a future CIL bid to fund a feasibility study, although KB explained that CIL was designed more for actual projects rather than studies, so some match funding might be required. SM agreed to dig out the plans.</p> <p>AZ reported the need to revisit Lancaster Gate to try and resolve traffic problems at the junction with Bayswater Road and SM to contact the Council to ask for the NRP traffic study report at the end of January. This project would not be ready for the next round of CIL applications.</p>	<p>SM</p> <p>SM</p>
<p>8. Date of next Steering Group and Public Meetings</p> <p>The date of the next Steering Group meeting was fixed for Thursday 9 January at 08:30 at 7 Praed Street.</p> <p>The date of the next Public Meeting which would be an AGM was fixed for Thursday 6 February, 6pm for 6:15 start at the VSC. KB to add to website and notify members of the date.</p>	<p>KB</p>