

Hyde Park Paddington

Note of Steering Group Meeting held on 14 July 2020, 2-3pm, via Zoom

Attendees:

Residential Members:

- Allen Zimble (Chairman)
- Andy Beverley
- Sally Martin
- Bernadette McKernan
- Sergio Chiquetto
- Rev'd Stephen Mason
- Sarah Clifford
- Matthew Lindsay
- Maria Parpou

Business Members:

- Ian Lush (Imperial Health Charity)
- Kay Buxton (The Paddington Partnership)
- Mark McKeown and Joanna Love (Church Commissioners)
- Chris Peers (Paddington BID) as nominated replacement by Vaughan Smith (Frontline Club)
- Isabel Turner (British Land)
- Will Clayton (PaddingtonNow BID)
- Mike Fairmaner (Marble Arch London)

Apologies Received:

- Andrew Scrivener (European Land)
- Paul Charalambous (Stylotel)

	Actions
1. Introductions and Apologies These were duly made and apologies noted.	
2. Minutes of last meeting and matters arising The minutes were agreed and there were no matters arising not covered by the agenda.	
3. Revised feasibility designs by WCC for Sussex Gardens and Burwood Place. MF presented the latest drawings from WCC for Burwood Place and Sussex Gardens. For Burwood Place, MF explained that the parklet that had previously been proposed and welcomed by the Group had proved too costly (at double the £30k budget) and so WCC had redesigned the scheme that now consisted of a metal bench, 3 large planters and a communal cycle pump and repair station which met the budget and the original ambitions set out in the CIL application. It was unclear whether the current cycle stands would need to be moved to accommodate the scheme. There was widespread disappointment at the revised scheme and concern that this represented poor value for money. The high level of WCC's costs in designing and managing the scheme was	

<p>questioned. MF explained that the SG had no choice but to use WCC to design and implement the scheme (as had been reiterated at last night's Forum of Forum meetings by Ezra Wallace of WCC) and so had no option but to accept these highway authority standard costs. AZ said at the very least could there be another bench, as with social distancing there needed to be more seating space. MM offered to donate three large pots of the same design that the Church Commissioners used on its estate and promised to send MF the details. MF to feedback to Susan Chon at WCC</p> <p>On Sussex Gardens, WCC had taken into account the Group's previous concerns and had revised the scheme accordingly. MM reminded MF on the need for a gap between the seat and the gardens, though AZ reported he had seen someone just climb over the fence without any assistance. MF explained that TfL was looking at removing the left hand slip lane on Edgware Road at this junction and this would give a bigger expanse of pavement and it was hoped to try and coordinate the works, although this depended on how quickly TfL could proceed with their plans. Either way the schemes will be integrated design wise, if not undertaken simultaneously.</p>	<p>MM</p> <p>MF</p>
<p>4. Hyde Park Estate Low Traffic Neighbourhood Proposals</p> <p>AZ presented a plan that WCC had drawn up for early ideas to create a low traffic neighbourhood for the estate. This divided the estate into three areas and stopped all vehicular traffic being able to move between each area. The purpose was to stop rat running through the estate, as drivers tried to avoid Bayswater Road and Edgware Road. Traffic analysis had shown much of the traffic on the estate was through traffic with at least half of the vehicles being taxis or private hire vehicles. AZ explained the measures would be brought in via an experimental traffic order and be temporary in the first instance. AZ was aware that some residents would be unhappy, but it was impossible to stop rat running and allow free vehicular movement for residents. The current status quo was simply not an option, something had to change.</p> <p>JL expressed concern that businesses had not been engaged in drawing up the proposals as they would impact on essential servicing for businesses and also remove passing vehicular trade that many businesses relied on. It was essential that businesses be consulted before any changes were introduced. SM expressed concern that the Royal Park's newly published Movement Strategy contained an action to close North Carriage Drive, and this could send more traffic through the estate. MP said that on a recent cycle ride down through Fulham and SW8 the traffic calming measures/cycling facilities had made it a very pleasant bike ride. AB said it was essential that the estate became a place people wanted to come to and visit, as much for businesses and residents, and with less traffic footfall should increase as it became an attractive destination – this offers real potential to transform the estate. Rev'd SM expressed concern that some elderly parishioners might not be able to drive to Church. Likewise the impact of the changes to the operating hours of the CCZ. CP expressed concerns that the proposals might push traffic into Praed Street which was in no position to accommodate any extra traffic.</p> <p>AZ said he fully understood all these concerns, but the traffic studies showed that 70-80% of the traffic in the estate was simply driving through the estate and this has to be addressed. There is an acceptance that this is complex, and that there are differences of opinion.</p>	
<p>5. Hospitality Sector Re-Opening</p> <p>KB presented the map of temporary road closures and interventions that WCC had agreed to enable cafes and restaurants etc to have extra seating to help in the recovery of the sector. For HPP this included Connaught Village, Paddington Central, Merchant</p>	

<p>Square and neighbouring Seymour Place. KB emphasised the need the support the sector, and that although premises might look busy with people sitting outside, they could be deserted inside.</p> <p>JL talked through the proposals in Connaught Village, centring on Porchester Place and Connaught Street/Le PQ corner. At Paddington Central IT explained that three new shared tables and chairs zones for F&B customers were being established, managed by the estate team. KB explained that at Merchant square each operator had dedicated additional external seating.</p> <p>AB promised to put something in the next HPEA newsletter to encourage members to eat out. KB said the most up to date information on premises re-opening was on the Paddington Partnership and Marble Arch BID websites, and promised to send the links to AB. CP said that Paddington BID was doing surveys of businesses to find out their re-opening and return to offices plans.</p> <p>IL mentioned some concerns about the barrier schemes limiting access for some users, with poor dropped kerb provision.</p>	<p>KB</p>
<p>6. Edgware Road Insight Study MF explained that the study was now out to tender with five sets of consultants with a tender return date of Monday 20 July, with interviews planned for the following week and appointment by 31 July.</p>	
<p>7. Proposed planning reforms MF explained that the Government was intent on changing the planning system to increase the number of homes being built and that a number of reforms were being considered. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permitted development rights for upward residential extensions – up to 2 storeys. This was due to come into force on 1 August 2020 but would have limited impact on the Form area because of exemptions for conservation areas and that it did not apply where the new building height would exceed 30 metres. • Proposing a new ‘commercial, business and services’ use class, combining commercial, retail and leisure use. This would remove all current A Use Class controls and beyond but not apply to pubs, theatres, community and education uses and there would be controls on hot food take-aways and betting shops. • Proposing permitted development rights to demolish commercial buildings and replace with residential. • Allow a wider range of commercial buildings to change to residential use without needing planning permission. <p>AZ expressed concerns on these changes and it was agreed to support WCC in any lobbying they would be doing to reduce the scope of these changes.</p>	
<p>8. Forum of Forums Feedback MF explained that the Westminster Neighbourhood Forum of Forms had met the previous evening for the first time since February and had a follow up discussion with Ezra Wallace from WCC following his presentation on CIL at the last meeting. Many of the actions/feedback presented then had not been undertaken because of Covid-19 but he agreed to chase them up. This included more transparency on CIL, a dedicated section on the WCC website on Neighbourhood Planning and CIL, and making it easier to apply for CIL funding and claim CIL monies when the work was not undertaken by WCC. On the City Plan, EW said that the Inspectors would hold virtual sitting sessions in the autumn and EW hoped the plan would be adopted by the end of winter. MF thought this</p>	

<p>was optimistic. Simon Birkett of Knightsbridge had given useful advice on planning for the neighbourhood plan referendum. There was general concern expressed at the meeting on WCC's lack of joined-upness on meeting their CO2 emission targets, including in the City Plan and climate change generally and their ambitions needed to be reflected better in their policy documents and actions. The next virtual meeting was scheduled for 14 September and AZ, KB and MF were all due to attend.</p>	
<p>9. Date of next meetings It was agreed to hold next meeting on Wednesday 23 September 2-3pm via Zoom.</p>	<p>KB</p>