

Hyde Park Paddington

Note of Steering Group Meeting held on 23 September 2020, 2-3pm, via Zoom

Attendees:

Residential Members:

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

Business Members:

- Kay Buxton (The Paddington Partnership)
- Mark McKeown and Joanna Love (Church Commissioners)
- Chris Peers (Paddington BID) as nominated replacement by Will Clayton (PaddingtonNow BID)
- Isabel Turner (British Land)
- Andrew Scrivener (European Land)
- Mike Fairmaner (Marble Arch London)

Apologies Received:

- Maria Parpou
- Paul Charalambous (Stylotel)
- Ian Lush (Imperial Health Charity)
- Will Clayton (PaddingtonNow BID)
- Sergio Chiquetto
- Vaughan Smith (Frontline Club)

Guests: Sam Fox and Olivia Gannon from Pragma for item 3

	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. Edgware Road Insights Study KB introduced Sam Fox and Olivia Gannon from Pragma who had been appointed, along with Gerald Eve, to carry out the Edgware Road Insights Study that would provide the evidence and recommendations for policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.	

Sam Fox outlined their overall approach to this interesting study and presented some key questions that the study intended to do its best to answer, and these included:

- What is the quantum and nature of existing provision on Edgware Road?
- Who does it attract, from where and for what reasons?
- How is the addressable market augmented by office workers and tourists?
- How well does Edgware Road meet the needs of its audience and what are its strengths and weaknesses and areas of opportunity?
- What are the planning policies and recommendations that can be implemented to improve its performance and satisfaction with Edgware Rad?

The first stage was an on-street audit of all of the retail premises and uses open to the general public in the study area and this had been completed. This shows that the retail offer is led by services, with a limited provision of standard retail goods and a low representation of national multiples. Pragma were looking at dividing the area into distinctive zones to enable a more in-depth analysis. Pragma had also carried out a desk top analysis looking at who lived and worked within a 10 minute walk of Edgware Rd and this had found:

- 21,000 residents live within a 10 minute walk;
- 42% were aged 25-44 years old and are largely either pre-family or child free, with 75% characterised as affluent;
- By comparison, 113,000 workers are employed in the wider area, with 60% being office workers and 40 % non-office workers, primarily in accommodation and service roles;
- Visitors tended to stay in hotels or with friends, rather than be day visitors from elsewhere in London.

The intention now was to carry out on-line surveys amongst residents and workers to gain views on Edgware Road and then follow these up with some more in-depth interviews. Sam Fox then outlined the likely questions to be included in the residents' questionnaires which would seek to find out how often they visited the area, when and for what purpose and what they thought about it. This would be followed by more in-depth interviews with a representative sample of residents.

For workers, a similar process would be followed – an on-line questionnaire looking at how often staff visited Edgware Road and for what purpose, then in depth interviews with managers, including hotel staff, to find out detail such as key market areas .

There then followed questions/discussion. AZ noted the dominance of uses serving a particular group of customers. SC said that people from the rest of London did visit Edgware Road and primarily came by car. SM thought that a day-time survey would miss out on the evening activity as this period, especially 9pm -midnight, was often the busiest part of the day. Olivia Gannon clarified that the residents on-line survey was being finalized at the moment and KB would be circulating the link in early October. This would include a question asking residents if they wanted to take part in a more in-depth interview. KB asked for help in circulating the link to HPEA members and this was agreed.

KB/AZ/AB

KB confirmed that Marble Arch BD would be circulating the workers questionnaire to its businesses and hoped to arrange focus groups of local workers for more in-depth interviews. Pragma was also due to present to the BID's Hotels and Venues Group as a means to engage the hotels and follow this up with individual discussions to get information on where hotels guests mainly came from. It was acknowledged that visitors would be a difficult group to engage with. BMcK asked about taxi and bus drivers and Sam Fox said she would think about them.

KB/SF

<p>AB asked about the impact of Covid 19. Sam Fox explained that the study was using information prior to the pandemic but the study would look to assess the long-term implications of the virus.</p>	
<p>4. CIL Funded Projects: Burwood Place and Sussex Gardens</p> <p>Following the consideration of the feasibility designs earlier in the year, MF explained that WCC had carried out a stage 1 assessment for both schemes, which was an internal check with all relevant service departments, and this had not resulted in any major issues arising.</p> <p>For Burwood place, work would now begin on Stage 2 Initial Design and then Stage 3 Detailed Design. Implementation might possibly take place before Christmas, but more likely afterwards. WCC had advised that we might want to defer planters until the spring but MF had explained the need to get the planters in, but obviously subject to horticultural advice.</p> <p>For Sussex Gardens, this has been made complicated by TfL looking to do their own works at the junction and considering carrying out a feasibility study. This would mean that the CIL project would be effectively on hold until December pending the completion of the study, and its implementation would depend on how quickly TfL intended to move to an actual scheme which would combine the two projects.</p> <p>Post meeting note: TfL has confirmed they will carry out a feasibility study to look at removing the left hand turn slipway (but still keep the ability to turn left) with completion in December, effectively pausing the CIL project until then and possibly for longer in order to implement the two schemes together.</p>	
<p>5. Hyde Park Estate Low Traffic Neighbourhood Proposals</p> <p>AZ presented a plan that WCC had drawn up 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. Consultation was due to begin in October and AZ reported that it was due to be introduced in December. AZ explained that he supported the overall aims of the scheme, but was not happy that one of the effects of the scheme would prevent residents being able to drive to different parts of the estate without going on main roads, substantially increasing their journey times, by a factor of 5 or 6 in some cases. He and SM had driven these routes to prove this was the case, in the absence of WCC providing detail modelling information that AZ had repeatedly asked for to assess the impact on residents needing to make these journeys. There was a variation of opinions within the HPEA on the scheme, with some supporting and other objecting to the proposals, but in AZ's mind, the ambitions to reduce pollution would not be met by residents having significantly longer journey times to get from one part of the estate to another.</p> <p>MM and JL reported that the Church Commissioners had concerns about the scheme and the impact on their business tenants in Connaught Village and had failed to get specific answers to some of the questions that they had raised with the City Council. JL was particularly concerned at the basic temporary nature of the infrastructure that was proposed by the Council to block traffic on the roads, and was concerned that the Connaught Village Green scheme that had good local support might be seen as responsible for the traffic measures and attract objections.</p>	

<p>SM was very concerned at the impact on the church and the ability of his parishioners to easily get to church especially the elderly and more vulnerable who had no option but to use cars. He thought it would deaden community life, rather than increase it. KB stated that she had made the Council aware of his concerns and had given his contact details to the City Council who were seemingly keen to engage with him.</p> <p>SM reported that consultation was due to take place in October but would not be limited to the estate but much wider, such as Westbourne Grove and Marylebone and was concerned that comments from further field might be given the same weight as residents who were more directly affected.</p> <p>AB said that perhaps the scheme could lead to an extended Connaught Village Green public realm scheme, creating space big enough for temporary markets – he knew that the Notting Hill farmers market was looking for a temporary home.</p> <p>AZ asked whether the Forum should make a response to the proposals? KB said we needed to see the details as the effect on Praed Street and the Paddington BID area was not clear. It might not be possible to get a consensus amongst the Forum members. CP agreed on needing to see the detailed proposals. AS said would need to get a consensus across the forum to make a response and was unclear at this stage what it would say. JL said that it was important to have high quality public realm interventions, not temporary looking ones as that would send out the wrong message. There was still a lot of unanswered questions.</p> <p>AZ expressed concern that the City Council was not listening and was intending to go ahead with the scheme regardless. SM thought the same, with implementation scheduled for only 3-4 weeks after the consultation had ended. The lack of modelling data from the City Council was very disappointing. All that was needed was a short report on the impact on residents of the proposals.</p> <p>AZ thanked everyone for their contributions. It was resolved to hold the next SG meeting at the end of the consultation period for a further discussion and to consider whether the Forum should express a view on the proposals and engage with the City Council as it considered its next steps.</p>	
<p>6. Westminster Forum of Forums/Planning Reforms</p> <p>MF briefly fed back from the Westminster Forum of Neighbourhood Forums meeting that had been held on 14 September. Cllr Elizabeth Hitchcock, the Deputy Cabinet Member for Business and Planning had explained that Neighbourhood Forums were important to the City Council and the Council had compiled new planning guidance for Forums on how to do a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>On the Planning White Paper, the Government was proposing major planning reforms that made it easier for development to take place if it accorded with national guidance and removed both local policy approaches and local decision making. The City Council had held a very useful briefing session for Forums and Amenity Societies earlier in the month where the Council had explained it had three main concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of local decision, with schemes not needing to apply for permission and the removal of Councillors from making planning decision, instead Officers making those decisions. • The section on strategic plan making was very light on detail. It wasn't clear what the implication would be for local plans, and in that sense it was hard to respond to the paper. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial implications, with CIL and S.106 being merged, and national CIL rates and CIL and affordable provision effectively competing against each other. <p>The Council had organised another session with Amenity Societies and Forums for Thursday 15 October to exchange opinions and compare potential responses.</p> <p>The Forums had discussed the merits of continuing with neighbourhood plan but the consensus was that they were still worth writing and KB added that one role for a neighbourhood plan might be to set out a local design code.</p>	
<p>7. AOB</p> <p>KB raised the need to hold a general meeting. The constitution said these should be held twice a year, and last year they were held in February and November, although the challenges of holding a virtual general meeting was not to be under-estimated. Post meeting note, MF checked the constitution which says general meetings should be held every 6 months.</p>	
<p>8. Date of next meetings</p> <p>It was agreed to hold the next meeting on Tuesday 3 November 2-3pm via Zoom.</p>	KB