

# Hyde Park Paddington

## Minutes of General Meeting held on 2 December 2021 via Zoom

	Actions
<p><b>1. Introduction and Apologies</b></p> <p>Allen Zimble (AZ, Chairman) welcomed everyone to the meeting. 23 people had registered to attend and 19 people were online at the start of the meeting. Apologies had been received from Will Clayton.</p> <p>Kay Buxton (KB) shared a presentation for the meeting which can be found on the HPP website at <a href="https://www.hydeparkpaddington.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/HPP-General-Meeting-Presentation-2-December-2021.pdf">https://www.hydeparkpaddington.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/HPP-General-Meeting-Presentation-2-December-2021.pdf</a></p>	
<p><b>2. Agreement of minutes of the Annual General Meeting held on 23 March 2021</b></p> <p>The draft minutes of the last annual general meeting had been available on the HPP website. No comments were made at the meeting. The minutes were agreed and will be added to the website.</p>	KB
<p><b>3. Presentation on progress with Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) projects</b></p> <p>KB reminded the meeting of the £557,000 (including CIL money) projects which had been approved to date and provided updates as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Star Street Open Space Improvements – related to space which had been prone to inappropriate use. Improvements had been completed and the corner section may be extended (CIL £30,000)</li> <li>• Norfolk Square Gardens Showcase – the butterfly friendly garden had led to an increase in the number of butterflies and other species which was an indication of the impact of the project improving air quality in the area. Next phase in January 2022 will involve caterpillar friendly planting (CIL £20,000)</li> <li>• Edgware Road Insights Study – completed in August 2021 as an evidence base for planning policy and public realm interventions. The study highlights the dominance of food and beverage and multiple leases (one third are up in next 5 years and one third in 5-10 years). (CIL £20,000 plus £20,000 from Marylebone forum)</li> <li>• Burwood Place – progressing plans to add seating and pots. Cabinet Member approval secured and work expected to start in January/ February 2022 (CIL £15,000 with matching funding from Church Commissioners &amp; BID)</li> <li>• Edgware Road/Sussex Gardens – involves a new tree pit plus bench and planter. Achieved improvements to the street scape already by removing the recycling bins and railings. Complicated land ownership has led to delays but the scheme now has Cabinet Member approval and should start in March 2022. (CIL £110,000)</li> <li>• Connaught Village Green – will create new public amenity space and cultural landscape in a busy intersection. It is expected to involve greening, benches and a drinking water fountain. Although 3 parking bays will be lost, the existing trees, phone box and notice board will be retained. First round review with WCC expected mid-December. (CIL £185,000)</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Bays – involves improved signage and way finding. Design has been completed, and there have been multiple landowners to consult with and obtain relevant consents. Installation expected to commence in spring 2022. (CIL £100,000)</li> <li>• Bishop’s Bridge Road – the feasibility study has been completed with the aim to clearly define the zoning around the bridge – canalside, intersections/ road and railway. Ideas include improved railings &amp; signage, planting and cycle lanes as well as improvements in the pedestrian crossing and removal of clutter on the pavement. (CIL £50,000)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4. Discussion on Neighbourhood Plan Ideas and Priorities</b></p> <p>AZ and KB set out a basis for the discussion on the Neighbourhood Plan including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan covers the whole Forum area but some policies may be restricted to geographical zones, like Praed Street and Edgware Road.</li> <li>• Plan could provide an opportunity for the Church Commissioners (CC) to bring in policies that they have not been able to.</li> <li>• Some policy issues that were not possible within the City Plan may be possible within a Neighbourhood Plan, supported by a robust evidence base.</li> <li>• Character – defining what we want to see and do not want to see.</li> <li>• Policies – will these be different for different areas of the Plan</li> <li>• Greening and measures to reduce anti-social behaviour</li> </ul> <p>On the issue of night-time economy, Paul Charalambous (PC) flagged the impact of the 24 hour market on the area and whether or not that was desirable (e.g. McDonalds &amp; Tesco). It was noted that these would be important for key workers at St Mary’s hospital and at Paddington station.</p> <p>It was noted that all stakeholder engagement would be important as some businesses might be concerned that a Neighbourhood Plan would bring additional restrictions.</p> <p>Chris Peers (CP) noted that there was an increasing concern at the differences between the south side of Praed Street and the north side with the developments in Paddington Square and proposed re-development of St Mary’s. Although listed, the South side was not attractive and had limited use to residents and the business community. The size and scale of the properties meant they could not be updated for modern use (combining properties/ installing lifts). 101 properties with 53 different owners meant the south side had limited development potential unless the neighbourhood plan could incorporate a policy to allow for flexibility to develop properties behind the street façade.</p> <p>Charlotte Moss (CM) noted that a reversal of the policy on subdivision of premises would require WCC approval.</p> <p>KB noted that sub-divided premises on Edgware Road often led to problems, especially when associated with money services businesses (MSBs).</p> <p>KB agreed that bringing in design elements such as retaining frontages and setting out conditions around food and beverage use would be important.</p> <p>KB also discussed whether a policy could be included around short-term lets, demonstrating the damage they were otherwise creating for the local community.</p> <p>Telephone boxes could also be included in the Plan, where they are increasing in numbers and hosting advertisements.</p> <p>On the environmental side, the group discussed listing improvements raised by the local community and setting out the main infrastructure projects / walking routes to promote the area.</p> <p>AZ noted that through the Safer Neighbourhood Ward Panel and community discussions, he understood the desire to achieve environmental improvements and broader amenity. The al fresco dining had been well received. CM added that an opportunity to designate</p>	

<p>preferred alfresco locations in the Plan would be a great opportunity, as local residents would like to see more in Connaught Village.</p> <p>KB explained the importance of increasing membership and stepping up engagement through wider business/ residential and other stakeholder events.</p> <p>AZ explained that it was the start of the process.</p>	
<p><b>5. AOB</b></p> <p>PC asked when the Forum might be in a position to start meeting in person. AZ agreed that the ability to meet in person, as soon as Covid restrictions allowed, would be highly important for the success of the Plan process.</p>	
<p><b>6. Date of Annual General Meeting</b></p> <p>The meeting agreed that holding the AGM in April (or earlier) would be important and that the aim would be to hold it in person at the Church.</p>	