



# MARYLEBONEFORUM

## MARYLEBONE FORUM COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday 26 September 15.00-16:30 on Zoom

Committee members		Guests	
Michael Bolt (MB)	Resident	Rosa Han (RH)	The Portman Estate
Kay Buxton (KB)	Marble Arch BID		
Sheila D'Souza (SD)	Resident		
Will Dyson	NWEC	Apologies	
Canon Stephen Evans	St Marylebone Parish Church	Penny Alexander	Baker Street Quarter Partnership
Mark Gazaleh	Small business owner	Guy Austin	Resident
Ann-Marie Johnson	Resident	Alan Bristow	Resident
Simon Loomes	The Portman Estate	Sarah Buttleman	Resident
Ian Macpherson <b>Treasurer</b>	Resident	Will Scott	British Land
Andrea Merrington (AM)	HDWE		
Yael Saunders <b>Chair</b>	Resident	Minutes	
Steven Thomas (ST)	Resident	Jane Parsons	

	<i>Actions in bold</i>	ACTION
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introductions, apologies, minutes of the last meeting</b>	
	The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting, including Jane Parsons who was attending her first meeting as Committee administrator. Apologies were noted from Penny Alexander, Alan Bristow, and Sarah Buttleman. <b>The Chair noted that the new website was live and asked members to share any issues with design or functionality.</b>	<b>ALL</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Treasurer update</b>	
	The Treasurer shared a brief update on Forum finances. Annual Accounts for the year ending 31.08.21 had been submitted, and the tax return and confirmation statement for the company were complete. The Forum had circa £5000 in its bank account, less the cost of the accountancy fees (£487). A project report on the new Forum website had been submitted to WCC (Westminster City Council), this was requested by the Council as a condition of it part-funding the website development.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Westminster CIL update</b>	
3.1	Kay Buxton (KB) shared an update on the approach to Neighbourhood CIL of the new Westminster City Council, gleaned at the recent Westminster Forum of Forums meeting including:	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new WCC Public Realm Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and an Environmental Strategy SPD would be issued later this year/2023. The Heritage SPD was on hold as WCC said the current policies offered sufficient protection.</li> <li>• An indication that in future, it might be the role of Ward Councilors and WCC Officers to bid for Neighbourhood CIL.</li> <li>• WCC was receiving more bids for funding for project support, rather than capital work which previously dominated bids.</li> <li>• New guidance for applying for CIL would be issued by WCC shortly, for discussion with interested parties.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair reported that it appeared that the direction of travel of the new WCC administration was to widen CIL to more community-led projects, going to the community in the first instance to encourage engagement with projects that might benefit from CIL funding.</p>	
3.2	<p>Members discussed the significant amount of money currently sitting in Strategic and Neighbourhood CIL ‘pots’ and discussed where the priorities for WCC might be if it was looking to use CIL to fund council-led projects. It was suggested a meeting with local Councilors be arranged to specifically address projects that might be funded through CIL and ensure there is engagement with the relevant WCC officers.</p> <p>There was some discussion about whether Marylebone should list its priority projects to facilitate a more proactive than reactive approach; lists had been created and shared in the past, which might present a good starting-point. There was caution expressed about determining priorities without community consultation, although it was suggested that there was sufficient evidence already on file for some projects (e.g. Marylebone Library), as well as the input from committee members representing all local amenity societies and BIDS, which could then be supported with further community consultation. Some of the data might, however, need updating with refreshed engagement and consultation.</p> <p>It was suggested that consideration should also be given to accessing CIL for funding maintenance work, and not solely for new capital projects. Another project suggestion was acoustic cameras to record loud vehicles and generate fines.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Neighbourhood Plan update</b></p>	
4.1	<p>Andrea Merrington (AM) from HDWE updated members on the Marylebone Neighbourhood Plan ‘Planning Brief – September 2022’, revision 4 of which had been shared with members for comment in advance of the meeting. Members were reminded that the MF (Marylebone Forum) had secured Neighbourhood CIL Funding to allocate towards plan making and more specially towards the appointment of a planning consultant and/or an engagement team to assist in creating a Neighbourhood Plan. The first step was for this brief to be approved by the Committee so it could then be approved by Westminster City Council. Points to note including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) This was a high-level document; it did not address policies in any detail as the development of these would only begin once a planning consultant was engaged and public consultation on the Plan was in progress.</li> <li>b) The forum boundaries were raised by several members, but it was noted</li> </ol>	

	<p>the designated boundaries could not be altered at this stage.</p> <p>c) There was a question regarding the demolitions policy, which was not covered in the brief as no policies were being included at this stage of the process. A member (MB) asked why basements were addressed but not demolitions and noted that they would like to see demolitions addressed in the emerging plan.</p> <p>d) <b>A member (ST) noted that their Amenity Society had not been mentioned in the plan; this would be rectified before its submission to WCC.</b></p> <p>e) <b>A member noted the language in item 3.4 was somewhat impenetrable, the authors agreed to look at breaking it down further into components and language meaningful to those who were not Planning experts.</b></p> <p>f) <b>Members suggested there might be a better word to use than “resistant” in item 2.6; possibly ‘resilient’.</b></p> <p>Members agreed that subject to the minor changes discussed above, the brief could be submitted to WCC. WCC would then circulate the document internally for comment, which may then be returned to MF for further edits or approved.</p> <p><b>ACTION: The authors would make minor changes to the brief as discussed above, circulate them to the Committee for information, and submit the brief to WCC by end of w/c 26.09 or early the following week.</b></p>	AM / KB
5.	<b>Air Quality Monitoring Dashboard</b>	
5.1	<p>The Air Quality Working Group had prepared a paper outlining their recommendation for an online air quality monitoring dashboard specific to Marylebone; this paper had been shared with members for comment via email in advance of the meeting. Rosa Han (RH) and Sheila D’Souza briefed members on the key issues:</p> <p>a) The Working Group recommendation was for the Committee to approve development of the dashboard and agree to the costs outlined in the paper under Quote 1 (£8,100 + VAT for the complete package) and Quote 3 (website enhancements to facilitate publication of the dashboard, est. £600+VAT).</p> <p>b) The Working Group recommended that the Committee authorise an application for Ward budget funding from Marylebone and Regent’s Park Wards in the first instance, with Neighbourhood CIL funding a backup option. Many of the sensors were funded through Ward budget so it was felt the likeliest route to success, although it was noted there might be a challenge as it could be argued some sensors were in other Wards, depending on the sensor position.</p> <p>c) Procurement was underway at WCC for a borough wide AQ monitoring platform, with the intention to go live by March 2023. Despite this, members agreed it was prudent to continue with the development of the dashboard for Marylebone for several reasons:</p> <p>a. WCC was not intending to prepare bespoke analyses for specific districts. It was unclear how easy it would be for members of the public without technical know-how to interrogate their new AQ portal. Members agreed it was a priority that the Marylebone dashboard be user-friendly, and MF could share lessons learned on this with WCC. It was also noted that whatever investment was</p>	

	<p>made by MF must remain relevant and useful once/if a larger scale system was put in place.</p> <p>b. The quote represented good value and flexibility, which would ensure the product represented the data that Marylebone businesses and residents wanted to see.</p> <p>c. The Working Group had discussed the MF dashboard with the WCC team. Both parties agreed there was merit in developing the dashboard as its ambitions complemented the WCC platform and would provide bespoke information relevant to the Marylebone community. The AQ dashboard could be delivered by the end of 2022 (subject to funding approval) and there would be the opportunity to gather feedback from users once operational to help inform WCC's platform.</p>	
5.2	<p>Additional comments included the following:</p> <p>a) There was additional value in Marylebone having its own AQ data if there were instances of discrepancies with WCC data.</p> <p>b) Consideration should be given to the audience for the data and how to present it most usefully. The publication of the data should also draw an additional audience to the Marylebone Forum website and increase awareness of its wider brief. The synergy with the Forum's plan making and public engagement work was noted.</p> <p>c) The current locations of the monitors and sensors measures pollution on main roads and near schools. The issue of dust pollution from building sites was raised and whether this could be considered. WCC Officers mentioned that access to the data from dust monitors on construction sites had been requested in their public engagement.</p> <p>d) RH added that separate to this proposal, Portman Estate, Howard de Walden, and Baker Street Quarter were exploring additional sensors/monitors in their respective areas and would keep the forum updated on this.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Members agreed that the Air Quality Working Group could continue to progress the project to the recommended next step, which was applying for Ward budget funding. The Working Group would report back to the Committee in due course.</b></p>	RH / SD
6.	<b>Potential CIL application: Paddington Street Gardens</b>	
6.1	<p>The Chair briefed members on a proposal for improvements to Paddington Street Gardens, which it was hoped would fit the new WCC administration aims of a community-led project. This included the improving the active space in the South by the addition of a 'kickabout' space for older children, alongside updating the current play area equipment for under 12s, with no loss of green space or any trees. Also improvements to the North side of the park, to create enhanced areas of tranquil seating. The proposal was supported by Harley Street and Baker Street BIDs, as it would create additional seating for local workers. The proposal would require a site survey, the proposed cost of which members noted was significant (circa £25k) if it were to come from Neighbourhood CIL funding. The gardens' history as a burial ground and consecrated space was noted, as the existence of interred bodies would</p>	

	<p>also present challenges to cost and logistics, hence the requirement for a detailed survey and viable options for both spaces</p> <p>Members suggested some consultation with residents surrounding the park might be prudent. Local students already use the space, and it was a public park (albeit church land, managed by the City Council) so the point was made that the project was more about making better use of the space for the students already accessing it.</p> <p><b>As most the Committee's business members had left the meeting before this item, members agreed this item should be deferred to a future meeting and the project could be discussed by the CIL group in the interim.</b></p>	
7.	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>Members noted that it would be useful to share projects with neighboring Fora when there were potential areas of alignment.</p>	

**MEETING CLOSED 16:30.**