



MARYLEBONEFORUM

Marylebone Forum Committee Meeting
 Streathers, 44 Baker Street, W1U 7AL / MS Teams
 8 December 2022 08:30-10:00

Committee members		Committee members	
Penny Alexander	Baker Street Quarter Partnership (Teams)	Andrea Merrington	HDWE (Teams)
Michael Bolt	Resident	Yael Saunders Chair	Resident
Alan Bristow	Resident	Steven Thomas	Resident
Sarah Buttleman	Resident	Will Scott	British Land (Teams)
Kay Buxton	Marble Arch BID (Teams)		
Linda Davies	Marylebone Association	Guests	
Sheila D'Souza	Resident (Teams)	Rosa Han	The Portman Estate (Teams)
Will Dyson	NWEC (Teams)		
Rev'd Canon Stephen Evans	St Marylebone Parish Church	Minutes	Jane Parsons (Teams)
Mark Gazaleh	Small business owner		
Ann-Marie Johnson	Resident (Teams)	Apologies	
Simon Loomes Secretary	The Portman Estate	Guy Austin	Resident / Marylebone Association
Ian Macpherson Treasurer	Resident	Nicki Palmer	Harley St BID

ACTIONS

1. The Committee agreed with the recommendation that the draw-down of approved funding to commission the AQ dashboard would be paused. The AQ Subgroup was asked to write to Councillors explaining the reason and lessons to be learned, along with a request that Councillors continue to fund the sensors.
2. Jane Parsons offered to set up a shared document for members to record amenity, resident and community groups, and a corresponding map (liaising with Sarah Buttleman).
3. Andrea Merrington and Kay Buxton would work on the amendments to the Planning Brief and then come back to Main Committee to discuss what was needed / what was missing.
4. Jane Parsons offered to help set up a system to store engagement records, probably using Google Drive.
5. An initial Coordinating Committee meeting would be diarised by Jane Parsons .

6. Members agreed that previous sub-committee minutes would be removed from the website (**Jane Parsons** to action).

7. **The Chair** would invite Alex Csiscek from WCC to the next MF meeting (07/02/23 08:30) to discuss the changes to the CIL process.

MINUTES

	<i>Actions in bold</i>
1.	Introductions, apologies, minutes of the last meeting
1.1	<p>The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting, including new attendee Linda Davies from the Marylebone Association. Minutes were approved subject to two amendments from Sheila D'Souza;</p> <p><u>Para 5.1 c) a</u> WCC was not intending to prepare bespoke analyses for specific districts. It is unclear how easy it will 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 made by MF must remain relevant and useful once/if a larger scale system was put in place.</p> <p><u>Para 5.2 c)</u> 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><i>ACTION: Minutes will be adopted and posted on website (JP)</i></p>
2.	AQ Monitoring Dashboard
2.1	<p>Sheila D'Souza and Rosa Han explained to members that the project had hit a hurdle as members had discovered, following their own investigations and conversations with Breathe London, that 4 or 5 of the Breathe London sensors installed near schools in March 2022, funded by the Ward Budget, were not operating as they should be. Their erratic data collection would affect the validity of the AQ Reporting dashboards. Consequently, they decided to delay commissioning the Reporting System.</p> <p>CIlr Arzymanow had ascertained that the sensors were installed by the Council's Street Lighting contractor (Conway), and she was making arrangements the faulty ones to be re-charged and relocated to better-lit positions near the schools in order to continue data collection until the paid-for term ends in March 2023. This will demonstrate how well these sensors perform in a built-up area like Marylebone during the winter months.</p> <p>The recommendation to the Committee was to postpone drawing down the Ward budget funds approved for the AQ Reporting Dashboard until there was certainty that the sensors worked well in their new locations.</p> <p>An additional complexity was that additional funding of £12,000 + VAT would need to be found to extend deployment of the six sensors for another year after March 2023. The following issues were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The initial decision of where to put the sensors was made by Councillors after direct discussions with the schools. The Forum was not involved but supported the decision

	<p>in principle because children were more vulnerable to pollution and the schools could also use the sensors for education and awareness raising.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members were unclear about what was covered by the £2k annual fee. It was explained that Breathe London operated the equivalent of a "leasing system". It owned the equipment (sensor and charger) provided and charged £2,000 p.a. for a service package which covered the collection, management and display of AQ data on its website, system checks for faults, maintenance of the sensor and repair or replacement as necessary. Instructions were provided for installation by the sponsor or their contractor. <p>ACTION: The Committee agreed with the recommendation that the draw-down of approved funding to commission the AQ dashboard would be paused. The AQ Subgroup was asked to write to Councillors explaining the reason and lessons to be learned, along with a request that Councillors continue to fund the sensors.</p>
3.	<p>Planning sub-committee (PSC) update</p>
3.1	<p>Andrea Merrington noted that the planning brief for draft Neighbourhood Plan, agreed by the Forum Main Committee, had been sent to WCC for approval and WCC had since reverted with some useful comments.</p> <p>Based on these comments, members of the PSC would write to WCC to confirm the Forum would be writing two briefs; one for a planning consultant to work on the plan itself, and a separate brief for an engagement consultant to focus on engagement. The applications would be for £25k for the Planning Consultant, and £20k for the Engagement Consultant.</p> <p>The PSC would draw out key themes and priorities from the draft plan's area of focus, then look at the calendar of events for 2023 and find key times to consult with the public.</p> <p>It was noted that there was a good opportunity to capture community priorities at AGM's and statutory meetings and other stakeholder meetings such as Marylebone Association AGM and BID meetings. The Forum would also engage further with Ward Councillors, following on from the meeting in early 2022, and record evidence of that engagement.</p>
3.2	<p>Members suggested that it would be very useful to catalogue the large number of local and individual/mansion block resident associations stretching across the Forum area and then engage with them proactively. Managing Agents could also potentially be contacted with a request to share details of their relevant resident group, if the group was willing to have their details shared (data protection issues were noted). A map of all the groups would also be helpful to make the geographical spread clear.</p> <p>Creating this list would need some manpower and commitment from members. If there were a live shared document that members could all help populate this would be a good starting point.</p> <p>ACTION: Jane Parsons offered to set up a shared document for members to record amenity, resident and community groups, and a corresponding map (liaising with Sarah Buttleman).</p>
3.3	<p>Members discussed whether the evidence base could be created by the Main Committee or if this project needed consultant support. The suggestion of engaging a consultant at this stage was raised, although the new consultation funding would not be available until the exercise was complete. It was also not clear whether this was necessary and whether a direct consultant appointment could potentially hinder a subsequent tender process, or this could be a separate project.</p> <p>The purpose of the evidence base was to show how the Forum had come up with the themes for the Planning Brief and how those themes reflected what the community wanted. It was important that the evidenced consultation was relevant to this – it did not need to be recent,</p>

	<p>if it addressed this issue.</p> <p>MB raised previous Forum community consultation and asked whether results had been included in submission to WCC. KB advised those results had not been included.</p> <p>ACTION: Andrea Merrington and Kay Buxton would work on the amends to the Planning Brief and then come back to Main Committee to discuss what was needed / what was missing.</p>
3.4	<p>Penny Alexander shared some of the engagement methods that had been used for a recent piece of work in Baker Street Quarter and offered to help draft the engagement brief for end of January.</p> <p>Members suggested it would be useful to create repository of all engagement work to date that could be accessed by all members and was categorized and dated clearly.</p> <p>ACTION: Jane Parsons offered to help set up such a system (a repository of engagement records), probably using Google Drive.</p>
4.	Governance and Comms
4a)	<p>Simon Loomes reminded members of who held the role of Forum Director and enquired whether the Directors should set up a Coordinating Committee for “management and administration of the forum’s affairs”, as allowed by the Articles of Association. This might address, for example: finance, Governance, appointments to Main Committee and succession planning.</p> <p>At the time of the meeting the Directors were Michael Bolt, Rev’d Canon Stephen Evans, Simon Loomes, Ian Macpherson, Andrea Merrington and Yael Saunders.</p> <p>There was some discussion as to whether a Coordinating Committee was needed, how much time would be required for it, and whether meetings could be appended onto current meeting dates.</p> <p>Members agreed that it would be useful to consider the management of the Forum in a devoted session and so to set up the Coordinating Committee with Directors and others with an interest (TBA), approx. three times a year. It could be appended to current main committee meeting dates or standalone if time is an issue.</p> <p>ACTION: An initial Coordinating Committee meeting would be diarised by Jane Parsons.</p>
4b)	<p>Notes/ minutes from sub-committees had, to date, been posted on the Forum website. This was not required by the Articles, and it was proposed that it was not needed going forward as any decisions made by the sub-committees should be ratified by the Main Committee and minuted accordingly before being aired as the Forum’s position and those minutes would continue to be posted online.</p> <p>ACTION: Members agreed that previous sub-committee minutes would be removed from the website, and sub-committee minutes would continue to be shared with other SC members post-meeting, and with the Main Committee before its next meeting. The Main Committee would be asked to ‘note and Comment on’ sub-committee minutes at its subsequent meeting.</p>
4c)	<p>The process of approving and sharing Main Committee (MC) minutes was discussed, as the Articles had several internally conflicting requirements concerning this. (Post Meeting Note: in one section it states, “the minutes... shall be posted on the Forum's website within seven days from their approval”, in another section it states “Minutes...publish(ed) to Forum members within 15 days of a meeting”.)</p> <p>It was recommended and agreed by members that the Main Committee minutes would be</p>

	<p>agreed 'in draft' by the Chair and/or Secretary following the meeting and then shared with Main Committee members within seven days of the meeting. Corrections/amends to the minutes would be taken prior to the subsequent MC meeting, agreed at the meeting and the minutes then published on the website. The Articles could be amended accordingly in due course.</p>
4d)	<p>Comms (website, email accounts)</p> <p>Jane Parsons now had access to the Marylebone Forum website and email accounts. Marylebone Association still held the email accounts domain name and had been asked to grant Jane with administrator rights to ensure they were adequately password protected and not accessible to previous employees.</p>
5.	CIL sub-group
5.1	<p>Members discussed the application from All Souls; the CIL sub-group would meet to review it in the next few weeks. There were no comments from members although it was suggested it might be useful to amend the wording regarding the CIL process on the Forum website to reflect recent WCC changes to the process.</p> <p>Members asked for some information and clarity on the WCC CIL changes and suggested inviting the relevant officer from the Council to the next MF meeting to brief members accordingly.</p> <p>ACTION: The Chair would invite Alex Csicsek from WCC to the next MF meeting to discuss the changes to the CIL process.</p>
6.	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following changes on Marylebone Association committee, Mark Gazaleh and Guy Austin have stood down from Marylebone Forum Committee. Both were thanked by all for their contributions. • New members representing the Marylebone Association would be Julie Redmond, the new Chair of Marylebone Association, and Linda Davies. • Harley Street BID has been invited to join the Committee – Nicki Palmer sent apologies for this meeting. • Simon Loomes noted the ULEZ changes were coming soon. Imperative therefore to establish AQ monitoring properly before ULEZ implementation. • Penny Alexander was congratulated on the huge success of the Baker Street Quarter renewal ballot.

MEETING CLOSED 10:05.

Next meeting: 7 February 2023 (08:30-10:00).