

MAYFAIR —FORUM— MAYFAIR NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

MAYFAIR NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM – STEERING GROUP MEETING 15:00-17:00, WEDNESDAY 19th AUGUST Teams Conference Call

PARTICIPANTS

Jeremy Bishop (Chair)	Resident
Jace Tyrell (Vice-Chair)	Business
Bob Dawson	Business
Marie-Louise Burrows	Resident
Gordon Morrison	Resident
Sandeep Bhalla	Business
Keith Bailey	Business

SECRETARIAL

Hannah Kinnimont	Grosvenor
------------------	-----------

IN ATTENDANCE

Piers Townley	Grosvenor
Hannah Jordan	Guest

AGENDA:

1.0 Welcome & Apologies

- JB welcomed all to the meeting.
- Apologies from Cllrs Lewis and Glanz, Diana Dennis, Kate Goodwin, Fr Richard and Fr Dominic.

2.0 Minutes of last meeting

- JB assessed progress against actions from the July Steering Group meeting.
- On the HK NCIL action JB suggested not to circulate the NCIL sheets, and to wait for now.
- BD described re the action on seed funding that the MNF can include administrative element of costs for the project within applications. These costs can cover the fees of a third-party administering study applications.
- JT agreed that a top line requirement could be made for seed funding for projects, with funds used to get CIL projects off the ground. JT confirmed there are c.10 days of Dan Johnson funding remaining
- The HK action to arrange an SMT team meeting did not happen due to the team's view that they aren't offering presentations now planning has been submitted.
- JB requested that the team return to the SG in due course, due to the scale of the project.
- KB confirmed there is no date set for when the project is going to committee.
- Lansdowne House is to be left with the Steering Group.
- The minutes were authorised to be put on the website.

3.0 Environmental Suggestions for Buildings in Mayfair (Hannah Jordan)

- NH described the need for zero carbon and ES4 guidance from the forum on what this means in practice for people developing buildings/operating the buildings in more sustainable ways.

Action = HJ to circulate email of presentation later.

- HJ talked through the attached handout (Attachment 1) and presentation (Attachment 2). HJ discussed suggestions for net zero carbon, including favouring sustainably sourced materials.
- JB asked for Crown and Grosvenor's point of view regarding guidelines developers are likely to support.
- KB commented the headline for Grosvenor is switching to deep green renewable energy.
- NH commented the background that all non-domestic developments could be zero carbon. It is easier for larger buildings to justify interventions.
- JB commented a need for developers to make the interventions as it's more difficult for individual homeowners to do it.

Action = BD to take HJ's list away and look at what the Crown do and return, to create a composite list.

- GM commented that it's a recommendation rather than an enforcement.
- BD suggested making MNF support conditional on developers meeting points on the list.
- NH commented he has not seen WCC planners enforcing zero carbon requirements.
- JB described that the next step is to get a consolidated list with everyone's input, and then take it to WCC for enforcement.
- JT suggested developers look through the list of suggested actions and address how their scheme meets this when they come to present.
- Cllr Barnes described two changes in upcoming policy – 1) a recognition of the amount of carbon already in existing building infrastructure and factoring in demolition work to total carbon build. 2) taking more notice of in life activity e.g. waste collection. As part of the conversations had about coming out of lockdown WCC wants to be more prescriptive about consolidation of deliveries etc.
- JB commented his main concern that the ambition is lost down the line – good intentions are sometimes lost. Is WCC concerned with this?
- Cllr Barnes described that this point is on WCC's agenda with the planning changes but can't comment further.
- NH mentioned the UKGBC could be used for industry wide advice to support too.
- JB suggested it could be an NCIL project to pull the information together in a format that is easily digestible.
- Cllr Barnes described that WCC is in future to publish name and shame lists where developers' failures are publicised and considered in future planning applications.

4.0 SMT

- JB commented that there have been no requests from SG members, for alterations to the SMT planning application draft response and it was agreed that this should be used as the Forum's response and that it should be posted on the WCC planning portal. (Attachment 3).

Action = HK to upload comments to planning portal.

4.0 NCIL – Update & Discussion (JCB)

A3 Study

- NH described a view that the study should go ahead despite use class order changes; to get a benchmark for today.
- Subject to getting the pro forma right, the next step is to submit the application.

Action = JT to organise Dan Johnson at NWEC could help with the proforma

Greening

- NH commented there is a framework to submit the application.
- JB asked should the cost of Dan be included in the application?
- NH agreed yes.
- JT commented the MNF needs to build in extra funding to get the project off the ground.

Action = JT to ask Dan Johnson to the next session for update, and for action to occur in the meantime.

Reverse Vending Machines

- HJ described the project has reached a stage of nearly confirming 3 locations – outside Boots on Oxford Street, Weighhouse Street and in West One. Site meetings are to occur in September.

Leadership and Support

- There is a need to find someone to help with CIL application. They do not have to live or work in Mayfair.
- JB asked SG members to ask within their organisations for help with CIL.
- JB described a need to make applications.

5.0 WCC Funding Update (BD)

- BD described seed funding within applications is possible.

- Dan Johnson had drafted a CIL application for wider admin that should be submitted too.
- JT described that Ezra suggested 5% of community CIL couldn't be taken for admin – but feasibility for 5/6 projects could be bunched to get funding.
- Cllr Barnes stressed that the exceptional nature of Mayfair lends to bunching up funding making more sense than trying to set a rule.
- JB described an obligation for the Forum to act and a need for funding resultantly. There's a need to communicate the projects back to the NCIL committee. It would be nice to build awareness as the projects develop.
- JT clarified that WCC do not use CIL for comms agencies. The MNF need funding for engagement.
- JT suggested a monthly sum put together to help with communication to communities.
- Cllr Barnes advised the Forum to stay away from agencies, but the principal of communication (like dropping of letters) would be supported.
- JT said the marketing group produced a plan on how to communicate, with a £40k cost.
- BD is to ask colleagues to vet this plan, and it can then be adopted into proposals – grouped/split across the CIL projects.

Action = JT and BD to link up on comms document and turn into 1+ applications with Dan

6.0 Annual General Meeting (KB & JCB)

Steering Group Members

- JB commented on the options discussed in his email sent around and a need to decide how to move forward. JB invited an opinion from all SG directors.
- KB is happy to stay as director until October and a potential AGM; or for Piers to join now as non-voting member.
- JB commented KB stepping away now means Grosvenor will not have any voting rights.
- JT commented support for an AGM in October, for Grosvenor staying voting member and for chair changes to be considered in May.
- BD commented he is okay to stand again if he needs to. To make it a more democratic process is important, but anyone standing at the AGM as director for the SG needs to understand the work involved.
- SB commented it's okay for KB to wait until October.
- MLB agreed for KB to stay until October.
- GM commented on a need for stability at this time. There is no guarantee that Piers would be voted in at an AGM, and there is a need for the major landowner to be represented on the SG.
- JB described that he doesn't want to see 2 business directors standing for election at the AGM and possibly lose their seats, as there needs to be reasonable continuity balanced with refreshing the membership of the SG.
- JT commented it's a challenge to encourage business members of the Forum to join the SG due to the commitment required.
- JB commented the timing of meetings contributes to residents struggling to join the SG.
- JB suggested that anyone who wants to stand should be allowed to attend the upcoming meetings to see what it's like to be on the SG, especially given Piers is doing this.

Date and Organisation

- 21 clear business days' notice needed for AGM – if November, that is by 21st October.
 - There's a need to ensure enough time to allow potential SG members to attend SG meetings.
 - KB agreed to stay until November. Piers is welcome to attend until November and his ratification.
- Action = In consultation with JB and JT, KB to produce a draft timetable and process for the AGM**
- JB asked NH to put together a presentation on all the planning applications that have been considered/reviewed/commented on, with comments attached, that could be circulated before the AGM.
 - JB thinks an overview of the schemes the Planning & Public Realm Committee see are worth putting on the website, but not the minutes of the planning meetings per se.

7.0 Any Other Business

- Nick Brindley of Gerald Eve is attending the September SG to go through changes to the use classes order.
- Cllr Barnes commented that there have been a flurry of significant developments North/West of Oxford Street, including West One, following the change.
- JT commented that as a community group the MNF need to be sensitive to the fact that developers/tenants will need to repurpose buildings to ensure they have tenants in the future.
- Fr RF's constitution change is to be left until next meeting when he is in attendance.

- MLB questioned if she is to be replaced on the SG, can there be weight given to finding an alternative female.
- JB commented on the Mayfair Times being a possibility of how to advertise for SG members to get involved.
- JB to send draft to KB and HK of a round robin email to go to the membership – a first draft for modification. This will then go to the SG and then to the membership.
- JT commented Teams can be used to do voting online if needs be.
- SB suggested a survey monkey could be used too for voting at any AGM.
- Cllr Barnes flagged that many restaurants want al fresco to continue – there will be a consultation at the end of the licensing period.

8.0 Date of next meeting

Wednesday 16th September

Attachment 1

Mayfair Neighbourhood Plan - Sustainability Suggestions for Owners

The Mayfair Neighbourhood Plan encourages owners and developers to achieve the highest possible sustainability credentials when building a new, or adapting an existing, building. Even for existing buildings, significant improvements can be made for minimal capital outlays by changing the way the building is managed and operated.

The checklist below includes a number of areas which you might address when considering making improvements to how a building performs.

1. Energy efficiency appliance selection:
 - LED light bulbs
 - T5 fluorescent lamps/ low energy Compact Fluorescent Lamp (CFL)
(<https://www.westminster.gov.uk/retrofitting-historic-buildings>)
 - A+ to A+++ appliances (<https://www.energysavingtrust.org.uk/home-energy-efficiency/home-appliances>)
2. Low-flow bathroom appliances/ water-saving fittings:
 - Low-flow toilets and showerheads (<https://water-saver.org/water-efficiency-toilets-vs-regular-toilets/> & <https://www.rightwater.co.uk/save-water/low-flow-taps/>)
 - lockable taps (<https://waterwise.org.uk/save-water/>)
3. Enhanced metering for auditing energy performance:
 - Smart meters for energy and water consumption
(<https://www.betterbuildingspartnership.co.uk/better-metering-toolkit>)
4. Operational improvements to change consumption patterns:
 - Consider a green lease (<https://www.betterbuildingspartnership.co.uk/green-lease-toolkit>).
 - Provide data from metering to tenants, enforce regular inspections
5. Water recycling:
 - Greywater plumbing systems
 - Rainwater harvesting
 - Raingardens (<https://www.aquaco.co.uk/>)
6. Renewable energy generation:
 - PV solar panels and slates
(<http://grosvenorlondon.com/GrosvenorLondon/media/GrosvenorLondon/SustainableRefurbishmentAToolkitForGoingGreen.pdf>)
 - Air source and ground source heat pumps.
 - Ensure that your electricity comes from renewable sources.
7. Renewable heat generation:
 - Solar water heating systems
 - Ground source heat pumps
 - Passive Flue Gas Heat Recovery Device (PFGHRD)
(https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/545245/PFGHR_Report_-_FINAL_1_.pdf)

8. Energy-waste reduction:

- Carbon profiling (<https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/brochure-on-sustainable-design-fi-1277743905.pdf>)
- Motion sensors
- Programmable thermostats
- Automatic window ventilation and brille soleil to provide shading on south-facing elevations
- Consider mixed-mode ventilation utilising openable windows when mechanical heating or cooling is not required and secondary or double glazing (planning and listed building consents may be required).
- Outdoor heaters, and in particular gas powered heaters, are strongly discouraged.

9. Waste reduction:

- Composting food
- Smart recycling bins (<https://trend-monitor.co.uk/smart-recycling/>)
- Paper-free policy
- Reverse vending machines (<https://www.veolia.co.uk/services/waste-management/commercial-waste-collection/reverse-vending-machines-rvms>)
- Participate in local waste and freight consolidation schemes through established providers (<https://thefirstmile.co.uk/our-partners>)

10. Encouraging Zero emission transport:

- Secure cycle spaces and facilities for employees
- Promote the use of Santander London cycle-hire
- Deliveries by electric vehicles
- Electric vehicle charging points (<https://energysavingtrust.org.uk/transport/fleet/fleet-management-toolkit/switching-electric-vehicles>)
- Green travel plans (<https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/urban-planning-and-construction/travel-plans>)

11. Encourage biodiversity:

- Herb boxes/ vegetable gardens
- Swift and swallow boxes
- Insect hotels (<http://www.wildwestend.london/stories-feed/2017/4/26/insect-hotel>)
- Beehives
- Green roofs/ walls
- Green lamp posts (<https://www.grosvenor.com/news-and-insight/all-articles/london-gets-world%E2%80%99s-first-green-lamp-posts>)

12. Sustainable cleaning/ refurbishment products

- iClean Mini device (<https://www.icleanmini.co.uk/>)
- Low Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) paints, furniture and carpets (<https://www.bre.co.uk/filelibrary/Briefing%20papers/98660-Sustainable-Refurb-Briefing-Paper.pdf>).
- Use of natural and recycled products.

Zero-Carbon

Definitions:

- April 2019, UK Green Building Council published: [‘Net Zero Carbon Buildings: A Framework Definition’](#)
 - Net zero carbon: **construction** (1.1): “When the amount of carbon emissions associated with a building’s product and construction stages up to practical completion is zero or negative, through the use of offsets or the net export of on-site renewable energy.”
 - Net zero carbon: **operational energy** (1.2): “When the amount of carbon emissions associated with the building’s operational energy (maintenance) on an annual basis is zero or negative. A net zero carbon building is highly energy efficient and powered from on-site and/or off-site renewable energy sources, with any remaining carbon balance offset”

Zero-Carbon

Why?

- 2019 legislation committing the UK to a legally binding target of net zero emissions by 2050
- The building sector has the largest potential for significantly reducing greenhouse gas emissions compared to other major emitting sectors – [UNEP, 2009](#).
- The energy used in the operation of existing buildings represents the most significant carbon impact from the built environment, contributing 30% of UK’s total emissions in 2017

Zero-Carbon Construction:

- Goal of reducing supply-chain emissions
 - Perform a whole life-cycle carbon assessment prior to construction
 - Specify low-carbon concrete mixes
 - Utilize carbon sequestering materials e.g. wood, straw and hemp
 - Locally source building materials
 - Minimize waste

Zero-Carbon Operational Energy:

- Prioritize reductions in energy demand and consumption
 - Enhanced metering and public disclosure of energy consumption
 - Energy efficient and water-saving appliances
 - Low carbon energy supply
 - Energy and material waste reduction
 - Encouraging Zero-Carbon emission transport

Attachment 3

South Molton Triangle, London W1. Planning reference 20/03987/FULL

Introduction and Executive Summary

The Mayfair Neighbourhood Plan ('the Plan') came into effect on 24th December 2019 and is now part of the statutory development plan for Westminster. The Plan, which was prepared following several years of engagement with the business and residential communities in Mayfair, is a statement of how those communities would like to see Mayfair grow and develop. The ongoing role of the Mayfair Neighbourhood Forum (MNF) is to work with developers and their agents to ensure that when an application is made to the City Council for planning consent, that the application is aligned with the aspirations of the Plan.

Against the standards that apply more widely to Mayfair in terms of the quality of the public realm, the quality of retail and commercial floor-space and the provision of residential accommodation, the application site currently falls far below what might be expected. This is especially so when you consider its proximity to the world class retail opportunities in Oxford Street, Bond Street and South Molton Street, to the Bond Street Underground and Elizabeth Line stations in Davies Street, to Claridge's Hotel, to the commercial heart of East and Central Mayfair and the reality that this will become one of the premier entry points to London where the opportunity exists to create design more deserving of the location's importance.

The Plan supports appropriate development and taking the above into account, the MNF has always supported, and continues to support, the clear intention of the applicants to bring this somewhat tired and neglected part of Mayfair up to the standard that Mayfair deserves. The issue for the MNF, and for the City Council, is to ensure that in doing so, the proposals satisfy not only the policies of the Plan but in particular, the aspiration and direction set out in paragraph 3.1.3 of the Plan:

"The challenge for Mayfair is to deliver sustainable mixed use growth; locating growth in sustainable locations; ensuring growth happens in such a way that it enhances the quality of life for residents, workers and visitors; highlighting key Mayfair uses, and supporting greater growth for those.....Our aim in the Plan is to direct where that growth is most appropriate and better reflects and responds to local character and dynamics."

It is almost inevitable that a scheme of this magnitude will cause some harm to the designated heritage assets within, and potentially around, the site but the test is whether on balance the benefits of the proposal outweigh any potential harm. It is the view of the MNF that subject to the comments set out below, the proposals will result in considerable benefits to the area and that because it is in general conformity with the policies set out in the Plan, the application should be approved.

Assessing the application against the Plan

In assessing this application against the Plan, it is clear that it represents one of the most significant development proposals in Mayfair for many years. Uniquely situated within Mayfair, the site falls within several different Plan policy areas. While it is predominantly within Central Mayfair, South Molton Street falls within Eastern Mayfair but the site is also within the area designated for Transport Related Growth and South Molton Lane marks the northern end of the Tyburn Opportunity Frontage. In addition to the scale and complexity of the changes to the buildings themselves, the proposals therefore need to address a greater number of policy objectives than might ordinarily be the case.

The applicants presented their initial proposals to the Steering Group and more recently they have presented, on several occasions, to the Planning and Public Realm committee of the MNF.

Additionally, they provided a very helpful assessment of the scheme against the Plan policies. At a time when consultation has been difficult to achieve in person, the applicants are to be commended on their use of digital and other means of communication.

The MNF particularly welcomes the proposals for the buildings that front onto South Molton Lane and Davies Mews that together with the enhanced public realm around the site, will provide a much improved pedestrian experience which will be particularly important once the Elizabeth line opens. We are also very supportive of the proposed increase in residential on the site, both market and affordable. However, it is not clear or certain that this development will take advantage of the benefit afforded by Neighbourhood Plan's Tyburn Opportunity Frontage proposal and policies, and we would like to see that opportunity fully embraced. The retention of the Running Horse public house and the provision of additional A3 amenities are welcomed, subject to the applicant's promise that a strict management plan will be implemented, specifically to protect local residential amenity and minimise crime. We similarly support, as a condition of any consent, the implementation of a scheme wide servicing, operational and deliveries management plan and the production of a detailed plan that guarantees to achieve the zero-carbon footprint that the application promises.

Although the scheme cannot be required to make up for the lack of public toilets within Bond Street Station or on the Elizabeth Line, one omission which we would have liked to have seen addressed (under policy MR4) is the provision of publicly accessible toilets. If they are not to be provided within a stand-alone unit as part of the scheme, then we would like to see a condition imposed that would require retail and restaurant units to have toilets that are publicly accessible, and not just for customers, during normal opening hours.

Our principal reservation however, which the applicants are aware of, is that we do not believe that enough information has been provided so far about the elevations and roofscapes of the upper storeys of the north and south blocks. These details are needed so that the impact of these extensions on the neighbouring designated assets (that include the Mayfair Conservation Area, the listed buildings on site and the nearby grade I and grade II* listed buildings), can be assessed. The absence of this information makes it difficult for us to confirm that the proposals satisfy design policy MD1. Although we understand that the applicants are seeking to have the detailed design approved by condition, our strong preference would be to see more detail provided as part of this application as we fear the lack of elevations probably disguises the sheer scale of the proposed buildings and it is unclear now the associated impact might be mitigated. We believe that exemplary public realm and greening will be required to balance the impact of this and neighbouring projects at this primary entry point into London, and we would like to see detailed proposals addressing this opportunity and challenge.

In summary, we believe that the applicants have gone to considerable lengths to design a high quality scheme that strikes a fine balance between development and conservation, retaining some existing uses and inserting new ones. In doing so, and providing the public realm requirements can be achieved, they have met the challenge set out within paragraph 3.1.3 of the Plan.