

MAYFAIR — FORUM — MAYFAIR NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

MAYFAIR NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM – STEERING GROUP MEETING
16.00 – 17.30, THURSDAY 26TH JULY 2018
FORSTERS LLP, 31 HILL STREET, LONDON, W1J 5LS

PARTICIPANTS

Mark Henderson (Chairman)	Business
Mike Dunn (Vice-Chair)	Resident
Diana Dennis	Resident
Jeremy Bishop	Resident
Keith Bailey	Business
Bob Dawson	Business
Fr Richard Fermer	Community

IN ATTENDANCE

Nigel Hughes	MNF Planning Committee
Debbie Flevotomou	MNF Planning Committee
Sophie Dracup	Grosvenor (Secretarial)

APOLOGIES

Kate Goodwin	Community
Jace Tyrrell	Business
Marie-Louise Burrows	Resident
Fr Dominic Robinson	Community
Tim Steel	Community
Alexander Hauschildt	MNF Planning Committee

MINUTES:

1.0 Approval of Minutes from June's meeting

Minutes were approved.

2.0 Matters arising

To arrange a meeting with Cllrs Lewis, Barnes and Glanz

MH has not yet been able to set up a meeting with the Cllrs although will continue to try to do so.

To invite Raoul Veevers to become Chair of the Planning sub-group

Raoul Veevers has confirmed that he is not able to join the Steering Group or Planning sub-group due to a conflict of interest with his day to day work.

To write a letter in support of the Plan (which can be submitted online if this is easier, via the Neighbourhood Forum page on Westminster's website)

Letters of support have been written.

To contact Richard Cutt in relation to the short time-frame remaining for consultation and asking whether he would like to write a note to Josephine Gay (WCC) about the Plan

MH wrote to Richard Cutt to ask RSMSJ to support the Plan, although it is not clear if a letter of support was

subsequently written.

To organise a pop up at Summer in the Square, together with some publicity setting out some key reasons to support the Plan.

The pop up at Summer in the Square was successfully organised.

To draft an application to Westminster for the Forum's re-designation

To be discussed in detail later in the meeting.

To contact Josephine Gay asking for clarification regarding the classification of major development

MH confirmed that the SG cannot receive sets of planning applications only relating specifically to 'major' development, so it may be a case of receiving all applications. To be discussed in greater detail later in the meeting.

To investigate whether there are any Mayfair-based communications companies who would offer their services to the Forum pro-bono where needed

JT sent his apologies so this action will be addressed at the next SG meeting.

To arrange a meeting with RSM SJ within the next month, in order to update them about the SG's future plans for the Forum.

This action will be addressed at the next SG meeting.

To ask Councillors about the possibility of ward grant funding.

Since the Chairman has not yet met the Councillors, this action will be addressed at the next SG meeting. In the interim BD has offered to look into this.

To ask Westminster to send planning applications through from now (on an informal rather than statutory consultee basis given that the Plan has not yet been adopted).

NH/JB handling.

3.0 Receiving Planning Applications

The SG discussed the way in which Planning applications may be handled/reiewed

It was agreed that JB would lead on development of a process by which the Planning sub-group (PSG) would review and refer matters to the SG.

It was reiterated that the Planning Sub-Group will be the first port of call within the Mayfair Forum to look at planning applications. It was agreed that when looking at these applications, the Planning Sub-Group will flag relevant applications for the SG's attention. The general initial criteria for filtration would be by size/scale, i.e. bringing forward major and largescale applications, and sensitivity. Any flagged application would need to either call into question one of the policies in the Plan or be in contravention of one of the policies in the Plan, and therefore the Planning Sub-Group would ask the SG to comment. When flagged applications are brought forward to the SG, there could be a covering sheet with the issue raised by the application and the Planning Sub-Group's recommendation for the SG's action. As a group, it was agreed that the SG would keep an eye out for largescale projects, as SG members are likely to hear about these.

The SG agreed that it will be difficult to refine the filtering criteria further until the process of receiving applications has been underway for some time, to see how well the system works and whether the workload is manageable.

NH highlighted that in relation to the US Embassy alone, 109 documents were available on the Planning Portal and

each comprised around 30 pages. This would be a huge task for the Planning Sub Group to read through all the documents. The SG therefore acknowledged that it may turn out to be too large a task, but the Planning Sub-Group will not know if this is the case until they begin sorting applications. It was agreed that once the process of filtering applications has been underway for a month or two, the Planning Sub-Group will be in a better position to report back on the effectiveness of the process and whether or not the necessary workload is realistic.

JB highlighted that even if planning applications start coming through to the SG from now, the SG would not yet need to make comments on any application. It may however assist the Planning Sub-Group assess the workload involved ahead of time. It was therefore agreed that NH would contact Josephine Gay to ask for planning applications to be sent through from now (on an informal rather than a statutory consultee basis given that the Plan has not yet been adopted). It was agreed that electronic copies of applications would be best. In order for these to be sent through, the SG agreed that the Secretary should set up a new email address, planning@mayfairforum.org. Once this is set up, the login details will be shared with the Planning Sub-Group so members can access the applications sent through.

NH is checking with Westminster whether they will email the list of applications directly to Planning Sub-Group members, or whether these will need to be individually downloaded. If this is the case, NH noted that all Mayfair planning applications are contained within the West End section of the 'Central' links (although not all West End entries are within Mayfair), accessed via the following link:
<https://www.westminster.gov.uk/weekly-lists>.

DF questioned whether, if it was later decided that the process of sorting applications was too large a task for the Planning Sub-Group alone, it might be possible to raise sponsorship to fund a part-time employee to help sort through the planning applications. NH mentioned Four Communications, a communications and engagement agency who are aware of virtually every major scheme in the area. While generally retained by the developer, they might be able to come and speak to the SG about the high profile developments going on in the area. However, JB highlighted the danger of encouraging developers to present schemes to the SG and thereby encouraging claims that the Mayfair Forum had been consulted.

It was agreed that JB will update the SG at the September SG meeting as to how the process of receiving and filtering applications is going.

4.0 Progress with Westminster

MH confirmed that having met with Josephine Gay (who is responsible for policy development at Westminster) before the previous SG meeting, he received the impression that Josephine felt the MNF's role could be helpful to the planning process. MD concurred.

Finding a Planning Inspector

MH confirmed that the RICS has a process by which suitable candidates are put forward. A shortlist of three candidates was drawn up, and the SG received their CVs. The SG had agreed that the criteria for selection were as follows:

1. The candidate should have dealt with Neighbourhood Plans before;
2. The candidate should have experience working in Central London due to the complexity involved; and
3. The candidate should not have any conflict of interest

Jill Kingaby recently completed work on the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Plan, and MH has heard very positive feedback about her, as has Josephine Gay at Westminster. She has also worked on the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan, West Ealing Neighbourhood Plan and Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan. Applications were also received from Edward Cousins and John Parmiter, but the SG felt that Jill Kingaby would be the best candidate. Josephine Gay at Westminster agreed, and has appointed JK, who has accepted.

It was noted that feedback from Westminster is still not forthcoming in relation to the consultation, despite all other statutory consultees' responses having been received. It was agreed that MH would raise the lack of response with Westminster (Cllor Beddoe). All comments will be sent to the Inspector, and the Inspector will draw up a position document highlighting the points that are agreed, together with any issues that the Inspector feels the SG should re-consider. Feedback received from the Knightsbridge Neighbourhood Forum is that the process was relatively straightforward.

The report that the Inspector produces will either recommend putting the Plan to referendum or recommend some amendments by the Forum before the Plan goes forward to referendum. It is very unlikely that JK will decide that the Plan is entirely unfit for purpose.

MD highlighted that Westminster had submitted around thirty pages of comments when the SG originally consulted on the draft Plan, the majority of which were addressed within the final amendment of the Plan. Therefore the SG thought it unlikely that a significant number of comments on the final version would be received from Westminster.

Josephine has recommended meeting on a monthly basis during the upcoming few months until a decision has been reached. It was agreed that MH and one or two others from the SG will take part.

JB pointed out that the timing for the referenda may be around Christmas 2018 following the decision.

5.0 Renewal

JB confirmed that there has been little progress since the last SG meeting. Requirements vary around the country, and different councils demand different processes when Neighbourhood Forums re-apply for designation. Westminster has confirmed that their required process is a precise replication of the original application for designation as a Forum; however it is a very long document. It was agreed that JB and MD would draw up the draft and attach the constitution as this document currently stands.

JB and MD will also need the full Mayfair Forum membership list to attach to the application. The Secretary will send JB and MD the list.

NH confirmed that the authorisation of the application would most likely come from Cllr Beddoe.

6.0 South Molton Triangle

KB updated the SG with Grosvenor's South Molton Triangle proposals. KB has been the Mayfair Director at Grosvenor for two and a half years, and Grosvenor feels the time has come to collect views from resident, business and community stakeholders about possible plans for the future of the South Molton Triangle area.

Setting and Context

The South Molton Triangle area is bound by Davies Street, Brook Street and South Molton Lane. KB highlighted that fact that there is a clear synergy here with the Tyburn Retail Opportunity.

The area currently suffers from a lack of investment, with poor-quality public realm space and the lane itself is inanimated, generally serving only as a busy cut-through. There are a number of service vehicles in the area and it is not pedestrian-friendly. The architecture is relatively incoherent in style, although Grosvenor recognises the importance of certain aspects.

The Elizabeth line is due to open within the next year or so, with significantly increased visitor numbers anticipated via the Bond Street Crossrail station. One could argue that this part of Mayfair is not well prepared at present to deal with this. KB confirmed that Grosvenor aims to focus on the impact on jobs and employment, as well as dealing with issues of traffic and congestion in Mayfair.

Response

KB highlighted that Grosvenor's response to these issues is guided by national policy, the Local Plan and the draft Mayfair Neighbourhood Plan, which is likely to have been published when Grosvenor's proposals are eventually finalised.

Grosvenor's 20 Year Vision for Mayfair

KB summarised Grosvenor's 20 Year Vision for Mayfair: better connected neighbourhoods to encourage economic activity, amenity, pedestrians and quality of life for residents and workers, as well as preserving architectural and social heritage. Grosvenor's vision will be visible in what they produce.

South Molton Triangle – The Vision

KB highlighted that Grosvenor's proposals are very early stage, and Grosvenor is keen to involve stakeholders in an evolving early conversation.

Grosvenor's vision is to provide:

- A new and inclusive place for London that people will enjoy
- A gateway that connects the local area
- A commercial site; retail and office being the two dominant uses, as they are presently.
- An exceptional public realm.

KB confirmed that Grosvenor intend to retain Grays Antiques as an occupier, with the majority of traders either consolidating within the front building or moving to an alternative site. Grosvenor is not looking to redevelop the front unit, or the Running Horse pub as Grosvenor recognises its value as a local amenity.

Heritage

Grosvenor recognises the important of the site's Heritage and will be cognisant of this in their design of the scheme.

Emerging Proposals for a Masterplan

While many visitors arriving at Bond Street station will head towards Oxford Street, many are also anticipated to come across the South Molton Triangle area. Grosvenor is therefore planning a number of walkways to aid the circulation of people through the area, enabling a more natural footfall flow. Grosvenor will explore activation of the units on South Molton Lane (currently, these are just the backs to shops on South Molton Street and therefore do not have retail frontages), although KB confirmed that there would be some challenges to overcome in terms of ground levels. If these changes could be made, the environment on South Molton Lane would be far more pleasant and inviting. KB also noted that 48 Brook Street is a listed building, so there can be little change in terms of that physical building.

Indicative Consultation Timetable and Public Engagement

There have been some early briefings, and Grosvenor held consultation drop-ins last week on Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday. There was a good turnout, with 40-50 attending on each of those days, representing a good cross section of local residents, office workers and some visitors. Grosvenor is processing the responses now as there was a significant number. Having reviewed these consultation responses, Grosvenor will work on the design and share the updated version later in the year. This would follow through to presenting a final scheme in February 2019, with a view to submit a planning application once a final review process is complete.

KB shared feedback forms with the SG in case they'd like to submit a response.

SG Questions and Comments

DF questioned whether South Molton Lane would be pedestrianised. KB confirmed that Grosvenor doesn't currently have a particular view on this, although he confirmed that the current plans are for Davies Street to return to be a trafficked street, as it was prior to the currently ongoing Crossrail development. The SG agreed that there is certainly an argument for a pedestrianised area immediately outside Bond Street for both safety and aesthetic reasons. KB agreed with DF that South Molton Lane would be an obvious street for pedestrianisation if this were rolled out more widely, and indeed, the servicing of units was something that has been raised during the initial consultations.

DF queried the initial design on the masterplan emerging proposals, and thought there should be an increased number of restaurants and cafés immediately outside Bond Street station. She also thought that the walkway should be moved closer to the station. KB noted her comments.

MD highlighted that the South Molton Triangle represents a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to bring to life one of the key transformational ideas within the Mayfair Plan – the Tyburn Retail Frontage. KB confirmed that the South Molton Triangle is the northern bookend of the Tyburn Retail Frontage.

JB proposed an alternative flow of traffic to retain the pedestrianisation of the northern section of Davies Street that has arisen during the Crossrail development. However, NH highlighted the issue of servicing West One and access to Stratford Place in the context of private traffic having to be routed along Davies Street rather than along Oxford Street given the current proposals to remove private traffic from Oxford Street.

JB suggested that some smaller residential units could potentially be delivered within the wider development, which would be in accordance with the Mayfair Plan and would also provide some additional, more affordable, residential space as compared to the typical Mayfair unit size.

KB thanked the SG and noted their comments.

7.0 AOB

Website Updates

JB highlighted that the SG minutes are now up to date on the Mayfair Forum website. A majority decision was taken by the SG that Planning and Marketing sub group minutes ought to be removed from the website – not for fear of transparency but concerns that this will put additional pressure on minuting and a risk that text may be quoted out of context or otherwise mis-used

MNF Involvement in Grosvenor Square Stakeholder Group

MD proposed that because the licence application for Grosvenor Square has been relatively controversial among the residential population of North Mayfair, it would not be advisable for the Mayfair Forum to be represented on the Stakeholder Group.

NH highlighted that Grosvenor had had to liaise extensively with DCMS to set up the management agreement which because it hadn't been signed until 1st May, had inhibited the amount of prior consultation although subsequently, a range of stakeholders were consulted. DCMS, relatives of the 9/11 atrocities and other stakeholders have expressed interest in being represented, and NH is obliged to use his best endeavours to persuade the Mayfair Forum to be represented on the Stakeholder Group. However, JB thought that while the topic is very sensitive, the function of the Forum is to provide support for the Plan, and as a planning based discussion, perhaps there is no formal place for the Mayfair Forum on the Grosvenor Square Stakeholder Group. There would be other, more appropriate, ways that the Forum could comment on planning applications later on.

NH confirmed that within the Management Agreement it is specified that there will be no more than 15 commercial events per year. MD and JB highlighted the fact that the Terms of Reference for the Stakeholder Group set out that there will be 15 commercial events per year. NH clarified that the draft Terms of Reference, which need to be agreed with DCMS, confirm that it is 'up to 15 commercial events'.

The SG decided that the Mayfair Neighbourhood Forum will not be represented on the Stakeholder Group.

Referenda: Voting Entitlement

DF highlighted that JT has not yet contacted her following the last Planning Sub-Group meeting, during which

MAYFAIR — FORUM —

MAYFAIR NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

discussions took place about the voting entitlement of residents and businesses. The Planning Sub-Group was advised that business entitlement would be via a list that Westminster will have of all of the businesses currently paying business rates.

DF highlighted that in Mayfair there are a number of serviced offices where small individual businesses may be located, but the whole building has only one business rate payer and thereby one vote between all of the individual businesses contributing to the business rates via a service charge. These businesses would therefore technically be unable to vote in the election. JB highlighted that this is the consequence of a decision that was likely taken with the intention of preventing large holding companies with a number of subsidiaries having multiple opportunities to vote, It was also pointed out that the same problem is faced by community members, as Fr Richard is supposed to be able to represent all of his community, within which there may well be opposing views, with his single vote.

It was agreed that JT will confirm to Debbie whether this is the case, and that the Chairman would make contact with Josephine Gay at Westminster to ask whether anyone had considered this situation.

Actions

1. To arrange a meeting with Cllr Pancho Lewis, Cllr Timothy Barnes and Cllr Jonathan Glanz.	The Chairman
2. To investigate whether there are any Mayfair-based communications companies who would offer their services to the Forum pro-bono where needed.	JT
3. To arrange a meeting with RSMSJ within the next month, in order to update them about the SG's future plans for the Forum.	Fr Richard
4. To check the possibility of ward grant funding.	BD
5. To ask Westminster to send planning applications through from now (on an informal rather than statutory consultee basis given that the Plan has not yet been adopted).	NH
6. To set up a new planning@mayfairforum.org email address and share the login details with the Planning Sub-Group.	Secretary
7. To update the SG at the September SG meeting as to how the process of receiving and filtering applications is going.	JB
8. To raise the lack of response to the consultation on the Plan with Westminster.	The Chairman
9. To arrange to meet monthly with Josephine until the Inspector has made a decision on the Plan, accompanied by one or two other SG members.	The Chairman
10. To draft an application to Westminster for the Forum's re-designation.	MD and JB
11. To send MD and JB the full Mayfair Forum membership list.	Secretary
12. To update the Forum website, removing Planning and Marketing minutes	Secretary
13. To confirm to Debbie Flevotomou whether individual businesses occupying serviced office space and thereby not individually paying business rates would be unable to vote in the referendum.	JT
14. To raise the above issue with Josephine Gay at Westminster and ask whether this situation had been considered.	The Chairman