

MAYFAIR NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM – STEERING GROUP MEETING  
16:00-18:00, THURSDAY 21<sup>st</sup> November 2019  
The Farm Street Church Hall, 114 Mount Street, London, W1K 3AH

**PARTICIPANTS**

Jeremy Bishop (Chair)	Resident
Jace Tyrell (Vice Chair)	Business
Bob Dawson (Treasurer)	Business
Fr Richard Fermer	Community
Marie-Louise Burrows	Resident
Diana Dennis	Resident
Kate Goodwin	Community
Fr Dominic Robinson	Community
Gordon Morrison	Resident
Sandeep Bhalla	Business

**APOLOGIES**

Scott Collier	Community
Keith Bailey (Secretary)	Business

**GUESTS**

Nick Brindley	Gerald Eve
Nigel Hughes	Planning Committee
Cllr Tim Barnes	Westminster City Council

**SECRETARIAT**

Oliver Ayling	Grosvenor
Hannah Kinnimont	Grosvenor

**AGENDA:**

**1.0 Welcome**

- JB welcomed all to the Steering Group meeting.
- JB introduced and welcomed Hannah Kinnimont who will be taking over from Oliver Ayling in Forum secretarial duties. JB thanks Oliver Ayling for his contributions to date.

**2.0 Briefing on the WCC City Plan 2019 – 2040 (Nick Brindley, Partner, Gerald Eve)**

- Nick Brindley from Gerald Eve presented on The WCC City Plan, and advice to the Mayfair Neighbourhood Forum following the Plan.
- NB began with congratulations to the Steering Group on the Mayfair Neighbourhood Plan being formalised.
- The government produces a national planning policy framework that consolidates all government ideas on jobs, plans etc. Within this document, the development plan is key. There are three elements to planning in Mayfair – the City Plan at city level, Westminster city plan at Westminster level, MNF at neighbourhood level.



- The GLA are looking to take onboard comments on the City Plan based on recent consultation, and send the new version to the planning inspectorate to review. It's anticipated that there will be an examination in Q1 next year, then the WCC can formally adopt the Plan. As of today, there are two draft plans in place.
- The Mayfair Neighbourhood Plan hence has weight as a recently approved document, but in the next six months all three documents will become current. The Mayfair Neighbourhood Plan has to be in compliance with the Westminster City Plan and where's there's conflict, it's for decision maker to determine which plan carries more weight in the locality.
- In Mayfair, Steve Brandon is the central area team leader. As Neighbourhood Plans are a comparatively new element to be considered in planning applications, it's for forums to remind officers that full consideration has to be given here as well as to other plans.
- NB recommends three key things: 1) engagement with Steve Brandon, 2) the forum can comment on committee reports published, 3) the forum has the right to appeal. It's important to gently remind all parties to the significance of neighbourhood plans in considering planning applications.
- JB agreed with NB's advice, and recommended that the Forum need to ensure the Mayfair Neighbourhood Plan has meaning and is used in the Westminster planning department.
- JT commented that the challenge with Neighbourhood Forums is that the team in Westminster needs to be aware of the planning application and CIL relevance of Neighbourhood Forums' Plans.
- TB explained that the democratic, ground up nature of Neighbourhood Plans means they're strong documents to start. However, from an industry perspective an issue is that Neighbourhood Forums will give them more weight than others. TB suggested the Soho Neighbourhood Forum could be a template, as the WCC issued a formal response to the planning suggestions it put forward.
- JB asked who in WCC will be working with neighbourhood plans? Cllr TB replied that it depends –he can't give answer on who yet, but reassures that officers have another democratic mandate to consider now and Neighbourhood Plans aren't being dismissed. The Mayfair Neighbourhood Forum is ahead of the curve, and the process of using Neighbourhood Plans isn't formalised yet.
- NH asked whether it's worthwhile meeting with Steve Brandon and his officers to discuss the Mayfair Neighbourhood Forum and its plans. NH commented that reports pre-referendum suggest a mentality that Neighbourhood Plans don't hold weight.
- JT asked whether we need to brief counsellors. Cllr TB replied saying yes, but that the executives at WCC need to work out how to incorporate the Neighbourhood Plan into guidance.
- NB suggested a briefing session will be helpful to summarise key elements of the Mayfair Neighbourhood Plans and key policies to draw out. NB, NH, JB, JT confirmed they'd attend this session.

**Action: Cllr TB agreed to arrange a meeting with WCC. (HK to co-ordinate)**

- JB discussed how the City Plan incorporates lots of Neighbourhood Plan ideas, and the decision for MNF to continue their development of the Plan rather than wait for the City Plan to be updated, had been correct. The forum will deal with the other two plans when they arise.

**3.0 Minutes of last meetings**

September Minutes

- The minutes from the September meeting were approved by the Steering Group.

October Minutes

- JB discussed a conversation with JT about a comment under CIL section saying that advice was coming from Forsters.

- JB described this was born from concern that New West End Company are concerned with JT's liability on Neighbourhood Forums.
- JB alluded to the constitution, that was drafted in principle by Forsters.
- JB discussed that the MNF are a forum where individual members have personal liability of a maximum £1 should the Forum close.
- JB suggested if members are concerned, then professional liability insurance is an option.
- GM queried whether the professional liability insurance would provide cover.
- JB questioned the Steering Group on whether they take comfort from the constitution.
- JT commented that he thinks the constitution does cover us.
- Item 2 of the MNF Articles of Association - Liability of Members, refers to this topic.
- TB informed that if any member misdirected funds, insurance cover wouldn't work as everyone is individually liable.
- MLB asked whether professional liability insurance will cover the whole Steering Group?
- JB commented that says he doesn't advise any insurance but rather it's an option.

**Decision: All agreed that Insurance would not be pursued.**

- The minutes from the October meeting were then approved by the Steering Group.

#### **4.0 Review of referendums and next steps for the plan**

- Cllr TB congratulated the Steering Group on the Mayfair Neighbourhood Plan and its success at the polls, saying the MNF is at the forefront having achieved this.
- JB commented that the MNF is the first business forum in Westminster to pass this post and questioned what the MNF can judge from the referendum result and process.
- JB described that Fr RF had a polling booth in his premises, and that a number of people hadn't heard of the MNF.
- Fr RF described how he spoke to officers at the polling booth, who said a few residents didn't have any awareness of the referendum and so for some, this meant they voted against the plan.
- JB described a similar experience at dance studio where a voter hadn't heard of the plan or forum. In total 44 voted against.
- JB described how moving forward, the plan has to be brought to life in order to initiate CIL applications with community support.
- JB suggested the Forum needs better ways to liaise with businesses and the community in Mayfair.
- JB asked the Steering Group for comments on how to gauge resident, community and business needs, as well as gaining their interest.
- Fr DR suggested the Group should put information everywhere, including on social media and taking it to residences.
- Cllr TB agreed that engagement with the group and plan is an ongoing process that required an ongoing plan, and that he experiences this in Westminster.
- MLB suggested the Plan could be allocated time on the television, with journalists putting together points the plan and locals interviewed.
- JT agreed that a big focus has been on referendum and the Group needs to move into a new engagement phase.
- JT suggested that the Forum needs members who can provide communication resources, as Alice did in the referendum.
- JT asked for all organisations to help with resources for communication.



- GM commented that other Neighbourhood Plans don't have the same problems with engagement and it's down to the Forum's locality. The Forum can't give up now the referendum has passed, as it leads to false authority in the area.
- DD suggested that a lot of people are afraid to engage as they're insular.
- SB agreed that social media allows people to engage when they want and it's a good medium as it's quick to spread information.
- Cllr TB disagreed, saying there's no way of tying a small geographical area to what you put on social media. Our unit, smaller than ward, is too small for social media. It's hard to make sure you don't have people making comments who aren't relevant to the conversation when using social media.
- NB suggested that from a business perspective, there should be an electronic not way of engaging businesses.
- NB proposed that the Forum needs something that they can grasp as success, something they are able to shout about – maybe CIL.
- NB suggested the Forum should have a party to raise their profile, such as in Grosvenor Square. This shouldn't be a planning event explicitly as that would not be engaging enough.
- BD agreed that we should use key headlines to push out. But how to do cost effectively? Don't have resources. Do we accept we won't get to everyone?
- Fr RF commented that the Plan passing is a success story and should be first thing to communicate. WCC should think about basic info at election centres moving forward.
- GM asked whether the Forum's newsletter could be communicated via the Westminster City Council's list of names and addresses.
- JB commented that the Forum has a database of residential addresses in Mayfair, that were invited to attend the referendum. However, there are no names for the residential or businesses addresses. Personalised communication works better.
- JB described how he asked, via our local Cllrs, WCC for names 4 years ago and they refused to provide them.
- Cllr TB commented that the electoral register is public realm, has names of all those there, and a company can buy one. It excludes those who want to remain private, which he suspected many in Mayfair are.
- GM suggested the Forum's project should be to collect email addresses. This should be used with newsletter and social media.
- JT commented that he'd like more resources from those around the table going into 2020.
- JT asked members whether their businesses have marketing teams?
- JB described that the Forum has 310 business and 229 resident/community members emails.
- JB suggested each Steering Group member can encourage all we know with a Mayfair interest to come along to meetings.
- JB described that a restructuring of the marketing group is needed, and it should be adequately resourced.
- JT suggested that the Forum creates a communication plan for the next year.
- FRF questioned whether the Steering Group will use the platform of upcoming events, such as the Mount Street Christmas Lights turn on.
- SB mentioned The Connaught's event to 400 people, where he could share MNF information.
- JT suggested Grosvenor says something about MNF.
- TB suggested that there should be a handout to give out if the Forum speak at events.
- JT suggested discussing the plan and forum at the Mayfair community awards in January, and that he'd follow up with this.

**ACTION: JT to establish if the MNF and the Plan can be discussed at the Mayfair Community awards**



- Cllr TB asked if property groups that distribute newsletters have one that goes to every resident in Mayfair? They feel like community newsletters.
- JT suggested that other communication, such as the Mayfair magazine, could be targeted.
- GM commented on the possibility of the use of Wetherell's news report.

**CONCLUSION: All businesses to decide what marketing resources they can make available (skills and hours). If they are not sufficient to create and implement a marketing communications plan, then funds must be sought sufficient to appoint an outside agency**

#### **5.0 General meeting agenda**

- JB discussed that the General Meeting includes ratification of new Steering Group members.
- Fr RF commented with unease about the ratification process.
- JB asked the Steering Group if everyone is happy to proceed with the General Meeting given there was less than 21 business days' notice.
- JB described that the constitution states ratification will happen at the next Annual General Meeting. He commented he'd rather ratify now, unless any Steering Group members object.
- JB asked the group whether Scott would be put up for ratification in his absence?
- Fr RF commented that it's problematic for there to be no chance for membership to propose other candidates.
- Fr RF suggested from the floor, that we reconsider this part of the constitution.
- JB advised that as no proposals had been made to alter our Articles of Association, the existing Constitution would prevail at this General Meeting. Any proposals to change the Constitution should be presented to the SG in advance of the 2020 AGM, in line with the requirements stated in our Articles of Association.

**DECISION: The General Meeting would proceed as planned.**

#### **6.0 CIL – next steps**

- JB suggested that CIL is the topic lying ahead to begin Q1 of 2020. There's no obligation to bring applications, but his suspicion is they'll open next round of CIL applications in March for an April/May decision. There is £888k of neighbourhood CIL allocated to Mayfair, the second highest in Westminster.
- JB commented on the neighbourhood CIL applications from Belgravia that he sent, saying that most were successful.
- JB asked the Steering Group to consider a CIL strategy; either one big drive scheme, or a number of small local schemes representing small successes. How would this be promoted?
- GM stated that the steering group can't just be reactive, but rather needs a three-year plan for CIL money based on what we want output to be in three years. He described an ambition for Mayfair to be clearly articulated, and that we can take steps in line with the plan.
- JT suggested the example of free street WIFI.
- GM suggested CIL could be used for training.
- Fr RF commented that he doesn't want CIL expenditure to take away WCC responsibility to maintain within Mayfair. It should also not overlap with development spending in the area, such as in Grosvenor Square. Spending shouldn't overlap with the responsibility of others.
- Cllr TB described that says CIL money from WCC goes to neighbourhood forums, localising decisions away from the WCC.



- NH described that as opposed to parish Neighbourhood Forums where all CIL is distributed, here anyone in the neighbourhood can apply. The Mayfair Neighbourhood Forum is more integral, and WCC should put applications in front of the Forum.
- JB clarified that if the Mayfair Neighbourhood Forum doesn't do anything, it opens the door to others. Rather the Forum should demonstrate we're a reliable partner.
- JB alluded to co-funding on CIL, and recalled Tim Steele lobbying for support for a partially funded project in Shepherd Market.  
JT commented that this is a good leveraging model.
- NH suggested CIL be used for reverse vending machines, where you put in plastic bottles for example, and receive a voucher with restaurant discount for recycling. NH suggested that CIL could fund this machine and provide a donation to homeless. If discounts were badged with the Mayfair Neighbourhood Forum, it also provides an opportunity for advertising.
- JT suggested CIL expenditure on lighting being used for dark streets.
- JB suggested that in the General Meeting, we start the conversation and ask for broad ideas for CIL expenditure.
- Cllr TB commented that as a member of the CIL committee in WCC, he'd rather see less of a process to CIL spending.

**DECISION: a) JB to encourage discussion on possible CIL ideas at the General Meeting and  
b) At the January SG meeting, the Steering Group to bring forward project ideas that can be discussed with the community; also, a list of all those with whom CIL consultation would occur.**

#### **7.0 Date of next meeting**

- JB confirmed the next Steering Group meeting will be on the 19<sup>th</sup> December at 4pm at Grosvenor Estates offices.