

Minutes of the Marylebone Forum Committee Meeting- 6th December 2018

Held at Streathers, 44 Baker Street, W1

Present:

Yael Saunders (chair) (YS), Tim Carnegie (TC), Michael Bolt (MB), Sarah Buttleman (SB), Simon Loomes (SL), Dan Johnson (DJ), Michael Meadows (MM), Sheila D'Souza(SD), Ian Macpherson (IM), Stephen Evans (SE), Richard Lovell (RL), Kay Buxton (KB), Ann-Marie Johnson (AJ), Penny Alexander (PA), and Andrea Merrington (AM) Kevin Coyne (KC).

Apologies

Michael Meadows

1. Introduction

YS welcomed all attendees

2. Details of Meeting

Insurances and Accounts:

Bank Account with HSBC- Yael not on as a signatory but MB and YS will sort out

Sub group of SB, MB and YS, IM will form a sub group to sort out insurances.

CIL funds and Consultation:

65 responses received so far online- aggregated results will be circulated via e-mail.

Flyers to be circulated by all forum members.

YS ran through the consultation process online and how it works.

SB- who is putting this out to schools and do we need a sub-committee?

Sub-committee to confirm who this is going out to so there is no duplication.

Consultation open for 12 weeks until beginning of Feb.

TC to produce pie charts to display results.

Marble Arch Presentation- ideas for public realm-

SL conducted a short presentation on the public realm ideas for Marble Arch

Marble Arch was put deliberately included within the forum area as it is an area that has been long neglected and including it helps to put it on the priority list.

Report on ideas for Marble Arch now completed with Public, Portman Estate-SL to run through.

SE- features very much on plan for what is proposed for Oxford Street therefore how do these proposals work with Ox Proposals?

SL-WCC must consult with TFL and WCC needs permission from the Mayor- discussions need to be taken forward. The proposals have not been tested from a highway's perspective.

SD- air quality concerns with providing a playground within such a busy area with cars.

SB- is the traffic for Marylebone or cars passing through, is there a way to get people stop driving through central London. SE there are not many other alternatives for traffic to go.

Great Cumberland PI- This report looks at this as well and also at Hyde Park and Speakers corner.

TC- Mayfair Forum has a strategic proposal to grass over park lane as their proposals for connections to the park.

SL- Looking for continued support from the Forum on this proposal.

RL- what is the current state of the proposals?

SL- the report is separate to Oxford Street and hopefully it can be fed in at a later stage but it's to keep a focus.

SD- Olympics- temporary structure for the event, any residual drawings to show that the events can be sustained.

SB- as a forum we should support this, DJ- would like to echo this comment as well.

YS – we are generally supportive with some concerns in relation to traffic

SE- details of traffic and playgrounds need to be provided going forward (SD and KC echo these comments)

Oxford Street Proposals:

All committee members are broadly supportive with some concerns.

MB and SL that both documents (Oxford Street Proposals and Marble Arch) have a common line of thinking.

MB- Combination of residents group (Better Oxford Street) have created a draft response with broader principles and separate groups respond individually.

MB Association broadly supportive and very happy with the logical piecemeal approach and district wide approach. However, 3 main concerns regarding Oxford Street itself- elements of closure which result in traffic displacement, allowance made of deliveries, so there is no displacement. Concerns on high pedestrian priority areas- traffic diversions to accommodate the part closure (afternoon closures), 3 concern- Oxford Circus- closure east west but allow traffic north south and this creates additional traffic time, diversions and creates further traffic displacement.

MB- happy to share draft response.

YS- do we share concerns?

SE- one concern- all relating to traffic displacement all related to other issues within the area.

SB- Questions the traffic numbers that are reduced, but questioned whether this is different types of traffic?

SD- would like to see NWECC comments.

DJ- support neighbour's concerns, there needs to be traffic management scheme, deliveries need to be reduced.

Oxford Circus – busiest station, very unsafe, duty to give more space to pedestrian

Proposals for lane widths don't make a huge difference

Restricted Access at certain times of the day- this could work if this does not create traffic displacement, could create only certain licenses for taxis within central London.

PA- management of space is a concern and a management plan that sits with this proposal and focuses on Oxford Street only would be helpful.

Delivery traffic needs to be reduced

KB- Marble Arch- A designated area in front of Selfridges has been identified however the area to the east on Oxford Street still needs to be a priority so it does not get forgotten

Bus routes will still operate, and this has been agreed this for accessibility issues

Management of the space still needs to be improved.

MB- is the forum drafting a response?

Agreed that we should issue a response- YS to draft and circulate for agreement

City Plan:

Affordable Housing:

SB- Page 48 don't want short term lettings and Air BnB- this need to be beefed up

TC- there should be a clause E within Policy 8- take a huge amount of housing out of market

SL- there is no way to enforce short term lets.

Air Quality:

SD- air quality – no proposals on how this will be included within draft policy

Parking:

SB- parking- should be taken away from all new housing developments, residential parking permits taken away, less requirements for parking. – All supportive

TC- appendix electrical charging points

Portland Place:

AM- Portland Place- no change- all support

Open Space Policies

YS- Open spaces- WCC Open Spaces and Biodiversity- question regarding consultation on this document.

Overall Comments:

KB- Forum should register with WCC to receive all policy documents

YS- Policy proposed less robust, and would like to see text more like within City Plan (current)

AM- suggest that housing (open space requirement needs to be considered)

Design and Conservation:

TC- policy density and building height- how does this work with audits

AM- Hdwe will suggest that audits needs to be reviewed.

SD- listed buildings need to be considered

TC- 66 Chiltern Street- example

SE- Listed building and conservation area legislation will override policies and new policies can't override this.

SL- mansard suggesting is mis- leading, should be re-worded to create encouragement for adding extra floors.

Generally supportive- on commercial policy proposals

Further comments on the residential Policy and- do we want to consider the wording of this policy because of the restrictions on providing additional units.

SE- would we support a policy to increase housing numbers and additional bedrooms.

SL- to draft wording up to support this

TC- irregularities of historic roofs should be maintained- TC to draft wording on this

TC- Policy 12 housing size- will draft wording on 150sqm too small as this could reduce affordable housing stock. This number should be increased to 250 sqm.

SL- intention of this policy is stop super prime housing

TC- Should refer to quality of housing as well.

AM- to provide some example of flats that are larger in size.

Economy and Employment

TC- to draft up some wording

TC- Policy 14- supporting economic growth – policy should be clarified

KB- co-working so expensive for so should be excluded from this policy.

SL- Our response needs to be general

Affordable Housing

AM- gave an overview of the proposed policies and intentions

SL- needs to be on gross floorspace and not on net

SB- policy should say rental and not sale

YS- We need to draft a response that we are not supportive of policy proposals as they stand.

Basement Policy

IM- Basement- does not distinguish between areas

Forum response- similar to what we have proposed.

Soho Special Policy Area

TC- Soho policy- demolition behind retained façades to combine buildings,

YS- should we look at this as a forum policy and Forum will make comment on City Plan regarding retained facades.

IM- is this something to consider as retail issue.

Prior to the meeting ending SE questioned the next date for the next AGM?

Next Forum Committee meeting confirmed as -24th January, however YS to confirm with group.

AM

06.12.18