St. James’s Neighbourhood Forum
Regulation 14 report
Concilio update

Nathan Parsad-Wyatt – Director and Head of Public Affairs
This presentation will provide an update on the consultation activities that Concilio has been conducting over the last three months as part of the Regulation 14 Consultation on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan for St. James's, before being submitted to Westminster City Council for scrutiny.

We will also present the feedback that we have received from the St. James's community on their thoughts on the draft plan.
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Our outreach

Concilio raised the profile of the St. James’s Neighbourhood Plan through several in-person sessions around St. James’s

- St. James’s Garden Party
- 3 street stalls
- More than 100 businesses door-knocked
- 41 survey responses from across St. James’s
St. James’s Garden Party

- Concilio attended the St. James’s Conservation Trust’s annual garden party in St. James’s Square
- We were able to speak to more than 30 people regarding the draft plan and Regulation 14 consultation
Concilio held three street stalls in the St. James’s area, talking to members of the public about the draft plan and encouraging them to read more and fill in the survey.

WHERE AND WHEN?

Jermyn Street – Thursday 29th June

Pall Mall – Saturday July 1st

St. James’s Market – Wednesday 19th July
Door knocking

After each street stall the Concilio team walked into the businesses of St. James’s to hand out flyers and discuss the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

We had constructive discussions with business owners and employees while encouraging them to leave their feedback formally in the survey.
Consultation key figures

- More than half of respondents identified as local business people.
- 92% believe the neighbourhood plan will have a positive impact on St. James’s.
- All policies received a majority answer of “support” from respondents.

“I really like the emphasis on protecting the look and style of the local area”

“All very sensible to preserve this lovely part of London”

“The plan seeks to enhance existing heritage and architectural merit whilst seeking to harness and facilitate innovation in the built environment.”
Launched on June 21st our survey was made available to the St. James’s community through our website, a brochure and in-person methods.

The survey requires respondents to read through the 11 policies in the draft plan and for each signal their:

- Support
- Objection or;
- Neither the two

Objectors were invited to explain what about a particular policy they had issue with. People were forthcoming with their thoughts, both in this regard and with raising other ideas for the plan.

In the following slides we will display the responses received to each of these questions and more in the survey.
What is your relationship to the area?

41 out of 41 people answered this question (with multiple choice)

- Local Businessperson/employee: 20 resp. 48.8%
- Local Resident: 14 resp. 34.1%
- Visitor: 13 resp. 31.7%
- Property owner: 6 resp. 14.6%
- Community representative: 1 resp. 2.4%
Building Design in St. James’s

The plan proposes that all new buildings, conversion and refurbishments in St. James’s will be of architectural excellence and should contribute to the local distinctiveness of St. James’s. What do you think of this proposal?

46 out of 46 people answered this question

Support
41 resp. 89.1%

Neither support nor object
4 resp. 8.7%

Object
1 resp. 2.2%

1 objection:
“Higher density residential property should be prioritised.”
The Plan has identified separate areas within St. James’s that share similar characteristics. These areas will guide development to ensure it is cohesive with the existing spatial environment. What do you think of this proposal?

2 objections:

“Each of these areas is already far more heterogeneous than the zoning would suggest. They’re maybe a majority style in an area but certainly not a unique one.”

“If ‘cohesive’ means that more such clubs will be concentrated in my area designated ‘Duke St, King St’, residential life will be made impossible. If having an all-night club means the plan will designate the area as suitable for more of the same, residents’ committees will strongly object.”
Sustainable Development

The Plan states that environmentally sustainable materials should be used in development works. Building materials should promote a circular economy and aim to be net zero. What do you think of this proposal?

41 out of 41 people answered this question

3 objections:

“Removal of the term "aim". New construction should have to be demonstrably consistent with Net Zero in order to proceed.”

“Over emphasis on Zero Carbon.”

“These measures have a habit of resulting in viability issues that then effect build quality, the provision of affordable housing and workspace. Further thought should be given to the compatibility of the design excellence/build quality policy and this one.”
Roof-top Plant

The Plan will encourage that roof-top plant and clutter is mitigated or located away from any areas it may cause disturbances. Planning proposals will be directed (where possible) to install plant and building infrastructure in basements or enclosed spaces. What do you think of this proposal?

41 out of 41 people answered this question

- Support: 34 resp. 82.9%
- Neither support nor object: 7 resp. 17.1%
- Object: 0 resp. 0%

No objections
Traditional Shopfronts

The Plan will ensure that new, restored or adapted shopfronts must be designed in a manner that is complementary to the prevailing character of the area. What do you think of this proposal?

1 objection:

“Use of sustainable materials should be mandatory for new, restored or adapted shopfronts.”
Views

The Plan identifies and aims to protect iconic views in St. James’s. Proposals will be expected to respect and enhance these local and metropolitan views. What do you think of this proposal?

41 out of 41 people answered this question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>37 resp.</th>
<th>90.2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor object</td>
<td>3 resp.</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>1 resp.</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 objection:

“Views should be a secondary consideration as opposed to a priority.”
Hotels

The Plan will allow for new hotel development primarily in commercial areas of St. James’s. In areas where there are local residents, proposals must demonstrate how they will mitigate any adverse impact on residential amenity. What do you think of this proposal?

3 objections:

“I simply cannot understand why another hotel is needed ahead of other uses for the building/spaces in the area.”

“Development would be harmful, and mitigation would be inadequate.”

“It is already extremely noisy in Duke of York Street, there is no room for any more through/commercial traffic. Leaving only a few hours of rest during summer months when windows need to be open.”

Support 23 resp. 56.1%
Neither support nor object 14 resp. 34.1%
Object 4 resp. 9.8%

41 out of 41 people answered this question
Private Members’ Clubs

The Plan will aim to protect the existence of Private Members’ Clubs that occupy some of the most architecturally important buildings in St. James’s. PMCs can only be closed if it can be demonstrated that there is no demand for another operator of such a club. What do you think of this proposal?

1 objection:

“Whilst PMCs represent an important historical aspect of the area, their operations are a matter for their members and trustees I don’t see why this plan should be singling out this type of organisation for particular treatment or seen as more advantageous to the area than any other type of organisation. Indeed, given that some clubs still operate outdated and sexist membership policies are they really to be protected and encouraged in this way?”

41 out of 41 people answered this question

Support 26 resp. 63.4%
Neither support nor object 14 resp. 34.1%
Object 1 resp. 2.4%
1 objection:

“The policy needs to account for organisations - charities, not-for-profits etc which wouldn’t be able to support public realm works. Also, making developers provide may lead to uncoordinated investment.”

Any major development will be required to provide or support the public realm in the immediate vicinity of the site. This includes – but is not limited to – upgrading/repairing public footways or replacing listed and historic street furniture. What do you think of this proposal?

41 out of 41 people answered this question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>36 resp. 87.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor object</td>
<td>3 resp. 7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>2 resp. 4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Plan will encourage the facilitation of walking and cycling. New developments should provide new or improve existing infrastructure which supports safe and active travel. What do you think of this proposal?

41 out of 41 people answered this question

Support 28 resp. 68.3%
Neither support nor object 7 resp. 17.1%
Object 6 resp. 14.6%

6 objections (sample below)

“We should encourage walking not cycling. I am sick and tired of cyclist riding the wrong way down one way streets and riding on our footpaths”

“I am concerned about the quantity of rental e-bikes, pedal bikes and electronic scooters being deposited in the area. This clutters the pavements and roads and obscures shopfronts.”

“A desirable objective—but only if in conjunction with serious measures taken to stop on pavement and against traffic flow cycling”
The Plan endorses the sustainable policies as outlined in the Westminster City Plan 2021 and London Plan 2021 in order to reduce emissions and improve bio-diversity. What do you think of this proposal?

41 out of 41 people answered this question

Support

Neither support nor object

Object

2 objections:

“We already have effective emissions controls. No need for this policy to be extended here”

“This area has remained sustainable for years. If it ain't broke, don't fix it!”
Other comments on the plan

These quotes are taken from the offer to comment further at the end of the survey.

“More trees and fountains as well as pedestrians roads”

“Clean up alleyways, find ways to stop anti social cyclists riding on pavements, cycling the wrong way - ie on the roundabout the wrong way, knocking people over on the crossing by Marlborough road.”

“Better policing to keep parks pavements safe for all including disabled blind and elderly”

“Please install speed cameras and/or speed bumps on pall mall leading into St. James’s street.”

“I would like to see an active encouragement system in place for independent shops and galleries. Customers do not come to St. James’s for the chain stores. They come for the speciality shops that are only found here”

“More tree and wildflower planting if possible”

“Thanking everybody concerned, always a wonderful place to visit beautifully maintained.”

“Flexibility to allow energy efficiency improvements that are not visible from public spaces, e.g. double glazing in the back of buildings.”

“Really like the emphasis on protecting the look and style of the local area, I hope this extends up above street level”

“Further moves towards pedestrianizing busy areas”

“I think [the plan] it has all it needs”
Next Steps

The following is the expected timeline for the progression of the St. James’s Neighbourhood Plan:

**PRE-SUBMISSION (Regulation 14) Consultation**
- Summer 2023

**POST-SUBMISSION (Regulation 16) Consultation**
- Winter 23/24

**LOCAL REFERENDUM ON PLAN**
- 2024

**SUBMISSION OF PLAN TO LOCAL AUTHORITY (Regulation 15)**
- Autumn 2023

**INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF PLAN**
- Spring 2024

**PLAN COMES INTO FORCE**
- 2024
Thank you for listening this evening

We will now take any questions that you may have