

AGENDA

REGENERATION AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING



Overview and Scrutiny

Date: Tuesday 30 June 2009
Time: 6.30 pm
Venue: Town Hall, High Street,
Maidstone

Membership:

Councillors: Sherreard (Chairman), Beerling,
FitzGerald, Nelson-Gracie (Vice-
Chairman), Paine, Ross, Thick and
Vizzard

Page No.

1. **The Committee to consider whether all items on the agenda should be web-cast.**
2. **Apologies.**
3. **Notification of Substitute Members.**
4. **Notification of Visiting Members.**

Continued Over/:

Issued on 18 June 2009

The reports included in Part I of this agenda can be made available in **alternative formats**. For further information about this service, or to arrange for special facilities to be provided at the meeting, **please contact Esther Bell on 01622 602463**.

To find out more about the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees, please visit www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk/osc

David Petford, Chief Executive, Maidstone Borough Council,
Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone Kent ME15 6JQ

5. Disclosures by Members and Officers:

- a) Disclosures of interest.
- b) Disclosures of lobbying.
- c) Disclosures of whipping.

6. To consider whether any items should be taken in private because of the possible disclosure of exempt information.

7. Minutes of the Meetings Held on: 1 - 16

- a) 14 April 2009;
- b) 23 April 2009; and
- c) 27 May 2009.

8. Cabinet Member for Environment - Progress for 2008-09 and Plans and Priorities for 2009/10: 17 - 26

Interview with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Councillor Mark Wooding.

9. Cabinet Member for Regeneration - Progress for 2008-09 and Plans and Priorities for 2009/10: 27 - 38

Interview with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Councillor Malcolm Greer.

10. Work Programming 2009/10. 39 - 50

11. Future Work Programme and Forward Plan of Key Decisions. 51 - 62

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE REGENERATION AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 14 APRIL 2009

PRESENT: Councillor Sherreard (Chairman)
Councillors English, Batt, Beerling, FitzGerald, Nelson-Gracie, Paine, Ross and Thick

APOLOGIES: There were no apologies.

135. Web-Casting

Members agreed that they did not wish to discuss the exempt information in Agenda Item 15, 'Exempt Appendix to the Report of the Assistant Director of Environmental Services' and that all items on the agenda would therefore be webcast.

Resolved: That all items on the agenda be webcast.

136. Notification of Substitute Members

There were no substitute Members.

137. Notification of Visiting Members

It was noted that Councillors Chittenden and Vizzard were visiting Members with interests in Agenda Item 8, Call-In Park and Ride Establishment and Agenda Item 14, Call-In Park and Ride CCTV and that Councillor Chittenden wished to speak on these items.

138. Disclosures by Members and Officers

Councillor Beerling declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10, 'Cabinet Member for Regeneration Progress During 2008/09' by virtue of his position as a Director of Maidstone Housing Trust.

139. Exempt Items

The Committee agreed that it did not wish to discuss the exempt information contained in Agenda Item 15, 'Exempt Appendix to the Report of the Assistant Director of Environmental Services'.

Resolved: That all items on the agenda be taken in public

140. Amendment to Order of Business

The Chairman proposed the following:

- Agenda Items 9, 'Cabinet Member for Environment Progress During 2008/09' and 10 'Cabinet Member for Regeneration Progress During 2008/09' be deferred to the meeting of the Committee on 30 June 2009;
- Agenda Item 12, 'Road Safety Report' be deferred to the meeting of the Committee on 23 April 2009 to allow more time for discussion; and
- Agenda Items 8, 'Call-In: Park and Ride Establishment', 14, 'Call-In: Park and Ride CCTV' and 15, 'Exempt Appendix to the Report of the Assistant Director of Environmental Services', be taken together.

The Committee agreed to these proposals.

Resolved: That

- a) Agenda Items 9, 'Cabinet Member for Environment Progress During 2008/09' and 10 'Cabinet Member for Regeneration Progress During 2008/09' be deferred to the meeting of the Committee on 30 June 2009;
- b) Agenda Item 12, 'Road Safety Report' be deferred to the meeting of the Committee on 23 April 2009; and
- c) Agenda Items 8, 'Call-In: Park and Ride Establishment', 14, 'Call-In: Park and Ride CCTV' and 15, 'Exempt Appendix to the Report of the Assistant Director of Environmental Services', be taken together.

141. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 February 2009 be agreed as a correct record and duly signed by the Chairman.

142. Call-In: Park and Ride Establishment and Park and Ride CCTV

The Chairman invited Councillors Daley and Robertson to explain their reasons for calling in the decision of the Cabinet Member for Environment with regard to Park and Ride Establishment and Park and Ride CCTV.

Councillors Daley and Robertson felt that a substantial loss in the quality of the Park and Ride service would ensue if the seven Park and Ride attendants were replaced by two mobile attendants and CCTV. They considered that the role of the existing Park and Ride attendants was valuable, noting that it included duties such as meet and greet, customer information, security and service time monitoring. They therefore felt that CCTV was an insufficient replacement and should only be used to compliment the existing service. Councillors Daley and Robertson considered that the Willington Street Park and Ride Site would be significantly compromised by the removal of permanent attendants as it was enclosed by trees that could potentially be used as camouflage by vandals or car thieves. They were also concerned by the quality of CCTV coverage at night. Councillor Robertson highlighted that Park and Ride Officers from Cambridge, Canterbury, Salisbury, Oxfordshire and Derby

Councils considered CCTV to be inadequate on its own and noted that Cambridge City Council had proposed to increase the number of attendants at its Park and Ride sites from 15 to 17.

The Chairman invited the Cabinet Member for Environment, Councillor Mark Wooding, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Chris Garland, the Parking Services Manager, Mr Jeff Kitson, and the Surveillance Controller, Mr Chris Stewart, to respond to the reasons given for the call-in. Councillor Wooding began by stating that any decision that impacted upon the jobs and livelihood of individuals employed by the Council were not taken. He advised the Committee that it was a financial decision, as it was unsustainable to continue subsidising £429,000 to the Park and Ride Service. He highlighted to the Committee that an academic study had found that supervision at Park and Ride sites was considered one of the most important attributes by the customer. Attractiveness of the service had increased significantly with the use of cameras, whilst the additional presence of attendants also increased attractiveness, albeit to a much smaller extent. Councillor Wooding concluded that the report showed that CCTV was far more beneficial in providing supervision than attendants on site.

Councillor Wooding agreed that meet and greet was important, but noted that not all customers were currently greeted by the attendant due to the other tasks they undertook. He also highlighted that the bus driver was able to meet and greet customers. A member of the public advised the Committee that she felt that attendants were valuable as they were able to notify customers of delays or accidents, in addition to enhancing the security of the site. Councillor Wooding assured the Committee, and the member of public, that the mobile attendant would be able to attend a site to provide customer information if a particular issue arose, and noted that the bus driver, who was in direct contact with the mobile attendant, was also able to provide information to customers.

Councillor Wooding stated that he felt that CCTV would be more effective in surveying Park and Ride sites as the height of the cameras would enable a larger area to be viewed at any one time. The Committee acknowledged that a determined thief would avoid detection irrespective of supervision from cameras or attendants. Mr Kitson informed the Committee that there had been approximately five to ten reported incidents of damage to vehicles in Park and Ride car parks in 2008/09 and that only one incident had been witnessed by an attendant. He also highlighted that the camera design was such that it prevented detection of the direction the camera was facing. Councillor Wooding advised the Committee that the Park and Ride site would also benefit from central two way contact points in cases of emergency. In response to a question from the Committee, Mr Stewart advised Members that the cameras would be monitored by the Council's control room with links to the Police control room. A site survey had already been conducted by officers that had determined that CCTV was suitable on all of the sites. Mr Stewart highlighted that the London Road site already had a camera and the three additional cameras would be positioned across the three sites as required. The Committee was concerned that the CCTV cameras would not survey

the whole of each site and therefore requested an operational report on CCTV camera coverage. In response to concerns over night-time coverage, Members were informed that the sites were sufficiently lit and that the cameras were able to operate in low light level conditions. A Councillor queried the effect of a power cut on the surveillance of sites and was advised by Mr Stewart this would lead to no CCTV coverage, as was the case with town centre CCTV.

Councillor Garland highlighted to the Committee that Park and Ride had been identified as the Council's tool for dealing with congestion and that he did not feel the proposal would compromise the service. He felt that it was important to develop the Park and Ride Service into a sustainable asset. Councillor Wooding acknowledged that the proposal was not necessarily the most desirable option, but highlighted that it would ensure that Park and Ride remained economically viable. The Committee agreed the Service needed to remain financially sustainable and noted that Planning Policy had initiated work on this. Members agreed that this work should be accelerated.

The Committee was informed that one mobile attendant would be on duty until midday and would hand over to the other mobile attendant in the afternoon until closing. A Councillor queried the potential impact of periods of sickness or annual leave and was advised that the Operations Team would provide support in the event of short periods of absence. Mr Kitson advised Members that the attendant would be utilised to have more periods of 'active time' to carry out the duties than the existing permanent attendants.

Concern was raised with regard to the level of pre-decision consultation and research. Mr Kitson advised the Committee that he had consulted a number of groups but public consultation had not taken place. Councillor Wooding highlighted that recent place survey results had shown that the public considered Park and Ride as one of the least important areas requiring attention, being ranked 15 out of 16. Members were, however, assured that the service would continue to be monitored and that any deficiencies would be addressed. The Committee agreed that a report on customer satisfaction, levels of crime and staffing arrangements should be submitted to the Committee six months after the implementation of the decision.

Mr Kitson advised the Committee that the actual bus service times would continue to be monitored in real time using global positioning and that the monitoring could also be enhanced by mobile attendant monitoring. Councillor Wooding also assured the Committee that the number of Park and Ride Attendants would not reduce until after the CCTV was operational.

The Committee voted to take no action with regard to the Park and Ride Establishment Decision, with 6 votes for this and 3 abstentions. The Committee voted to take no action with regard to the Park and Ride CCTV decision, with 8 votes for and 1 vote against. Councillor FitzGerald requested that it be noted he voted against.

Resolved: That

- a) A review of customer satisfaction, levels of crime and staffing arrangements, with regard to the new Park and Ride structure, be reported to the Committee six months after the implementation of the decision;
- b) An operational report on the Park and Ride CCTV camera coverage at each site be submitted to the Committee six months after the implementation of the decision; and
- c) Planning Policy be urged to expedite the work on the sustainable funding of Park and Ride.

The meeting was adjourned from 8.45pm to 8.52pm.

143. Enforcement of Planning Conditions and Compliance with Section 106 Agreements Report

Members considered the Enforcement of Planning Conditions and Compliance with Section 106 Agreements Report and agreed that the report should be submitted to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration subject to the following amendments:

- That the report be amended to include a statement regarding Section 278 of the Highways Act;
- Section 5.3 be amended to 'Planning breaches are not criminal acts with the exception of unauthorised advertisements or works to listed buildings *or in areas of conservation*'; and
- Section 8.4 be amended to include the following recommendation '*That the Committee supports the commitment and development of enabling committees*'.

Resolved: That the Enforcement of Planning Conditions and Compliance with Section 106 Agreements Report be submitted to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration subject to the following amendments:

- a) That the report be amended to include a statement regarding Section 278 of the Highways Act;
- b) Section 5.3 be amended to 'Planning breaches are not criminal acts with the exception of unauthorised advertisements or works to listed buildings *or in areas of conservation*'; and
- c) Section 8.4 be amended to include the following recommendation '*That the Committee supports the commitment and development of enabling committees*'.

144. 2009/10 Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme

The Chairman highlighted the forthcoming work programming workshop on 27 May 2009 to the Committee and it was agreed that Members would

contact the Overview and Scrutiny team with further work programme suggestions. A Councillor suggested that a Social Housing review should be considered as a topic at the workshop.

Resolved: That

- a) The Committee contact the Overview and Scrutiny Team with work programme suggestions for the work programming workshop on 27 May 2009; and
- b) A Social Housing Review be considered as part of the 2009/10 Work programming workshop.

145. Duration of Meeting

6.30 p.m. to 9.10 p.m.

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

**MINUTES OF THE REGENERATION AND SUSTAINABLE
COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 23 APRIL 2009**

PRESENT: Councillor Sherreard (Chairman)
Councillors English, Batt, Beerling, FitzGerald, Nelson-Gracie, Thick, Hinder and J.A. Wilson

APOLOGIES: There were none.

146. Web-Casting

Resolved: That all items on the agenda be webcast.

147. Notification of Visiting Members.

It was noted that Councillors Bob Hinder and John A Wilson were substituting for Councillors Stephen Paine and James Ross respectively.

148. Disclosures by Members and Officers:

It was noted that there were no disclosures.

149. Exempt Items

Resolved:

That all items of the agenda be taken in public.

150. Amendment to the Order of Business

It was agreed that items 7 Objection to Traffic Regulation Order Off-Street and 8 Objection to Traffic Regulation On-Street of the agenda be taken together.

Resolved: That items 7 and 8 of the agenda be taken together.

151. Call-In: Objections to Traffic Regulation Order Off-Street and Traffic Regulation Order On-Street.

Councillors Clive English and Ian Chittenden began by presenting their reasons for calling in the two decisions of the Cabinet Member for Environment with regard to "Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders On- and Off-Street".

Consultation

Councillor English was of the opinion that consultation demonstrated a lack of support from residents and businesses with regard to the decisions. He stated that it had previously been made clear that changes to parking regulations were only progressed where the public supported the proposals. Councillor Chittenden stated that it was an insult to the public to ask for their opinion and then simply ignore it. Only 2% of those who responded to the Council with regard to the amendments were in support of the proposals and the two petitions signed by 1500 people demonstrated significant opposition. It was suggested that these petitions had been 'airbrushed' out of the decision and that the decisions had ignored the advice of the Joint Transportation Board (JTB). It was noted that those who were not resident within the Borough but who had signed the petition were likely to be those affected by the proposal of Sunday car park charges.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Councillor Mark Wooding outlined that the statutory required consultation had been carried out with local residents and businesses. The response received to the official public consultation was much lower than had been expected and 93.5% of those consulted had made no attempt to respond. The consultation responses and the JTB had been listened to, which had been demonstrated by the deferral of the proposed reduction in waiting times and the introduction of visitor parking charges. Councillor Wooding suggested to the Committee that there had been no evidence of overwhelming opposition. The Parking Services Manager, Jeff Kitson, identified that there were situations in which decisions must be taken despite public opposition. As these decisions attempt to control parking demand, some opposition was expected. The Assistant Director of Environmental Service, Steve Goulette stated that objections had been given careful consideration.

With regard to the petitions, Councillor Wooding acknowledged that both petitions were submitted outside of the consultation period and so it was difficult to determine how much weight should be attributed to these. One petition had been submitted prior to the beginning of formal consultation and therefore the public were unlikely to have had sufficient information regarding the proposals. The second was facilitated by a political party and so was likely to have been politically biased.

A number of Members felt that it should not be assumed that all those who did not respond to the formal consultation were in favour of the proposals. Mr Stephen Pullen, a local resident, believed that a lack of response was more likely to be as a result of the general public disaffection with the political process at a local and national level. It was also suggested that the decisions to implement these changes had been made prior to the beginning of the consultation process. Councillor Wooding indicated that amendments which had been made to the proposals following consultation indicated that this was not the case.

Mr Ivan White, the Chair of the Maidstone branch of the Federation of Small Businesses informed the Committee that he felt businesses within the affected areas had not been sufficiently consulted with. Councillor

Wooding indicated that the statutory required consultation process had been followed and adverts regarding the proposals had been published in the local press.

A Councillor identified that the majority of the general public was not familiar with the formal consultation process. Therefore, those who signed the petitions may have believed they had made their opinions known and subsequently did not respond to the formal consultation process. Furthermore, it was proposed that inadequacies with the consultation process and the advertisement of relevant meetings may indicate problems with the consultation process adopted by the Council generally, but was not specific to this issue.

Objection to Traffic Regulation On-Street

Cost

Councillor English suggested to the Committee that the proposal to charge residents for parking permits was effectively an additional tax imposed upon those who lived within inner Maidstone and some rural areas of the Borough. Councillor Chittenden was of the opinion that this represented a 16.4% Council tax increase. It was suggested that a large proportion of the affected residents fell into the lower income bracket. Nine of the areas fell within the top 20% of the most deprived areas in the Borough. Furthermore, almost all of those affected by the proposals did not have access to off street parking and so had no choice but to purchase a permit. Mr David Pickett, a local resident, questioned what residents would receive for the £25 charge, particularly as spaces were not being assigned to residents. Mr Pickett suggested that the first permit should be issued free of charge. Additionally, Mr Low, a member of the general public questioned what the percentage of parking spaces to cars was.

Councillor Wooding stated that the report outlined what would be received for the payment. Most notably, it was expected that parking spaces per car would increase as it was anticipated that not everyone would opt to pay for the permit. It would cost £16.05 in administration fees to produce the permits with the additional £8.95 covering maintenance costs, enforcement of the scheme and future inflation increases. During the formal consultation period, no objections had been made specifically with regard to the cost of the permit. A Committee Member questioned whether the charge of £25 for the permit was really expected to influence driver behaviour, as surely to do so, the price would have needed to be significantly higher.

In response to a question as to whether low income residents could be exempt from the scheme, Mr Kitson informed the Committee that this would result in the scheme becoming more costly. Mr Goulette indicated that a means tested system would be accompanied with difficulties. It was suggested that residents receiving benefits be considered exempt; however it was indicated that the qualification for different types of benefits complicated this proposal.

North Zone Migration

Councillor English was of the opinion that insufficient evidential basis had been provided which demonstrated that the cessation of North Zone migration would increase the number of available parking spaces. Councillor English requested the opportunity to research and present evidence to the Committee with regard to this matter. It was suggested that this would be more beneficial than implementing the change and then discovering that it was not of benefit. In response, Mr Kitson indicated that data demonstrated that over the investigated period, 24% of cars were parked in a different zone to that which they were registered to. This figure decreased to 18% at night. Officer experiences had also helped to form the decision. Mr Michael Lowe indicated that he resided within the affected area and often was forced to park away from his home due to a lack of parking spaces. Mr Lowe questioned whether it would be possible for residents to use their permits to park in local car parks at night.

Councillor Wooding informed the Committee that residents within the North Zone were able to use their permits to park in certain car parks after 6.30 pm. A Councillor requested that it be investigated as to whether more car parks could be made use of for this purpose and highlighted the need to advertise this concession to residents.

Objection to Traffic Regulation Off-Street

Councillor English stated that imposing additional charges on the retail and commercial heart of the Borough would have negative implications, particularly in light of the current economic climate and the decision of other authorities to suspend or decrease parking charges on Sundays. Councillor Chittenden questioned why £4 million was to be spent on the development of the town centre yet shoppers were to be discouraged from visiting the town. Further concern was raised with regard to the impact the charges would have on religious groups that worshipped on Sundays. It was noted that the JTB had no remit over off street parking and the decision to implement the charges did not have to be approved by KCC.

Mr Ivan White indicated that on a Sunday The Mall charged 50p for up to 4 hours. All car parks within the Borough that charged for Sunday parking were well lit, covered by closed circuit television and were close to retail services. This was not the case for the majority of the Council car within the town centre. It was also suggested that the implementation of Sunday charges was likely to be detrimental to employees, who on other days of the week were able to rely on the Park and Ride service or public transport to avoid parking within the town centre. It was requested that if Sunday charges were to be implemented the public must be made fully aware of these changes.

In response, Councillor Wooding stated that Maidstone was the last major retail town within the Kent which did not employ Sunday charges. Additionally the Mall, the Fremlins Walk car park and Sainsbury's car park all employed Sunday parking charges. Night time charges were

implemented some time ago, however the town continued to have a thriving night time economy. The report had considered the possibility of an initial decrease in the number of visitors to the town on a Sunday, nevertheless it was expected that this would be overcome relatively quickly as had happened following the introduction of Sunday parking charges in other towns.

Finally, it was suggested that a reduced parking rate on Sundays would not be favoured by the independent parking adjudicators who had previously asked for simplification of the parking charges imposed within the Borough.

Objection to Traffic Regulation On-Street

1. The Committee voted to take no action with regard to the proposal for resident parking permit charges decision, with five votes for this and three against.
2. The Committee voted unanimously to take no action with regard to the decision to defer the proposed reductions in waiting times and the introduction of visitor parking charges.
3. The Committee voted to take no action with regard to the decision to allow the cessation of north zone migration, with five votes for this and three votes against.
4. The Committee voted unanimously to take no action with regard to the proposal to increase the number of on Street Pay and Display bays.

Objection to Traffic Regulation Off-Street

1. The Committee voted to take no action with regard to the decision to extend the current Pay and Display tariff to all days, with five votes for this and three votes against. Councillor English requested that it be formally noted that he dissented from this decision.
2. The Committee voted to take no action with regard to the decision to implement orders as outlined in Appendix A of the Report of the Assistant Director of Environmental Services and the objectors informed of the outcome, with five votes for this and three votes against.

Resolved: That:

- a) The Cabinet Member for Environment investigate the possibility of residents being able to park in all those Council car parks that are in the vicinity of their parking zones;
- b) The concessions for residents with parking permits be promoted;

- c) The decision on north zone migration be monitored and reviewed during the first six months of its implementation; and
- d) The Cabinet Member for Environment investigate the possibility of residents on income-based benefits being exempt from parking permit charges or charged a reduced rate.

152. Road Safety Report

Members considered the Road Safety Report and agreed that they would contact the Overview and Scrutiny Officer, Mrs Bell, with any further comments by Friday 1 May 2009. The Committee made the following initial comments and suggested amendments:

- That the report be amended to include a recommendation for an annual road safety day with key stakeholders;
- That a recommendation be made to the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership regarding the importance of urging all partners to be actively involved in promoting road safety;
- That recommendation (a) (ii), 'Allowing the police to breathalyse more drivers using intelligence led breath testing' be clarified;
- That with reference to the witness session with the Executive Director of the Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety, a recommendation be included to lobby Central Government with regard to keeping British Summer Time all year round; and
- That a recommendation be included with regard to raising awareness of the impact of tiredness.

The Committee agreed that the final draft of the report would be approved by the Chairman in consultation with the road safety working group Chairman, Councillor FitzGerald, prior to its submission to the Cabinet Member for Environment. The Committee agreed that the report should be presented to the Joint Transportation Board and the Local Strategic Partnership.

Resolved: That

- a) The Committee submit further comments with regard to the Road Safety report to the Overview and Scrutiny Officer by Friday 1 May 2009;
- b) The Chairman approve the final draft of the Road Safety report for submission to the Cabinet Member for Environment in consultation with the Chairman of the Road Safety working group;
- c) That the final report be presented to the Joint Transportation Board and the Local Strategic Partnership; and
- d) The report be amended to include the following:
 - i. A recommendation that the Council hosts an annual road safety day with key stakeholders;

- ii. A recommendation be made to the Crime and Disorder Partnership regarding the importance of urging all partners to be actively involved in promoting road safety;
- iii. Recommendation a (ii), 'Allowing the police to breathalyse more drivers using intelligence led breath testing' be clarified;
- iv. A recommendation that Central Government be lobbied with regard to keeping British Summer Time all year round; and
- v. A recommendation with regard to raising awareness of the impact of tiredness.

153. Duration of Meeting

6.30 p.m. to 9.25 p.m.

This page is intentionally left blank

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

**MINUTES OF THE REGENERATION AND SUSTAINABLE
COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 27 MAY 2009**

PRESENT: Councillors Sherreard, Beerling, FitzGerald, Nelson-Gracie, Ross, Thick, Hinder and Vizzard

1. The Committee to consider whether all items on the agenda should be web-cast.

The meeting was not web-cast due to the change of meeting venue to Committee Room B.

2. Apologies.

Apologies were received from Councillor Paine.

3. Notification of Substitute Members.

It was noted that Councillor Hinder was substituting for Councillor Paine.

4. Notification of Visiting Members.

There were no visiting Members.

5. Disclosures by Members and Officers.

There were no disclosures.

6. To consider whether any items should be taken in private because of the possible disclosure of exempt information.

Resolved: That all items be taken in public as proposed.

7. a) Election of Chairman b) Election of Vice Chairman

Resolved: That

- a) Councillor Sherreard be elected Chairman for the Municipal Year 2009/10; and
- b) Councillor Nelson-Gracie be elected Vice-Chairman for the Municipal Year 2009/10.

8. Duration of the Meeting.

6:15 p.m. to 6:18 p.m.

This page is intentionally left blank

Maidstone Borough Council

Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 30 June 2009

Cabinet Member for Environment: Progress for 2008-09 and Plans and Priorities for 2009-10

Report of: Overview and Scrutiny Officer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee is responsible for holding to account those Cabinet Members whose portfolios fall within the remit of the Committee.
- 1.2 The Cabinet Members whose portfolios relate to the Committee are the Cabinet Members for Regeneration and for Environment.
- 1.3 At its meeting on 14 April 2009, the Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to defer progress report will therefore be considered alongside the Cabinet Member's plans and priorities for 2009-10.

2. Cabinet Member for Environment

- 2.1 The areas of the Cabinet Member for Environment's portfolio that are relevant to the Committee are as follows:
 - **Parking** – to be responsible for the development, operation and enforcement of the pay and display car parks, and on-street waiting and parking restrictions in the Borough.
 - **Public transport** – to be responsible for transportation policy including the operation of the Park and Ride service and the development of public transport initiatives; to be responsible for the Council's Concessionary Fares Scheme.
 - **Highways** – to be responsible for seeking strategic highways improvements; to oversee the delivery of the local (District) Highways functions; to be responsible for the Council's Environmental Improvement Schemes.

3. Progress

- 3.1 At the meeting of the Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 10 June 2008, Members interviewed the Cabinet Member for Environment with regard to his priorities for the Municipal Year 2008/09. Members also considered

a written statement by the Cabinet Member at this meeting, which is attached at Appendix A to this report.

3.2 The relevant extract from the minutes of the 10 June meeting is below:

"The Chairman welcomed the Cabinet Member for Environment, Councillor Mark Wooding to the meeting. Councillor Wooding informed the Committee that he advocated pre-decision scrutiny and that he intended to work closely with officers to ensure draft policy initiatives and supporting documents were supplied to the Committee as early as possible. He advised the Committee that if Members felt documents were not being received early enough to notify him of this.

Parking

The Committee was advised that Councillor Wooding had asked for a report on the competitiveness of pay and display car park and on street parking tariffs in comparison to other Local Authorities in Kent and other providers in the town centre, to ensure they remained financially and economically sustainable. A review of the effectiveness of parking restrictions, their control times and associated costs had also been requested although he considered that it was unlikely that changes to parking restrictions could be made within the municipal year. A Member related that the High Street Councillors had surveyed residents regarding the hours of residents' parking and considered that it was possible to implement changes within the municipal year. Councillor Wooding agreed that a separate meeting would be arranged with Councillors Beerling and English to discuss residents' parking.

Public Transport

Councillor Wooding introduced the Director of Change and Support Services, Mr David Edwards and the Public Transport Officer, Mr Clive Cheeseman to the Committee and advised that they would answer any queries regarding the re-tendering of park and ride and the service in general. Councillor Wooding advised the Committee that all three park and ride sites ran at a loss. A strategic assessment would be carried out to produce a strategic vision for Park and Ride, which would include both short and long term strategies. He informed the Committee that no plans existed to cut the service and that he supported the growth of park and ride and was working to identify future sites. The Committee noted that the re-tendering process for the three park and ride sites was imminent as the current contracts run out in January 2009. Mr Edwards advised the Committee that potential tenderers had been invited to a meeting and that there had been significant interest with 12 local and national companies had attended. A decision to commence the tender process would shortly be made by Councillor Wooding with the decision to appoint. Work had been conducted to investigate the current market, resident views and consider what else was being offered across the country. The Committee was assured that

the tender process would be competitive and that the quality of the service and cost would be key considerations.

Councillor Wooding advised the Committee that he would continue to work with KCC (Kent County Council) to improve Maidstone's transport links to the capital and that the findings of the Environment and Leisure Overview and Scrutiny Committee "Image of Maidstone" report had identified this as an issue of concern. A Member noted that they were pleased to hear that Councillor Wooding intended to utilise Councillor Robertson's experience and would discuss methods for taking this issue forward.

Councillor Wooding advised the Committee that he was committed to investing in and establishing a travel assistance scheme for the disabled and their carers within the Borough. Maidstone Borough Council would remain entitled to the grant of £444,000 towards the new National Bus Concession providing that the Council itself did not provide an additional scheme. A third party would therefore be used to provide the proposed travel assistance scheme on behalf of the Council. Mr Cheeseman advised the Committee that discussions had been held with Age Concern and Maidstone Volunteer Bureau to ensure that the new scheme would only target those in most need. It was hoped that the new scheme would be in place by August or September. A Member noted that careful consideration of the terminology used regarding the new scheme was required in order to ensure that Maidstone Borough Council did not lose out on the Government grant. Councillor Wooding advised the Committee that he was aware of this and that the terminology used would be carefully considered.

The Committee was informed that officers had been asked to look at the feasibility of the new scheme. 238 disabled residents and 111 carers had used the concessionary scheme. A number of Members were disappointed that the new scheme had not been implemented immediately. Councillor Wooding advised the Committee that they had been unable to implement the new scheme immediately as the exact number of those who were previously eligible and were now eligible for the new national bus concession was unknown but that the numbers requiring a new travel assistance scheme would be determined in the coming weeks. In response to a question, Councillor Wooding advised that it would be prudent to circulate the costing of the new scheme following receipt of this information rather than provide copies of the original fully costed scheme mentioned in their campaign literature as the costs of the scheme had changed. Councillor Wooding advised that the implementation of the new scheme required a secure system, noting that it would be managed by a third party and therefore required proper administrative and operational assessment prior to the allocated money being distributed. A Member commented that the number of disabled people in the Borough did not fluctuate as it was a criteria set by Central Government, and therefore queried why the existing

numbers could not be used to predict the cost of implementing the scheme. Councillor Wooding acknowledged that the numbers in reality should not be that different.

The announcement from KCC regarding the Kent wide extension to the National Bus Pass starting time from 9.30 to 9.00 a.m. was raised as an issue of great concern. Mr Cheeseman advised the Committee that KCC had not consulted with Maidstone Borough Council prior to their announcement and that he was apprehensive with the figures KCC had based their funding on. The Leader of the Council, Councillor Chris Garland advised the Committee that he had received an email from the Leader of KCC, Councillor Paul Carter confirming that KCC would indemnify Maidstone Borough Council of extra costs. However, in response to a question, Mr Cheeseman noted that technology did not exist to indicate how many additional journeys took place as a result of the earlier start time of 9.00 a.m.

Highways

Councillor Wooding informed the Committee that he was concerned with the issue of safety on the roads as the amount of time and resources dedicated to addressing this was falling and that he was committed to establishing a safety plan for the Borough.

A number of Members felt that the priorities set by Councillor Wooding were not ambitious and that they would like to see the vision revisited at a later date."

4. Plans and Priorities

- 4.1 The Cabinet Member for Environment will present his plans and priorities for the 2009/10 municipal year to the Committee. This will enable the Committee to monitor the progress of the Cabinet Member through the year.

5. Recommendation

- 5.1 Members are recommended to consider the statement made by the Cabinet Member for Environment in June 2008 and ask questions with regard to the progress that has been made on those issues highlighted as priorities.
- 5.2 The areas of the Cabinet Member for Environment's portfolio that are relevant to the Committee are outlined at section 2.1. Members are also recommended to consider these, and ask questions of the Cabinet Member for Environment with regard to his plans and priorities for the year for these areas.
- 5.3 Furthermore, Members are recommended to make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Environment with regard to his plans and priorities for the year.

5.4 Members are reminded that “Quality Recommendations” are those that adhere to the following categories:

- Recommendations that affect and make a difference to local people;
- Recommendations that result in a change in policy that improves services;
- Recommendations that identify savings and maintain/improve service quality; or
- Recommendations that objectively identify a solution.

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT

VISION FOR PORTFOLIO

PRIORITIES & PLANS 2008/09

As Cabinet Member for Environment, my priorities and plans for the year ahead are to work towards delivering good quality and cost effective services to the residents of the borough; to drive real improvements in the environmental issues that people really care about. In achieving this, I will work to ensure alignment to the six key themes that the council has already adopted in its strategic plan:

- A healthy environment
- Sustainable communities
- Prosperity
- Lifelong learning
- Quality living
- Quality decent homes that people can afford

Highways

Many aspects associated with the provision of highways lie with Kent County Council and the Highways Agency. However, I am concerned with those issues surrounding road safety; figures for casualties on Maidstone's roads are on the increase and this is an issue that now requires resources from KCC.

I will seek the strategic highway improvements we need in Maidstone over the coming year through the Joint Transportation Board (JTB) and will also work, through this channel, on tackling the increasing congestion in the town and the borough to help improve the quality of life for all residents of Maidstone in the years to come.

Public Transport

Transportation has an affect on how the borough will flourish and remain attractive for living in and accessing. The one key tool we have at our disposal to tackle rising congestion in the town centre is our Park and Ride service. Park and Ride is still heavily subsidised by the council and for the long term survival of the scheme this cannot be allowed to continue. However, I am committed that Park and Ride is, and will remain, the central feature for tackling congestion in the town and surrounding borough.

Consequently, we will begin a 'Master Planning' exercise for the development of a strategic approach to the long term provision of Park & Ride; developing a programmed implementation of sites, on a business case approach, to cater for projected growth in population, housing and car usage over the life-cycle of Growth Point status. This will bring to an end the ad-hoc approach that historically has been taken to Park & Ride. It will also assist in reducing and ultimately eliminating the heavy subsidisation of the past. This will ensure its long-term survival and viability.

In the short-term, we are currently reviewing the Park and Ride service contracts currently in place and will shortly be entering a tender procedure to ensure the service proposition still remains competitive and represents 'best value'.

Improving the quality of lives and prosperity of ALL in the borough is a key priority of this administration. To this end, we have remained steadfast in our commitment made at the budget meeting on 27th February, that we will retain a travel assistance scheme for the disabled and their carers within the borough to mitigate the effects of the removal of the voucher scheme when the national bus pass was introduced in April.

Work on this proposal started on day one under this administration and a scheme operated under a grant aid approach with a third sector appears the most efficient and viable scheme to run, and I expect to see a report on this by the beginning of July. I anticipate that this scheme will be in operation by August/September of this year.

Parking

I want our pay and display car parks and on-street parking to remain competitive with other providers in the town centre and other shopping centres in Kent so that we continue to attract people to the borough and town centre and to ensure it continues to thrive and be an attractive place to visit and shop.

With increasing levels of congestion and car ownership, we have to be mindful of the environmental impact and sustainability that comes with such increases and I will work to ensure our on-street parking provision and restrictions in the borough continue to address this, whilst also recognising the continued need to promote Maidstone as a great place to work and live.

Conclusion

I will work to deliver real and tangible improvements within my environment portfolio during the coming year with continued focus on the themes of the council's strategic plan and this administrations vision to achieve a vibrant, prosperous and dynamic borough. It is particularly important that we create a sustainable and environmentally conscious borough when taking into account the effects of growth point and planning over the next twenty years.

Councillor Notes on Agenda Item 8:
Cabinet Member for Environment – Plans and Priorities

Key Points

Questions

Additional Research/Evidence/Notes

Potential Recommendations/Action Points

Maidstone Borough Council

Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 30 June 2009

Cabinet Member for Regeneration: Progress for 2008-09 and Plans and Priorities for 2009-10

Report of: Overview and Scrutiny Officer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee is responsible for holding to account those Cabinet Members whose portfolios fall within the remit of the Committee.
- 1.2 The Cabinet Members whose portfolios relate to the Committee are the Cabinet Members for Regeneration and for Environment.
- 1.3 At its meeting on 14 April 2009, the Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to defer the Cabinet Member's progress report to its meeting in June 2009.

2. Cabinet Member for Regeneration

- 2.1 The areas of the Cabinet Member for Regeneration's portfolio that are relevant to the Committee are as follows:
 - **Local Development Plan** – to be responsible for planning strategy for the Borough including detailed consideration of planning policy and guidance; to be responsible for developing the Local Development Plan alongside the Leader of the Council for submission to Cabinet and the Council for approval; to be responsible for the preparation of development briefs and informal guidance notes.
 - **Planning** – to be responsible for all Executive planning matters, including Building Control.
 - **Economic Development** – to be responsible for the implementation and review of an annual strategy that will foster the local economy and bring associated benefits to the wider community; to be responsible for the development, review and application of the Council's Economic Development Strategy alongside the Leader of the Council.
 - **Sustainability** – to guide, advise and provide a strategic overview on sustainability issued as they affect the Council's internal and external activities; to ensure that the Council, the non-executive Committees, Cabinet and Cabinet Members are aware of sustainability issues when formulating policy; to make recommendations to Council on sustainability

issues arising from Council policies, and promote proposals to be adopted as Council Policy; to maintain the environmental quality of the Borough.

- **Housing** – to be responsible for the Housing Strategy; to be responsible for the relationship with local Registered Social Landlord's (RSLs); to be responsible for the development, operation and review of all the private housing functions of the Council and protection of private sector tenants, including the provision of the homelessness service.

3. Progress

3.1 At the meeting of the Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 8 July 2008, Members interviewed the Cabinet Member for Regeneration with regard to his priorities for the Municipal Year 2008/09. Members also considered a written statement by the Cabinet Member at this meeting, which is attached at Appendix A to this report.

3.2 The relevant extract from the minutes of the 8 July 2008 meeting is below:

"The Chairman welcomed the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Councillor Malcolm Greer to the meeting. Councillor Greer informed the Committee that he believed that resources were not adequate across a number of services, specifically Building Control, Development Control and Enforcement particularly in relation to the Information Technology (IT) interface between the services. Following meetings with senior management, reports had been requested for September to evaluate whether these services could be more efficient. He informed the Committee that officers in IT were visiting other local authorities to identify best practice including the IT interface equipment used between departments. The Committee was informed that money was available for an additional senior surveyor and it was hoped that this position would address the imbalanced work load. It was also envisaged that this post would give Building Control additional capacity to assist in ensuring that planning conditions were not breached. Councillor Greer offered to report back to the Committee on the findings of the efficiency reports.

Planning Enforcement

Councillor Greer advised the Committee that he intended to address the problems with enforcement through an enabling panel to work with contractors, to monitor and ensure procedures and planning conditions were adhered to and enforced. The Council's representatives on these panels were Councillors Harwood and Greer. Councillor Harwood would take responsibility for environmental and landscaping issues, whilst Councillor Greer would take responsibility for development delivery. The Committee welcomed the innovative idea of the enabling panels. Councillor Greer noted the achievement under the previous administration of a

reduction in the number of enforcement cases from 600 to 400 but noted that a number of the remaining cases required legal assistance. He advised the Committee that he intended to set the precedent that repercussions would ensue for developers if they breached planning conditions. He had therefore asked for estimates of the extra costs involved in pursuing high profile cases, noting that the Council does not have capacity within its Legal Service to pursue these. Councillor Greer advised the Committee that he had requested a report for September on methods of becoming more pro-active in enforcement. In response to a question Councillor Greer noted the importance of communicating the timescale of delivery and the actions the Council was undertaking to enforce conditions. A Member believed that there was a general timidity and lack of willingness on the part of legal services in enforcement to pursue anything that was difficult or might result in the need to litigate and it was therefore requested that the Cabinet Member gives attention to this. Councillor Greer advised the Committee that he was mindful of these issues and that these formulated part of the reason he had requested the reports.

A number of Members commented on Parish Councils' dissatisfaction with regard to the level of information they were allowed to access regarding enforcement investigations. Councillor Greer noted the Parish Councils' frustration but advised the Committee that he was seeking advice from officers and that they intended to introduce planning service information packs for Parish Councils. The Committee requested that they be informed of the legal information that Parish Councils will have made available to them. As well as the forthcoming information packs the Council had a limited fund available to provide equipment such as projectors to Parish Councils. The Committee expressed concern that Community Groups and Forums in non-parished areas of the Borough did not have the assistance available to them that was available to Parish Councils and requested that this be investigated and appropriate action be taken.

Character Area Assessments

In response to a question, Councillor Greer informed the Committee that he supported Character Area Assessments. Public consultation on Character Area Assessments was taking place in August 2008. The results of the consultation would inform the policy for Character Area Assessments which would be developed by the end of December 2008. Councillor Greer informed the Committee that he was currently unsure of the timetable of future Character Area Assessments. Future Character Area Assessments were being prioritised and it was hoped that future assessments would be identified by the end of December 2008. It was explained that assessments cost approximately £20,000 each so the number of future assessments would be constrained by the level of finances available.

Economic Development

Councillor Greer advised the Committee that his priority was the economic development of Maidstone. Councillor Greer informed the Committee that he approved of the development at junction seven of the M20 as he believed that this would create a high quality 'Grade A' office space. With regard to the town centre the work that had previously been conducted was highlighted to the Committee. It was explained that he was particularly interested and committed to the pedestrianisation of the high street including the transport infrastructure required. . Councillor Greer advised the Committee that the plans for pedestrianisation included additional arts facilities in Maidstone. The Committee was assured that the plans would include the requirements of various town centre users including disabled people, taxis and buses. A think tank would be created to collate details of best practice across the country and build on the previous work of the Scrutiny Pedestrianisation Working Group to create a costed progressive master plan to achieve pedestrianisation. The Committee requested to be kept informed on the progress of the pedestrianisation of the high street, especially in light of the requirement of Kent County Councils investment into Maidstone to achieve it.

Gypsies and Travellers

Councillor Greer invited Councillors to continue forwarding information with regard to the enforcement of gypsy and traveller policies to him. He also advised the Committee that a review of gypsy and traveller site's policies would be undertaken during the next municipal year. Legal advice was also being received with respect of pursuing a gypsy and traveller site policy.

UCCA (University College for the Creative Arts)

Councillor Greer advised the Committee that the contact with UCCA had been positive. The Committee was informed that UCCA were looking at a number of sites across Kent however he felt that UCCA had seemed encouraged by Maidstone's potential with respect of the positioning of the campus.

The Committee thanked Councillor Greer for an informative introduction to his priorities for the year ahead."

4. Plans and Priorities

- 4.1 The Cabinet Member for Regeneration will present his plans and priorities for the 2009/10 municipal year to the Committee. This will enable the Committee to monitor the progress of the Cabinet Member through the year.

5. Recommendation

- 5.1 Members are recommended to consider the statement made by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration in July 2008 and ask questions

with regard to the progress that has been made on those issues highlighted as priorities.

- 5.2 The areas of the Cabinet Member for Regeneration's portfolio that are relevant to the Committee are outlined at section 2.1. Members are also recommended to consider these, and ask questions of the Cabinet Member for Regeneration with regard to his plans and priorities for the year for these areas.
- 5.3 Furthermore, Members are recommended to make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration with regard to his plans and priorities for the year.
- 5.4 Members are reminded that "Quality Recommendations" are those that adhere to the following categories:
 - Recommendations that affect and make a difference to local people;
 - Recommendations that result in a change in policy that improves services;
 - Recommendations that identify savings and maintain/improve service quality; or
 - Recommendations that objectively identify a solution.

This page is intentionally left blank

**REPORT FOR THE
REGENERATION AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

JUNE 10TH. 2008.

Please accept my apologies for non-attendance at your meeting, but I have to go into hospital for a procedure to address the Atrial Fibrillation of my heart.

The only time within the next few months that I could have this procedure performed was on June 10th, so I had very little option with respect to re scheduling.

As you are undoubtedly minded, my Portfolio is large – covering –
Planning
Housing
Sustainability
Economic Development
Local Development Plan.

May I record my thanks to Councillor Clive English for the time he has made available to me, with bringing me ‘up to speed’ on numerous matters concerning my Portfolio.

It is not my intention to ‘re – invent the wheel’ but to build on the work done in the past.

However, I do have my own ideas to forward the Image of Maidstone which I will share with you at future meetings, should I be asked.

I have over the past few weeks started the process of meeting with Officers and Staff within these Portfolios, to ensure that I have a close working relationship with them and understand any problems they may have,

It is my consideration that Maidstone is planning led, as planning has an effect on all aspects of the Towns future – be it Structural Developments, Economy, Housing and the associated well-being of the Town.

Maidstone being the County Town of Kent should be vibrant, economically challenging and an attractive place to live, work or visit.

At this stage I will highlight the meeting that I have had.

PLANNING

I have had numerous meetings with Officers, relating to planning procedures and it is my consideration that we review the day-to-day working of Development Control and Building Control.

I do believe that the Planning Office requires an Office Manager dedicated to the day to day running of the office. This would alleviate Planning Officers from the more mundane tasks and utilising their specialities more efficiently.

I have requested that a Report be given to me by September on ‘a way forward’.

Further to the workings of Development Control, Building Control and Enforcement, I have initiated a Survey of I.T. used in these areas, as it would appear that there are areas of concern relating to the transfer and interaction of information between Departments.

Report of: Cabinet Member for Regeneration

I have requested that Officers visit other Council's, whose systems are known to be more user friendly and efficient. I will also be attending these visits, the first one being to Tunbridge Wells.

I have also requested a Report by September on this matter.

I do believe that it is paramount, if we are to offer a 1st Class Service to our Residents, that we have in place an efficient system.

With regard to Landscaping, I consider that this is a vital aspect of Planning Applications. These schemes have to be robust and indigenous to the area of the Application.

I will be looking to have a robust landscaping schemes brought to the Planning Committee, in an effort to reduce Planning Committee time. To this end we are looking to appoint another Landscaping Officer, but again, I am awaiting a Report from the Officers.

With respect to Enforcement, I do believe that we need to address Planning Conditions more vigorously, at the earliest possible time and I do believe that Development Control and Building Control have a job to perform in this area. This will reduce the number of Enforcement issues, ensure that Developers deliver what was agreed and make the process of Development smoother and more cost effective for MBC. To this end I have requested a meeting with all related Officers to action my concerns.

As a possible way forward I have proposed that an Enabling Committee be set up, as and when The Clinic Application proceeds, to monitor the progress from Day 1.

This Committee would consist of possibly four people – 2 from the Developers side and 2 from Maidstone Borough Council, to ensure delivery of all aspects of the project.

It is my intention that this Committee would meet at least once a week, to ensure procedures are being adhered to and delivery is as agreed with MBC.

I consider that Members need to have more information available, especially relating to Planning Documentation and it is my intention to have a Library within Maidstone House for Member use. I will be raising this question more widely with Councillors, in order to establish the information that would be helpful to assist Members in their day-to-day workings. May I thank Councillor Richard Ash – Cabinet Member responsible for the new offices, for making a room available, and his encouraging remarks.

It is also my intention to make available to all Planning Committee Members and Substitutes, together with Parish Council's, an Information Pack relating to Planning Documentation, which will be helpful in their decision-making.

I have discussed this with Officers and will be looking to agree an initial list of content in the near future.

Further, it is my intention to continue the good work and continued involvement of Parish Council's, which is being led by Steven Goulette and Councillor Richard Lusty.

I will keep you updated on this and any further ideas, to ensure we have a smooth working relationship between Parish Council's and MBC

Report of: Cabinet Member for Regeneration

With respect to I.T., I understand that there are some problems in being unable to download information and I have brought this to the attention of Officers, who need to address this interface problem.

Further to equipment for Parish Council's, we do have a little money to help them and they will be contacted in the near future regarding any requirements they may have for improving their efficiency.

Regarding Gypsies – I am having meetings with Officers regarding the implementation of a Policy relating to Gypsies and Travellers.

I consider that we need to further the work already implemented, to address the formation of a Policy, which will help us in the future.

As you are aware this is a very difficult and sensitive matter, involving KCC and MBC, but a matter that I intend to forward as a matter of urgency.

General.

I have had meetings with Officers to forward my ideas relating to the pedestrianisation of Lower High Street, and it is my intention that a Project Group be established and also a Lead Officer be appointed for this initiative

At the same time, within this remit, we will be looking at the wider picture of Maidstone.

HOUSING.

I have had a meeting with John Littlemore and arranged future meetings regarding all aspects contained within this Portfolio.

I will bring you up to date in the future relating to associated matters, including Maidstone Housing Trust.

SUSTAINABILITY

I have had initial meeting with Officers, mainly in the area of Construction and Life Long Living.

Further to this, I have met with KCC Head of Development Investment, Nigel Smith regarding 106 Agreements and local initiatives regarding future developments and community infrastructure.

It is my consideration that money agreed by 106 Agreements should be used in the local community, to address local needs, but as a generalisation – all applications for 106 money would be addressed on individual requirements.

This is an ongoing matter on which I will update you in the future.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

I have had meetings with John Foster with respect to Economic Development and I also attended a meeting of the local Chamber of Commerce.

I will be pursuing John's ideas at future meetings with him, and I will update you as and when I have anything to report.

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Report of: Cabinet Member for Regeneration

As you are aware, this is an ongoing situation, and I will keep you informed on matters relating to this in the future, and as they develop.

I do have a meeting arranged with Professor Elaine Thomas regarding UCCA and their plans to re-locate from Oakwood Park.

Again, I will update you when information is available.

SUMMING UP.

I trust that the aforementioned gives you an idea of how I have spent the past few weeks and the way I perceive the image of Maidstone can be enhanced.

I am always happy to discuss any items with individual Members – so feel free to contact me.

Finally, should you wish to ask any questions during your meeting – please call me in Hospital on my Mobile.

(I did request a video link – but the Officers said NO!)

MALCOLM GREER.

Councillor Notes on Agenda Item 9:
Cabinet Member for Regeneration – Plans and Priorities

Key Points

Questions

Additional Research/Evidence/Notes

Potential Recommendations/Action Points

Maidstone Borough Council

Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 30 June 2009

Work Programming 2009-10

Report of: Overview and Scrutiny Officer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On Wednesday 27 May 2009, Members participated in a workshop to develop ideas for the 2009-10 Overview and Scrutiny Work Programmes. Ideas were received from residents, community and voluntary sector groups and officers, and these were considered alongside Members' own ideas at the workshop by each Committee.
- 1.2 Members of the Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee present at the workshop identified the following ideas as topics they wished to consider in 2009-10.

2. Potential Major Topic for Review

2.1 Gypsy and Traveller Sites Appendix A

- 2.1.1 Members at the workshop suggested an in-depth review to determine whether the promotion of a framework for a gypsy and traveller site Supplementary Planning Document was required.
- 2.1.2 The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) had revealed a need for some 32 additional pitches in the Borough for the period 2006 to 2011 which equated to a rate of some 6.4 permanent pitches per year. The Partial Review of the South East Plan will confirm how many pitches the Council must identify in the Borough for the 10 year period 2006 to 2016. The Council has recently invited consultants to help it prepare a Development Plan Document with the specific purpose of finding the additional necessary sites for Gypsies and Travellers. It is expected that the Consultants will be appointed in July 2009 and a long list of potential sites will be agreed by the Council by February 2010. Furthermore, it is anticipated that a Development Plan Document will be adopted by mid 2011.
- 2.1.3 Given the progress that has been made in producing a Development Plan Document to find additional sites, Members may not wish to review this topic yet and instead continue to monitor it under the Committee's watching briefs. However, if Members wish to conduct a review of gypsy and traveller sites, Members will need to amend the scoping report they produced at the work shop. A possible area the Committee could review includes the allocation of gypsy and traveller site prior to the adoption of the Development Plan Document. If the Committee wishes to conduct

this as a review, it is recommended that 1 to 2 months be allocated to this, including Committee meetings, visits to sites and desktop research by the Scrutiny Officer.

2.2 Clearance of Contaminated Land *Appendix B*

2.2.1 Members at the Workshop suggested that the Committee conduct an in-depth review of the clearance of contaminated land. This review would identify whether or not the Council was in a vulnerable position.

2.2.2 The country has the world's longest history of industrial activity dating back to the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in the 18th Century. Unfortunately this has left a legacy of contamination to address. Maidstone, as a historic town, has its share of previously industrial land including quarrying operations, often subsequently used for landfill.

2.2.3 This review would involve site visits and select-committee style interviews, in addition to desk based research by the Scrutiny Team. It could be undertaken over six months.

2.3 Economic Development Strategy *Appendix C*

2.3.1 The Cabinet Member for Regeneration endorsed the Council's Economic Development Strategy and Action Plan produced by Shared Intelligence in December 2008 and it may therefore be too premature to review the Council's Economic Development Strategy at this stage. Members may consider it more appropriate to request an update on the progress of implementing the strategy's action plan towards the end of the municipal year.

2.3.2 A possible alternative to this may be further involvement in the Council's production of a Regeneration Statement. A short regeneration statement is being produced by the Director of Prosperity and Regeneration to bring together the fragmented parts of regeneration across the authority. An initial draft is being produced and could be considered by the Committee at its meeting in July should Members wish to be involved. The production of a more comprehensive strategy will be considered after the adoption of the statement and Members may wish to also be involved in this.

2.4 Disabled Facilities Grants *Appendix D*

2.4.1 A Member suggested that the Committee review the Council's approach with regard to aids and adaptations to disabled housing to establish whether they were necessary. Members may also choose to review the distribution of Disabled Facilities Grants to home owners, private sector tenants and Registered Social Landlords to determine whether the distribution is appropriate.

2.4.2 Initial desktop research of this topic revealed a number of Local Authorities had reviewed the administration of Disabled Facilities Grants from initial enquiry to post adaptation, and Members may therefore wish

to expand this topic to a major review if they felt it was appropriate. This major review could be undertaken over three to four months. A scoping report for this review is attached at Appendix D.

- 2.4.3 This review could therefore either be done as a one-off review over one to two months or as a major review over three to four months. This review would involve select committee style meetings to interview the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and the Chief Housing Officer, in addition to desktop research undertaken by the Scrutiny Team. An informal meeting could also be undertaken to interview disabled housing tenants and Registered Social Landlords.

3. Potential One-Off Topics for Review

3.1 Maidstone's Roads

- 3.1.1 Members of the Committee suggested a one off review of Maidstone's Roads with regard to pot holes and congestion be undertaken at its meeting on 24 November 2009.

3.2 Concessionary Fares Update

- 3.2.1 Members of the Committee requested an update on concessionary fares at its meeting on 27 October 2009. This would include consideration of the impact of concessionary fares on the Council. This item could be expanded to also include an update of the Council's Travel Assistance for Disabled People Scheme. Members may consider a written update sufficient and request officers attend a future meeting if it was considered necessary.

3.3 Aids and Adaptation to Disabled Housing

- 3.3.1 Possibilities for an in-depth review of Disabled Facilities Grants are outlined at 2.4. However, if Members decide that sufficient time is not available for an in-depth review, they may wish to narrow the focus of the review to consider the Council's approach with regard to aids and adaptations to disabled housing to establish whether they were necessary.
- 3.3.2 This review could be done as a one-off review over one to two months, with a meeting to interview the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and the Chief Housing Officer, in addition to desktop research undertaken by the Scrutiny Team.

4. Setting the Work Programme

- 4.1 The Committee can choose up to 2 major reviews; these can be conducted either in traditional Committee meetings or as working groups. The Committee currently has a working group on Choice Based Lettings which will provide updates on its progress as appropriate. The Working Group is reviewing the advantages and disadvantages of a points, bands and hybrid allocation system. The Group will meet again in September to

monitor the progress of the existing points allocation system under the new Choice Based Lettings Scheme.

- 4.2 One-off reviews can be programmed into the work programme at any time; when deciding on this, Members should be mindful of other Committee work being undertaken at that time.
- 4.3 The complete work programme does not need to be drawn up immediately; Members are recommended to allow some flexibility in the work programme to allow for new issues to arise. However, it is recommended that Members identify potential items for the Committee to consider to ensure a varied, interesting and effective work programme.
- 4.4 The following work programme outlines the potential organisation of work for the Committee for 2009-10:

Environment and Leisure Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Future Work Programme 2009-2010

Date	Items To Be Considered
27 May 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elect Chairman and Vice- Chairman
25 Jun 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint LDDAG meeting
30 Jun 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member for Regeneration Vision • Cabinet Member for Environment Vision • Work Programme
28 Jul 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major Review (1)
25 Aug 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major Review (1)
29 Sep 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major Review (1)
27 Oct 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concessionary Fares Update (?) • Major Review (1)
24 Nov 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maidstone's Road –potholes and congestion (?) • Begin Major Review (2)
22 Dec 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major Review (2) • One off item
26 Jan 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major Review (2)
23 Feb 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major Review (2)

23 Mar 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• One off item
27 Apr 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cabinet Members Progress

Gypsy and Traveller Sites
<p>What are the objectives and desired outcomes of the review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Framework for a Gypsy and Traveller Site Supplementary Planning Document be promoted if necessary.
<p>Which witnesses are required?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Council Representatives; • Cabinet Member for Regeneration; • Planning Officer; and • Representative of Gypsy Community.
<p>Other ways to seek evidence? E.g. site visits, involving members of the public</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Visit
<p>What information/training is needed?</p>
<p>Suggested time for review and report completion date</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2-3 months
<p>How does the review link to council priorities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A place that has strong, healthy and safe communities; and • A place to live and enjoy.
<p>How does this item deliver CfPS effective scrutiny principles?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables the voice and concerns of the public • Is carried out by 'independent minded governors' who lead and own the scrutiny role
<p>Any co-optees or expert witnesses?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Councillor; and/or • Gypsy Representative.

Clearance of Contaminated Land
<p>What are the objectives and desired outcomes of the review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the Council's statutory role with regard to land contamination; • Establish whether the Council's Contaminated Land Strategy is fit for purpose; • Review the Council's progress in implementing the Contaminated Land Strategy Action Plan; • Identify whether a proactive or reactive approach is undertaken with regard to the identification and remediation of contaminated land; • Consider how identification and remediation of contaminated land is prioritised and whether it is fit for purpose; • Identify and compare the Council's approach to reviewing information regarding previously assessed individual sites; and • Determine whether the Council is in a vulnerable position and make recommendations as necessary.
<p>Which witnesses are required?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental health officer • Assistant Director of Environmental Services • Environmental Enforcement Officers • Environment Agency • Contaminated Land Officers, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs • Dr Paula Carey, Principal Lecturer in Environmental Science, The University of Greenwich and Co-ordinator of the Centre for Contaminated Land Remediation
<p>Other ways to seek evidence? E.g. site visits, involving members of the public</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible site visit • Photographic evidence
<p>What information/training is needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maidstone Borough Council's Land Contamination Strategy 2001 (Revised 2006) • Environmental Protection, England (2000 No.227) Contaminated Land (England) Regulations 2000
<p>Suggested time for review and report completion date</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 Months
<p>How does the review link to council priorities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A place that is clean and green.
<p>How does this item deliver CfPS effective scrutiny principles?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drives improvement in public services.
<p>Any co-optees or expert witnesses?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representative from Specialists in Land Contamination (SiLC) • Representative from Contaminated Land: Applications in Real Environments (CL:AIRE)

Economic Development Strategy
<p>What are the objectives and desired outcomes of the review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish whether the Council's Economic Development Strategy is appropriate, particularly in light of current economic developments.
<p>Which witnesses are required?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leader • Cabinet Member • Economic Development Manager • Assistance Director of Development and Community Strategy • Tourism Manager • Business Community including Town Centre Management, the Federation of Small Business and Kent Invicta Chamber of Commerce • Transport
<p>Other ways to seek evidence? E.g. site visits, involving members of the public</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Visit – other boroughs
<p>What information/training is needed? Information from regional development agency</p>
<p>Suggested time for review and report completion date</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long term
<p>How does the review link to council priorities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A place to achieve prosper and thrive. • A place that is clean and green. • A place that has strong, healthy and safe communities. • A place to live and enjoy.
<p>How does this item deliver CfPS effective scrutiny principles?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides 'critical friend' challenge to executive policy makers and decision makers. • Drive improvement in public services.
<p>Any co-optees or expert witnesses?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business community representatives • Bill Moss, Town Centre Manager

Disabled Facilities Grants
<p>What are the objectives and desired outcomes of the review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish whether the administration of Disabled Facilities Grants is appropriate and make recommendations as required; • Determine whether the distribution of Disabled Facilities Grants to Home Owners, private sectors and Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) is appropriate; and • Establish whether aids and adaptations to RSL's disabled housing are necessary, and make recommendations as required.
<p>Which witnesses are required?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disabled housing tenants • Cabinet Member for Regeneration • Chief Housing Officer • Registered Social Landlords
<p>Other ways to seek evidence? E.g. site visits, involving members of the public</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible site visit. • Photographic evidence. • Best Practice at other Local Authorities.
<p>What information/training is needed?</p>
<p>Suggested time for review and report completion date</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 – 4 months
<p>How does the review link to council priorities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A place with efficient and effective public services.
<p>How does this item deliver CfPS effective scrutiny principles?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides 'critical friend' challenge to executive policy makers and decision makers • Drives improvement in public services.
<p>Any co-optees or expert witnesses?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

This page is intentionally left blank

Councillor Notes on Agenda Item 10:

Work Programming 2009/10

Topic (Major Reviews)	Notes
Gypsy and Traveller Sites	
Clearance of Contaminated Land	
Economic Development Strategy	
Disabled Facilities Grants	

Councillor Notes on Agenda Item 10:

Work Programming 2009/10

Topic (One-Off Reviews)	Notes
Maidstone's Roads	
Concessionary Fares Update	
Aids and Adaptations to Disabled Housing	

Maidstone Borough Council

Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 30 June 2009

Future Work Programme and Forward Plan of Key Decisions

Report of: Overview and Scrutiny Officer

1. Future Work Programme

- 1.1 The Future Work Programme for the Committee is attached at [Appendix A](#); Members are requested to consider this to ensure that it is appropriate and covers all issues Members currently wish to consider within the Committee's remit.

2. Forward Plan

- 2.1 At the meeting of the Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 3 February 2009, Members considered the Forward Plan of Key Decisions and agreed that "this should be a standing item on the agenda to ensure important issues were dealt with in a proactive, rather than reactive, manner." The Forward Plan will therefore now be included on each Committee agenda under the "Future Work Programme" item.
- 2.2 The Forward Plan for 1 June 2009 – 30 September 2009 contains the following decisions relevant to the Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee:
- Landlords Accreditation Scheme;
 - Local Development Scheme 2009: Submission to Secretary of State;
 - Core Strategy Development Plan Document: Direction of Travel; and
 - South East Maidstone Strategic Link Road.

Reports with further details on these are attached at [Appendix B](#).

- 2.3 Members are recommended to consider the sections of the Forward Plan relevant to the Committee and discuss whether these are items requiring further investigation or monitoring by the Committee.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny
Committee**

Work Programme 2009-10

Date	Items To Be Considered
27 May 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elect Chairman and Vice- Chairman
25 Jun 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint LDDAG meeting
30 Jun 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member for Regeneration Vision • Cabinet Member for Environment Vision • Work Programme
28 Jul 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Regeneration Statement (?)
25 Aug 09	
29 Sep 09	
27 Oct 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concessionary Fares Update (?)
24 Nov 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maidstone's Roads (pot holes and congestion) (?)
22 Dec 09	
26 Jan 10	
23 Feb 10	
23 Mar 10	
27 Apr 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Members Progress

Watching Briefs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gypsy and Traveller Sites • Housing Survey

This page is intentionally left blank

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

**FORWARD PLAN OF
KEY DECISIONS**

1 June 2009 –
30 September 2009

Councillor Christopher Garland
Leader of the Council



FORWARD PLAN **June 2009 – September 2009**

INTRODUCTION

This is the Forward Plan which the Leader of the Council is required to prepare. Its purpose is to give advance notice of all the "key decisions" which the Executive is likely to take over the next 4 month period. The Plan will be updated monthly.

Each "key decision" is the subject of a separate entry in the Plan. The entries are arranged in date order – i.e. the "key decisions" likely to be taken during the first month of the 4 month period covered by the Plan appear first.

Each entry identifies, for that "key decision" –

- the subject matter of the decision
- a brief explanation of why it will be a "key decision"
- the date on which the decision is due to be taken
- who will be consulted before the decision is taken and the method of the consultation
- how and to whom representations (about the decision) can be made
- what reports/papers are, or will be, available for public inspection
- the wards to be affected by this decision

DEFINITION OF A KEY DECISION

A key decision is an executive decision which is likely to:

- Result in the Maidstone Borough Council incurring expenditure or making savings which is equal to the value of £250,000 or more; or
- Have significant effect on communities living or working in an area comprising one or more wards in Maidstone.

WHO MAKES DECISIONS?

The Cabinet collectively makes some of the decisions at a public meeting and individual portfolio holders make decisions following consultation with every member of the Council. In addition, Officers can make key decisions and an entry for each of these will be included in the Forward Plan.

WHO ARE THE CABINET?



Councillor Christopher Garland
Leader of the Council
chrisgarland@maidstone.gov.uk
Tel: 01622 602683

**FORWARD PLAN
June 2009 – September 2009**



Councillor Marion Ring
Cabinet Member for Community Services
marionring@maidstone.gov.uk
Tel: 01622 686492



Councillor Richard Ash
Cabinet Member for Corporate Services
richardash@maidstone.gov.uk
Tel: 01622 730151



Councillor Mark Wooding
Cabinet Member for Environment
markwooding@maidstone.gov.uk
Tel: 07932 830888



Councillor Brian Moss
Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture
brianmoss@maidstone.gov.uk
Tel: 01622 761998



Councillor Malcolm Greer
Cabinet Member for Regeneration
malcolmgreer@maidstone.gov.uk
Tel: 01634 862876

HOW CAN I CONTRIBUTE TO THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS?

The Council encourages and welcomes anyone wishing to express his or her views about decisions the Cabinet plans to make. This can be done by writing directly to the appropriate Officer or Cabinet Member (the details of which are shown for each decision to be made).

Alternatively, the Cabinet are contactable via our [website](#) where you can submit a question to the Leader of the Council or any Cabinet Member on-line. There is also the opportunity to invite the Leader of the Council to speak at a function you may be organising.

Cabinet Roadshows are held 3 times a year in different wards. This is an opportunity for you to meet the Cabinet Members direct and discuss any issues that may concern you.

FORWARD PLAN
June 2009 – September 2009

Title:	Landlords Accreditation Scheme
Portfolio:	Cabinet
This will be a "Key Decision" because:	Affects whole Borough
Purpose:	The introduction of a Landlord Accreditation Scheme for Maidstone as part of a wider Kent based scheme.
Decision Maker:	Cabinet
Proposed Date of Decision:	10 June 2009
Consultation and Method:	Consulted landlords by post and landlords forums
Representations should be made to:	John Littlemore, Housing Manager johnlittlemore@maidstone.gov.uk
Representations should be made by:	29 May 2009
Relevant documents:	London Landlords Accreditation scheme details Draft service level agreement
Wards affected:	All Wards
Other Information:	Swale Borough Council has been a lead authority in proposing a Kent wide Landlord Accreditation scheme. Maidstone along with others in Kent has been asked to participate in the scheme which will be very beneficial for MBC in supporting housing strategy key objectives.
Director:	Alison Broom, Director of Operations
Head of Service:	John Littlemore
Report Author:	Stuart White

FORWARD PLAN
June 2009 – September 2009

Title:	Local Development Scheme 2009: Submission to Secretary of State
Portfolio:	Cabinet
This will be a "Key Decision" because:	The Local Development Scheme sets the timetable for the production of LDF policy documents, which consequently has policy and budgetary implications
Purpose:	To approve the Local Development Scheme for submission to the Secretary of State, and to adopt the Local Development Scheme (subject to the Secretary of State's approval)
Decision Maker:	Cabinet
Proposed Date of Decision:	29 June 2009
Original proposed Date of Decision:	11 th February 2009
Reason for Delay:	Pending Member decisions on the direction of the Core Strategy, including the allocation or otherwise of land for strategic rail freight interchange. Decisions are required prior to confirming the timescales for the production of documents in the Local Development Scheme, which have implications for Housing & Planning Delivery Grant.
Consultation and Method:	LDDAG advice
Representations should be made to:	Sue Whiteside suewhiteside@maidstone.gov.uk
Representations should be made by:	1 June 2009
Relevant documents:	Local Development Scheme 2007
Wards affected:	Whole borough
Other Information:	Important to liaise with Government Office for the South East prior to submission to ensure acceptance of approach
Director:	Alison Broom, Director of Operations
Head of Service:	Brian Morgan
Report Author:	Sue Whiteside

FORWARD PLAN
June 2009 – September 2009

Title:	Core Strategy Development Plan Document: Direction of travel
Portfolio:	Cabinet
This will be a "Key Decision" because:	The DPD is the key document of the LDF policy framework, and the production of its evidence base has financial implications
Purpose:	To seek Members' approval for the direction of the Core Strategy, including consideration of representations on the Preferred Options draft and agreement of a draft timetable for the production of the DPD; and to advise Members of the progress of the Core Strategy evidence base
Decision Maker:	Cabinet
Proposed Date of Decision:	29 June 2009
Consultation and Method:	Stakeholder and statutory public input to Preferred Options stage; LDDAG advice
Representations should be made to:	Michael Thornton, Policy and Environment Manager michaelthornton@maidstone.gov.uk
Representations should be made by:	1 June 2009
Relevant documents:	Core Strategy Development Plan Document Preferred Options (January 2007); Representations on Preferred Options viewed on the Limehouse system at http://maidstone-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal
Wards affected:	All Wards
Other Information:	
Director:	Alison Broom, Director of Operations
Head of Service:	Brian Morgan
Report Author:	Michael Thornton

FORWARD PLAN
June 2009 – September 2009

Title:	South East Maidstone Strategic Link Road
Portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Regeneration
This will be a "Key Decision" because:	Have significant effect on communities living or working in an area comprising one or more wards in Maidstone.
Purpose:	To seek approval for expenditure to begin the design, alignment and cost estimation work for the SEMSL
Decision Maker:	Cabinet Member for Regeneration
Proposed Date of Decision:	Before 31 July 2009
Original proposed Date of Decision:	December 2008
Reason for Delay:	There has been a delay receiving the brief for the planned works from Jacobs.
Consultation and Method:	
Representations should be made to:	John Foster, Economic Development Manager johnfoster@maidstone.gov.uk
Representations should be made by:	19 June 2009
Relevant documents:	Cabinet Report September 10 th 2008
Wards affected:	All Wards
Other Information:	
Director:	Alison Broom, Director of Operations
Head of Service:	Brian Morgan
Report Author:	John Foster

This page is intentionally left blank