

## **MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

### **RECORD OF DECISION OF THE CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION**

Decision Made: 18 December 2009

#### **BEARSTED CONSERVATION AREAS: DRAFT APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS**

##### **Issue for Decision**

To consider whether to approve the draft combined Conservation Area appraisal and management plan documents for Bearsted and Bearsted Holy Cross Conservation Areas for public consultation purposes.

##### **Decision Made**

1. That the text of the Conservation Area appraisal and management plan documents for Bearsted and Bearsted Holy Cross Conservation Areas, attached as Appendix A to the Report of the Assistant Director of Development and Community Strategy, be approved for consultation with relevant bodies and individuals.
2. That delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director of Development and Community Strategy to make presentational, editorial and minor changes to the texts prior to publication for consultation, including the inclusion of maps and photographs.

##### **Reasons for Decision**

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires local authorities to review their conservation areas from time to time in order to consider the possibility of revising their boundaries and to identify changes and pressures which may affect the original reasons for their designation. In order that informed decisions can be made on planning applications it is important to identify the special character of conservation areas which it is sought to preserve or enhance.

The first part of the document, the appraisal, identifies the key elements which combine to produce the special historic and architectural interest of the Conservation Areas, analyses how they interact and impact upon one another and explains how the areas have developed into their current form. It seeks to identify pressures and developments which threaten the special character of the Conservation Areas and sites and features which detract from their character and appearance. The clear understanding of the Areas' qualities provided in the appraisal offers suggestions for future policies and improvements as well as providing a framework against which decisions on individual planning proposals may be assessed. These are

further elaborated in the second part of the document, the management plan.

Resulting from the findings of the appraisal, the management plan contains proposals to preserve or enhance both Bearsted Conservation Areas. The document includes the policy background to the management plan, principles for development control, and suggested boundary alterations. It also contains information on review and good practice procedures.

The Conservation Area appraisal and management plan has been written in accordance with guidelines set down by English Heritage and Planning Policy Guidance Note 15. This has now been drafted (attached as Appendix A to the Report of the Assistant Director of Development and Community Strategy) for my approval to enable a consultation process to be carried out. The combined documents will be the subject of appropriate consultation in accordance with the aims of the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. This will include the following bodies and individuals:-

- a) English Heritage
- b) Kent County Council Heritage Unit
- c) Ward Members
- d) Bearsted and Thurnham Parish Councils
- e) Any other relevant organizations with an interest in the particular areas, e.g. the Bearsted and Thurnham Amenity Society, Bearsted Woodland Trust, and the Council for the Protection of Rural England.

In addition, copies will be placed on the Borough Council's website, in local libraries and a display will be located in the Gateway. A formal notice will be published in the KM and there will also be a press release. This should ensure that the combined appraisal and management plan documents are brought to the attention of the local public.

Once responses are received changes may need to be made to the documents. These will then be reported back to me for final approval for publication.

### **Alternatives considered and why rejected**

The alternative would be not to approve the appraisal and management plan for consultation. However, following this course of action would mean that the Council was not complying with national guidance and best practice.

### **Background Papers**

None

Should you be concerned about this decision and wish to call it in, please submit a call in form signed by any two Non-Executive Members to the Scrutiny Manager by: **30 December 2009**

**MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**RECORD OF DECISION OF THE CABINET MEMBER FOR**  
**REGENERATION**

Decision Made: 18 December 2009

**ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2008/09**

**Issue for Decision**

To consider the reference from the Local Development Document Advisory Group regarding submission of the Annual Monitoring Report to the Secretary of State.

**Decision Made**

That the Annual Monitoring Report, as attached to the Reference from the Local Development Document Advisory Board, be approved for submission to the Secretary of State.

**Reasons for Decision**

On 2 December 2008, the Local Development Document Advisory Group considered the report of the Assistant Director of Development and Community Strategy regarding the submission of the Annual Monitoring Report ("AMR") to the Secretary of State.

The Local Development Document Advisory Group resolved:-

"That the Cabinet Member for Regeneration be recommended to approve the Annual Monitoring Report for submission to the Secretary of State, subject to the following amendments (text to be deleted has been struck out and replacement text is highlighted in yellow):-

- i) Para 2.11: People who live or work in Maidstone earn more than ~~the~~ **in Kent average** (excluding Medway). Earnings continued to increase from 2007 to 2008 (latest figures). **There is however a marked disparity (10.42%) between those who work in Maidstone and those who commute to London or elsewhere** ~~People who live in Maidstone earn more than those who work in Maidstone. This is because people who live in Maidstone often commute to London and elsewhere to work.~~ In 2008, the average Maidstone resident earned £23,975 and the average person who worked in Maidstone earned £21,713, ~~this is a disparity of 10.42%.~~
- ii) Para 2.13: However, Maidstone's Growth Point status will attract new investment for regeneration and improved transport links. **Surprisingly despite the towns proximity to London (2.11 above)**

46.1% (2001 census) of all journeys to work are made within Maidstone Borough. This is a relatively high rate given the town's proximity to London.

- iii) Para 4.14: However, such conditions are unnecessary if either the new build is on the footprint of the existing building or demolition was clearly stated in the plans. for the remaining dwellings because they are either being built on the footprint of the existing dwelling or it was clearly stated in the plans that the existing dwelling would be demolished.
- iv) Para 4.10: Work being undertaken for the Town Centre Study recognises Maidstone's rivers the river as a key asset and will look to improve access to the rivers.
- v) Tables 2.5 and 3.14: To incorporate figures for semi-natural ancient woodland if data is available.
- vi) Para 4.8: The word "potential" be removed from the last line."

Some Members of the Group had requested amendments and a copy of these were circulated at the meeting. The members concerned explained the reasoning behind the amendments. The Group were informed that a programme of re-surveying the ancient woodland areas will take place over the next 3 years and this would result in changes to the relevant indicator.

Following the meeting, a rogue figure was identified in the AMR housing trajectory (table 3.8). The figure 1,836 was incorrectly inserted into the SHLAA column for the year 2012/2013. As a result, the subsequent figures in the table were incorrectly calculated. The figures in table 3.8 have now been recalculated and the associated graphs (figures 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3) amended. The corrected trajectory still demonstrates that the Council is able to achieve the 11,080 requirement.

The AMR attached to the reference from the Local Development Document Advisory Group has been amended to reflect the recommendations of the Local Development Document Advisory Group.

### **Alternatives considered and why rejected**

The Council is required to submit the AMR to the Secretary of State by 31<sup>st</sup> December each year. If the Council does not meet a December submission, there could be financial penalties through the Housing and Planning Delivery Grant system.

### **Background Papers**

Local Development Scheme (2009) -  
<http://www.maidstone.gov.uk/pdf/LDS%20Combined.pdf>

Should you be concerned about this decision and wish to call it in, please submit a call in form signed by any two Non-Executive Members to the Scrutiny Manager by: **30 December 2009**