

# AGENDA

## Regeneration And Sustainable Communities Overview And Scrutiny Committee Meeting



Overview and Scrutiny

Date: Tuesday 12 February 2008

Time: 6.30 pm

Venue: Town Hall, High Street,  
Maidstone

Membership:

Councillors: Moriarty (Chairman), Beerling (Vice-Chairman), Mrs Batt, Chittenden, Greer, Mrs Marshall, Nelson-Gracie, Thick and Yates

---

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 31 January 2008**

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](http://www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk/osc)

**David Petford, Chief Executive**  
**Maidstone Borough Council, London House, 5-11 London Road,**  
**Maidstone Kent ME16 8HR**

<b>5. Disclosures by Members and Officers:</b>	
a) Disclosures of interest.	
b) Disclosures of lobbying.	
c) Disclosures of whipping.	
<b>6. To consider whether any items should be taken in private because of the possible disclosure of exempt information.</b>	
<b>7. Minutes of the Meeting held on 15 January 2008.</b>	<b>1 - 10</b>
<b>8. Parking Regulations and Enforcement:</b>	<b>11 - 12</b>
Interview with:	
• Assistant Director of Regulatory and Environmental Services, Steve Goulette; and	
• Parking Services Manager, Jeff Kitson.	
<b>9. Forward Plan of Key Decisions.</b>	<b>13 - 24</b>
<b>10. Future Work Programme and Actions Taken Since Last Meeting.</b>	<b>25 - 34</b>

**MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF THE REGENERATION AND SUSTAINABLE  
COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD ON TUESDAY 15 JANUARY 2008**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Moriarty (Chairman), Mrs Batt, Beerling, Chittenden, Greer, Horne, Mrs Marshall, Nelson-Gracie and Yates.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor Thick.

**88. Web-Casting**

**Resolved:** That all items on the agenda be web-cast.

**89. Notification of Substitute Members**

It was noted that Councillor Horne was substituting for Councillor Thick.

**90. Notification of Visiting Members**

It was noted that Councillors English and FitzGerald were visiting Members who wished to keep a listening brief on Agenda Item 8 – Best Value Review of Concessionary Fares. Councillor Garland was a visiting Member with an interest in all items.

**91. Disclosures by Members and Officers**

Councillors Horne and Mrs Marshall declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 8 – Best Value Review of Concessionary Fares by virtue of their holding concessionary fare passes.

**92. Exempt Items**

**Resolved:** That all items on the agenda be taken in public as proposed.

**93. Minutes**

**Resolved:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 December 2007 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **94. Best Value Review of Concessionary Fares – Implementation Plan**

The Chairman welcomed the Director of Change and Support Services, David Edwards, the Policy and Performance Manager, Alex Sharman, and the Best Value Support Officer, Anna Collier, to the meeting. Mr Edwards explained that since his last update to the Committee, the Government had announced that Maidstone would receive a grant of £444,000 towards the new concessionary fares scheme. The Cabinet had taken the decision on 19 December 2007 that the Council would follow the national concessionary fares scheme with no discretionary extras, such as the voucher scheme. The Local Government Association was challenging the Government on behalf of Councils with regard to funding for the scheme, and the Council had joined several other Kent local authorities in visiting the Department for Transport to lobby for more funding.

The Implementation Plan for the new scheme showed that the time lapse between the announcement of the funding and the implementation of the scheme was limited. Approximately 20,000 residents needed to be provided with Smart Cards, which consisted of existing users, new applicants and residents transferring from the voucher scheme. Work was also taking place to inform bus companies and other districts of the Maidstone position on the scheme. The Committee noted that a significant amount of work had already taken place to update the Council's database in preparation for the new scheme. The Implementation Plan provided the names of lead and accountable officers for each item to ensure delivery.

Mr Edwards explained that MCL was the company responsible for the collection of data on usage of the scheme across Kent and this would be closely monitored. It was noted that more accurate information would be provided by installing technology on buses to read the information on Smart Cards, but this was not likely to be available for several years.

A Councillor asked how long the Council would be able to sustain the additional expenditure for the scheme. Mr Edwards stated that this was difficult to answer because there were significant variables, for example the levels of future Government funding, the ageing population and the potential increased uptake of the scheme. In response to a suggestion, Mr Edwards agreed that a Kent-wide concessionary fares scheme would help to even out the current inequalities in costs to different local authorities but the likelihood of this depended on both central and local government.

In response to questions on the possible repercussions of continuing with the discretionary extras for the scheme, such as the voucher scheme, Mr Edwards stated that in the exempt appendix of the Findings and Options Report, a letter from the Department for

Transport to another authority stated that if such extras were offered, the authority would be unlikely to receive additional funding to meet any shortfalls. The Council was therefore left with little option financially but to fully comply with the national scheme. A Councillor stated that this lack of choice needed to be highlighted more clearly to residents who were concerned about the removal of the voucher scheme and companion passes and it was suggested that actions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 4.2, 4.3, 6.2 and 6.3 within the implementation plan should be amended to reflect this.

Further issues raised included:

- The later start time of 9:30 a.m. for the concessionary fares scheme was prescribed by the Department for Transport – bus operators had been written to highlighting the importance of rescheduling bus services to take account of this;
- It was hoped that robust audit mechanisms would be put in place to monitor usage of the scheme and accurately attribute costs to difference authorities. It would be easier to monitor the number of journeys starting in Maidstone than to monitor how Maidstone residents used their passes;
- The benefits for residents of the new scheme had not been explored but Smart Card technology, when implemented, would provide information on usage behaviour;
- There was no national policy on carers and companions, and disabled residents would still receive a concessionary fare pass. However, there were various voluntary arrangements available, such as through MVB and Age Concern, and the Council would be looking at how these could be supported through the grants scheme following the removal of the companion pass and voucher scheme;
- The Kent Freedom Pass was a Kent County Council (KCC) scheme for 11-16 year olds. This was currently being piloted in 3 local authority areas and would be rolled out to Maidstone by the end of 2009. KCC would meet the cost of this.

The Chairman thanked the officers for their attendance and requested that an update be provided in September 2008, when an update report was scheduled to be submitted to Cabinet, with regard to the implementation of the new scheme.

**Resolved: That**

- a) Actions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 4.2, 4.3, 6.2 and 6.3 be amended to emphasise that the Council had no choice but to change the concessionary fares scheme and to highlight alternative services; and
- b) An update be provided to the Committee in September 2008.

## **95. Section 106 Agreements – Internal Communications**

The Environmental Enforcement Manager, Sian Murphy, informed the Committee that a temporary Section 106 Compliance Officer had been in post for six months to look at how the Council monitored Section 106 (S106) agreements. The officer had also undertaken work to improve communication, both internally and externally, with regard to S106s. This would help the Council to ensure that S106 monies were spent in the correct way. A web-based application was being developed to track the progress of S106s which all relevant departments would have access to. It was noted that no collections of S106 monies or trigger points had been missed. An example of a trigger point was affordable housing; it was explained that the requirement for affordable housing to be provided was when the 15<sup>th</sup> property on a development was constructed. A Section 106 agreement could contain a large number of trigger points. In the financial year 2006-07, £2,048,585.85 in S106 monies was collected. In the three quarters to December 2007, £907,741.95 had been collected, which could be broken down as follows:

Education: £576,704.66  
Healthcare: £83,527.50  
Parks and Open Spaces: £225,867.87  
Highways: £21,641.92

£52,288.93 was still being awaited.

The Assistant Director of Regulatory and Environmental Services, Steve Goulette, added that there was close liaison between all departments within the Council to ensure that S106 agreements were fulfilled. It was also confirmed that the Council collected S106 monies on behalf of KCC.

A Councillor asked whether the Council could withhold S106 monies due to other bodies, such as KCC, until that body was ready to spend them to ensure that the money was spent in a timely and appropriate manner. Mrs Murphy explained that the collection and payment arrangements could be reviewed.

A Member asked whether other agencies informed the Council of how S106 monies allocated to them were spent. Mrs Murphy stated that communication with the Primary Care Trust (PCT) was not as good as it could be, however the Section 106 Compliance Officer had made good progress in establishing links with the KCC Education and Highways Departments. With regard to the records currently held to track the progress of S106s, a Councillor asked whether these could be made available to Members. Mr Goulette confirmed that this could be arranged. Mr Goulette added that the Council carried out checks to ensure that money awarded to other agencies was justified. If an agency tried to claim S106 monies

without justification, they would be challenged. Councillors requested that specific information on how the PCT had spent its S106 monies be provided.

In response to a question, Mrs Murphy confirmed that reporting how S106 monies were spent on a ward-by-ward basis was being considered. The web-based application that was being developed would make this easier. The application was in the testing stages and would be in place imminently, though an exact date was not available. The application would monitor both the financial and non-financial aspects of S106 agreements.

A Councillor asked why the Section 106 Compliance Officer was on a temporary contract as monitoring S106s was vital. Mr Goulette explained that a permanent post already existed to monitor S106s and so monitoring had been taking place for several years. The temporary officer was in place while a review of planning enforcement as a whole was carried out.

In response to a question, Mr Goulette confirmed that interest was charged to developers on late payments. If payments were not made, this was a breach of contract and the Council's legal team would take action. There were no significant issues with this currently. Developers were also responsible for paying the costs of drawing up S106 legal agreements.

A Councillor asked how developers could be prevented from buying a large plot of land and then selling it off in smaller plots to avoid S106s. Mr Goulette informed Members that planning policies should prevent this.

The Chairman thanked the officers for attending and requested that an update be provided at a future meeting of the Committee.

**Resolved: That**

- a) the collection and payment arrangements for Section 106 monies for external agencies, including Kent County Council and the Primary Care Trust, be reviewed;
- b) the spreadsheet currently tracking Section 106 agreements be made available to the Committee;
- c) information be requested on how the Primary Care Trust had spent Section 106 monies awarded to it by the Council; and
- d) an update be provided at a future meeting of the Committee.

**The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m. and reconvened at 8:00 p.m.**

## 96. Section 106 Discussion Paper

The Assistant Director of Development and Community Services, Brian Morgan, introduced the Section 106 Discussion Paper, explaining that it had been produced to stimulate debate on how the Council should enter into S106 agreements in the future. The paper had been written in the context of the government guidance contained in the Planning Obligations Circular 05/2005. The report identified 8 issues for discussion and comments on these were being sought from the Committee along with the Planning Committee and the Local Development Document Advisory Group. These comments would inform a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on S106s.

Prior to discussing the paper, Councillors asked for clarification on the requirements for affordable housing. Negotiations with the developers would establish what type of accommodation was provided so that there was a variety of affordable housing in the Borough. This requirement was separate to other planning obligations. If a development generated other requirements, these would be covered by a Section 106 agreement. Mr Morgan also informed Members that one option being considered was the tariff system. This would require a tariff to be paid on each property, rather than on a development, and would be in addition to the affordable housing requirement. It was noted that the tariff system was an alternative method of collection S106 monies, rather than a separate system.

The Committee then discussed the issues raised in the discussion paper.

*Issue 1: The question arises as to whether the priorities identified at Appendix 2 remain the Council's priorities.*

Mr Morgan clarified that the listed priorities for the allocation of S106 monies would only be used if a development could not afford all of them. In that case, contributions would be sought for each issue in priority order and in relation to identified need.

Councillor Garland stated that the previous Cabinet had altered the list of priorities to give "provision of open space and recreational land" the same status as "affordable housing". Members agreed that this would be a positive amendment to the list of priorities.

*Issue 2: The issue therefore arises as to how these external bodies should benefit from Planning Obligations and how the Council should integrate their priorities with its priorities.*

Mr Morgan highlighted that the PCT only sought financial contributions to medical provision such as doctors' surgeries, rather than hospitals, and the money therefore was for the benefit of Maidstone residents. While the Council was the collecting authority,



external bodies had to be specific in their requests for money so that the Council could monitor the use of that money.

Members agreed that the recommendation made within the report at paragraph 1.14.2, was appropriate.

*Issue 3: The issue therefore arises, should the Council require the full range of obligations even if the Developer argues that the development, for financial reasons, cannot meet the need for the obligation.*

Mr Morgan stated that more work needed to be done with regard to this. Councillor Garland raised concerns that if the Council insisted on all 6 contributions, even where the developer stated this was not affordable, this could affect the quality of the contributions.

The Committee agreed to refer this issue back to Mr Morgan for more research to be undertaken.

*Issue 4: There is the issue as to whether the money for the obligation should be divided equally between the priorities or on the basis of need.*

A Councillor stated that this issue depended on the circumstances and the issue of need could take precedence over the requirement for affordable housing. However, another Councillor pointed out that this could result in the Borough not meeting its affordable housing needs. Mr Morgan explained that this issue would only arise where a developer could not afford all 6 obligations.

Members agreed that the recommendation in the report at paragraph 1.16.2 should be approved, with the following amendment to the first section: "affordable housing *and the provision of open space and recreational land* should always be given the highest priority".

*Issue 5: Therefore in order to prevent the 'pot' being top sliced, the Borough will advise Developers that the Borough will not discount any payments to other Authorities when negotiating planning obligations. This approach would ensure that the Council would obtain maximum obligations to meet its priorities, some of which will include those of other bodies.*

The Committee agreed with this way forward.

*Issue 6: It is, however, an issue whether to levy contributions on developments of less than five additional dwellings would be counterproductive and whether contributions should be sought on all schemes over five dwellings.*

Mr Morgan explained that one route would be to use the tariff scheme, which would require planning contributions from each new

dwelling. The planning policy was in place to allow this. If the tariff system was used, S106 contributions would be received from each new dwelling for infrastructure, and S106 contributions for affordable housing and open space would still be triggered by the size of developments.

Members agreed to recommend that the tariff system be pursued as a way of obtaining S106 contributions.

*Issue 7: Should the prescribed period for spending monies received be amended to 10 years, given the time it takes to put infrastructure in place? The issue also arises as to whether, in addition, contributions should be sought to finance a S106 Delivery Officer to be located in Planning Policy.*

Members agreed that the prescribed period should be amended to 10 years. Due to the increasing complexity of S106 arrangements, Members also agreed that a S106 Delivery Officer post should be created and funded by S106 monies.

*Issue 8: However, this does raise a number of issues:-*

- a) Should part of the development be allowed to be commenced before the infrastructure is provided?*
- b) If one developer provides the infrastructure, what is the legal mechanism for obtaining contributions from other developers, particularly if they are not known at the time of the permission?*
- c) The same issues as (b) but where the Council or another Agency is carrying out the infrastructure provision.*

Councillors raised concerns that if part of a development was commenced before the infrastructure was put in place, the infrastructure may not be built. It was suggested that a bond or other type of guarantee be used to ensure the delivery of infrastructure obligations.

A Councillor asked whether a change in developer could mean that a S106 obligation would not be met. Mr Morgan explained that S106s went with the land, rather than the developer, so this would not be the case.

Councillors agreed that, with regard to (a) no development should be commenced without a bond or other guarantee being in place, and (b) and (c) should be referred back to the officers for further research.

Councillors also requested an update on the issues at a later date.

**Resolved: That**

- a) "provision of open space and recreational land" be given the same status as "affordable housing" in the Council's list of priorities for the negotiation of Section 106 obligations;
- b) the recommendation made within the report, at paragraph 1.14.2, be agreed;
- c) Issue 3 be referred back to Mr Morgan for more research to be undertaken;
- d) the recommendation in the report at paragraph 1.16.2 should be approved, with the first section being altered to say "affordable housing *and the provision of open space and recreational land* should always be given the highest priority";
- e) the statement at paragraph 1.17.1 be agreed as an appropriate way forward;
- f) the tariff system be pursued as a way of obtaining S106 contributions;
- g) the prescribed period for spending Section 106 monies should be amended to 10 years;
- h) a Section 106 Delivery Officer post should be created and funded by S106 monies;
- i) no development should be commenced without a bond or other guarantee being in place to ensure the delivery of necessary infrastructure;
- j) Issue 8 (b) and (c) be referred back to officers for further research; and
- k) An update be provided to the Committee at a later date.

## **97. Lockmeadow Market Report**

A Councillor pointed out that the recommendation within the report, "that...particular consideration be given to advertising on the back of buses and on local radio" was not reflected in the proposed marketing budget. The Senior Overview and Scrutiny Officer agreed to contact the Marketing Officer to amend this prior to the submission of the report.

It was also suggested, and agreed, that the wording within the proposed marketing budget be amended to reflect the potential alternative uses for a DVD promoting the Market, rather than just Kent TV.

Councillors asked whether the Bizarre Bazaars held at Christmas had been a success and the Senior Overview and Scrutiny Officer agreed to look into this and e-mail the Committee.

The Committee agreed that, subject to the change to the proposed marketing budget being agreed by the Chairman, the report should be submitted to the appropriate Cabinet Members.

**Resolved: That**

- a) The proposed marketing budget be amended to include advertising on local radio and on the back of buses;
- b) The suggested uses of a DVD promoting the Market be expanded;
- c) The success of the Bizarre Bazaars held at Christmas be reported to the Committee; and
- d) The Lockmeadow Market Report be submitted to the appropriate Cabinet Members.

## **98. Future Work Programme**

The Senior Overview and Scrutiny Officer, Miss Smith informed the Committee that Direct Access Homeless Provision was scheduled to be the next item on the work programme. The Officer stated, however, that an article in *The Guardian* recently had highlighted Maidstone as one of the easiest places in the country to get a parking ticket overturned and this may be a suitable item for review. Members agreed that it was important to look into this to establish whether there were problems with the issuing of tickets or the contesting of appeals. The Chairman also highlighted the new parking regulations that would come into force on 31 March 2008 and suggested that Members should be briefed on these.

Members agreed that parking enforcement issues should be considered before direct access homeless provision, but this should be kept in mind for future consideration.

**Resolved:** That Parking Enforcement issues be considered at the February meeting of the Committee.

## **99. Duration of the Meeting**

6:30 p.m. to 9:15 p.m.

## Maidstone Borough Council

### Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 12 February 2008

#### **Parking Regulations and Enforcement– Interview with the Assistant Director of Regulatory and Environmental Services, Steve Goulette and Parking Services Manager, Jeff Kitson.**

**Report of:** Overview and Scrutiny Officer

#### **1. Background**

- 1.1 At its meeting on 15 January 2008, the Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny discussed a potential review into parking enforcement following an article in *The Guardian* depicting Maidstone as one of the easiest places in the country in which to get a parking ticket overturned. Members agreed that it was important to look into this to establish whether there were problems with the issuing of tickets or the contesting of appeals.
- 1.2 The Chairman highlighted that new parking regulations were coming into force on 31 March 2008 and Members agreed that they should also be briefed on these.

#### **2. Parking Enforcement**

- 2.1 Consumer rights magazine *Which?* commented that it was worth persevering if an initial challenge against a parking fine was rejected, as most Councils did not contest repeated challenges against penalties.
- 2.2 *The Guardian* further commented that;  

"Away from the capital, Harlow and Braintree in Essex, Maidstone in Kent, St Albans in Hertfordshire, and Slough are among the locations where drivers won 80%-plus of appeals"<sup>1</sup>.
- 2.3 Figures for 2006-2007 rank Maidstone 11<sup>th</sup> of Local Authorities outside London to overturn a parking ticket following an appeal<sup>2</sup>. The Telegraph reported that 80% of the parking tickets in Maidstone which were appealed were overturned with 32% of these not being contested by the Local Authority.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.guardian.co.uk/money/2008/jan/05/motoring.consumeraffairs1>

<sup>2</sup>

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2007/12/19/nappeals119.xml>

### **3. Parking Regulations**

- 3.1 Civil Parking Enforcement Regulations come into affect on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2008. The new regulations form Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004.
- 3.2 The new regulations aims are to make parking fairer and transparent and provide motorists with consistency in service across the Country.
- 3.3 The major changes entail:
- i) Parking Attendants becoming known as Civil Enforcement Officers.
  - ii) Two levels of Penalty Charges depending on the severity of the contravention.
  - iii) Penalty Charge Notices no longer needing to be placed on vehicles or handed to the driver in order for it to be properly served and can instead be posted to the registered keeper.
  - iv) Penalties can be issued for parking alongside 'dropped kerbs' or for 'double' parking –being half a metre out from the kerb.
  - v) Annual Reports on Parking Enforcement are required to be produced by Local Authorities in order to perpetuate transparency.
- 3.4 The two levels of Penalty Charges in Kent include a higher tariff of £70 for more serious contraventions, and the lower tariff of £50 for less serious contraventions. Both fines are halved if paid within 14 days. However, the 50% discount period will be extended to 28 days if an informal representation is unsuccessful.
- 3.5 Local Authorities will be required to update their documentation to reflect the change of name for Parking Attendants to Civil Enforcement Officers and make reference to the new legislation where necessary.

### **4. Recommendation**

- 4.1 Members are recommended to consider the comments of the Parking Services Manager and ask questions with regard to Parking Enforcement and the new Regulations as they feel appropriate.
- 4.2 It is particularly recommended that Members consider any recommendations that they would wish to make with regard to the implementation of the new Parking Regulations.

## Maidstone Borough Council

### Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 12 February 2008

#### Forward Plan

**Report of:** Overview and Scrutiny Officer

#### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 Two of the key roles of Overview and Scrutiny are to hold the executive to account, and to review policy. The following extract is from the Scrutiny Handbook 2007-08:

Role	How
Holding the Executive to Account	Through pre and post cabinet decision scrutiny.
Policy Review	Keeping an eye on the policies developed by the council and the cabinet and making recommendations where appropriate for improvement.

- 1.2 One of the main ways in which the Council advertises forthcoming decisions is through the Forward Plan, which highlights all key decisions and reports due to be considered by the Executive in the four months following publication.
- 1.3 The sections of the Forward Plan attached at Appendix A are those that fall within the remit of the Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

#### 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 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



# **MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

## **FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS**

1 FEBRUARY 2008 –  
31 MAY 2008

Councillor Fran Wilson  
Leader of the Council



## **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 up-dated 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 Fran Wilson**  
Leader of the Council  
[franwilson@maidstone.gov.uk](mailto:franwilson@maidstone.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01622 673349



**Councillor Mike FitzGerald**  
Cabinet Member for Community Services  
[mikefitzgerald@maidstone.gov.uk](mailto:mikefitzgerald@maidstone.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01622 631301



**Councillor Peter Hooper**  
Cabinet Member for Corporate Services  
[peterhooper@maidstone.gov.uk](mailto:peterhooper@maidstone.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01622 729302



**Councillor Tony Harwood**  
Cabinet Member for Environment  
[tonyharwood@maidstone.gov.uk](mailto:tonyharwood@maidstone.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01622 677578



**Councillor Dan Daley**  
Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture  
[dandaley@maidstone.gov.uk](mailto:dandaley@maidstone.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01622 672459



**Councillor Clive English**  
Cabinet Member for Regeneration  
[cliveenglish@maidstone.gov.uk](mailto:cliveenglish@maidstone.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01622 672983

## **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.

<b>CABINET</b>		
Detailed Assessment – Air Quality Management Areas	13 Feb 08	3
Budget Strategy 2008/09 onwards	13 Feb 08	4
Treasury Management Strategy 2008/09	13 Feb 08	5
Strategic Plan 2008-11	13 Feb 08	6
Programme of Infrastructure Delivery 2006-2026 – Consideration of CLG’s response and grant award	13 Feb 08	7
Local Development Scheme	12 March 08	8
LDF Core Strategy	9 April and/or 15 May 08	9
Statement of Corporate Governance	15 May 08	10

<b>LEADER</b>		

<b>COMMUNITY SERVICES</b>		
CCTV – Manning Operation	Feb 08	11

<b>CORPORATE SERVICES</b>		
Partnership Working for Revenues and Benefits	Feb 08	12
Partnership Working – Revenues and Benefits	Feb 08	13

<b>ENVIRONMENT</b>		
Dog Control Strategy (formerly Dog Bin Strategy and Criteria)	March 08	14
Memorial safety Requirements in Closed Church Yards	March 08	15
Park and Ride	March 08	16

<b>LEISURE AND CULTURE</b>		
Maidstone Leisure Centre	Feb 08	17

<b>REGENERATION</b>		
Gypsy Site Regeneration – A vision for 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Feb 08	18
Conservation Area Appraisals	March 08	19

<b>OFFICERS</b>		

Title:	Programme of Infrastructure Delivery 2006-2026 – Consideration of CLG’s response and grant award
Portfolio:	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:	Following the submission to Communities and Local Government (CLG) of Maidstone’s Programme of Infrastructure Delivery, this report considers CLG’s response and grant award. If the grant award is less than bid for, a decision prioritising projects will be required.
Decision Maker:	Cabinet
Proposed Date of Decision:	February 13 <sup>th</sup> 2008
Consultation and Method:	Projects contained in the Programme of delivery will be subject to public consultation during master planning and strategy development and then through the normal planning process
Representations should be made to:	John Foster, Economic Development Manager <a href="mailto:johnfoster@maidstone.gov.uk">johnfoster@maidstone.gov.uk</a>
Representations should be made by :	31 January 2008
Relevant documents:	Programme of Infrastructure Delivery 2006-2026
Wards affected:	Borough wide impact
Other Information:	
Director:	Trevor Gasson
Head of Service:	Brian Morgan
Report Author:	John Foster

Title:	Local Development Scheme
Portfolio:	Regeneration
This will be a "key decision" because:	Framework document and budget
Purpose:	Work plan for the LDF
Decision Maker:	Cabinet
Proposed Date of Decision:	12 March 2008
Consultation and Method:	LDDAG advise
Representations should be made to:	Michael Thornton 10622-602768
Representations should be made by :	Mid – February 2008
Relevant documents:	LDS 2007 <a href="http://www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk/planning__building_control/local_development_framework.aspx">://www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk/planning__building_control/local_development_framework.aspx</a>
Wards affected:	all
Other Information:	
Director:	DCE
Head of Service:	Brian Morgan
Report Author:	Michael Thornton/Sue Whiteside

Title:	LDF Core Strategy
Portfolio:	Cabinet Member Regeneration
This will be a "key decision" because:	Policy Framework and significance
Purpose:	Principle decisions on the preparation and content of the revised draft Core Strategy for further public consultation, including associated evidence and master planning
Decision Maker:	Cabinet
Proposed Date of Decision:	April and/or May
Consultation and Method:	LDDAG, partners, evidence and studies, previous public and stakeholder engagement
Representations should be made to:	Michael Thornton – Economic Development Manager Brendon Neal
Representations should be made by :	Ongoing
Relevant documents:	LDF web page for information <a href="http://www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk/planning__building_control/local_development_framework.aspx">http://www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk/planning__building_control/local_development_framework.aspx</a>
Wards affected:	all
Other Information:	
Director:	DCE
Head of Service:	Brian Morgan
Report Author:	Michael Thornton/Brendon Neal



Title:	Memorial Safety Requirements in Closed Church Yards
Portfolio:	Environment
This will be a "key decision" because:	It will be a change to the way this service is delivered and affects several areas of the Borough
Purpose:	To consider the memorial safety requirements for Closed Church Yards
Decision Maker:	Cabinet Member for the Environment
Proposed Date of Decision:	March 2008
Consultation and Method:	Discussions with the Church of England
Representations should be made to:	Tim Jefferson, Facilities Management Officer
Representations should be made by :	15 <sup>th</sup> February 2008
Relevant documents:	
Wards affected:	High Street, Tovil, Sutton Valence, Ulcombe, Bredhurst, Loose, Hollingbourne, Boughton Malherbe
Other Information:	
Director:	Alison Broom
Head of Service:	Steve Goulette
Report Author:	Tim Jefferson

Title:	Park and Ride
Portfolio:	Environment
This will be a "key decision" because:	In excess of £250,000 budget, significance and other grounds
Purpose:	Review strategy and agree basis of new contract(s) tender
Decision Maker:	Cabinet
Proposed Date of Decision:	12 March 2008 (could be more than one report to one meeting)
Consultation and Method:	Research and studies into options, discussion with partners, customer feedback
Representations should be made to:	Clive Cheeseman 01622 602365
Representations should be made by :	End Feb. 2008
Relevant documents:	
Wards affected:	All
Other Information:	Should respond to LDF Core Strategy and transport modelling undertaken jointly with Highways Authority
Director:	Trevor Gasson
Head of Service:	Brian Morgan
Report Author:	Clive Cheeseman

## Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee

### Work Programme 2007-08

Date	Items To Be Considered
23 May 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forward Plan.</li> <li>• Call-In: Private Housing Sector Enforcement Policy.</li> </ul>
12 June 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member for Regeneration – Vision for Portfolio.</li> <li>• Cabinet Member for Environment – Vision for Portfolio.</li> </ul>
10 July 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concessionary Fares Best Value Review Scoping Report.</li> <li>• Call-In: Coombe Quarry Park and Ride.</li> </ul>
24 July 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Empty Homes Strategy.</li> <li>• Forward Plan.</li> </ul>
20 August 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maidstone’s Market.</li> </ul>
11 September 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Housing Strategy.</li> <li>• Maidstone’s Market.</li> </ul>
9 October 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation from Maidstone Housing Trust.</li> <li>• Consideration of Draft Market Report</li> </ul>
6 November 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on the “Memorial Safety” report.</li> <li>• Forward Plan.</li> <li>• Draft Housing Strategy.</li> </ul>
4 December 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concessionary Fares Best Value Review Findings and Options Report.</li> <li>• Update on Empty Homes Strategy (rec. 24 July)</li> <li>• Update on the “Support for Small Businesses and Entrepreneurialism in the Borough” report.</li> <li>• Update on Park and Ride Recommendations</li> </ul>
15 January 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concessionary Fares Best Value Review Improvement Plan.</li> <li>• Planning enforcement</li> </ul>
12 February 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forward Plan.</li> <li>• Parking enforcement and regulations.</li> </ul>
11 March 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct Access Homeless Provision</li> </ul>
8 April 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on the “Support for Small Businesses and Entrepreneurialism in the Borough” report.</li> <li>• Cabinet Member for Regeneration – update on progress during the Municipal Year.</li> <li>• Cabinet Member for Environment – update on progress during the Municipal Year.</li> </ul>

This page is intentionally left blank

**SCRUTINY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ACTION AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (SCRAIP)****Committee:** Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee**Meeting Date:** 6 November 2007**Minute No:** 73**Topic:** Draft Housing Strategy Review 2007

<b>Resolution<sup>i</sup></b>	<b>Chief Officer<sup>ii</sup></b>	<b>Response<sup>iii</sup></b>	<b>Timetable<sup>iv</sup></b>	<b>Lead Officer<sup>v</sup></b>
<p><u>Housing Services:</u></p> <p>i. prepare a short briefing report on the impact of the Comprehensive Spending Review and the proposed plans arising from the Queen's speech 2007 on Housing Services and the delivery of strategy</p>	David Edwards	<p>1. The Council's Budget Strategy was considered by Cabinet 19/12, and by Corporate Services O&amp;S on 8/1, item 9.</p> <p>2. A budget simulator exercise resulted in many comments from the public supporting affordable housing</p> <p>3. The following are implications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capital programme reduction – impacts on provision of affordable homes</li> <li>• Grant reductions – impact on decent homes and energy efficiency</li> <li>• Homelessness Grant reduction/ withdrawal will impact tenancy support</li> </ul>	Completed	Duncan Bruce
<p>ii. report back on the loan scheme requested for investigation as an alternative to the grants scheme by the Committee on 23 May 2007</p>	David Edwards	The council has joined a Kent-wide consortium that promotes equity release in order to fund works through the Home Proud scheme.	Completed	Duncan Bruce

<b>Resolution<sup>vi</sup></b>	<b>Chief Officer<sup>vii</sup></b>	<b>Response<sup>viii</sup></b>	<b>Timetable<sup>ix</sup></b>	<b>Lead Officer<sup>x</sup></b>
iii. report back on how the consultants targeted the postal samples for the housing need survey and an explanation of this be given in the strategy	David Edwards	See attached briefing note	Completed	Duncan Bruce
iv. report back to the Committee on the outcome of the Maidstone Housing Trust meeting with the Council	David Edwards	This is a matter between MHT and the Council		Duncan Bruce
v. The action plan be updated to reflect the changes to the targets for meeting the needs of older people and consulting hard to reach groups	David Edwards	See Housing Strategy Review, pages 47 & 48, Appendix 2	Completed	Duncan Bruce
vi. The information on the post in the policy development team in the action plan be updated	David Edwards	See Housing Strategy Review, page 48, Appendix 2	Completed	Duncan Bruce
vii. the figures on page 14 be updated	David Edwards	Not possible – Housing needs are only assessed every 5 years. Housing Needs report 2005 used data as at December 2004.	Completed	Duncan Bruce
viii. the second sentence on page 7 be reworded	David Edwards	See Housing Strategy Review, page 7, Section 2.4.1	Completed	Duncan Bruce
ix. the reference to appendix 7 on page 14 be changed to appendix 10, and;	David Edwards	See Housing Strategy, page 59, Appendix 10	Completed	Duncan Bruce

x. the reference to acceptance on page 21 be explained to improve clarity.	David Edwards	See Housing Strategy Review, page 20, Section 5.2.2	Completed	Duncan Bruce
--	---------------	---	-----------	--------------

**Notes on the completion of SCRAIP**

- <sup>i</sup> Resolutions are listed as found in the minutes of the relevant meeting.
- <sup>ii</sup> Insert in this box the Chief Officer whose service the resolution falls within.
- <sup>iii</sup> The Officer responsible for responding to the resolution should indicate in this box an explanation of the action to be taken to implement the resolution. Please also complete the 'timetable' and 'lead officer' boxes.
- <sup>iv</sup> The Officer responsible for responding to the resolution should indicate in this box when the action indicated in the previous box will be implemented.
- <sup>v</sup> The Officer responsible for responding to the resolution should indicate in this box the Officer responsible for the implementation of the action highlighted in the 'response' box.
- <sup>vi</sup> Resolutions are listed as found in the minutes of the relevant meeting.
- <sup>vii</sup> Insert in this box the Chief Officer whose service the resolution falls within.
- <sup>viii</sup> The Officer responsible for responding to the resolution should indicate in this box an explanation of the action to be taken to implement the resolution. Please also complete the 'timetable' and 'lead officer' boxes.
- <sup>ix</sup> The Officer responsible for responding to the resolution should indicate in this box when the action indicated in the previous box will be implemented.
- <sup>x</sup> The Officer responsible for responding to the resolution should indicate in this box the Officer responsible for the implementation of the action highlighted in the 'response' box.

This page is intentionally left blank



## Maidstone Housing Needs Survey 2005

### A note on sampling methodology

1. The Housing Needs Survey was carried out in partnership with Ashford Borough Council and provides robust data on which to base our future housing strategies and plan services.
2. The Council commissioned a housing needs survey to examine housing requirements in urban and rural areas for all population groups and to predict demand over the next 10 years. Our consultants reported in mid-2005. The survey consisted of three elements:
  - A postal questionnaire to 9,550 households (some 16% of all resident households) in 20 wards/parishes;
  - A housing market survey utilising Land Registry and Halifax databases, together with an internet/telephone survey of estate agents;
  - Secondary data analysis drawing upon HIP and Housing Register data, 2001 Census, household and population projections and other national research.
3. The questionnaire was in three parts:
  - Part One – sought information about respondents' existing housing situation;
  - Part Two - sought information about respondents moving intentions;
  - Part Three – collected information on the moving intentions of newly forming and concealed households.

To create awareness of the survey and its importance, it was promoted across the borough through posters and a press release.

4. Sampling methodology: Sample size depends on two factors: the degree of accuracy required and the extent to which there is variation in the population concerning key characteristics. However:
  - Beyond a certain size, there is no benefit in a bigger sample;
  - The size of the population is largely irrelevant for the accuracy of the sample – it is the size of the sample that is important.
5. The survey was structured to achieve a 95% confidence level across the borough. The postal sample was selected at random from the Council tax register and stratified into 20 wards/parishes. In order to achieve statistical validity in the smaller wards/parishes (so that parish-based recommendations are founded in a reasonable degree of statistical confidence), it was necessary to sample near 100% of households in some parishes.
6. It can be seen that in order *to ensure a reasonable number of responses* – such that the confidence interval (CI) was as small as practicable – some wards/villages had near 100% sampling e.g. Hollingbourne/Hucking/Bicknor with 500 questionnaires being issued for 556 households. This ensured that response rates from the questionnaires administered were similar at around 30% across the borough, and the CI was between  $\pm 6$  to 8% in even the smallest ward, although due to the high overall sample size it was  $\pm 1.5\%$  across the Borough.

7. Postal survey process: 9,250 questionnaires were posted on 15/2/05, with a return deadline of 8/3/05. An additional 300 questionnaires were dispatched to the four lowest response areas – Parkwood, Town east/north, Shepway and High Street.
8. Survey weighting: The data was checked against the 2001 Census housing tenure data and the HSSA<sup>1</sup> for bias and re-weighted where necessary. Given the nature of the random sample in the postal survey, tenure type was chosen as providing the main validation of the representativeness of the sample.
9. The second element of the survey drew on Land Registry and Halifax databases to assess the cost of access level property, and the supply and cost of private rented sector housing. An Estate Agency survey was carried out to assess entry prices for new households in each sub-area.
10. And thirdly, an analysis was carried out on HIP<sup>2</sup> and Housing Register data on the flow of social stock and need.
11. Age of data: Wherever possible, the data used was as at 31 December 2004, which was the most recent available.
12. Details of the sub-area sampling and response rates are tabled overleaf. The sub-areas shown represent housing market areas within the Borough.

---

<sup>1</sup> Housing Strategy Statistical Appendix – an annual statistical return to Government

<sup>2</sup> Housing Investment Programme.

## Response rates by Ward

Sub-Area	Ward/Parish	Households	Postal Sample	Postal Responses	Response rate %	Confidence Interval $\pm$ %
Sub-Area 1	Allington/Bridge/Heath/Fant	10,693	375	110	29.3	7.63
	East/North	6,908	475	113	23.8	7.53
Sub-Area 2	High Street	3,753	415	116	28.0	7.43
	Parkwood	2,066	475	104	21.9	7.84
	Shepway East & West	5,683	435	109	25.1	7.66
Sub-Area 3	South (excl. Tovil)	1,541	375	127	33.9	7.1
	Harrietsham/Lenham/Wichling Otterden	2,281	500	169	33.8	6.15
Sub-Area 4	Hollingbourne/Hucking/Bicknor Wormshill/Frinstead	556	500	147	29.4	6.60
	Otham/Langley/Leeds/Broomfield/ Kingswood/Downswood	2,591	500	143	28.6	6.69
	Headcorn/Ulcombe/Boughton-Malherbe Boughton Monchelsea/Chart Sutton/Sutton Valance/East Sutton	1,900	500	173	34.6	6.08
Sub-Area 5		1,668	500	172	34.4	6.10
	Bearsted	3,328	500	178	35.6	6.00
	Bredhurst/Detling/Thurnham/Stockbury Boxley	1,389	500	153	30.6	6.47
Sub-Area 6		3,245	500	136	27.2	6.86
	Tovil/ Coxheath/Loose	1,273	500	132	26.4	6.96
		2,586	500	165	33.0	6.23
	Barming/Teston/West Farleigh/East Farleigh	1,800	500	187	37.4	5.85
	Nettlestead/Yalding/Collier Street Hunton/Linton/Marden	1,625	500	154	30.8	6.45
		1,978	500	143	28.6	6.69
	Staplehurst	2,271	500	158	31.6	6.36
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>59,135</b>	<b>9,550</b>	<b>2,889</b>	<b>30.3%</b>	<b>1.49</b>

This page is intentionally left blank