

AGENDA

PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING



Overview and Scrutiny

Date: Tuesday 21 April 2015
Time: 6.30 pm
Venue: Town Hall, High Street, Maidstone

Membership:

Councillors: Chittenden, English (Vice-Chairman), Mrs Gooch,
Powell, Ross, Round, Springett (Chairman),
de Wiggondene and Willis

Page No.

1. **The Committee to consider whether all items on the agenda should be webcast**
2. **Apologies**
3. **Notification of Substitute Members**
4. **Notification of Visiting Members**
5. **Disclosures by Members and Officers**
6. **To consider whether any items should be taken in private because of the possible disclosure of exempt information**
7. **Minutes of the Meeting held on 17 March 2015** 1 - 7
8. **Future GP and Health Service Capacity in Maidstone - Interviews with representatives from West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group (WKCCG)** 8 - 11

The Committee to interview:

- Gail Arnold, Deputy Accountable Officer / Chief Operating Officer, WKCCG;
- Ian Ayres, Accountable Officer, WKCCG, and;
- Multi Varshney, Consultant in Public Health, WKCCG.

Continued Over/:

Issued on 9 April 2015

Alison Broom

**Alison Broom, Chief Executive, Maidstone Borough Council,
Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone Kent ME15 6JQ**

9. Update report: Invicta Barracks **12 - 16**

A written report to the Committee covering Invicta Barracks and its status in the draft Local Plan by Steve Clarke, Principal Planning Officer, Spatial Planning.

10. SCRAIP Update Report 2014/15 **17 - 61**

Committee to consider the SCRAIP report attached at Appendix A, showing all the recommendations made by the Committee for the 2014-2015 municipal year with Officer responses to date.

PART II

To move that the public be excluded for the items set out in Part II of the Agenda because of the likely disclosure of exempt information for the reasons specified having applied the Public Interest Test.

Head of Schedule 12 A and Brief Description

11. Bus shelters 62 - 65

A report from David Tibbett, Property and Procurement Manager on the results of the bus shelter tender exercise February 2015.	3 – Financial/Business Affairs
--	--------------------------------

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 Tessa Mallett on 01622 602621**. To find out more about the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees, please visit <http://www.maidstone.gov.uk/osc>

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Planning, Transport and Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 17 MARCH 2015

Present: Councillor Springett (Chairman), and
Councillors Chittenden, English, Mrs Gooch, Powell,
Ross, Round and Willis

Also Present: Councillors Burton

162. THE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER WHETHER ALL ITEMS ON THE AGENDA SHOULD BE WEBCAST

RESOLVED: that all items on the agenda be webcast.

163. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor de Wiggondene.

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Willis, who joined the meeting at 18:41hrs.

164. NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

There were no substitute members.

165. NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS

Councillor Burton, Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development was in attendance.

166. DISCLOSURES BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

There were no disclosures by Members or Officers.

167. TO CONSIDER WHETHER ANY ITEMS SHOULD BE TAKEN IN PRIVATE BECAUSE OF THE POSSIBLE DISCLOSURE OF EXEMPT INFORMATION

RESOLVED: that the items on the agenda be taken in public as proposed.

168. MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 20, 22 AND 28 JANUARY 2015

Councillor Springett explained she thought the point Dr Speight was trying to make was the sites did not come back to the Committee prior to the Cabinet meeting on 4 January 2015. It was understood the changes to the sites would come back to the Committee before going back to Regulation 18 consultation. However, the sites, with the suggested

changes went straight to Cabinet on 4 February with the recommendation for the sites, with the changes, to go back to Regulation 18 consultation. Councillor Springett explained this was probably due to the lack of time between the working group meeting where the changes were agreed and the Cabinet meeting on 4 February. The wording that went to the Cabinet in the form of an urgent update reflected the changes agreed at the working group meeting on 27 January 2015, with Steve Clarke, but the officer report recommended the sites go to Regulation 19 consultation, and Cabinet agreed with this.

Councillor Springett went on to explain she was not sure what other action could be taken, but she understood Dr Speight had also written to Cabinet on this issue.

Councillor Springett explained the Committee had received an email from a Dr Speight questioning the draft minutes of the meeting on 28 January 2015, regarding the handling of the discussion of sites H1 (7), (8) and (9). Councillor Springett explained she had discussed the issue with Councillors English and Gooch, who all considered the minutes were correct, albeit not necessarily well worded.

RESOLVED: that the minutes of the meetings held on:

- 20 January 2015;
- 22 January 2015, and;
- 28 January 2015,

Be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

169. MINUTES OF THE CALL-IN MEETING HELD ON 2 MARCH 2015

RESOLVED: that the minutes of the meeting held on 2 March 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

170. VERBAL UPDATE ON INVICTA BARRACKS

Steve Clarke, Principal Planning Officer, Spatial Planning gave the Committee a verbal update of the position of Invicta Barracks and its inclusion in the draft Local Plan.

Mr Clarke explained that Invicta Barracks was included in the draft Local Plan as one of three broad locations for the delivery of housing from 2026 onwards. The site would provide 1300 new homes and was considered sustainable because it was currently built up, with an existing infrastructure and was close to the town.

Mr Clarke went on to explain the site was still in active use by the Ministry of Defence (MOD), who had no immediate plans for its disposal.

Officers had met with officials from the MOD estates department who stated the site was a retained site in their estate review of 2013 and will be in use for the foreseeable future. The MOD stated this position may

change in the future and agreed the site go forward into the draft Local Plan. Mr Clarke stated the wording of the draft Local Plan policy for Invicta Barracks was agreed with representatives from the MOD.

During the discussion the Committee raised the following concerns:

- That the site was being assessed differently to other sites that were unavailable, such as prisons;
- Maidstone's proud military connections needed to be preserved;
- The parkland on the site was the biggest after Mote Park and needed preserving;
- The 1300 figure for new houses on the site would be set and difficult to change in the future.

Mr Clarke confirmed discussions had taken place with other landowners, including the prison service, regarding possible sites, but these had not come forward for inclusion in the plan. Mr Clarke explained it was prudent to include Invicta Barracks in the plan. If the site was removed other sites, to accommodate the 1300 new homes, would have to be found. A review of sites would take place in 2021 and further discussions would take place with the MOD. Mr Clarke also stated the sensitivity of the site's ecology and buildings would be preserved using site criteria in the policy.

The Committee agreed it was unable to make recommendations based on a verbal update. The Committee would need an officer's report included on the agenda for the next meeting of the Committee on 21 April 2015.

RESOLVED: That the Head of Planning and Development be recommended to provide a written report to the Committee for their meeting of 21 April 2015 covering Invicta Barracks and its status in the draft Local Plan so that the committee could express its view on Policy H3 of the draft local plan.

171. VERBAL UPDATE ON THE INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN

Councillor Burton left the meeting at 19:16hrs.

Adam Reynolds, Planning Officer, Spatial Planning provided the Committee with a verbal update of the Infrastructure Deliver Plan (IDP).

During discussion the Committee raised the following concerns:

- The NHS had stated no new GP surgeries were needed, however, existing surgeries in the borough were oversubscribed. It was felt the NHS were poor at asking for assistance with funding new surgeries through Section 106 monies. There was a need for the NHS to engage with the Section 106 process;
- There was an issue with the delivery of semi-rural open space and the Council needed to be more proactive and negotiate with developers to provide this;

- MBC would have stewardship of any new open spaces negotiated with developers with a gradual handover to community groups to maintain;
- There was concern that the Parks Department may be reluctant to take on temporary responsibility for new open spaces due to the budget issues it presented. It was felt this would undermine the delivery of the Local Plan.

The Committee agreed there was a need to establish what infrastructure was needed in the borough, where it was needed in order to identify where the funding would come from to develop it and when it would need to be developed.

Mr Jarman, Head of Planning and Development explained the VISAM Highway Modelling should be completed by the end of March/beginning of April 2015. Also, a Task and Finish Group looking at foul water drainage was hoping to reengage with Southern Water, who were still not objecting to sites where there were on-going issues.

RESOLVED: That the Head of Planning and Development be recommended to update the Section 106 Report presented to the Planning Committee at their meeting of 26 February 2015 and circulate it to the members of the Planning Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee before their meeting of 21 April 2015 together with details of Local Enterprise Partnership funding, provided via KCC.

172. ADOPTION OF INTERIM PARKING STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

Steve Clarke, Principal Planning Officer, Spatial Planning presented his report and explained the Council did not currently have a locally adopted parking standards policy for new developments in the Borough. Parking provision for applications for new development was looked at on a site by site basis.

The intention was to develop a policy after the adoption of the Local Plan in 2017. The policy would focus on encouraging the use of sustainable transport methods and adhere to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) standards.

As an interim measure it was proposed the Council adopt two documents as material considerations for development management purposes as parking standards for new developments across the Borough:

- Kent County Council: Kent and Medway Structure Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG4: Kent Vehicle Parking Standards: July 2006;
- Kent Design Guide Review: Interim Guidance Note 3: Residential Parking: November 2008.

The Committee agreed the proposal was not perfect, but would be better than using a site by site, ad-hoc method.

Concern was raised regarding existing travel plan agreements and what checks were in place to ensure they were put in place after development take place.

Mr Jarman explained that monitoring regimes could be written into Section 106 agreements.

It was agreed that policy PPG3 V1 worked well in inner cities, but it was felt different places had different requirements. It was necessary to have a parking policy in place that provided flexibility for particular development needs.

RESOLVED: That the Committee noted and welcomed the report and recommended the adoption of the interim parking standards presented to the Committee as a material consideration for Development Management purposes.

173. FINAL DRAFT REPORT ON THE COMMITTEE'S REVIEW INTO TRANSPORT IN MAIDSTONE - ALTERNATIVES TO USING A CAR

The Committee discussed the draft review report and thanked Tessa Mallett for all her hard work in pulling the research together and writing the report.

The Committee discussed a few small amendments and the possibility of a launch event for the final report.

RESOLVED: That the approve the final draft report of the review of Transport in Maidstone – alternatives to using a car for submission to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development and external bodies, subject to:

- a) A paragraph and recommendations be included under the Park and Ride service section referring to the re-aggregation of the Park and Ride and parking Budgets and the incorporation of elements of an express bus service into the Park and Ride service, with particular reference to the southern transport corridor.
- b) Recommendation 'Q' of the report include reference to aspirations to re-secure the Canon Street service to and from Maidstone.
- c) The working group for the review discuss the possibility of a launch event for the review report.

174. FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee revisited their discussion on GP and health care service provision and their concerns regarding what, where and how the NHS planned to meet the shortfall in services. The Committee agreed to invite representatives from the NHS to their meeting of 21 April 2015 to discuss their plans for GP and health care service provision for the future.

The Chairman asked Mr Jarman to provide the Committee with an update on the two SCRAIPs issued at the meeting held on 19 August 2014, which were:

- That it be recommended officers be fully supported, including if necessary the provision of additional resources, to ensure all aspects are fully investigated to allow Maidstone Borough Council to achieve the minimum target figure possible.
- That it be recommended any evidence provided by the public, to assist in reducing the housing need figure, be taken into account.

Mr Jarman explained that the Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OSN) figure of 18,600 was the starting point housing need figure. Constraints could be applied to site allocations to reduce this figure to what was known as a housing target.

Mr Jarman went on to explain how the Census was used to assess trend based housing need projections. The 2011 Census was used to check the housing need projections and while the NPPF provided some flexibility, it would be difficult to go against Government trend based projections.

The Committee agreed it would be useful to monitor inspector reports for other local authority local plans to gather more information on the interpretation of the NPPF and what are acceptable constraints.

Mr Jarman explained if the Council's housing target was lower than the OAN figure the Council had a duty to negotiate with neighbouring authorities to help provide the shortfall. Neighbouring authorities would expect the Council to provide evidence of the constraints used.

RESOLVED: That:

- a) Representatives from West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group and East Kent Clinical Commissioning Group be invited to the Committee meeting of 21 April 2015 to discuss:
 - i. Their current and projected capacity for GP and other health support services for the Borough – how many are they planning (GP surgeries) and where are they planning to put them?
 - ii. What use they currently make of Section 106 monies from developers.
 - iii. What assistance MBC could offer them to make best use of Section 106 monies?
- b) The Head of Planning and Development be recommended to keep a watching brief on public examinations of other authorities local plans to establish any differing interpretations of the National Planning Policy Framework and more detailed information on the constraints argument.

175. DURATION OF MEETING

18:30hrs to 21:20hrs.

Agenda Item 8

Maidstone Borough Council

Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 21 April 2015

Future GP and Health Service Capacity in Maidstone - Interviews with representatives from West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group

While reading the following report you may want to think about:

- What you want to know from the report;
- What questions you would like answered.

Make a note of your questions in the box below.

As you read the report you may think of other questions.

Questions I would like to ask regarding this report:

-
-
-
-
-

Guidance note - Making Quality Overview and Scrutiny Recommendations

Scrutiny recommendations should seek to make a real difference to local people and the services provided. Recommendations that note a change or request further information fail to resolve problems or make changes. The scrutiny team have identified the following criteria for quality recommendations, they:

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

One way of checking the usefulness of recommendations is to evaluate them against the 'six Ws' set out below:

Good recommendations should answer these questions:

Why does it need to be done?	This will help ensure the outcome is relevant and in the right context – if a meeting is being requested it will ensure the correct people are invited to attend
Who is being asked to do it?	Without this nothing will get done (no one will take ownership)
What needs to be done?	Needs to be clear and specific
HoW will it be done?	Again, needs to be clear and specific, what is the expected output- for example a report to be written or a meeting to be arranged
Where does it need to be done/go?	If it's a meeting – where is it needed If it's a report – where is it to go, who needs to see it
When does it need to be done?	Crucial to have a timescale – without a deadline it will never get done

Thinking about these points will help ensure the outcomes of scrutiny are effective and will aid monitoring.

Maidstone Borough Council

Planning, Transport and Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 21 April 2015

Future GP and Health Service Capacity in Maidstone - Interviews with Representatives from West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group

Report of: Tessa Mallett, Overview & Scrutiny Officer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 At the meeting of the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting of 17 March 2015 the Committee requested that representatives from West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group and East Kent Clinical Commissioning Group be invited to the Committee meeting of 21 April 2015 to discuss:
- i. Their current and projected capacity for GP and other health support services for the Borough – how many are they planning (GP surgeries) and where are they planning to put them.
 - ii. What use they currently make of Section 106 monies from developers.
 - iii. What assistance MBC could offer them to make best use of Section 106 monies.
- 1.2 Gail Arnold, Deputy Accountable Officer / Chief Operating Officer, Ian Ayres, Accountable Officer, and; Multi Varshney, Consultant in Public Health, from West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group will be in attendance at the meeting to respond to the Committees questions listed at point 1.1.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 The Committee are advised to interview the three representatives from West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group.
- 2.2 The Committee are advised make recommendations as it considers necessary.

3. Impact on Corporate Objectives

- 3.1 The Strategic Plan sets the Council's key objectives for the medium term and has a range of objectives which support the delivery of the Council's priorities.
- 3.2 The Committee will consider reports that deliver against the following priorities:

- 'For Maidstone to have a growing economy' and 'For Maidstone to be a decent place to live'.

4. Financial Implications

4.1 There are no financial implications.

5. Relevant Documents

5.1 None

6. Background Documents

6.1 None

Agenda Item 9

Maidstone Borough Council

Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 21 April 2015

Update report: Invicta Barracks

While reading the following report you may want to think about:

- What you want to know from the report;
- What questions you would like answered.

Make a note of your questions in the box below.

As you read the report you may think of other questions.

Questions I would like to ask regarding this report:

-
-
-
-
-

Guidance note - Making Quality Overview and Scrutiny Recommendations

Scrutiny recommendations should seek to make a real difference to local people and the services provided. Recommendations that note a change or request further information fail to resolve problems or make changes. The scrutiny team have identified the following criteria for quality recommendations, they:

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

One way of checking the usefulness of recommendations is to evaluate them against the 'six Ws' set out below:

Good recommendations should answer these questions:

Why does it need to be done?	This will help ensure the outcome is relevant and in the right context – if a meeting is being requested it will ensure the correct people are invited to attend
Who is being asked to do it?	Without this nothing will get done (no one will take ownership)
What needs to be done?	Needs to be clear and specific
HoW will it be done?	Again, needs to be clear and specific, what is the expected output- for example a report to be written or a meeting to be arranged
Where does it need to be done/go?	If it's a meeting – where is it needed If it's a report – where is it to go, who needs to see it
When does it need to be done?	Crucial to have a timescale – without a deadline it will never get done

Thinking about these points will help ensure the outcomes of scrutiny are effective and will aid monitoring.

Maidstone Borough Council

Planning, Transport and Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 21 April 2015

Update Report: Invicta Barracks

Report of: Tessa Mallett, Overview & Scrutiny Officer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 At the meeting of the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting of 17 March 2015 the Committee requested that Officers provide a written report to the Committee for their meeting of 21 April 2015 covering Invicta Barracks and its status in the draft Local Plan so that the committee could express its view on Policy H3 of the draft local plan.
- 2.1 The update report is attached as **Appendix A**.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 The committee are advised to review the attached update report and make recommendations as it considers necessary.

3. Impact on Corporate Objectives

- 3.1 The Strategic Plan sets the Council's key objectives for the medium term and has a range of objectives which support the delivery of the Council's priorities.
- 3.2 The Committee will consider reports that deliver against the following priorities:
 - 'For Maidstone to have a growing economy' and 'For Maidstone to be a decent place to live'.

4. Financial Implications

- 4.1 There are no financial implications.

5. Relevant Documents

- 5.1 **Appendix A** – Update Report: Invicta Barracks.

6. Background Documents

- 6.1 None

Planning, Transport and Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee 21 April 2015

Update Report: Invicta Barracks

1. Invicta Barracks has been identified as one of three 'broad locations' for further housing growth in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18). These are locations which will deliver housing in the latter years of the Plan (2026 onwards).
2. Various component parts of the Reg. 18 plan have been amended as a result of the last consultation and considered through a series of Overview and Scrutiny and Cabinet meetings. After the elections in May further reports will be presented to Members, including for Policy H3 (Broad Locations).
3. The Barracks site is an inherently sustainable brownfield site within the built up area of the town and within striking distance of the town centre. The barracks site is still in active use and the MoD has no immediate plans for its disposal. Officers had meetings with one of the MoD's Senior Estates Surveyor in January/February 2014. The site has been identified as a 'retained' site under the latest MoD estates review (2013). Core sites are those which are definitely required in the long term whilst a retained site is needed for the foreseeable future (in the order of 10 years). Beyond this timeframe, the need for it is unconfirmed. The MoD may choose to retain it, use it for another MoD purpose or declare it as surplus to dispose of it for an alternative use. Meanwhile the MOD has indicated that it supports the identification of the site for inclusion in the Local Plan.
4. As there is some realistic prospect of the site becoming available in the longer term, the wording in the draft plan was agreed with the MoD as follows:

Invicta Park Barracks covers a substantial area (41 ha) to the north of the town centre. It comprises a range of military buildings, including army accommodation, set within expansive parkland. The site is currently home to the 36 Engineer Regiment. The MoD has categorised the site as a 'retained' site in its most recent estates review (2013); there are no immediate plans to vacate this site.

The MoD keeps its property portfolio under regular review. It has been confirmed that, in the longer term, there could be some prospect that the site may be declared surplus and so become available for alternative uses.

In recognition of this potential, the Local Plan identifies Invicta Park Barracks as a broad location for future housing growth for towards the end of the Local Plan period (post 2026). The site has the potential to deliver in the order of 1,300 new homes.

5. The site is already substantially developed. Existing housing on the site comprises married quarters and officer's quarters. This housing is leased to Annington Homes on a 999 year lease (this is the case across the MoD estate). Elsewhere MoD estates and Annington Homes have come together in a joint venture to bring sites forward comprehensively. The MoD has also had experience of working in partnership with major developers to bring sites forward.
6. The next review of the Local Plan (after adoption) will be the time to bring forward more detailed proposals for the site, including a specific site allocation and/or masterplanning of the site. Policy H3(2) in the draft Local Plan highlights the particular development considerations which will apply to more detailed proposals for the site, namely
 - Integration of development within the existing landscape structure of the site
 - Provision of community facilities (as proven necessary) including neighbourhood shopping, and education and health facilities
 - Off-site highway improvement measures
 - Footpath and cycling connections through the site and improved connections to the town centre, including by public transport
 - Preservation and enhancement of existing ecological features including wildlife corridors
 - Preservation of the Grade II* listed Park House

Such criteria would ensure concerns surrounding the sensitivities of the site such as its ecology, parkland and heritage assets could be adequately conserved and potentially enhanced.
7. Until that time, as the current draft plan is developed toward Reg.19 and submission, and subject to consideration of all broad locations in the plan by committee later in 2015 Invicta Barracks remains a suitable candidate site for promotion as a broad location for development for the latter years of the plan. It is also important to consider the contribution toward the housing need figure made by this site. The site would deliver 1,300 dwellings which would need to be found elsewhere if the site is not progressed. Like any other allocation in the emerging Local Plan the dwelling number attributed is only a guide to the potential yield from the site, and the detail will be dealt with later through design briefs and / or masterplans and the development management process. At this stage of the development of the plan it is enough to demonstrate capacity in the 20 year plan period for the delivery of enough homes to meet the needs of the borough, in accordance with the NPPF.

Maidstone Borough Council

Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 21 April 2015

SCRAIP Report 2014-2015

While reading the following report you may want to think about:

- What you want to know from the report;
- What questions you would like answered.

Make a note of your questions in the box below.

As you read the report you may think of other questions.

Questions I would like to ask regarding this report:

-
-
-
-
-

Guidance note - Making Quality Overview and Scrutiny Recommendations

Scrutiny recommendations should seek to make a real difference to local people and the services provided. Recommendations that note a change or request further information fail to resolve problems or make changes. The scrutiny team have identified the following criteria for quality recommendations, they:

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

One way of checking the usefulness of recommendations is to evaluate them against the 'six Ws' set out below:

Good recommendations should answer these questions:

Why does it need to be done?	This will help ensure the outcome is relevant and in the right context – if a meeting is being requested it will ensure the correct people are invited to attend
Who is being asked to do it?	Without this nothing will get done (no one will take ownership)
What needs to be done?	Needs to be clear and specific
HoW will it be done?	Again, needs to be clear and specific, what is the expected output- for example a report to be written or a meeting to be arranged
Where does it need to be done/go?	If it's a meeting – where is it needed If it's a report – where is it to go, who needs to see it
When does it need to be done?	Crucial to have a timescale – without a deadline it will never get done

Thinking about these points will help ensure the outcomes of scrutiny are effective and will aid monitoring.

Maidstone Borough Council

Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 21 April 2015

SCRAIP Review of Recommendations for the 2014 to 2015 Municipal Year

Report of: Tessa Mallett, Overview and Scrutiny Officer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Committee are asked to consider the SCRAIP report, attached at **Appendix A**, showing all the recommendations made by the Committee for the 2014-2015 municipal year with Officer responses to date.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Committee identifies where work is still outstanding from the recommendations made by the Committee and make recommendations to the new Committee responsible for planning, transport and development in the new Governance structure from May 2015 to follow up these recommendations.

3. Scrutiny Committee Recommendation Action and Implementation Plan (SCRAIP) Responses

- 3.1 The issue of making, and monitoring, recommendations is an important part of the scrutiny process. SCRAIPs set out recommendations following scrutiny meetings/reviews and information is sought as to whether recommendations are accepted, the action to be taken and by who.
- 3.2 Throughout the municipal year 2014 to 2015 the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee have made recommendations. Some have been completed and some are awaiting responses from Officers. The Committee may consider some need following up.
- 3.3 On 10 December 2014 the Council made the decision to change its Governance arrangements from the Executive System to a Committee System. The agreed Committee structure will come into being after the Council's Annual Meeting on 23 May 2015. After this time, the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee will no longer exist.

- 3.4 The Committee may decide to recommend any outstanding SCRAIPs after May 2015 are followed up by the relevant new Committee.

4. Impact on Corporate Objectives

- 4.1 The Strategic Plan sets the Council's key objectives for the medium term and has a range of objectives which support the delivery of the Council's priorities.

- 4.2 The Committee will consider reports that deliver against the following priorities:

- 'For Maidstone to have a growing economy' and 'For Maidstone to be a decent place to live'.

5. Relevant Documents

- 5.1 Appendix A – SCRAIP report

6. Background Documents

- 6.1 None

Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee - SCRAIPs issued 2014-15

A report showing all the SCRAIPs made by the Committee during the municipal year 2014-15



Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
PTD.140317.173i 21	Consideration should be given by Maidstone Borough council to aggregate the Park and Ride Service and Parking Services Budgets to ensure that the access to the Town Centre is managed in a more coherent and integrated manner and to safeguard against possible changes in the regulatory climate.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development			Rob Jarman; Jeff Kitson
PTD.140609.11.b	That ward members of the parishes Design South East are working with are invited to attend the multi-stakeholder meeting to be held in September.		Agreed	The stakeholder workshop for the parish councils that Design South East were working with has been arranged for 17 September 2014. Local ward members and a range of infrastructure providers have been invited to the event.	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140609.11a	That the Design South East report is reviewed by the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee prior to the planned multi-stakeholder meeting.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development	Agreed	It is anticipated that the report on the outcomes of the Design South East work will go to PTD Overview and Scrutiny committee on 19 August.	Rob Jarman
PTD.140609.11c	That before a final decision is made on the draft Local Plan site allocations Parish Councils be informed and discussions take place on the right to build as part of the neighbourhood planning with a view to facilitating a convergence of the two (ie the Neighbourhood Plans and the Local Plan site allocations).		Agreed	Further engagement with the parishes is planned.	

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
PTD.140609.11d	That feedback be sought from Parish Councils on the consultation with Design South East and Parish Councils be informed of how their feedback had been used to develop the Local Plan.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development	Agreed	A short survey has been sent to each of the parishes involved in the Design South East work in order to obtain feedback.	Rob Jarman
PTD.140609.11e	The Head of Commercial and Economic Development provide the Committee with a detailed report for the meeting on 21 October 2014 on the quality of existing and proposed employment sites being used for the development of the Economic Development Strategy and the Local Plan.	Cabinet Member for Economic & Commercial Development	Agreed in principle - further work required	Referred to Sarah Anderton in Planning to produce report for 21 October 2014. Completed.	Sarah Anderton; Test Test
PTD.140609.11f	That a joint meeting with the Planning, Transport and Development and Economic and Commercial Development Overview and Scrutiny Committees is arranged to look at the qualitative data for the employment review to be used for the Economic Development Strategy and the Local Plan, possibly in early November 2014.		Agreed	Joint meeting arranged for 21 October 2014.	Sam Bailey; Tessa Mallett
PTD.140624.21a	Air quality modelling be undertaken and recommendations included in the Maidstone transport modelling process. Information on the effect of the transport model on air quality be brought to the Committee after the transport modelling is completed.		Agreed	Data derived from the Maidstone transport modelling exercise will feed into the air quality modelling that will be undertaken by MBC environmental health. The results of the air quality modelling will be reported to the committee once received from environmental health.	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140624.21b	With regard to a parking standards policy for Maidstone officers ensure: i Any planned parking standards policy is cross referenced in the Integrated Transport Strategy, and;		Agreed	A Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will be produced for parking standards in the borough. The Integrated Transport Strategy will include reference to the SPD to ensure the policies are linked. The draft Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2014 includes a reference to the need for a Parking Standards SPD to provide greater detail in	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	ii The Local Plan and the Integrated Transport Strategy appropriately facilitate a Spatial Policy on parking standards in Maidstone.			support of policy DM13 which seeks to facilitate the delivery of sustainable transport.	
PTD.140624.21c	Mechanisms be put in place for Councillors to be included in discussion with transport providers. This will also be included as an objective for the 'Transport in Maidstone Borough - Alternatives to using a car' review for 2014-15.		Agreed	Cabinet Member currently attends the quarterly Quality Bus Partnership (QBP) meetings, which are attended by bus operators. It is recommended that members seek to re-establish the Passenger Transport User Group in order to engage with transport providers across all modes in the borough and beyond.	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140624.22a 23	The proposal to hold a joint meeting with the Economic and Commercial Development OSC to look at the Qualitative date be referred to the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee at their meeting on 10 July 2014.		Agreed	Joint meeting arranged for 21 October 2014	
PTD.140624.22b	Planning policy officer to meet with Ward Members, Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Forums to go through the proposed site allocations in the draft Local Plan in addition to the multi-agency event.		Agreed	Noted	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140624.22c	The Cabinet Member for PTD promotes appropriate progress going forward with neighbourhood plans by including PTD OSC to appropriately scrutinise and comment on the Borough's response to the consultation stage of neighbourhood plans.		Agreed	The council's response when formally consulted on a draft neighbourhood plan should in particular focus on the plan's consistency with the existing and emerging strategic policies of the local plan, the sufficiency of the evidence which supports the proposals in the neighbourhood plan, and conformity with neighbourhood plan making regulations. Local ward members are involved in the development of neighbourhood plans so, given the timing of neighbourhood plan consultations which may not coincide with regular Committee meetings, the Committee could consider only scrutinising plans where conflict arises. The Committee will be made aware of Cabinet Member	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
				reports on neighbourhood plans, so will be able to call a meeting within the consultation period if required.	
PTD.140624.22d	PTD OSC as part of the review of the Parish Charter scrutinise the planning policy processes to be included in the Parish Charter.		Agreed in principle - further work required	Noted	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140722.31a	That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development be recommended to lobby Kent County Council on the reconfiguration of the gyratory system in Maidstone to ensure safe cycle passages. The design of the gyratory system to incorporate surface cycle passages (not subways) for cyclist heading in and out of the town from west Maidstone using the A20 and A26.		Agreed in principle - further work required	MBC will work with KCC to ensure the bridge gyratory scheme incorporates suitable cycling infrastructure and provides safe access in and out of the town centre.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development; Sarah Anderton; Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140722.31b	That the Head of Planning and Development be recommended to urgently refresh and update the draft Maidstone Borough Council Cycling Strategy, dated June 2012 and present it to the relevant new Committee with responsibility for transport and development in their terms of reference in the new municipal year 2015-2016 before taking it for public consultation.		Agreed in principle - further work required	MBC will work with KCC to refresh and update the draft Maidstone Cycling Strategy as part of the development of the Integrated Transport Strategy to help ensure a comprehensive and holistic approach to transport matters.	Sarah Anderton; Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140722.31c	That the Head of Planning and Development be asked to report back to the relevant new Committee with responsibility for transport and development in their terms of reference during the 2015-2016 municipal year on:		Agreed in principle - further work required	MBC will work with KCC to refresh and update the draft Maidstone Cycling Strategy as part of the development of the Integrated Transport Strategy. As part of this process, consideration can be given to the inclusion of rural routes and cycle parking provision in the cycling strategy as appropriate.	Sarah Anderton; Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The identity of potential routes for the provision of cycle ways from rural locations (villages and hamlets) with poor bus services, to bus stops on major routes with a more frequent bus service; o The possibility of creating an orbital cycle and footpath route around Maidstone linking to Maidstone town centre via radial routes such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Len valley to the north of Maidstone o Medway Valley to the west of Maidstone o Tovil Nature Park o The Loose Valley Conservation area o Boughton Monchelsea, and o Langley to the east of Maidstone o The costs of firstly providing cycle parking at the end of these routes; o The cost of the longer term aim of developing the cycle route to the cycle parking. 				
PTD.140722.31d	That the Head of Planning and Development be recommended to request from Kent County Council a copy of the results of their trials of 20 mile per hour speed limits around schools in the borough and a copy of their policy for 20mph zones around schools in the borough.		Agreed	Noted. This information has been supplied to the Committee by Cllr Chittenden.	Sarah Anderton; Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140722.31e	That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development or the relevant new Committee with responsibility for transport and development in their terms of reference from the new municipal year 2015, be recommended to:		Agreed	A new dedicated transport planning resource for MBC is currently being appointed. The transport planning job remit will include the need to consider cycling as integral part of the development of the Integrated Transport Strategy and can extend to include re-establishment of the Cycling Forum.	Sarah Anderton; Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Proceed with establishing the Maidstone Cycling Forum and ensure it is supported by an officer with responsibility for cycling in their job description; o Identify a lead member to act as a cycling champion within the authority. 				
PTD.140722.31f	That the Head of Planning and Development be asked to report back to the Committee the reason why Maidstone Borough Council has not signed up to the Kent County Council service standards for Public Rights of Way.		Agreed	It was determined that this service could be delivered and charged for by the MKIP Legal Services rather than being out-sourced to KCC.	Sarah Anderton; Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140819.43a 26	That it be noted the Committee remained very concerned at the high value housing need figure but reluctantly recommended it be accepted by the Cabinet as the current bench mark need figure from which to do the work to arrive at the housing target figure.		Agreed	Cabinet noted the concerns of the Committee around the high value housing need figure. It was noted that the revised figure was helpful in that it had taken the figure downwards.	Sarah Anderton; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140819.43b	That it be recommended officers be fully supported, including if necessary the provision of additional resources, to ensure all aspects are fully investigated to allow Maidstone Borough Council to achieve the minimum target figure possible.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development	Agreed	This was referred to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development who agreed with the Committee's recommendation.	Sarah Anderton; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140819.43c	That it be recommended assistance be given to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development to produce interim policies, to include parking, gardens and open space, and housing standards, to protect the borough and ensure development is only		Agreed	This was referred to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development who advised that this work was already ongoing but any assistance would be most welcome.	Sarah Anderton; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	carried out where and how the Borough wanted it.				
PTD.140819.43d	That it be recommended any evidence provided by the public, to assist in reducing the housing need figure, be taken into account.		Agreed	Cabinet noted the recommendation and advised that any evidence provided by the public that had already come forward had been sent on for consideration by Spatial Policy officers.	Sarah Anderton; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140819.43e	That Cabinet be recommended to accept the figure of 960 for additional care home places in the Borough.		Agreed	Cabinet agreed with the recommendation and advised that they would be adopting the figure of 960 for additional care home places in the Borough.	Sarah Anderton; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140819.43f	That the Head of Planning and Development be asked to present a report at a meeting date, to be agreed, providing details on Affordable Housing; what it is; the impact of the percentages outlined in the draft Local Plan, etc. in order to better understand the detail and make informed decisions regarding the Local Plan.		Agreed	Cabinet advised that the Head of Planning and Development, in conjunction with the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development would be undertaking a workshop to give Members an understanding on affordable housing provision and this would include information on the viability work which lead to the differentials in percentage terms for the affordable housing.	Sarah Anderton; Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140819.44b	That it be recommended when representations to the Local Plan are collated, each representation to be provided with a response explaining why the representation had been / not been taken forward and included in the Local Plan using the template report attached to the agenda for the meeting.		Agreed in principle - further work required	The template report format will be followed to respond to the separate issues raised in the representations. Similar responses will be grouped and responded to together.	Sarah Anderton; Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140916.56.1	Cabinet Member for Community and Leisure Services be recommended to involve the Kent Association of Local Councils and Area Committee Officers in the preparatory work for the review of the Parish Charter, before consulting fully with all parish councils, to ensure a process of two way communication in	Cabinet Member for Community and Leisure Services		Meetings have taken place with representatives from the Parish Councils, CALC and members of MBC's senior management team. A draft new Charter is under review and should be adopted by March 2015.	Cabinet Member for Community and Leisure Services; John Littlemore

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	the development of Neighbourhood Plans and the Local Plan is included.				
PTD.140916.57.1	The Head of Planning and Development be recommended to ensure representatives from parish councils and Area Committee Officers are involved in the design of the process for administering the distribution of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), before consulting fully with all parish councils, before the Local Plan is adopted, so parish councils are assured Maidstone Borough Council fulfils its' duty to pass the appropriate level of CIL receipts to local councils.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		The Cabinet Member will ensure the progression of the CIL process continues to pass through Overview and Scrutiny and suggests that Overview and Scrutiny invite parish and KALC members to participate in their meetings whilst reviewing this subject.	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.140916.59.2 28	The Head of Housing and Community Services be asked to email to members of the committee an overview of the different categories and classifications of affordable housing and eligibility criteria for each.	Cabinet Member for Environment and Housing		Information provided to PTD OSC and training event on affordable organised for 20 October 2014.	John Littlemore
PTD.140930.69.1	The evidence submitted to Committee, on 30 September 2014, be used by the Review of Transport in Maidstone Working Group to develop draft recommendations for consideration by Committee on 18 November 2014 as part of the draft report for stages one (Walking and Cycling) and two (Buses) of the review.			Noted	Tessa Mallett
PTD.140930.69.2	The Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development be asked to provide the Review Working Group with further information about the re-tendering exercise for the provision and	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		The Cabinet Member has asked for a copy of the tender document and proposed to share this with Overview and Scrutiny. there is an early suggestion that KCC no longer support interactive information signage due to reliability and communication issues. This is being investigated and	David Tibbit

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	maintenance of bus shelters, and the selling of advertising at bus shelters, to enable consideration of how information about buses, including real time information and contact numbers for buses, could be displayed at bus shelters across the borough.			findings will be shared. Overview and Scrutiny may wish to contact Toby Butler at KCC. The Cabinet Member also suggest that commercial organisations also be involved.	
PTD.140930.70.1 29	The Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development be recommended, through emerging local plan policies and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy, to acknowledge the importance of migratory transport corridors to preserve wildlife population viability.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		<p>The Cabinet Member acknowledges the importance of migratory transport corridors to preserve wildlife population viability.</p> <p>the draft local plan countryside policy states "Natural assets, including characteristic landscape features, wildlife and water resources, will be protected from damage with any unavoidable impacts mitigates."</p> <p>Ecological surveys will be required in order for planning applications to be considered.</p> <p>The draft Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy contains an objective that states, " To maintain, enhance and extend the rich tapestry of distinctive wildlife habitats and improve water quality" and proposes to, " Continue Stewardship Schemes with farmers and landowners to create new or improved wildlife corridors in the rural area".</p> <p>Through further consultation on both documents the views of the public will continue to be sought on such issues and integrated into emerging policy where appropriate.</p>	Darren Bridgett
PTD.140930.71.1	The Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development be asked to circulate a briefing note to update Committee on Southern Water's position on flooding, drainage and sewage issues affecting the borough.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		The attached statement from Southern Water provides information on Southern Water's position relating to strategic planning for flooding, drainage and sewage issues. Further meetings with Southern Water at all levels are being progressed.	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
30	<p>PTD.141021.82.1</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development be recommended to develop a planning policy to mitigate damage and to ensure appropriate constraints for any employment land allocation at Junction 8 of the M20. This policy should be considered by the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee in January 2015.</p> <p>If the thresholds contained in the policy in recommendation 1 are met, the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee would, in principle, support development for employment land at Junction 8.</p>	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development	Agreed	<p>(Tessa) Reported to committee 16/12/14:</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development has requested outline work to explore options and mitigation strategies for junction 8 including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Do nothing 2) An area of land north of the A20 3) An area of land south of the A20 4) An area of land both north and south of the A20 5) Further consideration of options eastward of junction 8 (A20 corridor) with findings to be presented in January. <p>Agreed. A draft allocation policy for Junction 8 will be presented for PTD OSC's consideration at its meeting on 20th January 2015.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development will liaise with the Chairman of the Planning Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee to consider the content of the draft allocations policy with Members of the Committee in advance of the January meeting.</p>	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
	<p>PTD.141021.82.3</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development be recommended to acknowledge the importance of retaining the employment sites outside of the town centre detailed in Appendix B of the report (list of existing industrial sites/estates for inclusion in Policy DM18).</p>	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development	Agreed	<p>Agreed. Policy DM18 of the draft Local Plan (Reg 18) identifies key existing employment sites to be retained in employment use. A revised version of this policy will be presented for PTD OSC's consideration at its meeting on 16th December 2014.</p>	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
	<p>PTD.141021.83.1</p> <p>That subject to point XII (Some concern was raised regarding the wording and strength of the delivery mechanisms for the action plan for the draft Economic Development Strategy. It was agreed there was a need for a higher priority</p>	Cabinet Member for Economic & Commercial Development	Agreed in principle - further work required	<p>The comments from the Economic and Commercial Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee are noted and will be responded to as part of the public consultation. When the consultation process is completed and the draft strategy has been finalised, the action plan will be updated accordingly.</p>	John Foster; Dawn Hudd

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	and profile for tourism, leisure and the visitor economy and renewable and green energy in the strategy and it was felt the action plan needed to be written in more positive language) regarding the Draft Economic Development Strategy, under minute 80, being considered by the Cabinet Member for Economic and Commercial Development, the Committee recommend the Draft Economic Development Strategy be approved by Cabinet for consultation.				
PTD.141103.92.2 31	That the Cabinet Member for Community and Leisure Services be recommended to present the final draft of the Parish Charter to the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee at a meeting early in 2015.	Cabinet Member for Community and Leisure Services		Date to be agreed.	Sarah Robson
PTD.141103.92.3	That the Cabinet Member of Community and Leisure Services be recommended to include in the new Parish Charter: a. Consultation procedures for planning policy, and; b. A mechanism for disbursing Community Infrastructure Levy funds.	Cabinet Member for Community and Leisure Services		The mechanism for CIL is still work in progress, but it has been agreed by the PC working group that the Charter will refer to CIL and can be updated as necessary in the following year as the Charter is now a 'live' document.	Sarah Robson
PTD.141103.93.1	That Cabinet be recommended to agree the following paragraph for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan decision making framework: 3a Stage - MBC consulted on submission version of the neighbourhood plan (Ref 16)	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Agreed – the Cabinet Member supports this recommendation and this matter has been taken on to Cabinet for their approval. (It was noted that this was not to be included as a supplementary stage)	Rachel Elliott; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	Decision method - Internal consultation with ward members/adjoining ward members/Cabinet Member Decision take - Cabinet Member Report* to consider MBC comments on submission of draft plan.				
PTD.141103.93.2 32	That Coxheath Parish Council be recommended to: a. Make a request to Locate to put the verbal advice the parish council had received from them regarding their Neighbourhood Plan in writing, and; b. Share the advice given to them in writing by Locate with Maidstone Borough Council's Spatial Policy Team to assist with progressing the parish's Neighbourhood Plan.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		The Cabinet Member notes that this recommendation should be directed to Coxheath Parish Council.	Rachel Elliott; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.141103.93.3	That the Head of Planning and Development be recommended to recognise Neighbourhood Forums and Residents' Associations and other similar groups, who are developing a Neighbourhood Plan and include them in all communications on planning policy and consultation on planning applications in their areas of the borough.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		The Cabinet Member supports the recommendation and acknowledges the legal status of Neighbourhood Forums, and has noted that the Head of Planning and Development and his officers have already commenced dialogue on Planning Policy matters with Forums, Parish Councils, residents groups and other interested parties, and that such meetings will be continued as both the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans continue to be developed.	Rachel Elliott; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.141118.105.1	That the Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development or the relevant new Committee with responsibility for transport and development in their terms of reference from the new municipal year 2015, be	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		a) The Cabinet Member would welcome Planning Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committees initial steer upon consultation and before we draft our response (including point b) below already received The Cabinet Member supports this objective	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
33	<p>recommended to:</p> <p>a - Respond to the Department for Transport's franchise consultation, which due in 2016;</p> <p>b - Reduce unnecessary car travel within the borough, this response should request improved commuter and off peak services using high speed trains and Thameslink services to reduce the number of rail users travelling across the borough by car to other stations that offer better service than their local station;</p> <p>c - Continue to promote aspirations for re-securing a Maidstone to Canon Street service.</p>				
PTD.141118.105.2	<p>That the Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development or the relevant new Committee with responsibility for transport and development in their terms of reference from the new municipal year 2015, be recommended to promote the appointment of a Kent County Councillor for Maidstone and a Maidstone Borough Councillor to the Steering Group for the Medway Valley Line and Kent Community Rail Partnership to ensure Maidstone borough's needs are pursued.</p>	<p>Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development</p>		<p>The Cabinet Member agrees</p>	<p>Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside</p>
PTD.141118.105.3	<p>Councillor Chittenden investigate how Maidstone Borough can be represented on the South Eastern Public Transport User Group and report back to the committee at their meeting of 4 February 2015</p>			<p>Update will be provided at the meeting on 20 January 2015.</p>	<p>Tessa Mallett</p>

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
PTD.141118.105.4	The Head of Planning and Development be recommended to ensure Section 106 funding be sought from developers at every opportunity to: Support public transport links to and from new developments linking bus and rail services, and; Ensure the provision is timed in a way to provide services that increase as occupation of developments increase.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		We already do –furthermore the earliest possible move to the Community Infrastructure Levy is encouraged.	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.141118.105.5	The Chairman of the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee be recommended to write to Mr Mike Gibson of South Eastern Rail to: a. Establish how parish councils could access funding for improvements to rural rail stations; b. Request that he take forward his suggestion to approach Network Rail regarding the possibility of expanding rail station car parks at Bearsted and Headcorn and look into the possibility of extending this to other rural rail stations; c. Request that he take forward his suggestion to reduce parking costs at rural rail stations such as Headcorn to discourage rail users from parking in residential areas.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Completed. Letter written and response received.	Tessa Mallett
PTD.141118.105.6	The Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development be recommended to ask Kent County Council for an update on the progress with the building of the footbridge replacing the level crossing at the foot of	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		The Cabinet Member recommends that a more suitable approach would be for the Planning Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee to arrange to interview KCC officers on this matter. The Cabinet Member will update the committee on any progress he becomes aware of.	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	Bower Lane, Maidstone.				
PTD.141118.106.1	That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development or the relevant new Committee with responsibility for transport and development in their terms of reference from the new municipal year 2015, be recommended to carry out consultation with car users to establish why they drive into Maidstone town and what would encourage them to use an alternative mode of transport to get into the town.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		The Cabinet Member recommends that the existing data be reviewed.	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.141118.106.2	That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development or the relevant new Committee with responsibility for transport and development in their terms of reference from the new municipal year 2015, be recommended to survey the users of Maidstone East railway station car park to find out their reason for using it to establish how many users were rail passengers and how many were not.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		The Cabinet Member recommends that this is taken forward as part of the wider work on the Parking Strategy.	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.141118.106.3	That the Cabinet Member for Community and Leisure Services or the relevant new Committee with responsibility for Community and Leisure in their terms of reference from the new municipal year 2015, be recommended, as part of the Parish Charter refresh, to include a section on the powers and opportunities parish councils have in the provision of transport services and capital equipment, such as bus shelters and real	Cabinet Member for Community and Leisure Services		KALC have agreed to provide further information at their meeting on 29/4. Sarah R and Cllr Perry will be in attendance.	John Littlemore; Sarah Robson

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	time transport information, and funding streams available to them.				
PTD.141118.106.4	That the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee meet with the relevant officers regarding the possible inclusion of a review of the Park and Ride service and report back to the committee at their meeting of 16 December 2014.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Meeting arranged with HO P&D for 2pm on 16 December 2014.	Tessa Mallett
36 PTD.141216.116.2	That the Head of Planning and Development be recommended to inform those who responded to the Regulation 18 consultation on the draft Local Plan, using the most cost effective method, how their responses have been included in the amendments to the draft Local Plan.			In accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement, all representations to the Local Plan are acknowledged at the time of receipt and again at the point of validation. All comments made are publically available on the portal. When the plan is amended at any stage in its development as a result of representations, everyone who has commented, and all those on the consultee database are informed. Information is also disseminated to all those on the consultee database via the Planning Viewpoint newsletter when this is published. The next edition will be published in advance of the 20 Jan Committee meeting.	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.141216.116.3	That the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommends to Cabinet that the infrastructure delivery policies are amended as per the proposals in Appendix A of the Development Management and Infrastructure Delivery Policies report of 16 December 2014 and that the policies are approved for regulation 19 consultation subject to consideration of the following: a) That the Cabinet Member for			Agreed. Southern Water is currently responding to infrastructure requests as part of the IDP work.	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	Planning, Transport and Development be recommended to, should dialogue with Southeast Water fail, seriously consider the option of taking the matter up with the regulator.				
PTD.141216.116.4	That the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee approved the care home policy as proposed in the Development Management and Infrastructure Delivery Policies report of 16 December 2014.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Noted	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.141216.1161a 37	That the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommend to Cabinet that the development management policies are amended as per the proposals in Appendix A of the Development Management and Infrastructure Delivery Policies report of 16 December 2014 and that the policies are approved for regulation 19 consultation in July 2015 subject to consideration of the following recommendations: a) That the Development Management and Infrastructure Delivery Policies report be circulated to all councillors by the Head of Planning and Development and any further representations from councillors be expressed via their group's spokesperson to Cabinet at its meeting on 14 January 2015;	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Noted and agreed. The report and appendices were circulated by email to all elected members on 6 January 2015 with a request to forward any comments or representations via the group leaders to the Cabinet meeting on 14 January 2015.	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.141216.1161b	That the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommend to Cabinet that	Cabinet Member for Planning		For larger schemes, S106 agreements are already used to ensure sustainable travel plans are provided as part of the development with contributions secured to ensure their	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	<p>the development management policies are amended as per the proposals in Appendix A of the Development Management and Infrastructure Delivery Policies report of 16 December 2014 and that the policies are approved for regulation 19 consultation in July 2015 subject to consideration of the following recommendations:</p> <p>b) That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development be recommended to implement a strategy to make use of Section 106 agreements to ensure travel plans are robust and implemented by developers.</p>	Transport and Development		<p>provision. These agreements are monitored for compliance by the Council which has legal powers to secure compliance with the S106 agreement. The relevant tests set out in paragraph 204 of the NPPF and Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations are required to be met. For smaller schemes, where requested by the Highways Authority or where considered necessary and fulfilling the tests set out in paragraph 206 of the NPPF, planning conditions can be attached which are enforceable by the Council. It is therefore considered that there is already a mechanism in place to ensure, where required, that travel plans are robust and implemented by developers.</p>	
PTD.141216.1161c 88	<p>That the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommend to Cabinet that the development management policies are amended as per the proposals in Appendix A of the Development Management and Infrastructure Delivery Policies report of 16 December 2014 and that the policies are approved for regulation 19 consultation in July 2015 subject to consideration of the following recommendations:</p> <p>c) That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development be recommended to make the following amendment to point 3iii of policy DM13 to strengthen the intent:</p> <p>Development proposals must:</p>	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Agreed. Wording will be amended as suggested.	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	3iii Demonstrate that development in, or likely to adversely affect, in particular where a number of developments are likely to result in a cumulative impact, that Air Quality Management Areas incorporate mitigation measures to reduce impact to an acceptable level, in line with the borough's air quality action plan.				
PTD.141216.1161d 39	<p>That the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommend to Cabinet that the development management policies are amended as per the proposals in Appendix A of the Development Management and Infrastructure Delivery Policies report of 16 December 2014 and that the policies are approved for regulation 19 consultation in July 2015 subject to consideration of the following recommendations:</p> <p>d) That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development be recommended to make the following amendments to points 1 and 3 of policy DM29 – Leisure and community uses in the town centre:</p> <p>1 The development, including in combination with any similar uses in the locality, should not have a significant impact on local amenity, including as a result of noise and hours of operation.</p> <p>3 The wording be amended to allow for</p>	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		<p>DM29 – Proposed amendments: 1) Agree. Wording will be amended accordingly. 3) Delete existing point (3).</p> <p>Propose amendment to DM27 – Primary shopping frontages (2) as follows: "2. The proposal is for a professional and financial services use (A2), a cafe; and restaurant use (A3), a drinking establishment (A4), <u>a community use (D1) or a leisure use (D2)</u> and would not result in the percentage of ground floor retail (A1) floorspace in the frontage block in which the development would be located falling below 85%."</p>	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	greater flexibility to maintain the vibrancy of the primary shopping area.				
PTD.141216.118.1	The Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development be recommended to circulate the final draft of the Landscape Capacity Study to all councillors at the earliest possible date in January 2015 and provide copies for the members library to facilitate a full and informed discussion of the study at the committees meeting of 20 January 2015.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development			Deanne Cunningham; Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
40 PTD.141216.118.2	That the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee noted the update on the Landscape Capacity Study and agreed the draft document be brought back to committee for approval at the 20 January 2015 meeting.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		The meeting on 19 January went ahead as planned and from it there was clear cross party appetite to build on the completed capacity study to further refine landscape protection policy in the emerging local plan. At the Overview and Scrutiny meeting on 20 January reference was made in the officer report (page 14,15; para 1.3.9 and 1.3.10 of the report pack) to how the study had been used in the site assessment work resulting in the site allocation proposals contained in the report. There will be further engagement, and also additional work in the coming months, details of which will be shared with Members at it develops.	Deanne Cunningham; Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.141216.119.1	The Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee note the contents of the Agricultural Land Classification Survey and made the following recommendations: That the Head of Planning and Development consider applying the use of Agricultural Land Classification studies to any pending sensitive solar farm	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		The recent Agricultural Land Classification studies were only conducted on specific sites: some of the Regulation 18 sites, and on the some of the most recent sites that have been put forward as part of the call for sites. This was not a borough wide survey and therefore the information would not cover any pending solar farm planning applications unless on land proposed for housing development in the emerging Local Plan. Use could be made of the information on the MAGIC website which illustrates post 1998 classifications. http://www.magic.gov.uk/	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	planning applications.			Alternatively further specialist advice could be sought from consultants to assist in determination of such applications as and when they arise.	
PTD.141216.119.2	That the Head of Planning and Development make copies of the Agricultural Land Classification Survey and any previous studies in this area available to all members in the members library and provide any relevant email links to reports.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Agreed. Officers are working with colleagues in IT to digitise the 1990's MAFF survey work into GIS to allow for a more comprehensive digital mapping layer to be created covering both the old and new studies. Officers will also make available a paper file copy of each study for reference in the Members library.	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.141216.119.3 41	That the Head of Planning and Development provide details, to the committee, of the percentage of land classified as Best and Most Versatile (BMV) in the borough.			The Council does not have details of the percentage of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land across the Borough as a whole. The 1994 survey and the recent survey focussed on specific sites. Post 1988 information can be found on the MAGIC website. http://www.magic.gov.uk/	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.150120.130.1	Committee recommend Cabinet approve the new housing site allocation policies as set out in Appendix D for Regulation 18 consultation in February 2015, subject to: a) Site H1 (51) – Bridge Industrial Centre, Wharf Road, Tovil being accepted subject to a specific reference being made to include community infrastructure to improve medical services in the area and emergency access route to the site. b) Site H1 (52) – Dunning Hall off Fremlin Walk, Week Street, Maidstone being accepted.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		The Cabinet considered the recommendations at its meetings on 2 and 4 February, and these informed the decisions made.	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
42	<p>c) Site H1 (53) – 18-21 Foster Street, Maidstone being accepted.</p> <p>d) Site H1 (54) – Slencrest House, 2 Tonbridge Road, Maidstone being accepted.</p> <p>e) Site H1 (55) – The Russell Hotel, Boxley Road, Maidstone being accepted.</p> <p>f) Site H1 (56) - Land at 180-188 Union Street, Maidstone being accepted subject to a note at Point 5 Landscape – on air quality issues because of the location of the site.</p> <p>g) Site H1 (57) - Land at Former Astor of Hever Community School, Maidstone being rejected until further exploration work was carried out to find alternative access for the site and bought back to this Committee for further consideration.</p> <p>h) Site H1 (58) - Tovil Working Men’s Club, Tovil Hill, Tovil being accepted subject to issues with access to the site being addressed and Point 13 to include that the site be considered for the provision of a doctors surgery.</p> <p>i) Site H1 (59) - Bearsted Station Goods Yard, Bearsted being approved.</p> <p>j) Site H1 (60) – Fant Farm,</p>				

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
43	<p>Maidstone being rejected on the grounds on the grounds that:</p> <p>Further housing in this area would have a severe impact on the already congested junctions in the area which cannot be mitigated and would erode the unique pattern of development; It will have a detrimental impact on the Medway Valley landscape quality, and; The land is classed as 'best and most valuable' agricultural land as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>k) Site H1 (61) - Land at Cross Keys, Bearsted being rejected on the grounds that the site had a historical and continual flooding issues and school provision in the parish is at full capacity with no space to expand the existing schools.</p> <p>l) Site H1 (62) - Land at Boughton Lane Loose/Boughton Monchelsea being approved subject to the Head of Planning and Development receiving clarity from Kent County Council as to what would be appropriate improvements to Boughton Lane and the junction of Boughton Lane and A229 Loose Road and reporting back to this Committee.</p> <p>m) Site H1 (63) - Land at Boughton Mount, Boughton Lane, Boughton Monchelsea being approved.</p>				

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
44	<p>n) Site H1 (64) - Bell Farm, North East Street, Harrietsham being rejected on the grounds that the cumulative impact of development having a detrimental effect on the character and size of the village and community and the footprint of the village. Should Cabinet decide to include this site the Committee recommend point 2 be amended to reflect the need for public open space.</p> <p>o) Site H1 (65) being rejected on the grounds of: Severe highways congestion; Severe flood risk in the area; and, A lack of a sewage infrastructure capable of dealing with further development.</p> <p>p) Sites H1 (70) Land at the junction of Church Street and Heath Road, Boughton Monchelsea and H1 (71) - Lyewood Farm, Green Lane, Boughton Monchelsea being accepted subject to a reference to the need for additional medical facilities under point 9.</p>				
PTD.150122.140.1	A cross party group from the Committee meet with Planning Officers before the next adjourned meeting of the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee (28 January 2015 at 3pm) to discuss the development criteria and parameters for sites H1 (7, 8 and 9).	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Accept recommendation. Officers met with Members to discuss the aforementioned sites and agreed a set of revised criteria that were subsequently used in the consideration of these sites at Cabinet on 2 and 4 February.	Steve Clark; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
PTD.150122.140.2 4.5	<p>That the Committee recommend that Cabinet approve the new housing site allocation policies as set out in Appendix D for Regulation 18 consultation in February 2015, subject to:</p> <p>a) H1 (66) – Land south of The Parsonage, Goudhurst Road, Marden Being accepted subject to the addition of the words ‘In particular’ at the beginning of the sentence under point 10.</p> <p>b) H1 (67) - Land to the south of Marden Road, Staplehurst and H1 (68) – Lane to the north of Henhurst Farm, Staplehurst Both sites being removed as they are not in compliance with the parish footprint and the foul water infrastructure cannot be resolved by sites of this size.</p> <p>c) H1 (69) – Land at Lodge Road, Staplehurst Being accepted.</p> <p>d) H1 (72) – Land adj. The Windmill PH, Eyehorne Street, Hollingbourne Being accepted.</p> <p>e) H1 (73) - Land at Brandy’s Bay, South Lane, Sutton Valence Being accepted.</p> <p>f) H1 (74) – Land at Wren’s Cross, Upper Stone Street, Maidstone</p>	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		The Cabinet considered the recommendations at is meetings on 2 and 4 February, and these informed the decisions made.	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	Being accepted subject to the site being part of a wider regeneration of the area.				
46 PTD.150122.140.3	<p>The Committee recommend that Cabinet approve the amendments to Policy H1 set out in Appendix B for incorporation into the Regulation 19 version of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan, subject to detailed transport and infrastructure modelling be in place beforehand and subject to:</p> <p>a) H1 (43) – Linden Farm, Stockett Lane, Coxheath Being accepted subject to a reconsideration of the Section 106 contributions being used for the provision of local schools and subject to the necessary highway works being carried out.</p> <p>b) H1 (44) – Heathfield, Heath Road, Coxheath Being accepted subject to an additional green buffer and the parish’s proposed easy access walk be provided to preserve the line of the parish council as detailed in the Coxheath Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>c) H1 (45) – Forstal Lane, Coxheath Being rejected because highways and access to the site cannot be adequately addressed.</p> <p>d) H1 (1) – Bridge Nursery, London Road, Maidstone</p>	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		The Cabinet considered the recommendations at is meeting s on 2 and 4 February, and these informed the decisions made.	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
47	<p>Not being discussed as resolution to grant planning permission subject to S106.</p> <p>e) H1 (2) – East of Hermitage Lane, Maidstone Not being discussed as this site is subject to a planning appeal.</p> <p>f) H1 (3) – West of Hermitage Lane, Maidstone Not being discussed as resolution to grant planning permission subject to S106.</p> <p>g) H1 (4) – Oakapple Lane, Barming Being accepted subject to the site being developed in pace and alongside the establishment of a country park.</p> <p>h) H1 (5) – Langley Park, Sutton Road, Boughton Monchelsea Being accepted.</p> <p>i) H1 (6) – North of Sutton Road, Otham Being accepted.</p>				
PTD.150128.150.1	<p>The Committee recommend that Cabinet approve new housing site allocation policies as set out in Appendix A/B for Regulation 19 consultation in February 2015, subject to:</p> <p>a) The proposed changes to the layout and configuration of sites H1 (7) – North of Bicknor Wood, Gore Court</p>	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		The Cabinet considered the recommendations at its meetings on 2 and 4 February, and these informed the decisions made.	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
48	<p>Road, Otham; H1 (8) – West of Church Road, Otham, and, H1 (9) – Bicknor Farm, Sutton Road, Otham being brought back to the committee by the Head of Planning and Development for further consideration after which the sites should proceed to a further Regulation 18 consultation.</p> <p>b) The proposed changes to the proposed yield, site criteria and site area for site H1 (10) – South of Sutton Road, Langley as amended by the Urgent Update Report being accepted for Regulation 18 consultation in February 2015.</p> <p>c) The infrastructure provision for this site H1 (10) – South of Sutton Road, Langley, ie Highway infrastructure – Wheatsheaf junction congestion, and, insufficient sewage infrastructure capacity being further investigated to seek appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>d) The proposed changes to the site criteria and site area for site H1 (11) – Springfield, Royal Engineers Road and Mill Lane, being accepted as amended by the Urgent Update Report and Appendices for Regulation 18 consultation in February 2015.</p> <p>e) Site H1 (12) – Haynes, Ashford Road, Maidstone being accepted subject to the following being included in the policy:</p>				

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
49	<p>. A requirement for significant on site open space being provided; . A significant contribution towards off site open space, and; . The development be reasonably set back from the Ashford Road.</p> <p>f) Site H1 (13) – Medway Street, Maidstone being accepted subject to significant planting to mitigate the effect of poor quality in the area.</p> <p>g) Site H1 (14) – American Golf, Tonbridge Road, Maidstone being accepted.</p> <p>h) SiteH1 (15) – 6, Tonbridge Road, Maidstone being accepted.</p> <p>i) SiteH1 (16) – Laguna, Hart Street, Maidstone being accepted.</p> <p>j) H1 (17) – Barty Farm, Roundwell, Maidstone be rejected and taken out because school provision in the parish is at full capacity and there is no space to expand the existing schools.</p> <p>k) Site H1 (18) – Whitmore Street, Maidstone being accepted.</p> <p>l) Site H1 (19) - North Street, Barming being accepted.</p> <p>m) Site H1 (20) – Postly Road, Tovil being rejected due to:</p>				

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
50	<p>. The detrimental effect on the Loose Valley corridor;</p> <p>. The difficulty in defending the adjacent high quality agricultural land from future development, and;</p> <p>. The community infrastructure already at capacity with no reasonable improvements possible.</p> <p>n) Site H1 (21) – Kent Police Headquarters, Sutton Road, Maidstone being accepted.</p> <p>o) Site H1 (22) Kent Police Training School, Sutton Road, Maidstone being accepted.</p> <p>p) H1 (23) – New Line Learning, Boughton Lane, Loose be deferred for consideration until after the Public Enquiry.</p> <p>q) Site H1 (24) – West of Eclipse, Maidstone being accepted subject to:</p> <p>. A minimum of a 15 meter green buffer around the site, and;</p> <p>. The layout and landscaping of the site aims to minimise the impact of the development on the adjacent ancient woodland.</p> <p>r) The Head of Planning and Development undertaking, and completing, within three months, traffic modelling work in Lenham using 245 units (Policy H1) and 1500 units (Policy</p>				

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
51	<p>H2) in the broad location and report back to the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee before Regulation 19 consultation and to feed into any planning application coming forward for any sites in Lenham.</p> <p>s) Site H1 (25) – Tongs Meadow, West Street, Harrietsham being rejected and taken out of the draft Local Plan on the basis that it is a receptor site and should go back to Regulation 18 for deletion.</p> <p>t) H1 (26) – South of Ashford Road, Harrietsham be accepted subject to the necessary highway safety and traffic calming improvements being an integral part of the policy.</p> <p>u) H1 (27) – Mayfield Nursery, Ashford Road, Harrietsham be accepted.</p> <p>v) H1 (28) – Church Road, Harrietsham be accepted</p> <p>w) Site H1 (29) – Tanyard Farm, Old Ashford Road, Lenham being accepted subject to the delivery of high quality landscape protection to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in consultation with the Parish Council and Lenham Neighbourhood Plan Group to deliver a high quality scheme.</p>				

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
52	<p>x) Site H1 (30) – Glebe Gardens, Lenham being deferred pending clarification of the outcome of a detailed impact assessment regarding the preservation and enhancement of the pond which is the source of the Len.</p> <p>y) Site H1 (31) – Ham Lane, Lenham being rejected on the basis that the landscape impact of any development of this site on the village and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>u) Site H1 (32) – Howland Road, Marden, being accepted.</p> <p>v) Site H1 (33) – Stanley Farm, Plain Road, Marden, being accepted.</p> <p>w) Site H1 (34) – The Parsonage, Goudhurst Road, Marden, being accepted.</p> <p>x) Site H1 (35) – Marden Cricket and Hockey Club, Stanley Road, Marden, being accepted.</p> <p>y) Site H1 (36) – Hen and Duckhurst Farm, Marden Road, Staplehurst being accepted subject to:</p> <p>. Issues with the site being addressed as part of a strategic sewage and waste water solution for Staplehurst and Headcorn, and;</p>				

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
53	<p>. Subject to an additional surface and foul water solution being included with the design of any development for this area.</p> <p>z) Site H1 (37) – Fishers Farm, Fishers Road, Staplehurst, being accepted subject to:</p> <p>. The insertion in the policy of a maximum development of 535 units; . The insertion in the policy of a stronger worded paragraph, involving Borough and Parish Councillors, on the constraints on this site; . Issues with the site being addressed as part of a strategic sewage and waste water solution for Staplehurst and Headcorn, and; . Subject to an additional surface and flood water solution being included with the design of any development for this area.</p> <p>aa) Site H1 (38) – Old School Nursery, Station Road, Headcorn being agreed</p> <p>bb) Site H1 (39) – Ulcombe Road and Mill Bank, Headcorn being rejected on the grounds of:</p> <p>. Severe highways congestion; . Severe flood risk in the area; and, . A lack of a sewage infrastructure capable of dealing with further</p>				

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
54	<p>development.</p> <p>cc) Site H1 (40) – Grigg Lane and Lenham Road, Headcorn – the parts of the site with a planning application and the part of the site with a resolution to permit being accepted.</p> <p>dd) Site H1 (40) – Grigg Lane and Lenham Road, Headcorn – remainder of the site without planning permission being rejected on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Severe highways congestion; . Severe flood risk in the area; and, . A lack of a sewage infrastructure capable of dealing with further development. <p>ee) Site H1 (41) – South of Grigg Lane, Headcorn being rejected on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Severe highways congestion; . Severe flood risk in the area; and, . A lack of a sewage infrastructure capable of dealing with further development. <p>ff) Site H1 (42) – Knaves Acres, Headcorn being rejected on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Severe highways congestion; . Severe flood risk in the area; and, 				

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
55	<p>. A lack of a sewage infrastructure capable of dealing with further development.</p> <p>gg) Site H1 (46) – Vicarage Road, Yalding being accepted.</p> <p>hh) Site H1 (47) – Hubbards Land and Haste Hill Road, Boughton Monchelsea being accepted.</p> <p>ii) Site H1 (48) – Heath Road, Boughton Monchelsea being rejected, as set out in Appendix D of the agenda, for Regulation 18 consultation in February 2015.</p> <p>jj) Site H1 (49) – East of Eyhorne Street, Eyhorne Street (Hollingbourne) being accepted.</p> <p>kk) Site H1 (50 – West of Eyhorne Street, Eyhorne Street (Hollingbourne) being accepted.</p>				
PTD.150128.152.1	Report for 17 March PTD OSC meeting on Invicta Barracks	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		There is now no meeting on 17 Feb with the next committee scheduled for 17 March. Officers will present a verbal update on the Invicta Barracks site in policy H3 of the draft Local Plan, with a more detailed report to follow later in 2015 along with other strategic and spatial policies as a further part of the iterative development of the Local Plan.	Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.150302.160.1	a) Reconsider their decision on site H1 (25) Tongs Meadow, West Street, Harrietsham and reject the site, and for it to be taken back to Regulation 18 for deletion on the basis that it is a receptor site.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		a) Following receipt of further advice today from Natural England that a further EPS development licence is unlikely to be granted, Cabinet have reviewed their decision and recommend that the site be taken back to Regulation 18 consultation for deletion from the draft local plan.	Steve Clark; Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
56	<p>b) If during their reconsideration Cabinet decide to keep site H1 (25) in the Local Plan that the Revised Criterion for Design and Layout and Ecology be included in the policy with the inclusion of the requirement that an independent organisation such as Natural England or Kent Wildlife Trust be commissioned from the design stage of any development on the site to report whether the design of the development will adequately protect the species that are on the site</p> <p>c) That Cabinet remove point (e) of their decision – ‘that development here would not command the consent of local people as reflected in the consultation response’ from site H1 (10) south of Sutton Road, Langley, from reasons for rejection.</p> <p>d) Reconsider their decision on site H1 (10) South of Sutton Road, Langley and put it forward for Regulation 19 consultation for approval.</p> <p>e)It was the Committees view that as all four sites, H1 (7)Land North of Bicknor Wood, Otham, H1 (8) Land West of Church Road, Otham and H1 (9) Bicknor Farm, Sutton Road and H1 (10) South of Sutton Road come on to the Sutton Road that all comments regarding traffic management must be the same. The Committee therefore request Cabinet, either to give H1 (7), (8) and (9) the</p>			<p>b) Not now applicable given the response detailed at point a) above.</p> <p>c) Cabinet agree.</p> <p>d) Cabinet agree to amend their original decision, deleting point (c), while retaining reasons (a), (b), and (d).</p> <p>e) Cabinet agree that the decisions on sites H1(7), (8), and (9) remain unchanged and these sites go forward to Regulation 19 consultation. For site H1(10) Cabinet agree that reason (c) from the original decision be removed to ensure consistency with the decisions on sites H1(7), (8), and (9) whilst still recognising the impacts of traffic on the Sutton Road. Cabinet also agree to add in the additional wording in the policy criterion for transport, as suggested by Overview</p>	

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
57	<p>same wording as H1 10, i.e. point (c) 'there would be an unacceptable cumulative impact on traffic generation in the Sutton Road corridor'. In which case that may require cabinet to further decide sites H1 (7), (8) and (9) should be rejected in the same way as H1 (10). Or alternatively they can remove point (c) from H1 (10) and instead, under criteria, insert the same wording used for H1 (7), (8) and (9) i.e. 'strategic road infrastructure to significantly relieve traffic congestion on Sutton Road and Willingdon Street'. This may not necessarily mean the status of H1 (10) changing because there would still be three reasons for rejection of this site, (a), (b) and (d).</p> <p>f) Note the disappointment of the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committees' that Cabinet have not given a reason for recommending site H1 (20) – Postley Road, Tovil go forward for Regulation 19 consultation and ask that Cabinet provide a reason why the Committee's recommendation was overturned and incorporate this reason in the Decision Notice.</p>			<p>and Scrutiny to ensure consistency of policy wording with sites H1(7), (8), and (9). Cabinet consider that reasons (a), (b), and (d) given for rejection of site H1(10) are still valid and therefore their decision stands and that the site be taken back to Regulation 18 for deletion.</p> <p>f) Noted. Cabinet have fully considered the issues raised by both Overview and Scrutiny, and visiting members but after careful consideration consider that the policy criteria for site H1 (20) will afford the protection aspired to and therefore that the site allocation should proceed to Regulation 19 consultation.</p>	
PTD.150317.170.1	That the Head of Planning and Development be recommended to provide a written report to the Committee for their meeting of 21 April 2015 covering Invicta Barracks and its status in the draft Local Plan so that the committee could express its view on	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Noted. A short written report will be provided as requested.	Steve Clark; Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	Policy H3 of the draft local plan.				
PTD.150317.171.1	That the Head of Planning and Development be recommended to update the Section 106 Report presented to the Planning Committee at their meeting of 26 February 2015 and circulate it to the members of the Planning Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee before their meeting of 21 April 2015 together with details of Local Enterprise Partnership funding, provided via KCC.			Noted and agreed. The summary will be updated and circulated in advance of the meeting together with the LEP information.	Steve Clark; Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
58 PTD.150317.172.1	That the Committee noted and welcomed the report and recommended the adoption of the interim parking standards presented to the Committee as a material consideration for Development Management purposes.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Noted	Steve Clark; Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.150317.173a	That after publication of the Review of Transport in Maidstone - alternative to using a car report a subgroup be formed from the beginning of the municipal year 2015, by the relevant new Committee with responsibility for transport and development in their terms of reference, to explore: - Alternative methods of transport for the future that will help ease congestion in Maidstone town. This sub group to take forward research into future alternatives (for example rail halts on the Medway Valley Line, trains etc.) and improving existing forms of transport, and; - Possible European Union funding to	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Noted	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	fund new transport initiatives.				
PTD.150317.173b	That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development or the relevant new Committee with responsibility for transport and development in their terms of reference from the new municipal year 2015, use the principal proposals from the refreshed Cycling Strategy to inform the emerging Integrated Transport Strategy.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Officers are working on a refreshed Integrated Transport Strategy that will give consideration to the aspirations and objectives from the draft Cycling Strategy of 2012. Input from the newly established Cycle Forum as well as other transport groups will be considered in shaping the new strategy.	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.150317.173c 59	That a member of Maidstone Borough Council's PTD OSC or a member of the relevant new Committee with responsibility for transport and development in their terms of reference from the new municipal year 2015 be invited to join the Quality Bus Partnership.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Noted	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.150317.173d	That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development or the relevant new Committee with responsibility for transport and development in their terms of reference from the new municipal year 2015, be recommended to re-establish the Maidstone Borough Transport User Group. Membership to include representatives from all public transport service providers, KCC transport planners, MBC officers/members, parish councils, service users and other interested parties to ensure on-going issues with transport and ideas for enhancements to services are communicated and dealt with.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Noted	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
PTD.150317.173e	That a MBC transport planning officer investigate and report back to the relevant new Strategic Planning and Sustainable Transport Committee during the municipal year 2015-2016 on the progress and lessons learnt from the Medway twilight service once the trial is complete.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Noted. Officers will research this and update the new committee in due course.	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.150317.173f	That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development or the relevant new Committee with responsibility for transport and development in their terms of reference from the new 2015 municipal year, be recommended to include the potential use of Section 106/Community Infrastructure Levy monies to support the provision of bus service, and/or provide capital equipment for bus services in the Borough in the Local Plan.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		As part of the revisions to the Integrated Transport Strategy consideration will be given to encouraging modal shift toward greater use of public transport and how this will be funded.	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.150317.173g	That parishes, resident associations and neighbourhood forums be encouraged by the relevant new Committee with responsibility for transport and development in their terms of reference from the new municipal year 2015, to form groups similar to the East of Maidstone Bus User Group.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Noted	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside
PTD.150317.173h	Maidstone Borough Council, through the Committee with responsibility for transport in its terms of reference from the new 2015 municipal year, should actively investigate and seek to bring forward an express bus service linked to	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Noted. Officers are continuing to work on revisions to the Integrated Transport Strategy and will consider this in light of any wider decisions on the future of Park and Ride for Maidstone.	Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

Appendix A

Meeting, Date & Minute	Recommendation	Executive Decision Maker	Action Expected Outcome	Response	Lead Officer
	the Park and Ride service, with particular attention initially being paid to the South Maidstone route.				
61 PTD.150317.174.1	<p>Representatives from West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group and East Kent Clinical Commissioning Group be invited to the Committee meeting of 21 April 2015 to discuss:</p> <p>i. Their current and projected capacity for GP and other health support services for the Borough – how many are they planning (GP surgeries) and where are they planning to put them?</p> <p>ii. What use they currently make of Section 106 monies from developers.</p> <p>iii. What assistance MBC could offer them to make best use of Section 106 monies?</p>	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development			Tessa Mallett
PTS.150317.174.2	The Head of Planning and Development be recommended to keep a watching brief on public examinations of other authorities local plans to establish any differing interpretations of the National Planning Policy Framework and more detailed information on the constraints argument.	Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development		Noted. Officers have been monitoring national progress for a couple of years now, noting key points for both success and failure and will continue to do so to aid future development of the Local Plan.	Steve Clark; Rob Jarman; Cheryl Parks; Sue Whiteside

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted