

AGENDA

PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING



Overview and Scrutiny

Date: Tuesday 30 September 2014
Time: 6.30 pm
Venue: Town Hall, High Street, Maidstone

Membership:

Councillors: Chittenden, English (Vice-Chairman), Munford,
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 16 September 2014**
The minutes of the meeting of 16 September 2014 will be issued as an amended agenda item with week beginning 22 September 2014.

8. Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy update report

1 - 14

Report to be presented by Darren Bridgett, Principal Planning Officer, to consider two issues relating to the preparation of the Green and Blue Infrastructure (GBI) Strategy and make

Continued Over/:

Issued on 18 September 2014

Alison Broom

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

recommendations as necessary.

- Issue one: to consider key issues raised in the responses to the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy stakeholder engagement;
- Issue two: to consider progress of the open space audit.

9. Review of Transport in Maidstone - alternatives to using a car - BUS SERVICES 15 - 28

This is the second stage of the Committees review into Transport in Maidstone – alternatives to using a car.

This stage is focussing on Bus Services in the Borough.

Interviews with:

- Matthew Arnold, Commercial Director, Arriva Buses;
- Norman Kemp, Nu Venture Coaches Ltd., and;
- Mike Fitzgerald, Chair East of Maidstone Bus Group.

10. Future Work Programme and SCRAIP update 29 - 39

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 602524**. To find out more about the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees, please visit <http://www.maidstone.gov.uk/osc>

Maidstone Borough Council

Community, Environment and Housing Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 30 September 2014

Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy update report

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:

-
-
-
-
-

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

**PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT OVERVIEW &
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

TUESDAY 30 SEPTEMBER 2014

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Report prepared by Darren Bridgett

1. GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY - UPDATE

1.1 Issue for consideration

1.1.1 To consider two issues relating to the preparation of the Green and Blue Infrastructure (GBI) Strategy and make recommendations as necessary.

1.1.2 Issue one: to consider key issues raised in the responses to the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy stakeholder engagement. Attached at Appendix A is a full summary of the key issues raised in the stakeholder engagement exercise.

1.1.3 Issue two: to consider progress of the open space audit, which provides a key piece of evidence underpinning the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy and action plan.

1.2 Recommendation of the Head of Planning and Development

1.2.1 That the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee (PTD OSC) considers the two issues presented and makes recommendations as necessary.

1.2.2 Issue one: the key issues raised in the responses to the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy stakeholder engagement. Attached at Appendix A is a full summary of the key issues raised in the stakeholder engagement exercise.

1.2.3 Issue two: the progress of the open space audit, which provides a key piece of evidence underpinning the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy and action plan.

1.3 Reasons for recommendation

1.3.1 The Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy is a corporate strategy, covering the borough's open spaces and water bodies. It is being prepared for a number of reasons:

- To bring increased certainty about the importance of this key part of the borough's environment.
- To maximise the number of overlapping benefits of green and blue infrastructure by looking holistically at each area to ensure it is delivering as many benefits as possible.
- To co-ordinate a wide range of stakeholder interests and focus limited resources on a number of interlinked proposals to maximise the benefits for green and blue infrastructure.
- To act as a basis for attracting resources including grant funding and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – where qualifying infrastructure projects are identified.
- To form the basis for GBI delivery, through policies in the Maidstone Borough Local Plan (MBLP) and a supplementary planning document (SPD), which will set quantitative and qualitative standards for types of open space and provide detailed guidance to developers, partners and decision makers on its future provision.

1.3.2 The Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee approved the GBI Strategy for targeted stakeholder engagement at its meeting on 19 November 2013. The targeted engagement involved a stakeholder workshop held on 16 December 2013 and a six week open consultation period held from December 2013 until late January 2014.

1.3.3 There has been no update since the end of the stakeholder engagement period, this is for two reasons. The open space audit and the MBLP regulation 18 consultation. The open space audit is still ongoing and provides a key piece of evidence to underpin the strategy and action plan. The MBLP regulation 18 consultation, which ran from 21 March 2014 until 7 May 2014, required significant resources, as has

the subsequent and ongoing exercise to analyse the comments that were made.

1.3.4 **Stakeholder engagement – key issues**

1.3.5 Attached as Appendix A to this report is a full summary of key issues raised during the GBI strategy stakeholder engagement exercise. In all there were 48 respondents to the stakeholder engagement, as well as comments raised at the stakeholder event, which followed the same themes.

1.3.6 The preparation of the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy was in itself supported, however, concerns were raised on a number of issues.

1.3.7 **Process:**

- Concern that the process of developing the strategy and action plan was too slow and would not be able to impact on the local plan.
- No implementation plan means that there is no confidence in the council being able to deliver.
- Concern was raised over how adequate the consultation was with the parish councils.
- Concern was raised that the strategy may impede economic development.

1.3.8 **Content:**

- The strategy was considered by some to be too focused on the urban area, while others were concerned that there was too much distinction between urban and rural areas.
- The strategy needs a matrix of actions and benefits, including a needs analysis of what improvements are needed and where.
- Concern was raised over the loss of agricultural land (relating to the proposals in the MBLP).
- The strategy needs to link and cross reference existing documents, strategies and projects such as the local biodiversity action plan (LBAP) or biodiversity improvement areas (BOA).

1.3.9 Further comments were made relating to the specifics of the document, making detailed suggestions for improvement and further elements to be included. A range of location specific suggestions were also made. These were either made as suggestions to improve the

document, or as actual improvements to the locations themselves, which would more appropriately be included in an eventual action plan. These comments are summarised in Appendix A.

1.3.10 **Open space audit - update**

1.3.11 The open space audit is a PPG17¹ style assessment of open spaces in the borough. This means that the open spaces are assessed by **quantity, quality and accessibility**.

1.3.12 The two main reasons for the audit are to enable the council to assess at a strategic level where there is a need for open space provision, either new or improved, and to provide the evidence base to enable the council to require development contributions to open space on a development by development basis. At the strategic level this might translate as new open space provision, perhaps funded by pooling CIL receipts. When looking at a development by development scenario, it might translate as a per head contribution to open space on site, delivered by section 106 planning obligations or by a CIL payment in kind (potentially a land payment instead of money).

1.3.13 **Methodology**

1.3.14 The last time that a comprehensive open space audit was conducted in the borough was in 2004. This was updated partially in 2007. For the 2014 audit, the methodology has been amended to more accurately reflect the desired outcomes of local plan policy.

1.3.15 The 2004 and 2007 audit exercises researched only the quantitative information on open space sites in the borough, i.e. how much open space there is by area. This allowed a quantitative standard to be set per 1000 head of population. This standard provides the basis for the contributions sought through the Open Space DPD and policy OS1, adopted in December 2006.

1.3.16 The 2014 audit researches also qualitative and accessibility information. This will enable the council to seek and apply open space contributions on a more targeted basis. The qualitative information can be used to discriminate where funds might more appropriately be used

¹ PPG17, published in 2002, was the national planning policy guidance note: Planning for Open space, Sport and Recreation. The companion guide, also published in 2002, provided guidance on the assessment of open spaces in respect of quantity, quality and accessibility.

to improve the quality of existing open spaces. Accessibility information can be used on a similar basis, seeking to improve access to existing open space in preference to the provision of new space. Accessibility information can be used also at the strategic scale to identify which communities have existing deficiencies accessing open spaces of any given type.

1.3.17 Other changes to the methodology are that:

- The open space must be publicly accessible.
- The open space types must be quantifiable.
- The recording of open space types should accurately reflect fine grain differences within a given open space site.
- The open space type must be something that is appropriately delivered through/in connection to local plan policy.

1.3.18 This means that whereas the 2004 audit included the following open space types:

1. Parks and gardens
2. Natural and semi-natural green space
3. Amenity green space
4. Provision for children and young people
5. Green corridors
6. Outdoor sports facilities
7. Allotments and community gardens
8. Cemeteries and graveyards

The 2014 audit no longer covers categories 1, 5 and 8.

1.3.19 The reasoning behind the 2014 methodology is that:

- **Parks and gardens** – as entities, parks and gardens in the borough are already assessed against Green Flag standards. For the purpose of the audit, this category has been removed in order to more accurately understand the component open space types that a given park is comprised of e.g. Mote Park has a substantial mixture of natural and semi-natural green space, amenity green space, provision for children and young people and outdoor sports facilities.
- **Green corridors** – it is difficult to quantify green corridors as a single entity and to make determinations of where boundaries lie.

It is also difficult to deliver a green corridor through local plan policy intervention. For the purposes of the audit and ongoing strategy, these are more accurately assessed as their component types e.g. natural and semi-natural green space or amenity green space. These areas can still be identified on a strategic scale within the GBI strategy.

- **Cemeteries and graveyards** – the provision of cemeteries and graveyards is more appropriately dealt with through corporate policy, rather than as an expression of open space planning policy.

1.3.20 **Audit progress to date**

1.3.21 The Parks and Open Spaces team completed the quantitative element of the open space audit in May 2014. This element of the audit involved re-categorising open space sites subject to the revised methodology described at 1.3.17 and 1.3.19.

1.3.22 The council has commissioned consultants to undertake the qualitative element of the audit, with initial results expected at the end of October 2014. The qualitative survey involves the setting of appropriate criteria against which to judge sites, dependent on their categorisation under the five remaining open space types. This is a resource intensive exercise, involving site visits, however, the council has sought to minimise the time taken by using existing information, such as the work already undertaken by the Parks and Open Spaces team on children's play areas, and by applying a size threshold under which sites will not be surveyed.

1.3.23 The accessibility element of the audit is a desktop exercise, which is being completed in house with GIS software. This will be completed in line with the qualitative audit. Using straight line (as the crow flies) radii, which represent accessibility [as distance] standards, it is possible to identify in relative terms where accessibility deficiencies exist.

1.3.24 **Using the results of the audit**

1.3.25 **GBI strategy and action plan** – taken with the stakeholder comments, the results of the audit will inform further discussion with stakeholders to amend the GBI strategy and develop an action plan for implementation.

1.3.26 The timescale for completion and adoption of the GBI strategy is dependent in part on the outcome of the open space audit. Information from the audit will help to guide discussions with the key stakeholders and will enable the development of an appropriate and relevant action plan to sit as part of the strategy.

1.3.27 The next stage of consultation on the local plan (regulation 19) will be in the summer of 2015. However, amendments to local plan allocations and any potential new local plan allocations will be presented to the PTD OSC and Cabinet in January 2015 for recommendation/approval. Any location specific actions developed in the GBI strategy, that require planning policy support e.g. developer contributions from specific sites, would need to be presented to these meetings.

1.3.28 **Green and blue infrastructure supplementary planning document** – the results of the audit will inform the standards for inclusion in the GBI SPD. The open space standards, which will be used to either seek or guide the application of developer contributions, will reflect the audit in the sense that they will come as three sets of standards per open space type – a quantity standard, a quality standard and an accessibility standard.

1.3.29 The GBI SPD will be adopted following the MBLP in early to mid 2016. The SPD must be supplementary to an adopted policy/policies – in this case the relevant policies are DM10 – Historic and natural environment and DM11 – Open space and recreation. Preparation of the SPD can take place in tandem with and prior to the adoption of the local plan, however, the necessary public consultation and adoption must take place afterwards.

1.4 Alternative action and why not recommended

1.4.1 This is an update report for information purposes. There is no alternative action in this case.

1.5 Impact on corporate objectives

1.5.1 **For Maidstone to be a decent place to live.** The three core elements to sustainable development are society, economy and environment. The GBI strategy is involved primarily with improving the environment. The GBI strategy and GBI SPD, with incorporated open space standards, provide the basis on which to request and apply development contributions for open space.

1.6 Risk management

1.6.1 This is an update report for information purposes. No risks are associated with any recommendations in this report.

1.7 Other implications

1.7.1

1. Financial	
2. Staffing	
3. Legal	
4. Equality impact needs assessment	
5. Environmental/sustainable development	X
6. Community safety	
7. Human Rights Act	
8. Procurement	X
9. Asset management	X

1.7.2 **Environmental/sustainable development.** The three core elements of sustainable development are society, economy and environment. The GBI strategy is involved primarily with improving the environment. The GBI strategy and GBI SPD, with incorporated open space

standards, provide the basis on which to request and apply development contributions for open space.

1.7.3 **Procurement.** In the long term the implications coming from the GBI strategy and GBI SPD are that the council may be involved in procuring land for the purposes of GBI provision.

1.7.4 **Asset management.** In the long term, the provision of further GBI assets could require funding for ongoing maintenance and management. A solution to address this would need to be found either through the identification of funds within the council budget or by other means such as ongoing management arrangements with community associations or parish councils.

1.8 Relevant documents

1.8.1 Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy Consultation Draft – October 2013.

1.8.2 Appendices

1.8.3 Appendix A – Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy – key issues raised in stakeholder engagement.

<u>IS THIS A KEY DECISION REPORT? THIS BOX MUST BE COMPLETED</u>			
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If yes, this is a Key Decision because:			
Wards/Parishes affected:			

APPENDIX A

Maidstone Draft Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy: Stakeholder Engagement – Responses Summary

Who responded:

48 responses were submitted in total including 45 online and 3 by letter. Some online respondents also sent a letter or email with a copy of their response. Of the responses 8 were from parish council representatives and 2 from neighbouring authorities (Tunbridge Wells and Medway). Kent County Council, Kent Downs AONB and Kent Wildlife Trust responded. National statutory consultees Sport England, Natural England and the Environment Agency also provided responses. The remainder were from local voluntary organisations and individuals.

Overview of key themes:

The majority of respondents welcomed the strategy or generally supported its aims and objectives with a minority of exceptions. However, there were strong concerns related to the strategy development and consultation process. There were also many comments and suggestions regarding the content which are summarised below.

Strategy process:

- Strategy aspirations good but too general with no plan for implementation and no confidence that MBC will deliver.
- Timescale too slow, too late to impact on current development plans, out of sync with Local Plan development.
- Lack of evidence base to support strategy (open space audit, playing pitch and sports assessment).
- Need to assess progress and build on previous green space strategy.
- Concern over consultation process – particularly with Parishes – too little, too late.
- Concern that strategy proposals are not resourced/funded so will not be delivered (concern re lack of CIL policy to help fund local projects).
- Concern that strategy may impede economic development of the borough.
- Concern about how GBI proposals relate to Local Plan policies.
- Concern that updated audit will classify parks by component parts rather than whole parks.

Strategy content – general:

- Strategy too urban-centric/lack of recognition of rural and agricultural issues.
- Concern that urban and countryside objectives are separated – need to be considered holistically.
- Link between landscape features, function and green infrastructure is not reflected in strategy.
- Need more integrated thinking in the issues and opportunities section including a matrix of actions and benefits in summary.

APPENDIX A

Maidstone Draft Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy: Stakeholder Engagement – Responses Summary

- Key issues re agriculture are outdated – loss of land for food production and recreational green space is current issue.
- Focus should be more on protecting and improving GBI (concern over loss of green space to development).
- Need to provide analysis of what improvements are needed where to deliver stated objectives.
- Needs to link more with existing documents and projects eg LBAP, BRANCH, KRAG and BOAs.
- 'Unfriendly' wording is off-putting.

Strategy content – specific:

Policy context:

- Include AONB plans and strategies in regional policy section.
- Include Flood and Water Management Act, Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plans in policy context.
- Clarify status of documents in policy section.

Rural areas:

- Maps should include agricultural land including quality gradings.
- Maps should include detailed Borough Landscape Character Areas.
- Include map showing agri-environment schemes.
- ANGST should be a starting point for more qualitative analysis in rural areas – countryside may compensate for shortfall.

Blue infrastructure:

- Map showing relationship of Borough to water sub-catchment areas needed.
- Need to deal with issues in surface water management plans, catchment flood management plans and river basin management plans.
- Need to deliver strategic SUDS and provide more detail on SUDS in new development.
- Strategy needs to inform land use on flood plains.
- More emphasis needed on flood storage eg allowing flooding of green spaces, creation of flood meadows, wetlands, SuDS and not allowing building in flood plains.
- Need more proposals for enhancing water quality.
- Mention flooding in 2013/14.

Biodiversity:

- BOAs need more explanation.
- Need more focus on relationship between biodiversity and water.
- Need to focus on quality of habitats not just quantity.

APPENDIX A

Maidstone Draft Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy: Stakeholder Engagement – Responses Summary

Sustainable movement:

- Focus more on improving walking and cycling routes – cycle ways in particular are lacking.
- Safety and lighting of routes needs highlighting.
- Need to create 'quiet lanes' and protect byways and green lanes.
- Need to identify how gaps in rights of way will be addressed.

Community involvement:

- Need to create an umbrella group for GBI related voluntary groups to share knowledge etc.

Heritage:

- Need to highlight protection of locally important heritage assets and local landscapes as well as nationally important ones.

Other:

- Acknowledge playing fields in smaller villages.
- More information needed on school grounds and link to schools.
- Need to include private gardens and issues such as problem of paving over front gardens.

Area specific themes:

South East of Maidstone – concern about development proposals leading to loss of landscape, lack of outdoor facilities and coalescence of settlements.

Langley – preserve land as green wedge at Imperial Park and identify special landscape areas in South Maidstone.

Langley Fruit Plateau should be marked for protection on map.

Loose – cycle path proposed in Neighbourhood Plan from Loose to Maidstone town centre but needs funding.

Loose Valley and stream – benefits are understated in document.

Sutton Valence – oppose designation as a 'larger village'.

Coxheath Parish – concern re lack of public green space.

Kent Downs AONB – GBI to mitigate impact of development in AONB and visitor pressures.

Harrietsham – open space audit carried out for Neighbourhood Plan.

Marden – concern over loss of open space and views to development.

Vinters Valley Nature Reserve and Cobtree Country Manor Park – add to the historic parks list (map 4 of the strategy document).

Bearsted area – concern that BOAs don't extend to key sites in this area and open countryside not protected from development in Local Plan.

Area north of Bearsted Rd – concern that developments approved are in contradiction to this strategy.

M20 J6 to J7 – more tree planting needed.

APPENDIX A
Maidstone Draft Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy:
Stakeholder Engagement – Responses Summary

A20 corridor – needs more attention as river basin source and area of recharge for North Downs aquifer.

Mote Park and Cobham Park are overused and new sites are needed to take pressure off.

Headcorn, Staplehurst, Marden – why no green space provision/investment in these areas?

Boxley Parish – concern re lack of play areas.

Concern that there are no proposals to protect Greensand Ridge and Low Weald areas.

Oaken Wood – concern about protection from quarrying.

River Beult SSSI to be restored so that it changes from 'unfavourable' to 'unfavourable improving' and ultimately to 'favourable' condition.

River Medway through town centre - more needs to be made of river frontage, need to deculvert river, extend footpaths on west side of river.

River Teise labelling incorrect and need to state impact of Bewl water management on river and ecological status.

Maidstone Borough Council

Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 30 September 2014

Review of Transport in Maidstone - alternatives to using a car BUS SERVICES

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:

-
-
-
-
-

Maidstone Borough Council

Planning, Transport and Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 30 September 2014

Review of Transport in Maidstone – alternatives to using a car Stage Two – Bus Services

Report of: Tessa Mallett, Overview & Scrutiny Officer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 At its first meeting of the 2014-15 Municipal Year the Committee agreed to carry out a review of Transport in Maidstone – alternatives to using a car, with the main purpose of looking at ways of easing congestion in Maidstone town centre.
- 1.2 A Working Group was appointed to develop and scope the review topic. The scoping document is attached at **Appendix A**.
- 1.3 Stage one of this review – Walking and Cycling was carried out at the meeting on 22 July 2014.
- 1.4 The draft reports for stages one and two (Bus Services) of the review will be presented to the committee at their meeting of 18 November 2014.
- 1.5 Stage three of this review – Rail Services, will take place at the committee's meeting of 18 November 2014.
- 1.6 The full draft report for all three stages of the review of Transport in Maidstone – alternatives to using a car, will be presented to the committee at their meeting of 17 February 2014.
- 1.7 In preparation for the review of bus services the working group consulted with all Borough Councillors and Parish Councils asking for the following information:
 - Any bus service issues you may have in your constituency, and;
 - Any bus user groups you are aware of in your constituency.

Responses were received from ten Parish Councils and are attached at **Appendix B**.

The responses received were used as the basis for the questions put to the witnesses, who kindly agreed to attend meetings with the working group and the committee for this review.

The responses demonstrated the parishes who responded were not aware of any bus user groups in their parish.

- 1.8 On 16 September the Working Group met with and interviewed:
- Shane Hymers, Public Transport Policy and Strategy Manager for Kent County Council;
 - Dan Bruce, Local Transport Planner (Mid Kent) Kent County Council, and;
 - Norman Kemp, NuVenture Coaches Ltd.

The list of questions put to these witnesses is attached at **Appendix C**. Notes from this meeting and the witnesses' responses to these questions will be provided to the committee as a briefing note and verbal update at the meeting of 30 September 2014.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 The committee are advised to review the evidence gathered by the working group to date (Appendix B and C) in preparation for interviewing a further three witnesses at their meeting of 30 September 2014.
- 2.2 These three witnesses, who work in or have an interest in the bus service industry serving the Maidstone Borough, are:
- Matthew Arnold, Commercial Director, Arriva Buses;
 - Norman Kemp, Nu Venture Coaches Ltd., and;
 - Mike Fitzgerald, Chair East of Maidstone Bus Group.
- 2.3 For consistency of evidence gathering, the committee may wish to focus its questioning on the same areas covered with the witnesses on 16 September 2014 (attached at Appendix C).

4. 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 – Review scoping document

Appendix B – Feedback received from borough and parish
councillors

Appendix C – Questions sent to interviewees to help prepare for the
meeting

6. Background Documents

6.1 None

Scoping Template

<p>Name of Review:</p> <p>Transport in Maidstone Borough – alternatives to using a car</p>
<p>What are the objectives and desired outcomes of the review</p> <p>The review will initially be in three stages aimed at identifying how congestion in Maidstone town centre can be eased.</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <p>Stage 1 - Cycling and Walking (proposed date 22 July meeting):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify cycling/walking groups in the Borough • Establish what work has/is already been/being done regarding the promotion of walking and cycling to avoid duplication of effort • Identify and make recommendations on how MBC can work to increase the use of cycling and walking in the Borough <p>Stage 2 - Bus (16 and 30 September 2014):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve communication with the Quality Bus Partnership to enable Councillors to influence debate where they can • Identify bus user groups in the Borough to avoid duplication of effort • Identify existing bus service providers operating in the RSCs • Make recommendations how improvements can be made to bus service provision to the Rural Service Centres (RSC) <p>Stage 3 - Rail (11 November 2014):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify rail user groups in the Borough to avoid duplication of effort • Gain an insight into KCC and rail providers strategic plans for rail in the Borough • Establish MBC member links with KCC and rail service providers <p>Review of scope and objectives:</p> <p>After consideration of the evidence gathered from Stage 1, under each area, the working group will recommend either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support what is already being worked on; • Continue with further evidence gathering with revised objectives; • Other – depending on what comes to light from evidence gathering. <p>Final Report and Recommendations:</p> <p>Final report to include all three areas and recommendations.</p>
<p>What equality issues will need to be considered as part of the review – giving consideration to the 9 protected characteristics:</p> <p>Ensuring access to all</p>
<p>Which witnesses are required?</p> <p>Cycling and Walking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colin Finch, Snr Public Rights of Way Officer, KCC • James Gower – @maidstoneonbike suggestion via Twitter (FWP) • Bartholomew Wren, Tunbridge Wells BC • Tay Arnold Cycling Transport Planner, KCC • Elliott Dean, Cycling enthusiast • Cllr Paul Harper (MBC) • Michael Murphy, Principal Planning Officer, MBC

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tim Hapgood, Transport Planner, MBC <p>Rail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nina Peak, SouthEastern • Stephen Gasche <p>Bus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dan Bruce, KCC Highways • Shane Hymers - KCC • Norman Kemp, Nu-Venture • Matthew Arnold, Arriva • Mike Fitzgerald, East of Maidstone Bus Group
<p>Other ways to seek evidence? E.g. site visits, involving members of the public, consultation.</p> <p>To be agreed.</p>
<p>What information/training is needed?</p> <p>To be agreed.</p>
<p>Suggested time for review and report completion date</p> <p>To be agreed.</p> <p>The proposal is to split the review into three initially:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cycling and Walking – 22 July 2014 2. Bus – 16 and 30 September 2014 3. Rail – 11 November 2014
<p>How does the review link to council priorities?</p> <p>For Maidstone to have a growing economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A transport network that supports the local economy <p>For Maidstone to be a decent place to live</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continues to be a clear and attractive environment for people who live in and visit the Borough • Residents are not disadvantaged because of where they live or who they are, vulnerable people are assisted and the level of deprivation is reduced <p>Corporate and Customer Excellence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services are customer focused and residents are satisfied with them • Effective, cost efficient services are delivered across the Borough
<p>How does this item deliver CfPS effective scrutiny principles?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides 'critical friend' challenge to executive policy-makers and decision-makers • Enables the voice and concerns of the public • Is carried out by 'independent minded governors' who lead and own the scrutiny role • Drives improvement in public services
<p>Any co-optees or expert witnesses?</p>

Feedback from Parish Councils in full			
Issue/query/request		Parish	From
1	<p>Marden would like:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An integrated bus and rail service for Marden i.e a link bus from Marden to Stilebridge to enable parishioners to catch the no. 5 bus from Staplehurst to Maidstone and return. 2. A direct bus route from Marden to Maidstone and return, in the mornings and evenings, for parishioners and school children who regularly commute to Maidstone. 	Marden	Erika Lock Assistant Parish Clerk
2	Lack of a service in the North Ward. In the Walderslade area there is, after a half a mile walk, a two hour service (not on Sundays) to Maidstone. Alternatively you can catch a bus to Chatham and once it links to the 101 route change buses. Within Walderslade only part of the residential development is serviced (hourly) with a link to Chatham.	Boxley	Pauline Bowdery, Clerk
3	South Ward Grove Green. The bus service finishes very early.	Boxley	Pauline Bowdery
4	<p>The number 12 bus services Sutton Valence once an hour Monday to Saturday until 10:00pm. On Sunday the service finishes at 6:00pm.</p> <p>The Parish Council believes that the cost of £6.00 return per person to travel into Maidstone is a prohibitive factor for our Parishioners.</p> <p>Again the cost for travelling on the 59 bus is prohibitive and this service does not run at all on a Sunday.</p>	Sutton Valance	Janet Burnett Clerk to Sutton Valence Parish Council
5	Dedicated bus to Cornwallis school. Arriva state this is only for children who receive a "free bus pass" as this their closest school. Residents have been told by KCC that any child can use this, including those with Freedom passes. Please can KCC clarify the situation.	Staplehurst/Headcorn	Cllr Burton
6	Re: Dedicated bus to Cornwallis. Parents assume that this bus will continue to run next year - please can this be confirmed?	Staplehurst/Headcorn	Cllr Burton
7	There are on-going issues with how quickly the Freedom passes disintegrate. What could be done to resolve this next year?	Staplehurst/Headcorn	Cllr Burton
8	The Number 5 bus service seems to be deteriorating again. I had a call this morning from an older resident, who waited with many others, including her husband who has a portable oxygen supply that was close to running out, for over an hour when the 2.15 pm bus did not arrive on 7th July, leaving from Maidstone to Staplehurst. There were not enough seats at the bus stop and it was very hot - so it was very unpleasant for them.	Staplehurst/Headcorn	Cllr Burton
9	How many complaints have KCC / Arriva had in the past 2 months vs. the preceding two months?	Staplehurst	Cllr Burton
10	Bus STOPS and SHELTERS are a key issue though; safety, position, getting wet when there is no shelter etc.	Headcorn	Cllr Round

Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Review of Transport in Maidstone Borough – Bus Services – Issues raised by Councillors, Parishes etc. August 2014

Issue/query/request	Parish	From
11	A major issue is getting across the Borough - a service that does not exist by bus. Young people, the elderly and disabled are very disadvantaged in this respect. Many young people in my Parish/Ward like to travel to Lenham or Staplehurst (NOT close to the train Station) as well as Tonbridge/TWells and Ashford villages.	Headcorn Cllr Round
12	The main issue with the buses is the fact that there is only one an hour and none in the evenings.	East Farleigh Sarah O'Callaghan Clerk to East Farleigh PC
13	We have problems with our service 59 run by Arriva. Mainly the bus is not reliable and on many occasion has not arrived. The times are not really suitable for rural users as it means leaving at 9.40 am with a return of 12.30 pm or 17.00.	Kingswood and Broomfield Mike O'Neill
14	On several occasions the service is restricted or late due to road works and the bus states they did not know of these but we were informed that Arriva had a person responsible for these issues, but they still continue as last week the bus missed Kingswood and apparently this was because the bus could not get into the Village	Kingswood and Broomfield Mike O'Neill
15	The 501 Park and Ride site at Willington Street is very popular with Bearsted residents who either walk or drive to the site. Being every 20minutes and with a run straight into town it is well used. Comments have been made that it would be great to have a Sunday service especially during the Christmas shopping period.	Bearsted Cllr Ash
16	The number 19 serves north Bearsted. It is an hourly service. It runs between Cross Keys and Maidstone via the Landway, Ashford Road , Grove Green and back onto the Ashford Road. A 7-37am service will take pupils into the town centre schools schools (3) and carries on to the Oakwood complex (3 more schools). There is no Sunday service. During the week the last bus into town and back from town is early evening. With no evening service access to the town is by car. This bus accessing Tesco's at Grove Green is popular with elderly residents on the northern side of Beartsed who do not have a car.	Bearsted Cllr Ash
17	South Bearsted is served by the number 8 which from the town goes to Downswood before going around Madginford and back into town via the Ashford Road. If you live close to Mote Park you can get off and avoid the trip to Downswood but if you live further to the east and are elderly you have to stay on the bus as it goes to Downswood and wait until it returns to Madginford. This bus is a half hourly service but again the early evening service is similar to that of the number 19. Some of the number 8 buses into Maidstone continue to Maidstone Hospital which is great although the route does go around the houses.	Bearsted Cllr Ash
18	The Maidstone –Ashford bus , number 10 stops at Bearsted on it's way to and from Maidstone. It is the only bus that passes the commercial heart of Bearsted on the Ashford Road. It does not run very frequently.	
19	A complaint from elderly residents is that no bus takes the to the Yeoman Lane medical centre, they skirt the area.	Bearsted Cllr Ash

Issue/query/request	Parish	From
<p>20 Boughton Monchelsea has very limited services. The essential ones that are missing are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GP surgery • Pharmacies • Dentist • Bank • Butcher, Baker or Grocer that can satisfy a weekly shop (We do have a small village shop that is limited in selection and to survive it is expensive, Unlike other villages none of the super markets run a independent bus to the village) <p>Many of our children have to travel outside the village for primary education as the village school is four and half times oversubscribed. Most of these services are, and have to be accessed by the very limited bus service.</p>	Boughton Monchelsea	Cllr Munford
<p>21 With the majority of the population working away from the village many use the family car to get to work. This leaves non working partners and the more senior members of the community completely dependent on the bus.</p>	Boughton Monchelsea	Cllr Munford
<p>22 For those without access to a car or can't afford a taxi the village is cut off after 2pm (last bus out) and on Sunday where there is no bus service.</p>	Boughton Monchelsea	Cllr Munford
<p>23 Without going into detailed times, in general the village has 3 return services to Maidstone per day each week days (Partly sponsored by KCC), and Saturdays (solely sponsored by KCC). There is no service on a Sunday This is limited again for senior members of the community because of the rules relating to the bus pass.</p>	Boughton Monchelsea	Cllr Munford
<p>24 Again in general terms our last bus from town is 1745. This prevents some workers from being able to use it, and for our children to attend some school clubs/sports and activities. Sift worker are not able to use the bus service. There is no opportunity for anyone in the village to access the night time economy by bus during the week or the town on a Sunday</p>	Boughton Monchelsea	Cllr Munford

Issue/query/request	Parish	From
<p>25</p> <p>24</p> <p>With our limited services many of the community are solely dependent on the bus service, which, proves to be difficult and restrictive when planning the simplest of journeys required for day to day living.</p> <p>No opportunity to be out of the village past 1745 most day and no opportunity on a Sunday</p> <p>Visits to the hospital</p> <p>No direct link to a local doctors surgery. (Many of our elderly refuse to cross the busy road at Linton corner therefore they go into town and return on a bus to Coxheath later returning the same way. This takes most of the day)</p> <p>Arranging appointments with doctors/dentist.</p> <p>Getting the weekly shop</p> <p>If a parent wanted to escort a young child to school the first bus home is 1230 therefore this would be impossible</p> <p>The list is endless but I finish with consider the senior members who wish to attend a RC church service on a Sunday</p>	Boughton Monchelsea	Cllr Munford
<p>26</p> <p>The vast majority of the community are unable to use the very limited Kent carrier service (Dial a ride) because they live within 500m of a bus stop! Other feel they should be able to use their bus pass on this service and there is also a membership fee to pay.</p>	Boughton Monchelsea	Cllr Munford
<p>27</p> <p>The parish council are part of the South of Maidstone bus group While this group have done invaluable work to prevent services being cut, it has made no head way in increasing the service being provided.</p>	Boughton Monchelsea	Cllr Munford
<p>28</p> <p>It is also a concern that MBC polices require any new development in rural locations to provide 40% affordable housing. This in addition to the NPPF core principle to maximise the use of cycling ,walking and public transport. This seem to be contrary to the other policies being put through to make Boughton Monchelsea a larger village and take more development.</p>	Boughton Monchelsea	Cllr Munford

Issue/query/request	Parish	From
<p>29 The Maidstone Financial Capability Partnership have concerns over this too, as Louise rightly says it's too expensive compared to our neighbouring competitors. We have asked Arriva if they would like to meet us so that we can address the pricing issue, as it affects those that are seeking employment, trying to engage with any Maidstone Family Matter events, and it's just another barrier on the pathway to independence and budgeting skills. You can't even find out the price on their website!</p> <p>Perhaps we could talk with Kelly Walker, the new Community Development Officer as I know she's already involved with Arriva concerning Road Safety.</p> <p>We need to stick united in this, so that they (Arriva) understand what each of our agendas are: they're too pricey, have safety issues, and whatever scrutiny's thoughts are ...</p> <p>To add to the cost point.....I can get from Maidstone to Ashford (20miles) for a cheaper bus rate than from Maidstone to Sittingbourne (11miles)!</p>	General	MBC Officer
<p>30 They're really expensive! A return to town from the Wheatsheaf last week was £2.50 - it would have been cheaper (and just as quick) to drive in and park! And as soon as you have more than one person in the car, it therefore becomes much, much cheaper to drive.</p>	General	MBC Officer
<p>31 There is a failure by MBC to initiate a full place survey of the user needs of Maidstone people with regard to transport. This leads to the wrong assumptions being made for traffic needs; with people within the locality using car transport because there is no available alternative.</p>	Leeds	
<p>32 There is the oft repeated mantra of the planners for the use of sustainable or public transport, leading to a reduction in the number of parking spaces in new developments. Yet often the scarcity of that transport leads to an increased, unwished for and unnecessary use of the private car (when available). All of which adds to the gyratory traffic impediment in Maidstone.</p>	Leeds	
<p>33 The principal Bus operator is Arriva, which is owned and controlled by Deutsch Bahn in Germany. Their planning is done from Bedfordshire. A far cry from when Maidstone was the centre for the locally owned and operated M&D bus service, operated in conjunction with the MBC Borough line.</p> <p>The trolley bus service provided a fast and ultra green service within the confines of the former Borough.</p>	Leeds	
<p>34 All too often bus time- keeping is lax and there is no way of knowing "is it coming or is it not". Any comments will not receive a helpful response.</p>	Leeds	
<p>35 There is no public bus office in Maidstone. Hence, it is not possible to purchase say, National Express other bus tickets without paying a premium for on-line purchase (which selects against people). Timetables are not easily available.</p>	Leeds	

Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Review of Transport in Maidstone Borough – Bus Services – Issues raised by Councillors, Parishes etc. August 2014

36	There is shifting paradigm in Maidstone Borough in the provision of medical care. General Practices are now grouped within Medical Centres. There is no attention to the need of patients who travel there by bus. A case in point, a simple adjustment to a stop designation for P& R could at no cost have facilitated part of the travel pattern. MBC Officers showed total inflexibility and hostility to any such change. The then, Cabinet Member refused to even answer any letters on the topic. This is a serious issue which requires serious attention.	Leeds	
37	There is no viable public transport options for airport connections from Maidstone. Hardly, the hall-mark for the County Town of Kent.	Leeds	
38	Cabinet has just approved a contribution of £1.14m to improve the Bridge Gyrotory system. This is missing the point.	Leeds	
39	How many of the Councillors ,if any, attending this evening's meeting of the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee travelled to and from the meeting by public transport ?		

Main themes		
Questions relating to Parish issue/question raised - <i>Relating to enhancements to services provided (see feedback in the right hand column):</i>	Issue/Question raised	Parish
<p>27</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How viable is it to enhance the bus services (listed on the right) including to compliment the ‘twilight’ economy? If service providers are unable to provide the suggested enhancements – is there funding KCC could provide? The House of Commons Transport Select Committee report on Passenger transport in isolated communities (HC288 published 22 July 2014) discusses the concept of ‘total transport’ which involves pooling transport resources to deliver a range of services, eg, combining hospital transport with local bus services – Is it possible to create a form of total transport for Maidstone Borough? How are bus services for Maidstone borough currently marketed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What could MBC do to help with this? Could an ‘oyster card’ type system be introduced to provide flexibility to move from service to service? What would need to be done to ensure bus routes are in place and running before new developments are completed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What can MBC do to help with this? Has any consideration been given to providing a radial bus service running around Maidstone? How possible would it be to provide a ‘flag down’ service for rural services where bus stops are situated on roads without footpaths? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could a service such as this be trialled? When will real time service update boards be provided at rural bus stops? 	Regular integrated bus links from rural villages to train stations and Maidstone	Marden Boxley Leeds
	Bus services finishing too early (including on Sunday)	Boxley Sutton Valence Bearsted Boughton Monchelsea
	Sunday bus service needed	Boxley Sutton Valence Bearsted Boughton Monchelsea
	Cross borough service don’t exist – ie Headcorn to Lenham or Staplehurst	Headcorn Boughton Monchelsea
	Sunday Park and Ride service requested	Bearsted
	Routes not convenient for local shops and doctors etc.	Beasted
	Less parking in new developments and so of few bus service contradict and result in more cars in the town	Leeds
	No Arriva office in Maidstone	Leeds
	Bus service planning carried out in Germany – not locally	Leeds

Main themes		
Questions relating to Parish issue/question raised - <i>Relating to performance issues (see feedback in the right hand column):</i>	Issue/Question raised	Parish
<p>28</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What can be done to minimise disruption ie car parked blocking roads and lack of timely information going to service providers • How can the criteria for the different bus services be clarified? • Why are people who live within 500 meters of a bus stop not able to use the Kent Carrier Service? • How viable would it be to introduce interchangeability of tickets between the different service? • What is being done to combat buses arriving and leaving earlier than scheduled? • The House of Commons Transport Select Committee report on Passenger transport in isolated communities (HC288 published 22 July 2014) raise again the potential for local authorities to use Quality Contract to introduce franchising systems similar to those operating in London – where the local transport authority specifies what service is required and the private sector competes for the right to provide it – how viable would Quality Contracts be for the Maidstone borough? • Has KCC investigated how the test case, Nexus in Tyne and Wear, has performed with Quality Contract? If not, is this something they could find out? 	Arriva and NuVenture both run a highly valued service through Barming and Teston.	Barming Teston
	Issues are: narrowness of roads and cars parked obstructing the route and timetabling Notification of road works upsetting timetables causing detours	
	Buses to infrequent and unreliable	East Farleigh Bearsted Boughton Monchelsea Leeds
	Cost too high	Sutton Valence
	Inconsistency – use of different bus passes and Kent Carrier	Staplehurst Headcorn Boughton Monchelsea
	Bus passes disintegrating quickly (don't last the issue period – wear out)	Staplehurst
	Is the dedicated school bus to Cornwallis going to continue?	Staplehurst Headcorn
	Number 5 and 59 bus services – buses not arriving	Staplehurst Kingswood and Broomfield
	How many complaints have KCC received in last 2 months	Staplehurst
	Bus stops and shelters – not enough seat, positioning wrong, do not shelter from rain	Staplehurst Headcorn

Maidstone Borough Council

Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 30 September 2014

Future Work Programme and SCRAIP Update

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:

-
-
-
-
-

Maidstone Borough Council

**Planning, Transport and Development
Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

Tuesday 30 September 2014

Future Work Programme and SCRAIP Update

Report of: Tessa Mallett, Overview and Scrutiny Officer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Committee are asked to consider the future work programme, attached at **Appendix A**, to ensure it is appropriate and covers all issues Members currently wish to consider within the Committee's remit.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Committee considers the future work programme, attached at **Appendix A**, and the update provided in section 7 (below).
- 2.2 That the Committee considers the List of Forthcoming Decisions, relevant to the Committee at **Appendix B**, and discuss whether any of these items require further investigation or monitoring.
- 2.3 That the Committee considers its continuous professional development needs and recommends possible training or development sessions it would like to undertake.

3 Future Work Programme

- 3.1 At the future work programme workshop on 9 June 2014 members agreed the topics they wanted programmed in for the 2014-15 Municipal Year. The topic suggestions were made by members of the public, Parish Councils, officers and local press.
- 3.2 Throughout the course of the municipal year the Committee is asked to put forward, and review, work programme suggestions.
- 3.3 The Committee's work programme is currently very full. Members are asked to consider the work programme to ensure it remains appropriate, realistic and covers issues Members currently wish to consider within the Committee's remit.
- 3.4 The Committee is reminded that the Constitution states under Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules number 9: Agenda items that 'Any Member shall be entitled to give notice to the proper officer that he wishes an item relevant to the functions of the

Committee or Sub-Committee to be included on the agenda for the next available meeting of the Committee or Sub-Committee. On receipt of such a request the proper officer will ensure that it is included on the next available agenda, the Member must attend the meeting and speak on the item put forward.'

4 List of Forthcoming Decisions

4.1 The List of Forthcoming Decisions (**Appendix B**) is a live document containing all key and non-key decisions.

4.2 Due to the nature of the List of Forthcoming Decisions, and to ensure the information provided to the Committee is up to date, a verbal update will be given at the meeting by the Chairman. The Committee can view the live document online at:
<http://meetings.maidstone.gov.uk/mgListPlans.aspx?RPId=443&RD=0>

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

6.1 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 on the plan as to whether recommendations are accepted, the action to be taken and by who.

6.2 The committee has no SCRAIP update for this meeting.

7 Future Work Programme Update

7.1 At the time of writing this report there have been no changes to the committee's future work programme since the meeting of 16 September 2014.

8. Impact on Corporate Objectives

8.1 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.

8.2 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'.

9. Financial Implications

9.1 To assist O&S committees in their inquiries, a small budget is available for the purchase of necessary equipment and to cover the costs of training, site visits, meetings in locations other than the Town Hall, witness expenses, specialist advice, books and any other

cost that might be legitimately incurred by the committees in the course of their activities.

10. Relevant Documents

- 10.1 Appendix A – Future Work Programme
- Appendix B – List of Forthcoming Decisions

11. Background Documents

- 11.1 None

Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2014-15

2014

33

Meeting Date	Report Deadline	Agenda Items	Details and desired outcome	Report Author and Witnesses
9 June		Election of Chair and Vice Chair Forward Work Planning Draft results of Local Plan public consultation		
24 June		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on the state of play with the ITS 		Peter Rosevear and Tim Read from KCC possibly attending
22 July		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport review – Cycling witnesses to be invited 		
29 July		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop with ECD OSC @5:15pm to feed in ideas for the Economic Development Strategy in relation to the Local Plan 		
19 August	6 August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation and summary of representations from the consultation on local plan Review of strategic housing market assessment 		Rob Jarman Sarah Anderton
16 September	3 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet Member priorities for 2014-15 Design South East report on the Local Plan consultation events (before the multi-stakeholder workshop) Community Infrastructure Levy – preliminary draft charging schedule Verbal update on Infrastructure Delivery Plan SCRAIP response to 22/7 – 31b to f 		Cllr D Burton Sue Whiteside Darren Bridgett Darren Bridgett
30 September	17 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport in Maidstone – alternatives to using a car – BUS SERVICES <i>Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy – including the Open Space Standards action plan</i> 		Matthew Arnold, Arriva Mike Fitzgerald, EMBG Norman Kemp, NuVenutre Rob Jarman/Sue Whiteside
September		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-stakeholder meeting 	Date/time to be arranged	Rob Jarman
21 October	8 October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implications arising from a review of the Economic Development Strategy, Qualitative Study on Employment Sites and key employment issues arising from local plan representations Joint meeting with ECD OSC 		Sarah Anderton

Meeting Date	Report deadline	Agenda Items	Details and desired outcome	Report Author and Witnesses
18 November	5 November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport in Maidstone – alternatives to using a car – RAIL SERVICES • Draft Walking and Cycling Report • Draft Bus Services Report 		
16 December	3 December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maidstone Borough Local Plan representations - Development Management Policies • Results of Qualitative Landscape Study • Results of Qualitative Agricultural Land Classification 		Rob Jarman
2015				
20 January	7 January 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local plan site allocations (new and deleted) for further public consultation (regulation 18) including Gypsy and Traveller site allocation • Revisit inclusion of Invicta Barracks in Local Plan • Verbal update on Infrastructure Delivery Plan 		Rob Jarman Darren Bridgett
17 February	4 February	Draft report on review of Transport in Maidstone – alternatives to using a car		
17 March	4 March			
21 April	8 April	Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Local Plan ¹		Rob Jarman

Keep open for discussion possibly adding to FWP

- Update on the paperless pilot with parishes for planning support (see minutes of 15/4/14)
- Office space – ensuring prime office space doesn't get converted to residential developments
- Mobile phone services – eradicate dead zones in the town. Motorways and main trunk roads
- Improving the Borough's sewerage provision and infrastructure (relations with Southern Water)
- Planning permissions – recommending Planning Committee review the impact of contentious developments
- Revisit the discussion on the removal of the Invicta Barracks from the Local Plan

¹ Probably not needed if verbal updates given at Aug and Jan meetings



LIST OF FORTHCOMING DECISIONS

List of Forthcoming Decisions

INTRODUCTION

This document sets out the decisions to be taken by the Executive and various Committees of Maidstone Borough Council on a rolling basis. This document will be published as updated with new decisions required to be made.

KEY DECISIONS

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

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

At Maidstone Borough Council, decisions which we regard as “Key Decisions” because they are likely to have a “significant” effect either in financial terms or on the community include:

- (1) Decisions about expenditure or savings which equal or are more than £250,000.
- (2) Budget reports.
- (3) Policy framework reports.
- (4) Adoption of new policies plans, strategies or changes to established policies, plans or strategies.
- (5) Approval of portfolio plans.
- (6) Decisions that involve significant service developments, significant service reductions, or significant changes in the way that services are delivered, whether Borough-wide or in a particular locality.
- (7) Changes in fees and charges.
- (8) Proposals relating to changes in staff structure affecting more than one section.

Each entry identifies, for that “key decision” –

- the decision maker
- the date on which the decision is due to be taken
- the subject matter of the decision and a brief summary
- the reason it is a key decision
- to whom representations (about the decision) can be made

List of Forthcoming Decisions

- whether the decision will be taken in public or private
- what reports/papers are, or will be, available for public inspection

EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

The Cabinet collectively makes its decisions at a meeting and individual portfolio holders make decisions independently. In addition, Officers can make key decisions and an entry for each of these will be included in this list.

DECISIONS WHICH THE CABINET INTENDS TO MAKE IN PRIVATE

The Cabinet hereby gives notice that it intends to meet in private after its public meeting to consider reports and/or appendices which contain exempt information under Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended). The private meeting of the Cabinet is open only to Members of the Cabinet, other Councillors and Council officers.

37 Reports and/or appendices to decisions which the Cabinet will take at its private meeting are indicated in the list below, with the reasons for the decision being made in private. Any person is able to make representations to the Cabinet if he/she believes the decision should instead be made in the public Cabinet meeting. If you want to make such representations, please email committeeservices@maidstone.gov.uk. You will then be sent a response in reply to your representations. Both your representations and the Executive's response will be published on the Council's website at least 5 working days before the Cabinet meeting.

ACCESS TO CABINET REPORTS

Reports to be considered at the Cabinet's public meeting will be available on the Council's website (www.maidstone.gov.uk) a minimum of 5 working days before the meeting.

HOW CAN I CONTRIBUTE TO THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS?

The Council actively encourages people to express their views on decisions it plans to make. This can be done by writing directly to the appropriate Officer or Cabinet Member (details of whom are shown in the list below).

Alternatively, the Cabinet are contactable via our website (www.maidstone.gov.uk) where you can submit a question to the Leader of the Council. There is also the opportunity to invite the Leader of the Council to speak at a function you may be organising.

List of Forthcoming Decisions

List of Forthcoming Decisions

Decision Maker and Date of When Decision is Due to be Made:	Title of Report and Brief Summary:	Key Decision and reason (if applicable):	Contact Officer:	Public or Private (if Private the reason why)	Documents to be submitted (other relevant documents may be submitted)
<p>Cabinet</p> <p>Due Date: Wednesday 8 Oct 2014</p>	<p>Flooding Events in Maidstone</p> <p>To consider the issues that Borough residents, visitors, businesses and the Council faced during the flooding emergency</p>		<p>David Edwards davidedwards@maidstone.gov.uk</p>	<p>Public</p>	<p>Flooding Events in Maidstone</p>
<p> Cabinet</p> <p>Due Date: Wednesday 14 Jan 2015</p>	<p>Maidstone Borough Local Plan - Development Management Policies</p> <p>Proposed amendments to the development management policies in the local plan following regulation 18 public consultation in Spring 2014.</p>	<p>KEY Reason: Policies, Plans, Strategies</p>	<p>Rob Jarman, Head of Planning and Development Robjarman@maidstone.gov.uk</p>	<p>public</p>	<p>Maidstone Borough Local Plan - Development Management Policies</p>