

STRATEGIC PLANNING, SUSTAINABILITY AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING

Date: Tuesday 10 April 2018
Time: 6.30 pm
Venue: Town Hall, High Street, Maidstone

Membership:

Councillors D Burton (Chairman), Cox (Vice-Chairman), English, Munford, Prendergast, Springett, de Wiggondene-Sheppard, Wilby and Willis

The Chairman will assume that all Members will read the reports before attending the meeting. Officers are asked to assume the same when introducing reports.

<u>AGENDA</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Notification of Substitute Members	
3. Urgent Items	
4. Notification of Visiting Members	
5. Disclosures by Members and Officers	
6. Disclosures of Lobbying	
7. To consider whether any items should be taken in private because of the possible disclosure of exempt information	
8. Minutes of the meeting held on 13 March 2018	1 - 6
9. Presentation of Petitions (if any)	
10. Questions and answer session for members of the public	
11. Outside Bodies - Verbal Updates from Members	
12. Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Update	7 - 14
13. Off Street Parking Places Order Variation	15 - 38
14. Objections to Off Street Parking Places Order - Sutton Valence	39 - 68
15. Revised National Planning Policy Framework: consultation; Supporting housing delivery through developer contributions: consultation	69 - 82

Issued on Thursday 29 March 2018

Continued Over/:



Alison Broom, Chief Executive

PUBLIC SPEAKING AND ALTERNATIVE FORMATS

If you require this information in an alternative format please contact us, call **01622 602899** or email committee@maidstone.gov.uk.

In order to speak at this meeting, please contact Democratic Services using the contact details above, by 5 p.m. one clear working day before the meeting. If asking a question, you will need to provide the full text in writing. If making a statement, you will need to tell us which agenda item you wish to speak on. Please note that slots will be allocated on a first come, first served basis.

To find out more about the work of the Committee, please visit www.maidstone.gov.uk.

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

STRATEGIC PLANNING, SUSTAINABILITY AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 13 MARCH 2018

Present: Councillor D Burton (Chairman) and Councillors Cox, English, Munford, Prendergast, Springett, de Wiggondene-Sheppard, Wilby and Willis

Also Present: Councillor Perry

165. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

It was noted that apologies for lateness were received from Councillor de Wiggondene-Sheppard.

166. NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

There were no Substitute Members.

167. URGENT ITEMS

The Chairman informed the Committee that he had agreed to take an updated version of Agenda Item 16 – Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Administration and Engagement which amended formatting errors to avoid any confusion.

168. NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS

It was noted that Councillor Perry was present as a Visiting Member and wished to observe.

Note: Councillor de Wiggondene-Sheppard arrived at 18:46.

169. DISCLOSURES BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

There were no disclosures by Members or Officers.

170. DISCLOSURES OF LOBBYING

There were no disclosures of lobbying.

171. EXEMPT ITEMS

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

172. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS (IF ANY)

There were no petitions.

173. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 6 FEBRUARY 2018

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed, subject to the amendment of Paragraph 3 of Item 158, Page 2 of the minutes to read:

The Committee advised that the Council needed to be careful not to segregate members of the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller community into isolated rural locations within the Borough.

174. QUESTIONS AND ANSWER SESSION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

There were no questions from members of the public.

175. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee considered the Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee Work Programme 2017/18.

Mr Mark Egerton, the Strategic Planning Manager, informed the Committee that there would be a report detailing the proposed responses to the consultations relating to the Government's Revised National Planning Policy Framework and Supporting Housing Delivery through Developer Contributions.

RESOLVED: That the Committee Work Programme 2017/18 be noted.

176. OUTSIDE BODIES - VERBAL UPDATES FROM MEMBERS

There were no verbal updates from Members.

177. REFERENCE FROM THE PLANNING COMMITTEE - RESIDENTS' PARKING

The Committee considered the reference from the meeting of Planning Committee held on 19 December 2017 relating to Residents' Parking.

The Chairman informed the Committee that Mr Jeff Kitson, the Parking Services Manager, had considered the reference from Planning Committee and had made a recommendation in the Off Street Parking Places Order Variation report scheduled to be brought to this Committee in April 2018 in reference to it.

RESOLVED: That the reference be noted.

178. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR UPDATE QUARTER 3 17/18

Ms Anna Collier, the Policy and Information Manager, updated the Committee on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for quarter three of 2017/18.

It was highlighted to the Committee that:

- Performance had declined for all four indicators compared with the same quarter of 2016/17 and with the second quarter of 2017/18.
- 90.4% of 'other' applications were processed in time during this quarter and this was above the target of 85%.
- The 85% target for processing major applications in time was slightly missed this quarter by 3.5%. The main reason for the reduction in performance was the loss of five key staff who were involved in the processing of major applications and because there had been a focus on clearing backlog applications.
- The team processed 69.7% of minor applications in time during this quarter. The target of 85% had been missed. This was also due to the focus on clearing backlog applications. The impact on minor applications was being carefully monitored and the year to date performance level was 76.8%.
- There were 43 affordable homes delivered during this quarter, which was short of the target by 7 completions. This was usual as most completions occurred towards of the end of the financial year. It was expected that the year-end target of 200 affordable completions would be achieved.

In response to a question from the Committee, Mr Rob Jarman, the Head of Planning and Development replied that affordable houses were usually completed in the last part of the year as the housebuilding sector was very traditional and had a winter break. It was also because housebuilders liked to complete houses by the end of the financial year.

The Committee raised concerns about the performance of the indicators and the work that was being prioritised. It was concluded that if the indicators continued to underperform then the KPIs would be reviewed after the fourth quarter.

RESOLVED: That the summary of performance for Quarter 3 of 2017/18 for Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) be noted.

179. 20MPH SPEED LIMITS AND ZONES

Miss Anna Houghton, Planning Officer (Strategic Planning), presented this report to the Committee. The report highlighted the investigative work which had taken place in relation to the introduction of 20 mph speed limits and zones.

It was noted that:

- Officers had sought further advice from Kent County Council and explored the possible cost of implementing 20 mph schemes in the Borough.
- The development of 20 mph schemes were primarily funded through the County's Casualty Reduction Strategy or the Combined Member Grant.

The Committee advised that it was the design of schemes which would encourage drivers to stay under 20mph. Therefore the Committee requested that as part of the Local Plan Review 20 mph limits or zones were considered for inclusion in criteria for residential development and that Officers were asked to introduce the concept of 20 mph limits or zones in discussions with current developers. It was also requested that where practical this Council looked at the possibility of introducing 20 mph zones in regeneration schemes.

RESOLVED:

1. That the report be noted.
2. That as part of the Local Plan Review 20 mph limits or zones be considered for inclusion in criteria for residential development.
3. That Officers be asked to introduce the concept of 20 mph design in current discussions with developers.
4. That where practical this Council considers the possibility of introducing 20 mph zones in regeneration schemes.

Voting: Unanimous

180. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) ADMINISTRATION AND ENGAGEMENT

Mrs Tay Arnold, the Planning Projects Delivery Manager (Strategic Planning), presented the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Administration and Engagement to the Committee.

It was noted that:

- The distribution of CIL money was 15% for areas without a made neighbourhood plan (capped at £100 per dwelling per annum) or 25% where there was a made neighbourhood plan in place and which was made before a relevant planning permission first permits development.
- A process map had identified options for Parish Councils depending on their circumstances and their ability/wish to hold CIL money.
- To assist all Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Forums in making best use of their receipts, they would be encouraged to identify the

priorities for their area and produce and publish on their website a Parish/Neighbourhood Forum CIL Infrastructure spend plan.

- A workshop was being arranged to brief both Members and Parish Councils about the CIL. The workshop would discuss the administration processes of CIL, such as the collection of CIL and the passing and spending of money to Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Forums.
- Another workshop would be arranged to discuss issues and governance surrounding the spending of the larger strategic CIL money.

In response to questions from the Committee, Mrs Arnold replied that:

- CIL was liable on development from the day planning permission first permits that chargeable development. CIL would therefore apply to all relevant applications determined from 1 October 2018.
- CIL payments to Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Forums could be paid up to twice a year.
- The first payment which would be made to Parish Councils or Neighbourhood Forums would be 28 April 2019 and so there was still plenty of time to brief them.

In response to a question from the Committee Mr Mark Egerton, the Strategic Planning Manager, replied that the Council had the ability to utilise payment in kind, subject to several conditions, in lieu of the CIL contribution.

The Committee agreed that the first recommendation be updated to enable Officers to continue to develop both the administrative and governance arrangements for the CIL and also the second recommendation be updated to reflect the inclusion of Borough Councillors in the engagement process.

RESOLVED: That Officers be instructed to:

1. Continue to develop administrative and governance arrangements for the CIL;
2. Engage with all interested parties, both internal Council departments, parishes, Borough Councillors and the public, where relevant prior to the agreed implementation date; and
3. Ensure that infrastructure providers are aware of the CIL and the impact it will have on infrastructure requests under s106.

Voting: For – 8 Against – 0 Abstentions – 1

181. DURATION OF MEETING

6.30 p.m. to 7.56 p.m.

**STRATEGIC PLANNING,
SUSTAINABILITY &
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

10 April 2018

Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Update

Final Decision-Maker	Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee
Lead Head of Service/Lead Director	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning and Development
Lead Officer and Report Author	Stuart Watson, Planning Officer, Strategic Planning
Classification	Public
Wards affected	All wards

Executive Summary

This report provides Councillors with an update on the requirements to keep a self-build and custom housebuilding register, the number of entries on Maidstone's register and the number of plots for self-build custom house building granted planning permission by the Council in the last two years.

This report makes the following recommendations to this Committee:

That the statutory requirement for the Council to keep a self-build and custom housebuilding register and the duties required for increasing the availability of land for self-build and custom housebuilding be noted.

Timetable

Meeting	Date
Strategic Planning, Sustainability & Transportation Committee	10 April 2018

Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Update

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 National planning policy and practice guidance states that local planning authorities should identify local demand for people wishing to build their own homes, in their areas and make provision for it in their local plans¹.
- 1.2 The Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016) provides a legislative frame work for the Right to Build and provides a legal definition of self-build and custom housebuilding (SBCH). The Act does not distinguish between SB and CH and provides that both are where an individual, an association of individuals, or persons working with or for individuals or associations of individuals, build or complete houses to be occupied as homes by those individuals.
- 1.3 Responsibility for keeping a SBCH register falls to “relevant authorities”, including districts as set out in section 1 of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016), and includes:
- 1.4 The information that relevant authorities must include on their register differs for individuals and associations of individuals. For entries on the register for individuals, relevant authorities must record the name and address of the individual on the register. For entries on the register for associations of individuals, relevant authorities must record the name and address of the association; the name and address (if different from that of the association) of the lead contact; and the number of serviced plots of land in the relevant authority’s area the members of the association are seeking to acquire. In all cases the date on which an entry was made and any dates on which it has been amended must be recorded on the register.
- 1.5 Applicants must meet all of the eligibility criteria for entry on the register. Each individual applicant and every member of an association of individuals that applies for entry on the register must include *inter alia*:
 - Satisfy any local eligibility conditions set by the relevant authority;
 - Be seeking (either alone or with others) to acquire a serviced plot of land in the relevant authority’s area for their own self-build and custom housebuilding project.
- 1.6 For the purpose of calculating demand, associations of individuals count as a single entry on the register. The rationale for joining a register as a member of an association will be for the SBCH project to be in close proximity to other members of the association. Therefore associations will be interested in a single site that is large enough to encompass their needs rather than separate plots of land.

¹ Paragraphs 50 and 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework; paragraph 21 of National Planning Practice Guidance: housing and economic development needs assessments.

- 1.7 Local planning authorities should use the demand data from the registers in their area, supported as necessary by additional data from secondary sources (as outlined in the housing and economic development needs guidance), when preparing their Strategic Housing Market Assessment to understand and deduce future need for this type of housing in their area. Plan-makers will need to make reasonable assumptions using the data on their register to avoid double-counting households.
- 1.8 Section 1(2) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 requires each relevant authority to publicize its register. As a minimum, relevant authorities are recommended to hold a page on their website that is dedicated to SBCH. Further, authorities are encouraged to publish, in their Authority Monitoring Report, headline data on the demand for SBCH revealed by their register and other sources.
- 1.9 Relevant authorities should consider what additional optional information (for example, general location within the authority's area, plot size preferences and type of housing intended to be built) could be requested of applicants and made available to increase opportunities for SBCH in their area. The types of information relevant authorities are encouraged to publish include:
- the number of individuals and associations on their register;
 - the number of serviced plots of land sought; and
 - the preferences people on their register have indicated, such as general location within the authority's area, plot sizes and type of housing intended to be built, where this information has been requested by the authority and provided by an applicant.
- 1.10 SBCH development or part development, is exempt from the liability to pay a community infrastructure levy (CIL). However, this exemption is disqualified if, either the SBCH development or part development is let out or sold. If a developer submits a planning permission for 10 SBCH units, then they need to ensure that the development is phased in order for every SBCH builder to build their own home and be CIL exempt.

Self-build and custom housebuilding land duties

- 1.11 The 2015 Act (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016) has two duties; 'duty to grant planning permission etc.' and the 'duty as regards registers' which are concerned with increasing the availability of land for SBCH.
- 1.12 'Duty to grant planning permission etc.' means that relevant authorities must give suitable development permission to enough serviced plots of land to meet the demand for SBCH in their area. The level of demand is established by reference to the number of entries added to an authority's register during a base period.
- 1.13 The first base period began on the day on which the register was established and ended on 31 October 2016. Each subsequent base period is the period of 12 months beginning immediately after the end of the previous base period. At the end of each base period, relevant authorities

have 3 years in which to give permission for an equivalent number of plots of land, which are suitable for SBCH, as there are entries for that base period.

1.14 A relevant authority may make an application for an exemption for any base period if the demand for SBCH is greater than 20% of the land identified by that relevant authority as being available² for future housing. As relevant authorities have 3 years in which to give permission for sufficient land to match demand, demand should be assessed over 3 base periods. For this purpose demand is the aggregate number of new entries.

1.15 The authority is assumed not to be exempt until the Secretary of State has considered and written to the authority informing them of the outcome of their application. At the end of subsequent and concurrent base periods relevant authorities must continue to calculate demand on their register as a percentage of the deliverability of housing over the next 3 years. Where this continues to be over 20% that authority is deemed to still be exempt. However, if at the end of any given base period if the demand falls below 20%, the authority is deemed to no longer be exempt. If future demand increases again to over 20% then an authority must again re-apply for an exemption.

1.16 'Duty as regards registers' means that relevant local authorities have regard to the SBCH register that relates to their area when carrying out the following functions:

- **Planning:** registers may be a material consideration in decision taking and should be used as evidence when developing a local plan or associated documents;
- **Housing:** registers should be used as evidence when carrying out housing functions, including preparing local housing strategies and in developing plans for new housing on land owned by the local housing authority.
- **Land disposal:** registers should provide evidence when relevant authorities develop plans to dispose of land within their ownership.
- **Regeneration:** when developing plans to regenerate areas, relevant authorities should consider the demand identified within their register.

Cost recovery

1.17 Relevant authorities can only set fees on a cost recovery basis. Any fees charged must therefore be proportionate, reflect genuine costs incurred and should not act as a deterrent for people to be entered on or remain on the register.

1.18 Relevant authorities can charge a different fee to associations than to individuals where they incur a different cost for processing an application from an association of individuals.

² Land availability is the total number of new houses on land in the area of the relevant authority, assessed by that authority as being deliverable in that base period, the 2 preceding base periods, and the 2 subsequent base periods.

1.19 To recover the costs incurred when complying with the 'duty to grant planning permission etc.', relevant authorities can charge a higher entry fee to those whose entry onto the register counts towards the number of plots of permissioned land required. Relevant authorities that are not exempt from the 'duty to grant planning permissions etc.' can charge an additional annual fee in following years to those who are entered on their register and wish to remain on it.

Implications for Maidstone

1.20 Whilst the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 has not identified a need for SBCH within Maidstone, the Council has identified that the sector can play a key role in helping achieve a higher level of home ownership. The Maidstone Local Plan 2017 makes provision for SBCH within policy SP19 which states:

"In considering proposals for new housing development, the council will seek a sustainable range of house sizes, types and tenures (including plots for custom and self-build) that reflect the needs of those living in Maidstone Borough now and in years to come."

1.21 Maidstone's SBCH register is hosted externally from the Council website at: <http://localselfbuildregister.co.uk/localauthorities/maidstone-borough-council/>. The Council's register has been kept since April 2016, and table 1 shows the identified need at the 2016 and 2017 30 October base dates.

Base period	Individuals	Associations
1 April 2016 to 30 October 2016	134	3
31 October 2016 to 30 October 2017	127	2

Table 1. Maidstone base dated SBCH need

1.22 At 30 October 2017 base date, out of the 127 people, 31 individuals live within the borough, 114 showed an interest in more than one authority and 23 out of 97 ranked Maidstone as their first preference in a questionnaire attached to the register. Further, 71 respondents to the questionnaire gave their preference for the type of area they would like to build in - 62 stated rural (87.3%), 50 stated suburban (70.4%) and 31 stated urban (43.7%). Of those respondents, 67 stated they would like to build a single home (94.4%), 49 stated a small development (2-15 homes) (69.0%), 24 stated a medium (16-40 homes) (33.8%) and 17 stated a large development (40+ homes) (25.0%)³.

1.23 From the 71 respondents to the SBCH questionnaire 25 said they would like to start their project immediately (35.2%), 31 said in 6 months (43.7%), 11 said in the year 12 months (15.5%), and 4 said in 12 months or more (5.6%).

1.24 At present there are 2 associations on the Council's SBCH register, 1 is located within Maidstone borough and the other in Tonbridge and Malling. Both associations wish to build in more than one authority and 1 stated

³ Respondents where give the choice of more than one answer.

Maidstone as their number one preference on their questionnaire. There is an average of 3 households for both associations and both said they would like to start their project in the year 2017.

1.25 Currently, individuals or associations are not charged for entry or maintenance on the Council's SBCH register. A government grant was issued to the Council to cover the initial set up costs of SBCH register, and at present the remainder of the grant is being used to cover the register's costs.

1.26 At 21 March 2017, there's been one planning application approved for SBCH totalling 1 plot; and there's been two applications refused, one of which has an appeal outstanding (table 2).

Application number	Address	Description	Decision	Date	Appeal
17/503487/ FULL	Wickham Field Pattenden Lane Marden Kent TN12 9QU	Construction of 2 bedroom self-build detached bungalow	Approved	01 November 2017	
16/508522/ HYBRID	Land Adjacent To Westholme, Maidstone Road, Sutton Valence, Kent, ME17 3LR	Hybrid application for outline application for 14 self/custom build detached dwellings (Access being sought) and full detailed application for associated road infrastructure, access and landscaping.	Refused	16 May 2017	Informal hearing 20 March 2018, decision pending
16/503772/ OUT	Land North Of, Kenward Road, Yalding, Kent	Outline planning application for the construction of up to 60 no. bungalows, houses and starter home apartments, inclusive of self-build plots for sale, with 40% affordable housing and new vehicular access from Kenward Road with all matters reserved.	Refused	2 August 2016	

Table 2. Applications submitted for SBCH in last two years

1.27 In summary at 30 October 2017 the aggregate SBCH need over the two base dates is 261 individuals and 5 associations. The SBCH need has a negligible impact on the available housing land supply at 1 April 2017. However, so far no SBCH plots have been secured on sites allocated within the Maidstone Local Plan 2017.

1.28 The 30 October 2016 base date identified SBCH need of 134 plots and 3 associations plots, and the 31 October 2017 base date identified SBCH need of 127 plots and 2 associations, and there's approximately 1 year 7 months and 2 years 7 months remaining respectively in which the 'duty to grant planning permission' applies.

1.29 The Council are currently in the early stages of scoping future ways in which to maintain the SBCH register. Considerations include the introduction of a

charging cost for entry and maintenance on the register, and this may deter individuals and associations who state that Maidstone is not their first area of interest. Also the exemption of SBCH from Maidstone’s community infrastructure levy may lead builders identifying their schemes as SBCH where previously there had been no advantage to this.

1.30 The Council’s requirement to publish its SBCH need, and the monitoring of planning permissions for SBCH will be updated at a yearly base date of 30 October and reported in the Council’s Authority Monitoring Report.

2. RISK

2.1 No risk management implications.

3. NEXT STEPS: COMMUNICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISION

3.1 Applications for SBCH and the granting of plots will be measured against 30 October 2017 base date and subsequent base dates, and the results will be reported in the Council’s Authority Monitoring Reports.

4. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS

Issue	Implications	Sign-off
Impact on Corporate Priorities	The SBCH register, contributes to a sustainable range of house sizes, types and tenures that reflect the needs of those living in Maidstone Borough.	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning and Development
Risk Management	The Council may be subject to appeal on applications refused for self-build and custom housebuilding plots if the 31 October 2017 base requirement is not met by 30 October 2020	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning and Development
Financial	There are administrative and maintenance costs incurred in hosting, maintaining and reporting on a self-build custom housebuilding register. The balance of the government grant for set-up costs will cover costs in the short term and amendments to the register, prior to the introduction of fees.	Section 151 Officer & Finance Team
Staffing	The reporting on the self-build	Rob Jarman,

	and custom housebuilding register can be accommodated within the existing staff structure.	Head of Planning and Development
Legal	The maintenance and publication of a SBCH register fulfils the Council's duties under Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016)	Cheryl Parks Lawyer (Planning) Mid Kent Legal Services
Privacy and Data Protection	Data held by the Council relating to personal details, and other sensitive information will need to be managed very carefully and in line with the Council's agreed policies and procedures	Cheryl Parks Lawyer (Planning) Mid Kent Legal Services
Equalities	The SBCH register, contributes to a sustainable range of house sizes, types and tenures that reflect the needs of those living in Maidstone Borough. The recommendations do not propose a change in service therefore will not require an equalities impact assessment	[Policy & Information Manager]
Crime and Disorder	N/A	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning and Development
Procurement	N/A	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning and Development & Section 151 Officer

**STRATEGIC PLANNING,
SUSTAINABILITY AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

10 April 2018

Off Street Parking Places Order Variation

Final Decision-Maker	Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee
Lead Director	William Cornall Director of Regeneration & Place
Lead Officer and Report Author	Charlie Reynolds, Operations Engineer Parking Services
Classification	Public
Wards affected	All

Executive Summary

This report presents to the Committee the results following public consultation carried out in relation to the proposed variation of The Borough of Maidstone (Off-Street Parking Places) (Variation No10) Order 2018.

The report makes recommendations to the Committee to consider the objections received as part of the formal consultation process as required under the Parking Places (Variation of Charges) Act 2017.

This report makes the following recommendations to this Committee:

1. That the Committee agrees the recommendations to proceed in relation to The Borough of Maidstone (Off-Street Parking Places) (Variation No10) Order 2018 and agree to make the Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 with regard to:
 - Park and Ride
 - Pay and Display
 - Resident Parking Permit Concessions

2. That the Committee agrees the recommendation not to proceed in relation to The Borough of Maidstone (Off-Street Parking Places) (Variation No10) Order 2018 and agree to make the Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 with regard to:
 - Tovil Car Park

3. That the Committee agrees that the objectors are informed of the outcome as identified in the report and that the orders be sealed.

Timetable

Meeting	Date
Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee. 15	10 April 2018

Off Street Parking Places Order Variation

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 As part of the legal process to vary the Off Street Parking Places Order, the Council are required to conduct a formal consultation process which includes the placement of public notices in the car parks and notices in the local press.
- 1.2 The Parking Places (Variation of Charges) Act 2017 also makes provision in relation to the procedure to be followed by local authorities when varying the parking places order and requires any objections to be considered and reported formally.
- 1.3 Correspondence was sent to statutory and non-statutory consultees and notices were placed in each of the car parks.
- 1.4 A Public Notice formally advertising The Borough of Maidstone (Off-Street Parking Places) (Variation No10) Order 2018 was published in Local Press during the week ending Friday 16th February 2018 (Appendix 1)
- 1.5 Full details were contained in the draft orders which, together with a copy of the Public Notices, and a statement of the Council's reasons for proposing to make the orders were placed on deposit at the Main Reception, County Hall, Maidstone, Kent, ME14 1XX, and at The Link reception desk, Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone, ME15 6JQ.
- 1.6 The details of the proposals were also available online at www.kentonline.co.uk .

Park and Ride

- 1.7 Following the decision of the Committee on 22 January 2018 to introduce a pay to park system for park and ride services, proposals were published by Parking Services and all comments received during the formal consultation period were collated, reviewed and considered.
- 1.8 During the consultation period 5 objections were received with 13 comments recorded in relation to the Park & Ride service. By comparison to the number of customers using the service and the strategic reasons for making changes to the Park & Ride service, there are no compelling reasons to revise the proposals as advertised.
- 1.9 Further details on the objections and comments received are provided in Appendix 2.
- 1.10 Recommendation: To recommend to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transportation Committee to proceed with the proposal as advertised.

Pay and Display

- 1.11 Following the decision of the Committee on 6 February 2018 to revise the

Off-street car park tariffs, proposals were published by Parking Services and all comments received during the formal consultation period were collated, reviewed and considered.

- 1.12 During the consultation period 6 objections were received with 1 letter of support being recorded in relation to the Pay and Display tariff proposals.
- 1.13 Of the 6 objections, 4 directly related to the Lockmeadow complex where Maidstone Borough Council is required to agree any changes with the head lessee under a separate agreement in accordance with the lease arrangement. Discussions with the head lessee are therefore ongoing after which the pay and display tariff will be amended.
- 1.14 Further details on the comments received are provided in Appendix 2.
- 1.15 Recommendation: To recommend to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transportation Committee to proceed with the proposals as advertised as there are no compelling reasons not to amend the order in relation to the Pay and Display tariff except in relation to Lockmeadow as this car park may be amended separately once the tariff has been agreed with the head lessee.

Resident Parking Permit Concessions

- 1.16 The parking places order currently allows resident parking permit holders to use designated off-street car parks from 6.30pm to 8am to improve levels of parking availability in high demand resident zones.
- 1.17 Members of the Planning Committee on 19 December 2017 requested that to allay residents' concerns about the Brunswick Street application, the Parking Services Section be asked to exclude this development from the S2 residents' parking zone area and to allow residents with S2 zone residents' parking permits to park in the Brunswick Street public car park after 5.00 p.m. rather than 6.30 p.m.
- 1.18 Members of the Planning Committee also requested that to allay residents' concerns about the Union Street, Queen Anne Road application the Parking Services Section be asked to exclude this development from the N4 residents' parking zone area and to allow residents with N4 zone residents' parking permits to park in Maidstone Borough Council car parks after 5.00 p.m. rather than 6.30 p.m. Proposals were published by Parking Services and all comments received during the formal consultation period were collated, reviewed and considered.
- 1.19 During the consultation period no objections were received to these proposals.
- 1.20 Recommendation: To recommend to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transportation Committee to proceed with the proposal as advertised.

Tovil Car Park

- 1.21 Tovil Parish Council contacted Parking Services and requested an amendment to the current Limited Waiting Period in the Tovil Car Park from the current 2 hours, reduced to 1 hour.
 - 1.22 During the consultation period 11 objections were received and 4 Petitions containing 24, 46, 14 and 11 signatures.
 - 1.23 Recommendation: To recommend to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transportation Committee not to proceed with the proposal due to the objections received.
-

2. AVAILABLE OPTIONS

- 2.1 That the Committee considers objections and agrees the recommendations in relation to The Borough of Maidstone (Off-Street Parking Places) (Variation No10) Order 2018 and agree to make the Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and that the Committee agrees that the objectors are informed of the outcome as identified in the report and that the orders be sealed.
 - 2.2 To not proceed with the recommendations would not allow strategic objectives to be met in relation to the introduction of pay to park at the park and ride sites as agreed at the Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee meeting on 22 January 2018 or enable tariffs to be reviewed to promote migration from high demand car parks in the town centre to outer zone car parks as agreed at the Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee meeting on 6 February 2018.
 - 2.3 To not proceed with the recommendations will also impact on resident parking proposals recommended by the Planning Committee designed to improve levels of parking availability within resident parking zones.
 - 2.4 To make the orders as advertised would not take account of comments received during formal consultation and will be contrary to the requirements of the Parking Places (Variation of Charges) Act 2017.
-

3. PREFERRED OPTION AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That the Committee considers objections and agrees the recommendations in relation to The Borough of Maidstone (Off-Street Parking Places) (Variation No10) Order 2018 and agree to make the Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 3.2 That the Committee agrees that the objectors are informed of the outcome as identified in the report and that the orders be sealed.
- 3.3 This will allow strategic objectives to be met in relation to the introduction of pay to park at the park and ride sites as agreed at the Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee meeting on 22 January 2018 and enable tariffs to be reviewed to promote migration from high demand car parks in the town centre to outer zone car parks as agreed at the

4. RISK

- 4.1 Consideration has been given to objections and formal letters of support with regard to each proposal. However this is balanced against the strategic objectives to meet the existing commitments in the Integrated Transport Strategy and the Low Emissions Strategy by minimising unnecessary car journeys into the centre of Maidstone.

5. NEXT STEPS: COMMUNICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISION

- 5.1 Where agreed The Borough of Maidstone (Off-Street Parking Places) (Variation No10) Order 2018 will be amended accordingly and sealed by Mid Kent Legal Services.
- 5.2 The 'Has Made' order will be advertised in line with legal requirements set out under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 5.3 The objectors will be informed of the outcome.

6. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS

Issue	Implications	Sign-off
Impact on Corporate Priorities	The proposals are intended to support the Council's priority to improve access across the Borough through better roads, thereby keeping Maidstone Borough an attractive place for all.	Jeff Kitson Parking Services Manager
Risk Management	Consideration has been given to objections and formal letters of support with regard to each proposal. However this is balanced against the strategic objectives to meet the existing commitments in the Integrated Transport Strategy and the Low Emissions Strategy by minimising unnecessary car journeys into the centre of Maidstone.	Jeff Kitson Parking Services Manager
Financial	The costs of the order variation and implementation will be met from within the existing Parking	

	Services budget.	
Staffing	It is anticipated that the services will be delivered within existing staffing levels.	Jeff Kitson Parking Services Manager
Legal	Formal orders will need to be sealed by Mid Kent Legal Services.	
Privacy and Data Protection	None identified	
Equalities	None identified	
Crime and Disorder	The developments identified within this report will have no negative impact on Crime and Disorder.	Jeff Kitson Parking Services Manager
Procurement	None identified	Jeff Kitson Parking Services Manager

7. REPORT APPENDICES

- 7.1 Appendix 1 – Published variation to The Borough of Maidstone (Off-Street Parking Places) (Variation No10) Order 2018.
- 7.2 Appendix 2 – Details in relation to formal consultation to the proposals.

8. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 8.1 None.

Appendix 1

**THE BOROUGH OF MAIDSTONE (OFF-STREET PARKING PLACES)
(VARIATION No. 10) ORDER 2018**

Notice is hereby given that MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL intend to make the above Order under section 35 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, having obtained the consent of the Kent County Council in accordance with Section 39(3) of the Act, and of all other enabling powers, and after consultation with the chief officer of police in accordance with Part III of Schedule 9 of the Act -

The Order will;
To amend the current opening times and introduce Parking Charges in the following Car Parks within the Park & Ride Parking Facilities at Willington Street and London Road.

Introduce car park tariffs as follows -

(1) Item	(2) Period	(3) Tariff
1.	Between 06.00am and Midnight on All Days	£2.50

The Order will also Revise Car Park tariffs as follows;

Name of Off-Street Parking Place	Current Charges	Revised Charges
2, King Street Car Park	Up to 1 Hour £1.50 Up to 3 Hours £2.50 Up to 4 Hours £4.00 Evening/Overnight £2.00	Up to 1 Hour £1.30 Up to 3 Hours £3.90 Up to 4 Hours £5.20 Evening/Overnight £2.00
14, Palace Avenue Car Park	Up to 3 Hours £2.50 Up to 4 Hours £4.00 Evening/Overnight £2.00	Up to 3 Hours £3.75 Up to 4 Hours £5.00 Evening/Overnight £2.00
6, Medway Street	Up to 1 Hour £1.50 Up to 3 Hours £2.50 Up to 4 Hours £4.00 Evening/Overnight £2.00	Up to 1 Hour £1.25 Up to 3 Hours £3.75 Up to 4 Hours £5.00 Evening/Overnight £2.00
1, Wheeler Street 3, Brewer Street (East)	Up to 30 Minutes £0.50p Up to 1 Hour £1.00 Up to 3 Hours £2.50 Up to 4 Hours £3.50 Evening/Overnight £2.00	Up to 30 Minutes £0.60p Up to 1 Hour £1.10 Up to 3 Hours £3.30 Up to 4 Hours £4.40 Evening/Overnight £2.00
8, Mote Road 10, Mill Street	Up to 1 Hour £1.00 Up to 3 Hours £2.50 Up to 4 Hours £3.50 Evening/Overnight £2.00	Up to 1 Hour £1.00 Up to 3 Hours £3.00 Up to 4 Hours £4.00 Evening/Overnight £2.00
17, Lockmeadow	Up to 1 Hour £1.00 Up to 3 Hours £2.50 Up to 4 Hours £3.50 Up to 5 Hours £5.00 Over 5 Hours £6.50	Up to 1 Hour £1.10 Up to 3 Hours £3.30 Up to 4 Hours £4.40 Up to 5 Hours £5.50 Over 5 Hours £7.00
15, Barker Road 16, Brooks Place 5, Lucerne Street 13, Sittingbourne Road 12, Union Street (East) 9, Union Street (West)	Up to 1 Hour £1.00 Up to 3 Hours £2.50 Up to 4 Hours £3.50 Up to 5 Hours £5.00 Over 5 Hours £6.50 Evening/Overnight £2.00	Up to 1 Hour £1.10 Up to 3 Hours £3.30 Up to 4 Hours £4.40 Up to 5 Hours £5.50 Over 5 Hours £7.00 Evening/Overnight £2.00
4, College Road 7, Brunswick Street 11, Well Road	Up to 1 Hour £1.00 Up to 3 Hours £2.50 Up to 4 Hours £3.50 Up to 5 Hours £5.00 Over 5 Hours £6.50 Evening/Overnight £2.00	Up to 1 Hour £1.00 Up to 3 Hours £3.00 Up to 4 Hours £4.00 Up to 5 Hours £5.00 Over 5 Hours £7.00 Evening/Overnight £2.00

Appendix 1

Amend Part 3 of Schedule 1 of The Off Street Parking Places Consolidation Order 2008; Vehicles displaying a Valid residents parking permit from the current 18.30hrs and 08.00hrs to 17.00hrs to 08.00hrs where applicable.

To reduce the current Duration of Parking (hours at any one time) restriction from the current 2 hours between 08.00 Hrs to 18.30 hrs to 1 hour in Tovil Hill Car Park.

Copies of the proposed Orders, any Orders which will be amended by the proposed Orders, a statement of the Council's reasons for proposing to make the Orders and maps indicating the location and effect may be examined at The Link, Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone ME15 6JQ during normal office hours.

The deposit documents will also be available in the Main Reception, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XX.

If you wish to object to a proposed Order you should send the grounds for your objection in writing to the Parking Services Manager quoting the name of the Order to, Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone ME15 6JQ by 12 noon on Monday 12th March 2018. Indications of support for the proposals are welcome and should be sent to the same address.

If you have any questions concerning the Order or require further information please contact Maidstone Borough Council Parking Services (01622 602377) during normal office hours.

Parking Services Manager
Maidstone Borough Council
Maidstone House

Appendix 2

Off-Street Tariff Increase

Objection 6 (inc Lockmeadow 4)	Support 1
---------------------------------------	-----------

	Support
1	I would like to formally support the proposal which I believe will improve the park and ride service.

23

	Objections
1	<p>It's been brought to our attention that the council are seeking to raise car park charges. [REDACTED] Therefore we must be consulted before a raise is considered. Having reviewed the increases we are ultimately against them as we can't see any reason for them. If [REDACTED] costs were set to increase we can understand, [REDACTED] Therefore to implement a higher charging regime we cannot justify. Further to this, with the current regime in place we already have complaints from [REDACTED] and customers of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] I hope to tackle car parking charges in a manner beneficial to all without raising the costs.</p>
2	<p>I would like to object to the above Variation Order, the proposal to increase parking charges. The proposal would increase the tariff I incur by 26%. I would be interested to see published, the justification for this 26% increase when the UK inflation rate is at 3%. It is to be noted in April 2017, the charges were increased by 17%. With this Variation Order there will be an increase of 43% in the past 2 years. That doesn't align with the UK inflation rate over the same period being no more than 6%. As a user of the Barker Road car park I would be interested to see published the benefits expected from this higher than inflation increase. You will recall I made contact regarding numerous faulty street lights, and imagine the majority of similar notifications are via members of the public. I note it has been suggested asking enforcement teams to monitor lighting but currently that is not the case. I do often see cleaning operatives at this location. However, isn't street lighting and rubbish collection a cost covered by my Council Tax? Finally, it is to be noted, Maidstone residents are likely to incur a 5% Council Tax increase, of which 3% is for MBC services.</p>

3	<p>The Borough Councils proposal to make changes to the current of street parking places order including changes to car parking fees. [REDACTED] considered this at its meeting on [REDACTED] and made the following comment:</p> <p>It was felt that the proposed increase in parking fees, for any stay over one hour, would have a detrimental impact on the businesses in the Town Centre as shoppers would opt to go out of town shopping areas where there is free parking. It was considered that the decrease in fees for less than one hours stay would be of no real benefit to shoppers. Residents in [REDACTED] already gravitate towards Hempstead Valley Shopping Centre where there is free parking and towards the Medway Towns where there is now going to be considerably cheaper car parking charges. Should MBC go ahead with the proposed fee changes, it is suggested that figures are rounded down to 10 pence amounts as people are less likely to have 5 pence pieces to use in the machines.</p>
4	<p>With reference to the above I am writing to object to the proposed revised car park tariffs for the Lockmeadow car park, particularly as I was informed by [REDACTED] that no such increases would apply to this car park.</p> <p>As longstanding regular users of the Market Hall for [REDACTED] market held on a Tuesday and our fortnightly auctions of antique and modern furniture and collectables held on a Thursday, [REDACTED] large number of customers to Lockmeadow, the majority of whom need to park their car. Whilst some may see the proposed increase in the hourly rate from £1.00 to £1.10 (i.e. 10%) as acceptable, those who require to stay for any longer than an hour and up to 3 hours will be expected to pay £3.30, an increase of 80 pence over the current charge equating to a massive 32% rise. Given that the published rate of inflation is less than 4% such a large increase is most unfair in any circumstance.</p> <p>Customers visiting the Tuesday stall market and [REDACTED] weekly produce and plant market are naturally price conscious and will certainly notice any proposed increase especially when so many other retail outlets offer free parking to their customers. The market needs to attract more customers; the continual rise in parking costs will have the opposite effect.</p> <p>On [REDACTED] Thursday auctions [REDACTED] customers help to fill an otherwise empty car park. Overall any increase may well be found to be self-defeating for the Council revenues as people will tend to spend less time in the Market or Auction with consequential financial implications [REDACTED] as well. In general, we need to be attracting people to Maidstone for business and leisure purposes not frightening them off.</p> <p>Please confirm receipt of this correspondence, I trust you will take my comments into consideration when making a decision and I look forward to your early reply.</p>
5	<p>Re the proposed increase in car parking charges in Lockmeadow Market. [REDACTED] in the market and strongly object to increase in car parking charges because this will affect my customers (a lot who are elderly) in coming to the market on Tuesdays and Saturdays and consequently will affect my business [REDACTED]. The market is already being run down because of all the other increases in other charges and driving people away. If I become bankrupt because of your no running of the market properly or encouraging people there and the stallholders in, you will have to compensate me for loss of business.</p>

6	<p>I am writing to you in objection to the Borough of Maidstone (Off-Street Parking Places) (Variation No. 10) Order 2018 on behalf of all stallholders trading at Maidstone Market and Market Hall at Lockmeadow.</p> <p>We are deeply concerned by the proposed increases to parking charges that are due to take place, especially those at the Lockmeadow car parks. As such we must strongly object to the aforementioned increases.</p> <p>As you are aware it is currently a particularly unfavourable climate for the entire retail sector but especially for SMEs and independent sole traders and partnerships. At a time when inflation is outpacing wage growth; the challenges of leaving the European Union have weighed on consumer sentiment and increased the wholesale cost of much, perhaps most, of the goods which we sell; and the rise of online shopping continues to present difficulties to traditional forms of retail; we believe that the planned parking charge increases are yet another impediment to our businesses. One we fear is quite possibly a breaking point.</p> <p>It is not an exaggeration to say that we feel this issue could become an existential threat, not just to individual businesses who trade at the market, but to the market as a whole. As traders at Maidstone market for [REDACTED], it has been obvious to us that an increase in parking charges has correlated directly with a reduction in visitor footfall at the market and thus a reduction in potential customers. Due to the inhospitable trading environment currently faced, many stallholders are already struggling to preserve the sustainability of their businesses. Thus, it does not take a huge jump in deductive reasoning to envision a situation where, a decrease in customer activity would lead to a number of traders finding their business no longer profitable. Therefore by implication, at a time when the market itself is far from at maximum occupancy, it is clear that the loss of only a small number of traders would, in effect, bring the viability of the market itself into question. In short, the increases in parking charges create a real and present threat to the continued existence of the market and to the livelihoods of its traders.</p> <p>The proposed increases are remarkably galling, as they come during a period when Maidstone has; a council in which the Conservative party comprises the largest group of councillors (jointly with the Liberal Democrats), a Conservative Mayor and a Conservative MP, whilst at the same time the UK has a Conservative government and Prime Minister. We are repeatedly told that the Conservative party is both supportive of business and of local communities. We are also told that the Conservatives are delivering a strong economy. With that in mind then, why is there a need to increase parking charges? Charges that will both hinder local businesses as well as inconvenience and upset the local community. If the economy is doing well, why is the government not providing adequate funding to local government authorities? Authorities, who in turn, could surely generate revenues in less damaging ways; if the need for such revenues exist. A need which should not exist if, as according to the government, the economy is doing well. A strong economy should surely lead to increased local government funding? Is the local government to blame or the national one?</p> <p>Maidstone Borough Council and by association its Parking Services Management must decide if Maidstone Market is an amenity it values and wishes to continue to provide to the local community. This is because the planned parking charge increases could well herald its death knell.</p>
---	---

When considering this though, we would ask you to take into account not only the markets resident businesses, which would inevitably suffer, but also our customers.

For many of our customers, the market is an essential part of their life, providing their only point of social contact in the community. Without the market they would quite literally be shut off from society completely, at home, alone. For some disabilities mean that the market is their most practical and easily accessible shopping and social destination. Whilst for others, on fixed or low incomes, it is not an overstatement to say that they rely on the market for their very existence. If not for the staples they can purchase from us at low prices they would likely have to rely on food banks and other charity to survive. Others slightly less unfortunate are only able to afford what few meagre luxuries they have because of the market and its traders.

With that in mind, I again wish to object to the planned increases and urge the Parking Services Manager and the Borough Council to rethink and reverse this decision. If the increases go ahead, be in no doubt, both the stallholders and Maidstone Market and our customers will remember this decision and campaign and vote accordingly at the May local elections and the next general election, whenever it occurs.

Appendix 2

Park and Ride

Objection 5	Support 0
-------------	-----------

27

	Objections
1	<p>Objection to the P&R flat rate car park charge of £2.50.</p> <p>Objection to the median level increase of car park charges at King Street and Wheeler and Brewer Street, which represent a respective increase of 50% and 30%.</p> <p>Park and Ride: The stated intention is to charge a flat rate of £2.50 per vehicle, with bus tickets for up to 5 persons.</p> <p>The P&R bus is an eligible service under the Transport Act 1958 and 2000. Section 145A of the Concessionary Bus Travel Act 2007 subsection (1) provides:- any person to whom a current statutory travel concession permit has been issued and who travels on an eligible journey on an eligible service is entitled on production of the permit to a concession consisting of a waiver of the fare for the journey by the operator of the service. In the result this waiver will be denied to an eligible person.</p> <p>Accordingly, there is a discrimination against and eligible person within 3 (1) (a) (ii) for elderly persons or disabled persons.</p> <p>It is noted that the Equality Act 2010, s.149 provides: - (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its function, have due regard to the need to (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</p> <p>This section defines the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED). This is a duty for public bodies to have a due regard to the need to consider and apply fairness and equality in carrying out their functions, especially in making decisions or policies.</p> <p>The Equality Impact Assessment, at Appendix 5 states: - 61.6% of users use an Older Persons Bus Pass. A pay to park tariff will affect all users currently using a pass to travel. However, the purpose of the P&R service is to improve air quality by alleviating the volume of traffic travelling into the town centre. Holders of the pass will still be able to travel into the centre free of charge using another bus service.</p> <p>Comment:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The greatest number of users and income for P&R come from concessions. 2. To state that they will still be able to travel using another bus service does not meet s.149 (1) (b). 3. Further it is contrary to policy DM24 and 'Bus Priority measures will be provided in order to encourage the use of public transport by seeking to ensure the reliability and frequency of services will continue to be made more accessible to users' 4. This concession is important for the P&R acts as a hub service for the non-urban community, which has lost many of the local services (i.e. banking) and are forced to travel to Maidstone town centre. 5. Finally it is inimical to 'model shift', which was a main tenet of the Maidstone Local Plan.

	<p>Summary conclusion:- This PSED has not been satisfactorily applied in the instant case. Accordingly there is AGE discrimination under the Equality Act 2010. Increase of town centre car parking charges. The specimen revised charges represent an increase of 50% and 30% respectively. This is excessive. The Equality Act 2010 places a general duty upon the public sector. In the exercise of its functions, a public authority must have due regard to the need to: foster good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and people who do not.</p> <p>There is an expansion in town centre accommodation for the elderly. Town centre car parks are used by relatives and friends when visiting such persons. A disproportionate rise in car parking charges do not positively contribute to the advancement of equality and good relations.</p> <p>On these grounds, I object to the proposed Order.</p>
2	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed car park tariff for Willington Street Park & Ride.</p> <p>We are retired and regularly use the service to get into Maidstone using my bus pass. I have tried using the Arriva bus service from Headcorn but find this unreliable especially the return service on a Saturday.</p> <p>The Park & Ride saves me from adding to the town centre congestion and cuts down on car pollution from the exhaust. Multiply that by hundreds of cars, I thought environment issues were a priority of local and central government.</p>
3	<p>I am writing to register my objection to proposed order 2018 to introduce a £2.50 parking fee at the Willington Street Park and Ride.</p> <p>I use this service frequently using my free bus pass (for which I am grateful) but in the event of a £2.50 charge for parking my car (perhaps for only one hour in most cases) I shall no longer use the Park & Ride service as it will be cheaper to take my car into Maidstone to park in town.</p> <p>I am a widow and pensioner and can no longer walk any distance without pain and the Park & Ride service stopped at very convenient points in town. I think that many pensioners and other people, who also have to pay the fare on the Park & Ride, will do the same making Maidstone even more congested. May I suggest that on showing a free bus pass, which is not transferrable, we might be exempt from the car park charge perhaps between the hours of 10am – 3pm?</p>
4	<p>I am writing to oppose the changes to the Park & Ride services – charging for parking. Due to the P&R being in a residential area I walk to the park leaving extra room for more cars to park. Other residents also walk in for this bus, buying a 10 single trip ticket £10.30).</p> <p>I have been told that it is not known whether there will be a barrier for cars to collect a ticket and pay via machine or if you will pay on the bus. I have no objections to paying the £2.50 charge if I am still able to use this service as a pedestrian. I do believe we are unable to use this service you will lose a lot of revenue.</p> <p>I have used the P&R service daily to get to work ever since it began. I am unable to catch the number 9 even though it would be cheaper as I buy a 4 weekly Maidstone ticket because the times are not suitable for my connecting bus to Kings Hill.</p> <p>There is not an early bus which I can catch which will mean walking through Mote Park to make sure I arrive in time for my next bus.</p>
5	<p>Please note that the comments below refer only to the Willington Street and London Road Proposals.</p>

	<p>It is clear from the Council's January decision regarding the Park and Ride service that, sadly, there is a will on the parts of Council officers and/or members for the Park and Ride service to fail. The introduction of 'pay to park' using ticket machines at each site instead of the current arrangement of cash fares being paid to the bus driver, seriously affects the viability of running buses on a commercial basis to serve the Park and Ride sites, as revenue would in future accrue to the machine operator (i.e. the Council) and not to the bus operator. Such a proposal is also likely to adversely affect ridership in off-peak periods (and in turn damage trade in Maidstone) as those with English National Concessionary Passes who currently park and travel at no charge will in future have to pay for parking. Once such business is lost, the likelihood of regaining such patronage is likely to be extremely low. Overall revenue at peak times, when all users pay individually to travel, is also likely to reduce as multiple users in a single vehicle would in future only pay one parking fee rather than a separate fare for each rider. Changing the method of charging the user for Park and Ride by installing ticket machines at the car parks must be resisted as this will severely reduce options for the future and minimise the likelihood of the Park and Ride bus service ever being considered in the future as a commercial proposition.</p>
--	--

	Comment
1	<p>I am concerned about the proposals for change with the Park and Ride scheme. I use the P&R at Willington St several times a week as a pedestrian. Can I still use the bus in the normal way when car parking charges are introduced? Will I still be able to use my bus pass and not incur a £2.50 charge? More details of this scheme are required as many elderly friends of mine are very concerned about it. Can you give me the details in full so I can spread the correct word? If you have to pay £2.50 to park then you might as well use the other buses.</p>
2	<p>I wish to know what changes are to be made to Willington Street Park and Ride scheme. I have heard that charges are to be made for parking and have you considered the displacement effect this will have on surrounding streets?</p> <p>Thank you very much for prompt reply. I am in wholehearted agreement with the changes. I do, however wish to clarify the following.</p> <p>First, will travelling on the Park and Ride bus be solely on production of a valid ticket to park at the facility and as such parking elsewhere will be pointless as a £2.50 parking ticket will be required? That is to say, bluntly, surrounding roads will not become choked with parked vehicles avoiding the parking charge and riding the bus for free? Second, I frequently walk to the Park and Ride as it is only a few minutes away. Will I be able to purchase a ticket of any sort?</p>
3	<p>We were given a leaflet on the bus last week giving some details about new proposals. We are in our seventies and live near the park and ride. We do not park in the car park but use the bus with our bus passes. We have used this bus for twenty years without parking a car. My husband is classed as disabled and to walk down to the main road to catch a bus is a real struggle. Will we be able to use the new service without parking a car and use our bus pass?</p>
4	<p>They do not agree with the changes to park and ride. [REDACTED] doesn't drive and has a disabled daughter and regularly uses the park and ride</p>

	<p>bus and is angry that she won't be able to use it anymore. Her daughter has [REDACTED] and knows all of the drivers and the change will be distressing for her. The number 9 bus is further away and doesn't have a bus shelter. [REDACTED] will be forced to push her daughters' wheelchair further in order to catch the bus into town. They know they aren't the only ones that will be affected by this change. What does this mean for their existing bus passes will they still be able to use them?</p>
5	<p>503 P&R - parking fees of possibly £2.50 per car. What allowances will be in play for people on their own and "car-sharing" isn't an option. The scheme seems to be in favour of people travelling together in one car. Also, will the OAP bus pass still be used??</p> <p>Many thanks for replying so promptly and with such helpful information. My only slight query is when travelling and showing the parking ticket to the driver on the P&R – how will the Civil Enforcement Officers know which cars are parked with the fee having been paid and which are parked without the fee being paid, if the ticket is with the passenger??</p>
6	<p>I have read the following and would like to know when this will take effect please?</p> <p>The Park and Ride service will continue to be run from two sites (London Road and Willington Street) and will extend its operating hours to 7pm with the frequency of buses remaining at 20 minutes.</p>
7	<p>I have heard that the 501/503 Park and Ride bus service in Maidstone is changing, but no one seems to have any more details on this. I wonder therefore, if I can get answers to these questions please?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What date is the service changing from? 2. Are the timings/frequency/route of the P&R buses changing? 3. Will I still be able to buy a ticket/season ticket? 4. How much will tickets/season tickets cost? 5. Where/how can I buy tickets/season tickets? 6. Can I use the Park and Ride if I walk to the car park? 7. With my current season ticket, I sometimes travel from one Park and Ride stop at Willington Street into town, and then keep on the bus to the other Park and Ride stop at Allington - and return. Will I still be able to do this with the new system? 8. Can I travel from town TO one of the Park and Ride stops? i.e. I get on the bus at Willington Street P&R and get off in town, then need to continue my journey later on to Allington P&R. What ticket can I get to do this? 9. Are senior passes valid?
8	<p>I live in a house which is [REDACTED] minutes' walk away from the park and ride at Willington Street. I rarely drive my car round to the park and ride as I am more than capable of walking the short distance. I also, being a pensioner, have a concessionary fare. As the park and ride operates every twenty minutes and is an efficient and very reliable service you can see why I use it. I believe that there are many people in my area who, like me, walk to the park and ride, so counting the number of cars parked is not a reliable measure of how well the service is used. I have read that the council is considering withdrawing the service next year if it isn't better used by then. May I suggest that if you had two fare systems</p>

	<p>operating, i.e. one for a car and one for individual passengers, you might find it gets used far more? If however you change the fare system to paying for the car then I predict you will have even less people using it than there are now. The large majority of passengers are retired people like myself who really treasure this service and removing their ability to use it will not only be a blow to them but it will also affect the prosperity of the shops in the town centre. There is always a queue of pensioners in the mornings waiting to go into town and spend their money. The shops will lose out. Please reconsider how you will take fares from your passengers. Give them a choice. Pay for a car or pay for an individual. And let us oldies carry on using the bus service which we treasure.</p>
9	<p>£2.50 is too high for a single senior to pay, £1.00 is more realistic for a Pensioner to pay and I really would not object to that. Shops would lose customers as customers would not go to town as often they would use out of town shops where they can park free. Keeping open to midnight does not help shoppers I can see that the proposal would not pay and then I expect we will see housing pop up on the land. It's open to vandalism at midnight. If the proposal goes ahead we need a better bus service to Maidstone Town from Bearsted it's awful at the moment that being the reason why most people use the Park and Ride but would not be willing to pay £2.50 for a single passenger.</p>
10	<p>I have seen your Notice of proposed charges for the Willington Street and London Road car parks. I should be obliged to you for the following information:- 1. Does the proposed flat rate charge of £2.50 include VAT.? 2. What, if any, is the correlation between the car park charge and the P&R bus fare?</p>
11	<p>Wouldn't have known the proposed changes to the Park & Ride if it hadn't been for a neighbour copying me one of your leaflets. <i>Very poorly advertised,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not on your website • no notice on the buses, • none on the shelters in the park & ride • none on the bus stops • none in the Downs Mail • The Link - no staff member new anything about it just a phone number to call • Don't expect you have put a notice in the Kent Messages in all areas of Kent <p><i>Working People,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not suitable for working people, wages will not cover the parking charges especially those on the national minimum wage or 0% contract. If working 6 days would be £15 per week if no concessions. <p><i>Retired People,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not able to use as we have bus passes <p>I have travelled on the park & ride since it opened on day one, asking if I could travel on the buses as I live across the road to the site, answer was yes. Used it for many years going to and from work. Now retired have used it most days these changes will not allow me or other senior citizens to use it.</p>

	<p>On travelling on these buses checking the age group and the most majority are senior citizens, using their cars and bus passes as it is so convenient to get on and off the buses safely also out of town parking, which I thought was the idea of park & ride. Some senior citizens [same unable to walk far] are dropped off in the park & ride to catch the bus and then collected when they return, this makes it safer for them and stops the cars taking them into town and dropping off at Boots which causes a lot of problems with the buses stopping there. The buses always look busy and the drivers are always very polite and helpful.</p> <p>What will happen to your drivers, they have mortgages and families to support?</p> <p>If this goes ahead you will find pensioners will not use the park & ride due to the payment they will go elsewhere. You collect 82p per pensioner for using this service.</p> <p>The shops in town will also suffer as while we are in town we shop for many items and stop off for a drink and eat.</p> <p>It seems to me you intend to close the park & ride, does that mean you will build houses on the site?</p> <p>If you live in Kent you are penalised only get bus passes, senior citizens living in London travel free on buses, underground and trains.</p> <p>Recently visited Strafford Upon Avon Park & Ride which have meters but senior citizens use their bus passes.</p> <p>NOTE: Just been informed you had a survey about the Park & Ride Maidstone back in December this was not advertised enough, I travel most days and found no notice of this.</p>
12	<p>Park & Ride at Willington Street is a much needed and used facility, especially for the older generation.</p> <p>To find a parking space in Maidstone is a nightmare. The Council, having built thousands of houses (most houses having two cars or more) have not increased car parking spaces, hence the value of Park & Ride.</p> <p>If you must make a charge, there should be more than one tariff. For the main users 1 to 3 hours is the average time spent in Maidstone, so to be charged the same amount for all day parking does not seem fair. It is cheaper to park in the Mall car park for an hour (if you can get in) than your proposed charge of £2.50. There will be more cars driving into Maidstone causing more traffic when we are already gridlocked most of the time, and creating more pollution. If you must charge, a lower tariff for shorter stays.</p> <p>I do hope this will not deter people using the Park & Ride and turn people away from shopping in Maidstone. It could be cheaper driving to Hempstead Valley where there is free parking, leaving Maidstone to become another empty shopping centre. I sincerely hope that doesn't happen.</p>
	<p>I am writing with regard to the above Order which will affect the Park & Ride parking facilities at Willington Street and London Road.</p> <p>I have been a regular user of the London Road Park & Ride for many years as I work in Maidstone Town Centre, and would certainly not wish to see the service discontinued, albeit I understand that it is not making money at the present time.</p> <p>I have the following points to raise on the proposed Order:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I understand from speaking to the Attendant at the Park & Ride site that it is proposed that the buses will be 'cashless' and that one will just pay to park. How will the bus driver therefore know that people getting on the bus have paid the parking fee – will there be something like a 2-part ticket where half is displayed on the car windscreen and the other half shown to the bus driver? Otherwise I can see that people who live nearby will perhaps walk to the site and get on the bus without paying, or otherwise will park in nearby residential roads (or even

	<p>possibly the DFS car park!) and then walk round to the site and get on the bus, thereby avoiding paying the tariff.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. I note that it is proposed to extend the current opening time to midnight on all days – presumably this will therefore require an Attendant to be present at midnight to close the site? On the subject of an Attendant, it will surely also be necessary to have an Attendant regularly monitoring the sites during the day to ensure that cars parked there have actually paid the parking tariff and are displaying the necessary ticket? This will surely involve further costs to pay such an Attendant to regularly monitor the sites? I cannot personally see that there would be much attraction for the London Road site (I do not know the Willington Street site) to be used as a Pay and Display car park other than by users of the Park & Ride service, as there are no facilities nearby such as shops (other than DFS which has its own car park). 3. The proposal to introduce a car park tariff will stop people using it as a ‘free’ car park – having used the Park & Ride facility regularly for many years I often see people leaving their cars there in the morning and then either walking into town or being picked up by someone else and then presumably being taken to work. Similarly in the evening people are often dropped off there and then collect their own car and drive home. 4. Will there be any proposal to introduce a ‘season ticket’ scheme which may work out at a slightly cheaper daily rate rather than having to pay the tariff on a daily basis, for commuters who use the service daily for work? If not, this would entail having to have the correct change available every day for the car park ticket. 5. I understand from speaking to the Attendant that on ‘market’ days the bulk of the passengers on the Park & Ride buses after 9.30 am are concessions who do not currently have to pay anything at all to use the service. I do feel that if the proposed system is introduced a lot of these people, if they live close to a bus route, will use another bus service to travel into town to avoid having to pay the parking charge. 6. I understand that ‘up to 5 people’ in a car will be able to utilize the bus service for the parking tariff of £2.50. Whilst this would only equate to 50p per person, I do not think that there would very often be an occasion when there are 5 people in a car. With commuters there is invariably only one per in a car, who would still have to pay the £2.50. I do appreciate that compared to the current daily peak-time ticket rate this is 10p cheaper, but most regular commuters who travel before 9.30 am I believe either have a season ticket or buy a ‘10-trip ticket’ which works out considerably cheaper than buying a daily ticket. On a personal note I have a Bus Pass which I use in the evening but buy a 10-trip ticket which I use in the morning, so for me the cost will increase from just over £5 per week to £12.50 per week, unless some sort of season ticket is introduced (as I have mentioned in point 4 above). With the additional cost of petrol to and from the Park & Ride it would therefore probably work out cheaper for me to get a no.7 bus direct from Hadlow to Maidstone, paying a single fare in the morning and using my Bus Pass in the evening! <p>Thank you for reading this letter and hopefully some of the points I have raised will also be raised by other users of the service.</p>
13	<p>I use the Park and Ride London Road because where I live by East Farleigh Station we don’t have a bus service and a train once an hour. I go on the 9 o’clock bus and pay £1.60 to get to Maidstone before it gets to crowded. I lost my husband to asbestos lung cancer, so I travel alone, and will now have to pay £2.50. Once again the pensioners are the target so they can’t use their bus pass or will we be able to use our pass.</p>

Appendix 2

Tovil Car Park

Objection 11	Petitions 4 (24 signatures) (46 signatures) (14 signatures) (11 signatures)
---------------------	--

34

	Objections
1	<p>I wish to object to the proposed change to the Tovil Hill car park order. Reducing the time from 2 hours to 1 will harm the hairdressers and The Papermakers pub businesses. The car park was originally installed and funded with a view to supporting local businesses. The [REDACTED] have over the last few years indicated they would prefer an actual extension of time for parking for some of their customers. The Papermakers is the only pub left in Tovil and again a reduction in times would cause even more overspill parking onto surrounding roads. I also feel that enforcement of these proposals would prove more difficult than the current two hour limit. As you've probably seen I dropped in petition/letters from residents about their objections to the reduction in parking times at the Tovil car park. I think the Parish may be now having second thoughts on this and may be contacting you about withdrawing of their proposal. As I mentioned before this will have a direct effect on the hairdressers and the pub. I also think it will impact upon further overspill parking in Church Street which I deal with on almost a weekly basis.</p>
2	<p>I am writing on behalf of [REDACTED] about the planned reduction in parking in Tovil Hill car park to one hour from 2 hours. [REDACTED] runs the above hair salon which is adjacent to this car park. We have been having conversations with Tovil Parish Council about the parking and the need for us to have a 3 hour time limit or for us to have a parking permit that we can give to [REDACTED] for over 3 hours. The [REDACTED] did issue us with a parking permit, but it was not done official we found to our cost as one of your parking attendants issued a parking ticket on a vehicle that had this permit in the window. We now find that instead of increasing the parking and not giving us an official parking permit, they have had a meeting without informing us [REDACTED],</p>

	<p>even after us having heated conversations about lots of the issues we have had with the Tovil Parish Council on this car park), [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Well we have spoken with a number of the businesses adjacent to this car park and residents of Tovil and none of them have been consulted about this 1 hour restriction. We have got a petition going which we will send into you currently at over 50 names and also individual letters from businesses and Tovil residents complaining about this. Borough Council and Parish Council I thought are there to help support local businesses and support the locals and take into account what people want.</p> <p>This decision seems to have been mad without any consultation; the Parish Council seem to have just gone ahead with it.</p> <p>If this goes ahead it will cause the closure of [REDACTED] and I feel will affect the other businesses. [REDACTED] is part of the community and lots of older people [REDACTED] and they cannot get into town.</p> <p>We will be contacting the clerk of Tovil Parish Council to advice that myself and a number of other businesses and local people would like it put on the next meeting agenda 5th March to voice our views.</p> <p>We are also contacting Helen Grant and will be talking to the Kent Messenger and local news about the way that parish council has handled this situation and the lies and the false parking permits had out, should make good reading.</p>
3	<p>I am writing to object the parking limit being reduced from 2 hours to 1 hour in Tovil Hill car park.</p> <p>I work in [REDACTED] which is a small business located [REDACTED] the car park. Many of my clients [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>If my clients can't park then I will lose my clients meaning I will lose money there for I won't be able to work in the salon – the [REDACTED] will be closed down. I object to the reduced hours. You're supposed to support small businesses; instead this will close us down. We have until 12th March to sort this. Yet we have [REDACTED] booked up until May – are we expected to ring them up and say sorry we're going to cancel you, as there's no parking and you will get a ticket if you park in the car park?</p>
4	<p>I write to lodge my objection to the Parking Consolidation Order 2008, in respect of the Tovil amenity car park.</p> <p>I believe the proposal is to reduce the waiting time at this car park to 1 hour. I lodge my appeal on the basis that this is completely and catastrophically detrimental to the small businesses directly adjacent to the car park. They completely rely on the car park for their trade.</p> <p>From my own perspective, I [REDACTED]. [REDACTED]. Most [REDACTED].</p> <p>Reducing the wait time to an hour will mean I am unable to park as a customer [REDACTED], by necessity I will chose an alternative [REDACTED] with parking facilities elsewhere. Other customers will obviously do the same, resulting in a catastrophic effect to this business.</p> <p>At a time when Maidstone Borough Council are actively seeking to support small and thriving businesses, I am completely shocked by this</p>

	<p>arbitrary stance.</p> <p>Customers at [REDACTED] would be willing to pay for parking to attend this salon and to continue to support this local business. Why could the council not install a pay machine? Or provide some kind of permit scheme to this business that they can share with customers?</p> <p>I look forward to your response and update on these arbitrary proposals.</p>
5	<p>I am writing to object to the reduction on the parking restriction to one hour.</p> <p>I am the owner of [REDACTED] Church Street, Tovil. I have a lot of customers that spend more than 2 hours in the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] etc. Reducing the parking will force us to close the shop as [REDACTED] can take longer than an hour.</p> <p>We have a lot of disabled customers in the shop as the car park is convenient. We also do a service to long term customers that are house bound and we would no longer be able to go out and offer this service.</p>
6	<p>I am writing to you to object to the planned reduction in the parking within Tovil Hill car park from 2 hours to 1 hour.</p> <p>My family own [REDACTED] and this change will mean that our [REDACTED] will have to close.</p> <p>Our [REDACTED] is part of the Tovil community and we offer a service to the old and young and on a few occasions a day on [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p> <p>Tovil Parish Council has not consulted any business or local people about this reduction. Why has it been proposed?</p> <p>Local Councils and Parish Councils should support local businesses not force them out of business.</p>
7	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed Order 2018, restricting the hours of parking to 1 hour in Tovil Hill car park.</p> <p>I regularly visit [REDACTED] and have a 2+hour appointment every few weeks and will find this very inconvenient. Would it not be possible to either make this a pay or display with 1st hour free and the option to pay more for longer stay, or better still issue a business bay solely for the use of [REDACTED]? The only other option I will have is to leave the [REDACTED] to move my car!!</p> <p>I thought we were supposed to support local small businesses not put them <u>out</u> of business.</p>
8	<p>With reference to the above proposal, to reduce the current duration of parking from the current 2 hours to 1 hour, in Tovil Hill car park, I would like to raise the following objections: Whilst my trips to [REDACTED] would not be affected by the proposed changes, I do know that it would adversely affect those [REDACTED] who rely on the car park to be able to attend [REDACTED] at Tovil. My [REDACTED] is disabled and uses [REDACTED] [REDACTED] partly because of the close proximity of the car park. She would not be able to complete all her visits to [REDACTED] in one hour.</p> <p>The other businesses nearby do not require longer than one hour for their customers but the [REDACTED] would lose trade if the parking allocation was reduced.</p> <p>Please consider the needs of the customers of the [REDACTED]. Small businesses need all the help they can get.</p>

9	<p>With reference to the above proposal, to reduce the current duration of parking from the current 2 hours to 1 hour in Tovil Hill car park, I would like to raise the following objections: I am disabled and use [REDACTED]. I rely on my daughter to get me there and being able to use the car park opposite. The proposed reduction from 2 hours to 1 hour would not always be enough time for me to [REDACTED]. There are limited spaces but then the Post Office and Chinese Take Away do not require long term parking. Reducing the time allocation at this car park would cause me considerable problems as someone who is disabled and does nothing to help small businesses like [REDACTED]. I hope that a sensible decision is made and the proposed changes are not implemented.</p>
10	<p>With reference to the above proposal, to reduce the current duration of parking from the current 2 hours to 1 hour in Tovil Hill car park, I would like to raise the following objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst 1 hour is definitely enough time for patrons of the Post Office and Chinese Take Away which are situated opposite the car park, but not for [REDACTED]. The previous 2 hour allocation is not always long enough for an appointment [REDACTED]. This reduction would penalise disabled/elderly users of [REDACTED] who rely on the close proximity of the car park. This reduction does nothing to assist small businesses – in this case [REDACTED] – who will lose trade because of this proposed change. <p>I am unsure of the reasoning behind this proposed change, but as the car park is not near a railway station or other facility which may make it attractive to long term parkers, I do not understand why there is a need to change the current arrangements. If there is a 'need' then maybe special arrangements could be made for clients using the hairdressers to ensure that neither they nor [REDACTED] are disadvantaged. I really hope that a sensible decision can be reached.</p>
11	<p>With reference to the above proposal, to reduce the current duration of parking from the current 2 hours to 1 hours in Tovil Hill car park, I would like to raise the following objections:</p> <p>Whilst one hour is satisfactory for using the Post Office and Chinese Take Away, one hour is not enough time for appointments at [REDACTED].</p> <p>My [REDACTED] is elderly and disabled and relies on the use of the car park [REDACTED] at Tovil. Reducing the allocated time to one hour is barely enough time to [REDACTED].</p> <p>If further restrictions are to be put in place then maybe it would be possible to have some sort of voucher is someone is using the [REDACTED]? I trust there will be a satisfactory and sensible resolution to this issue that does not penalise small businesses and their clients.</p>

	Petitions
1	<p>I am writing to object the Consolidation Order 2018 regarding the parking restriction in Tovil Hill car park. I am supporting small local businesses by signing this letter. (24 signatories) Many of the businesses need longer than 2 hours in the car park, whether it's in the hairdressers, the Post Office, the beauty salon, the pub or Chinese. These businesses need supporting or will end up closing down, creating more traffic in town due to people having to go elsewhere. Tovil Council and Maidstone Borough Council should be supporting local businesses. I object to the parking restrictions that you're planning to enforce in Tovil Hill car park.</p>
2	<p>I am writing to object the Consolidation Order 2018 regarding the parking restrictions in Tovil Hill car park. I am supporting small local businesses by signing this letter. (46 signatories) Many of the businesses need longer than 2 hours in the car park, whether it's in the hairdressers, the post office, the beauty salon, the pub or Chinese. These businesses need supporting or will end up closing down, creating more traffic in town due to people having to go elsewhere. Tovil Council and Maidstone Borough Council should be supporting local businesses. I object to the parking restrictions that you planning to enforce in Tovil Hill car park.</p>
3	<p>We the undersigned (14 signatories) support [REDACTED] objection to the proposed reduction in waiting times at the Parish Tovil Hill car park as it would harm local businesses and cause parking overspill onto our already clogged streets.</p>
4	<p>Raise the car parking limit! Save [REDACTED] (11 signatories)</p>

**STRATEGIC PLANNING,
SUSTAINABILITY AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

10 April 2018

Objections to Off Street Parking Places Order - Sutton Valence

Final Decision-Maker	Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee
Lead Director	William Cornall Director of Regeneration & Place
Lead Officer and Report Author	Charlie Reynolds, Operations Engineer Parking Services
Classification	Public
Wards affected	Sutton Valence

Executive Summary

This report presents to the Committee the results following public consultation carried out in relation to the proposed variation of The Borough of Maidstone (Off-Street Parking Places) (Variation No 9) Order 2017.

The report makes recommendations to the Committee to consider the objections received as part of the formal consultation process as required under the Parking Places (Variation of Charges) Act 2017.

This report makes the following recommendations to this Committee:

1. That the Committee agrees the recommendation to proceed in relation to The Borough of Maidstone (Off-Street Parking Places) (Variation No9) Order 2017 and agree to make the Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
2. That the Committee agrees that the objectors are informed of the outcome as identified in the report and that the orders be sealed.

Timetable

Meeting	Date
Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee.	10 April 2018

Objections to Off Street Parking Places Order - Sutton Valence

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 As part of the legal process to vary the Off Street Parking Places Order, the Council are required to conduct a formal consultation process which includes the placement of public notices in the car park and notices in the local press.
- 1.2 The Parking Places (Variation of Charges) Act 2017 also makes provision in relation to the procedure to be followed by local authorities when varying the parking places order and requires any objections to be considered and reported formally.
- 1.3 Correspondence was sent to statutory and non-statutory consultees, neighbouring residential properties and notices were placed in the car park.
- 1.4 A Public Notice formally advertising The Borough of Maidstone (Off-Street Parking Places) (Variation No9) Order 2017 was published in Local Press during the week ending Friday 23rd June 2017.
- 1.5 Full details were contained in the draft orders which, together with a copy of the Public Notices, and a statement of the Council's reasons for proposing to make the orders were placed on deposit at the Main Reception, County Hall, Maidstone, Kent, ME14 1XX, and at The Link reception desk, Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone, ME15 6JQ.
- 1.6 The details of the proposals were also available on- line at www.kentonline.co.uk

Objections received

- 1.7 Sutton Valence Parish Council requested that Parking Services put forward a proposal to place restrictions within the Village Car Park in order to manage parking demand. Parking Services therefore proposed to introduce a "Closed" period from 07.15 – 08.15 to deter long term parking and upon instruction from the Parish Council, introduce a permit holders section where residents could purchase a permit at the cost of £120.00 per annum direct from Sutton Valence Parish Council.
- 1.8 During the formal consultation period Parking Services received 6 objections. These were based on the grounds that:
 - the demand for parking is minimal
 - vehicles could be dispersed onto the adjacent roads causing obstruction and impeding traffic flow, increasing safety concerns.
 - the cost of the permit is excessive and greater than the residents scheme within the town centre.
- 1.9 The proposal is intended to increase parking availability and reduce long term parking within the facility and although it is appreciated that there may be some inconvenience during busy periods it should also be noted that the introduction of a permit holders only section will ensure the permit

holders have parking availability. The permit holder's area has also been resurfaced by the parish council and marked bays implemented. Visitors will also be able to obtain a visitors permit from Sutton Valence Parish Council.

- 1.10 After careful consideration, it is unlikely that vehicles will migrate to the highway requiring intervention from Kent Police or Kent County Council Highways.
 - 1.11 1 letter of support was received in relation to the proposals.
 - 1.12 A full summary of the consultation results are contained in Appendix 1.
 - 1.13 Proposed orders were advertised and all comments received during the consultation were reviewed and considered and formally presented at the Parish meeting held on 26th July 2017 and subsequently during a Parish meeting held on 14th September 2017.
 - 1.14 Sutton Valence Parish Council subsequently amended the proposals to reflect the views of the objectors and amended the permit charge administered by the parish to £96.00per annum. The parish council also proposed an amendment to the "Closed" period to 06.15 – 07.15.
 - 1.15 Further consultation was therefore undertaken by Parking Services and 1 objector withdrew their objection and 1 withdrew part of their objection. However 5 objectors remain who have concerns that there is no assurance of security that the new Permit Holders section is not sufficient enough to cope with demand , and that if restrictions were to proceed residents may park on the adjacent roads presenting a larger problem.
 - 1.16 Recommendation: To recommend to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transportation Committee to proceed with the amended proposal as the Parish Council have addressed some of the concerns raised as they feel that the Permit Holder section will increase parking capacity and improve customers' ability to park and utilise the facilities.
-

2. AVAILABLE OPTIONS

- 2.1 That the Committee considers objections and agrees the recommendations in relation to The Borough of Maidstone (Off-Street Parking Places) (Variation No9) Order 2017 and agree to make the Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and that the Committee agrees that the objectors are informed of the outcome as identified in the report and that the orders be sealed.
 - 2.2 To not proceed with the recommendations would result in the order not being implemented, which is intended to regulate the parking by reducing parking difficulties identified by Sutton Valence Parish Council.
 - 2.3 To make the orders as advertised would not take account of comments received during formal consultation and will be contrary to the requirements of the Parking Places (Variation of Charges) Act 2017.
-

3. PREFERRED OPTION AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That the Committee considers objections and agrees the recommendations in relation to The Borough of Maidstone (Off-Street Parking Places) (Variation No9) Order 2017 and agree to make the Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 3.2 That the Committee agrees that the objectors are informed of the outcome as identified in the report and that the orders be sealed.
- 3.3 The proposal is intended to support the Council's priority for Maidstone to keeping Maidstone Borough an attractive place for all by managing parking demand and regulating antisocial parking behaviour.
-

4. RISK

- 4.1 Consideration must be given to objectors' comments and letter of support in relation to the proposal. However this must be balanced against the low risk of vehicle migration impacting on road safety or the free flow of traffic in the local area.
-

5. NEXT STEPS: COMMUNICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISION

- 5.1 Where agreed The Borough of Maidstone (Off-Street Parking Places) (Variation No9) Order 2017 will be amended accordingly and sealed by Mid Kent Legal Services.
- 5.2 The 'Has Made' order will be advertised in line with legal requirements set out under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 5.3 The objectors will be informed of the outcome.
-

6. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS

Issue	Implications	Sign-off
Impact on Corporate Priorities	The proposals are intended to support the Council's priority to improve access across the Borough through better roads, thereby keeping Maidstone Borough an attractive place for all.	Jeff Kitson Parking Services Manager
Risk Management	Consideration has been given to objections and formal letters of support with regard to each proposal. However this has been balanced against the low risk of vehicle migration	Jeff Kitson Parking Services Manager

	impacting on road safety or the free flow of traffic in the local area.	
Financial	The costs of the order variation and implementation will be met from within the existing Parking Services budget.	
Staffing	It is anticipated that the services will be delivered within existing staffing levels.	Jeff Kitson Parking Services Manager
Legal	The relevant statutory provisions and requirements are set out in the body of the report. Formal orders will need to be sealed by Mid Kent Legal Services.	Keith Trowell, Interim Team Leader, (Corporate Governance)
Privacy and Data Protection	There are no specific privacy or data protection issues to address.	Keith Trowell, Interim Team Leader, (Corporate Governance)
Equalities	None identified	Equalities and Corporate Policy Officer
Crime and Disorder	The developments identified within this report will have no negative impact on Crime and Disorder.	Jeff Kitson Parking Services Manager
Procurement	None identified	Jeff Kitson Parking Services Manager.

7. REPORT APPENDICES

7.1 Appendix 1 – The original proposal.

7.2 Appendix 2 – The summary of correspondence received during the consultation period.

7.3 Appendix 3 – The amended proposal.

8. BACKGROUND PAPERS

8.1 None.

**THE BOROUGH OF MAIDSTONE (OFF-STREET PARKING PLACES)
(VARIATION No. 9) ORDER 2017**

Notice is hereby given that MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL propose to make the above Order under section 35 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, having obtained the consent of the Kent County Council in accordance with Section 39(3) of the Act, and of all other enabling powers, and after consultation with the chief officer of police in accordance with Part III of Schedule 9 of the Act -

The Order will;

- (i) To introduce a maximum stay of 23 hours in the Sutton Valence Village Hall Car Park with a "Closed" period from 07.15 -08.15.
- (ii) Introduce a Permit Holders Section of the Car Park.

1 Item No.	2 Parking Place	3 Classes of Vehicles	4 Days of Parking	5 Hours of Parking	6 Duration of Parking (hours at any one time)
34	Sutton Valence Village Hall Car Park (A274 North Street, Sutton Valence)	(i) Passenger vehicles (ii) Motor cycle with or without side car (iii) Dual purpose vehicle (iv) Other vehicles with a maximum gross weight not exceeding one ton	All Days	08.15 hrs to 07.15 hrs the following day	23 hours No parking permitted between 07.15 hrs and 08.15 hrs during the " Closed " period
	Permit Holders only section Area situation in the north-east corner of the car park.	Season ticket holders only may use this area of the parking place.	All Days	All hours	24

Copies of the proposed Orders, any Orders which will be amended by the proposed Orders, a statement of the Council's reasons for proposing to make the Orders and maps indicating the location and effect may be examined at the Reception Desk, Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone ME15 6JQ during normal office hours, from Friday 23rd June 2017.

The deposit documents will also be available in the Main Reception, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XX.

If you wish to object to a proposed Order you should send the grounds for your objection in writing to the Parking Services Manager quoting the name of the Order to, Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone ME15 6JQ by 12 noon on Friday 21st July 2017. Indications of support for the proposals are welcome and should be sent to the same address.

If you have any questions concerning the Order or require further information please contact Maidstone Borough Council Parking Services (01622 602377) during normal office hours.

Parking Services Manager
Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone ME15 6JQ

Appendix 2

Sutton Valence Village Hall Car Park

Objection 6	Comment 4	Support 1
-------------	-----------	-----------

45

Name	Address	Comments	Response
[REDACTED]		I am reading your email with interest. Although this carpark is outside my ward, I am curious as to why this decision was taken and whether it will have any implications for the local Primary School which heavily relies on this car-park.	The Parish Council have requested restrictions be placed on the Car Park to deter overnight and all day parking to help manage parking demand, this should not have a detrimental effect on the School as the car park will only be "closed" between 07.15 -08.15 which we anticipate will alleviate the overnight/all day parking. However if during the consultation period this is raised as an issue we can amend the times if necessary.
Kent Police		Kent Police have no objections to offer in relation to this scheme	
Objection	[REDACTED]	I write in response to your letter dated 21 st June 2017 and object to the implementation of the proposed order. My reasons for objection are as follows: 1. The demand for parking at the village hall is minimal. The number of residents vehicles parked in the car park is generally in order of 10-12 vehicles only. There are very few events (in my experience, maybe one event per month) where there is a deficiency in parking spaces available either to the users of the village hall or to the residents. In these rare circumstances, the removal of the resident's vehicles would in any case not free up sufficient	Thank you for your correspondence received in relation to the above proposed parking restrictions. Your comments have been recorded and will be considered as part of the traffic regulation process and I will endeavour to clarify some of the parts you have raised. The Parish Council will authorise permits for the Permit Holders sections and undertake an annual review of allocation. Any changes to the allocation will be authorised by them. The

		<p>spaces to satisfy the over-demand. This statement by the Parish Council is not based on any survey or statistical analysis (that has been made available to residents at least), it is merely cover for them to introduce a revenue-generating permit system.</p> <p><u>The Parking Order is unnecessary for the stated reason.</u></p> <p>2. The residents of North Street have no other parking available to them. Should the order be implemented and a permit system be introduced, those residents that are unable to afford a permit will have no choice but to park either in the Haven Farm lay-by to the South of the village hall or on the road itself. Traffic travels at high speed in this area (often well in excess of the 30mph speed limit). Parking in the road will cause unnecessary obstruction to traffic flow on the Headcorn Road causing delay and risk to motorists (as is currently seen in Leeds Village).</p> <p><u>This presents a serious increased risk of road traffic accident, vehicle damage and risk to pedestrians.</u></p> <p>3. The designated residents parking area and permit system proposed by the Parish Council is not fit for purpose. The Parish Council has been unable to provide sufficient detail describing how the system is to be implemented and monitored, what security arrangements will be put in place and how they propose to ensure the safety of residents moving from the parking area to the properties close to Haven Farm (such as additional lighting</p>	<p>Council may limit the number of permits issued to reflect the limited number of spaces, the area designated for Permit Holders is as per the attached map, however there are no plans to implement parking charges for non-residents.</p> <p>The Parish Council requested the restriction to deter long stay parking and therefore a 07:15 - 08:15 hour parking ban has been put forward, we are therefore conducted consultation on this proposal, however I regret we are unable to reply to each individual comment received, nevertheless once all replies have been collated a report will be presented to the Parish Council for them to consider, the Parish will provide their comments on the proposals, and a report may then be subsequently submitted to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transport Committee, who will make a final decision on the proposal.</p> <p>Thank you once again for taking the time to record your comments and I look forward to being able to update you on the progress of the proposed parking order in the near future.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Further to your correspondence received in the course of the consultation in relation to the above proposal.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>requested in the residents consultation meeting with the Parish Council).</p> <p><u>This presents a direct personal safety risk to residents and their property.</u></p> <p>4. The residents were consulted by the Parish Council during the aforementioned consultation meeting. The Parish Council met with some resistance from residents, a number of queries were raised and suggestions made. The Parish Council has failed to respond to residents despite stating that they would do so. They have proceeded to apply for a Parking Order without consultation of residents and presumably to avoid having to respond to the questions they were asked and without consideration of the suggestions made.</p> <p><u>The Parish Council is acting in an under-hand manner in order to enforce a revenue-making permit scheme.</u></p> <p>5. The car park forms part of the memorial playing field gifted to the residents of Sutton Valence. It is for one unethical and I will be taking advice as to the legality of a proposal for the Parish Council to then utilise this ground as a means of revenue from Parish residents.</p> <p><u>The residents are not a revenue service for the Parish Council- the residents already pay Council Tax to support the Parish and utilise the local services.</u></p> <p>It is my belief that the Parking Services Manager should</p>	<p>During the consolation period we received a number of letters raising Objection and as a result of the views expressed and concerns raised a Parish Meeting was held on 4th September 2017 and at the meeting it was resolved to amend the Closed Period from; The Proposed 07.15- 08.15 to 06.15 to 07.15, and to reduce the cost of the Permits from £120.00 to £96.00 per annum which can be paid in two half yearly instalments.</p> <p>The proposed Permit Holders section of the Car park was also subsequently resurfaced and lined with numbered bays that can be allocated.</p> <p>Therefore I respectfully request that you consider withdrawing your objection which would enable us to continue with the proposal and if you are agreeable to withdrawing your objection this must be in writing, or if you wish to discuss the matter further please do not hesitate in contacting me.</p> <p>I apologise for any inconvenience caused and I would like to thank you for your comments.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>look very seriously at this proposal and consider in detail the justification that the Parish Council is putting forward. The overall effect of this proposal were it to be implemented would be detrimental to the local residents, to safety and to traffic flow through Sutton Valence. It would also fail to meet the objectives put forward by the Parish Council.</p>	
<p>Comments at first then objected, as now withdrawn 1 objection</p>		<p>I received your letter dated 21st June 2017 with reference to the off street parking places order for the Sutton Valence Village Hall car park (Off Street Parking Places Variation No. 9). I would thank you to subsequently forward this on to the Parking Services Manager.</p> <p>As a resident I have some concerns and questions with regards to this order and they are as follows;</p> <p>1. Firstly, the cost of the permit seems vastly greater than any Resident Parking Permit you show here http://www.maidstone.gov.uk/residents/parking-and-streets/residents-parking-permits2. I appreciate there's a difference between on and off-street parking but nearly five times as much in expense per permit seems very excessive. I raised this point with the council at one of their meetings and the response was simply that they were well within their rights and the £120 cost is reasonable, not exactly a satisfactory answer. I would welcome any comments from the Parking Services Manager as to how this amount came to be agreed upon.</p>	<p>Thank you for your correspondence received in relation to the above proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>Your comments have been recorded and will be considered as part of the traffic regulation process and I will endeavour to clarify some of the parts you have raised.</p> <p>The cost of the permit was set by the Parish Council who will authorise season tickets issued and undertake an annual review of allocation. Any changes to the allocation will be authorised by them. The Council may limit the number of season tickets issued to reflect the limited number of spaces, the area designated for Permit Holders is as per the attached map.</p> <p>This is a proposal on which we are currently conducted consultation on, I regret we are unable to reply to each individual comment received, however once all replies have been collated a report will be presented to the</p>

		<p>2. Where will the designated area be in the car park? Why not simply expand the general car park if that is what is happening anyway?</p> <p>3. What security will be placed on this designated area? Where I park currently, there is at least the benefit of some street lighting and the Village Hall's security light when walking to my car when it is dark. After talking to other residents, I know that many would feel safer if there is suitable lighting.</p> <p>4. When does this Order come into effect?</p> <p>5. We are a two car household, is there any opportunity for concession on a second permit?</p> <p>6. Given that we are a two car household, with a permit each would we be guaranteed designated spaces or do you have an alternative idea in mind? It wouldn't do to pay for a permit if all the spaces were taken by other permit holders because the area's capacity cannot cope with the number of permit holding residents.</p> <p>7. How will the area be monitored to ensure that only permit holders are parking in the area?</p> <p>I welcome your Parking Services Manager's answers and comments.</p>	<p>Parish Council for them to consider, the Parish will provide their comments on the proposals, and a report may then be subsequently submitted to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transport Committee, who will make a final decision on the proposal.</p> <p>Thank you once again for taking the time to record your comments and I look forward to being able to update you on the progress of the proposed parking order in the near future.</p> <p>Thank you for your further correspondence in relation to the above proposed parking restrictions.</p>
		<p>Thank you for coming back to me regarding this.</p>	<p>Please find attached a copy of the relevant map.</p>

		<p>I look forward to hearing how this progresses but prior to that could you attach the map you mentioned? There wasn't any file attached.</p>	<p>I hope this if of assistance to you, however if you do require any additional information please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
		<p>Is there any prediction on how many spaces will be made available in this area? I'm not overly confident this area will cope with the demand from all properties in this stretch that currently use the car park.</p>	<p>Thank you for your further correspondence in relation to the above proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>Unfortunately at this early stage, the exact number of spaces and other specific details have not yet been established. We will of course update you accordingly when more information is available.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to record your comments and I look forward to being able to update you on the progress of the proposed parking order in the near future.</p>
		<p>After meeting with the Parish Council to gain some answers to the previous correspondence, I'd like to formally object to the parking order on the following grounds.</p> <p>1) The cost is too great per permit at £120, especially in comparison to other permits set by Maidstone Borough Council and also based on research of other Parish Councils in a similar predicament. I asked the Parish Council why the</p>	<p>Thank you for your correspondence received in relation to the above proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>Your comments have been recorded and will be considered as part of the traffic regulation process.</p> <p>Thank you once again for taking the time to record your comments and I look forward to</p>

		<p>cost is so great and the Clerk informed me that the cost of tarmacking the area would cost around £20,000. This would be £20,000 on an area that nobody other than the Parish Council have asked for, yet many residents including myself feel punished simply because the village hall tends to overbook the facilities on occasion, especially during football season. Any cost of maintenance or upgrade to a public area should be incorporated into our Council Tax as per normal.</p> <p>2) There is no assurance of security. Where I currently park the car is across the road from my property and has the benefit of some street lighting and the village hall's security light, if my car alarm goes off I will clearly hear it, if I am forced to park right at the other end of the car park then I will not hear a thing. As the Parish Council cannot give me any assurance that there will at least be some element of security (e.g. lighting) then this is something I strongly object to in the interest of safety.</p> <p>3) The Parish Council can use the area marked out as an overflow car park in its current state, it would be no different to a gravel car park seen in many other places. There would be no need for the expense, no need for permits and solve the problem the Parish Council has highlighted.</p> <p>4) The area is not big enough to cope with the demand of those who would require a permit. The Parish Council has said that in that case permit holders can park</p>	<p>being able to update you on the progress of the proposed parking order in the near future.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Further to your correspondence received in the course of the consultation in relation to the above proposal.</p> <p>During the consultation period we received a number of letters raising Objection and as a result of the views expressed and concerns raised a Parish Meeting was held on 4th September 2017 and at the meeting it was resolved to amend the Closed Period from; The Proposed 07.15- 08.15 to 06.15 to 07.15, and to reduce the cost of the Permits from £120.00 to £96.00 per annum which can be paid in two half yearly instalments.</p> <p>The proposed Permit Holders section of the Car park was also subsequently resurfaced and lined with numbered bays that can be allocated.</p> <p>Therefore I respectfully request that you consider withdrawing your objection which would enable us to continue with the proposal and if you are agreeable to withdrawing your objection this must be in writing, or if you wish to discuss the matter further please do</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>in bays up the same end in the main car park, so I cannot see why if that is the case we cannot park where we currently do down the other end of the car park. It doesn't seem right that visitors would be able to park where is most convenient for free but that option would not be available to those paying for permits.</p> <p>5) If this Parking Order goes ahead then some residents may park in front of their property in objection, presenting a larger problem for the village's traffic flow.</p> <p>Please acknowledge by return receipt of this formal objection.</p> <hr/> <p>I formally withdraw on points 1 (reluctantly as the cost is still far from MBC permit charges) and 4 due to the revision of cost and what the Parish Council plan for over-demand but stand by the others. Point 3 is null and void as the tarmacking had already been proceeded with despite the Parking Order being fully in place because of the objections. I would have thought this work would have not proceeded until everything had been 100% ratified and in place? It is concerning that this work was proceeded with and it is only now you are asking me to renege my objections in order to ratify the proposal.</p> <p>In addition to my points made, the cost of the tarmacking came in significantly less than the £20,000 quoted during the consultation (around £13,000 if I am not mistaken). I know that the Parish Council needs to recoup the cost and</p>	<p>not hesitate in contacting me.</p>
--	--	---	---------------------------------------

		<p>limit the expenditure somehow but the whole point of this was because the Village Hall felt they were missing out on bookings because of the parking situation. Surely now that the tarmacking has been completed anyway and parking capacity has been increased, there is no reason why the Village Hall couldn't recoup from the bookings that they felt they were missing out on?</p> <p>If you would like to discuss any of these points further then please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	
<p>████████ rang on 8th Feb 18 at 14.01 He was enquiry why the charge for the Permits are being introduced, He will be writing in to express his views although confirmed that he did not object Per se</p>	<p>██████████</p>	<p>1/ If the extension to the car park had been completed with hard surface tarmac and in general use when constructed in August/Sep 2014, instead of being locked up and used only as an overflow car park when events in the hall or on the playing field are taking place, there would have been ample parking places.</p> <p>2/ If vehicle users disregard the parking order what punishment would be incurred and who and how would it be enforced.</p> <p>3/ Where would the permit holders car park be and would permit holders be allowed to use it during the day.</p> <p>4/ Parking availability will improve by opening up the uncompleted car park extension at all times which was constructed at a cost of £11759.99 using council tax payers money.</p> <p>5/ Charging another £120 for a parking permit for a car</p>	<p>Thank you for your correspondence received in relation to the above proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>Your comments have been recorded and will be considered as part of the traffic regulation process and I will endeavour to clarify some of the parts you have raised.</p> <p>The Parish Council will authorise permits for the Permit Holders sections and undertake an annual review of allocation. Any changes to the allocation will be authorised by them. The Council may limit the number of permits issued to reflect the limited number of spaces, the area designated for Permit Holders is as per the attached map, however there are no plans to implement parking charges for non-residents.</p> <p>The Parish Council requested the restriction to</p>

		<p>park I have already paid for is in my view a money grabbing exercise.</p> <hr/> <p>The contents of your letter of 6th February 2018 have been noted.</p> <p>Please note the comments and issues raised in my letter to [REDACTED] of Maidstone Borough Council dated 3rd July 2017 and my letters to [REDACTED] of Sutton Valence Parish Council dated 3rd September 2012, 1st November 2014 and 15th October 2017.</p> <p>The comments and issues are still relevant today.</p>	<p>deter long stay parking and therefore a 07:15 - 08:15 hour parking ban has been put forward, we are therefore conducted consultation on this proposal, however I regret we are unable to reply to each individual comment received, nevertheless once all replies have been collated a report will be presented to the Parish Council for them to consider, the Parish will provide their comments on the proposals, and a report may then be subsequently submitted to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transport Committee, who will make a final decision on the proposal.</p> <p>Thank you once again for taking the time to record your comments and I look forward to being able to update you on the progress of the proposed parking order in the near future.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Further to your correspondence received in the course of the consultation in relation to the above proposal.</p> <p>During the consulation period we received a number of letters raising Objection and as a result of the views expressed and concerns raised a Parish Meeting was held on 4th September 2017 and at the meeting it was resolved to amend the Closed Period from; The Proposed 07.15- 08.15 to 06.15 to 07.15, and to reduce the cost of the Permits from £120.00 to £96.00 per annum</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>which can be paid in two half yearly instalments.</p> <p>The proposed Permit Holders section of the Car park was also subsequently resurfaced and lined with numbered bays that can be allocated.</p> <p>Therefore I respectfully request that you consider withdrawing your objection which would enable us to continue with the proposal and if you are agreeable to withdrawing your objection this must be in writing, or if you wish to discuss the matter further please do not hesitate in contacting me.</p> <p>I apologise for any inconvenience caused and I would like to thank you for your comments.</p>
<p>In Theory in favour ,then in agreement of the proposal</p>		<p>I am writing in response to your letter dated 21st June 2017 and received 22nd June 2017, relating to the Parking Order for the Sutton Valence Village Hall Car Park. Whilst, in theory, I agree with the proposal of the Parking Order, I do have some questions for clarification please, as follows;</p> <p>1) The Parking Order references an area for permit holders to park in, can you confirm exactly which area of the car park this actually is. There is a fenced area that has been prepared with a hardcore finish only, is this the area? If yes is the intention to top finish this area, without which damage to tyres is a possibility? Again if this is the area how many cars is this intended for, at previous meetings it was indicated as 25 which seems a tight fit for this area, is</p>	<p>Thank you for your correspondence received in relation to the above proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>Your comments have been recorded and will be considered as part of the traffic regulation process and I will endeavour to clarify some of the parts you have raised.</p> <p>The Parish Council will authorise permits for the Permit Holders sections and undertake an annual review of allocation. Any changes to the allocation will be authorised by them. The Council may limit the number of permits issued to reflect the limited number of spaces, the area designated for Permit Holders is as per the attached map, however there are no plans to implement parking charges for non-</p>

		<p>there an agreed number of permits already confirmed?</p> <p>2) I fail to see how the ruling of a parking ban between the hours of 07.15 to 08.15 can help to ease the parking congestion for events happening later that day. Is there an explanation as to how this works? How will the hour be policed regarding someone to check to see who is parking legally and who is not? Those that will undoubtedly park illegally I assume will receive a fine for not following the rules?</p> <p>3) The issuing of a parking permit is a guarantee of a parking spot or a right to park only permit? If a guarantee of a spot, again how will this be policed to guarantee my spot being available whenever I require to park?</p> <p>4) How will the topic of my visitors parking be addressed? If I have guests who stay overnight, will there be additional passes issued to allow them to park without the need to move their vehicles by 07.15?</p> <p>5) Are there any plans to implement a parking charge for non-residents, those that use the car park when dropping off children at school, or dog walkers for instance?</p> <p>As I mentioned at the beginning of this e-mail, I am in theory in favour of a guaranteed parking spot for a payable fee of £120 per annum, however the initial details are very unclear and further clarification is appreciated from your side please.</p>	<p>residents.</p> <p>The Parish Council requested the restriction to deter long stay parking and therefore a 07.15 - 08.15 hour parking ban has been put forward, we are therefore conducted consultation on this proposal, however I regret we are unable to reply to each individual comment received, nevertheless once all replies have been collated a report will be presented to the Parish Council for them to consider, the Parish will provide their comments on the proposals, and a report may then be subsequently submitted to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transport Committee, who will make a final decision on the proposal.</p> <p>Thank you once again for taking the time to record your comments and I look forward to being able to update you on the progress of the proposed parking order in the near future.</p> <p>Further to your correspondence received in the course of the consultation in relation to the above proposal.</p> <p>During the consultation period we received a number of letters raising Objection and as a result of the views expressed and concerns raised a Parish Meeting was held on 4th September</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>I look forward to hearing from you soon regarding my above enquiry.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Many thanks for your below response to my recent e-mail relating to the residents parking for the Sutton Valence Village Hall. It seems that you have taken my e-mail as an objection to the parking proposal and this was never the intention, in fact within my e-mail I clearly state that I am in agreement for the proposal, the only intention of my e-mail being to clarify some points that remained unclear following the last parish council meeting.</p> <p>If my e-mail is still considered as an objection to the parking proposal then of course I am happy to confirm I do not object and if needed, this e-mail can be taken as my withdrawal to any objection seen. I trust this is all you require from me.</p> <p>Finally, I have seen already that the newly surfaced area is already being used by non-residents for parking, even when there is no requirement for overflow parking. Can you confirm when this area will be residents only and the appropriate notifications will be in place?</p> <p>I trust the above is clear and confirms my agreement to the proposal, I look forward to hearing from you soon</p>	<p>2017 and at the meeting it was resolved to amend the Closed Period from; The Proposed 07.15- 08.15 to 06.15 to 07.15, and to reduce the cost of the Permits from £120.00 to £96.00 per annum which can be paid in two half yearly instalments.</p> <p>The proposed Permit Holders section of the Car park was also subsequently resurfaced and lined with numbered bays that can be allocated.</p> <p>Therefore I respectfully request that you consider withdrawing your objection which would enable us to continue with the proposal and if you are agreeable to withdrawing your objection this must be in writing, or if you wish to discuss the matter further please do not hesitate in contacting me.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Thank you for your confirmation withdrawing your "Objection".</p> <p>Now that the proposed Permit Holders section of the Car Park has been resurfaced we are preparing to draft the Order that allows us to erect the appropriate signage and enforce the restrictions, however prior to this we are consulting with the objections before we can implement the restrictions, unfortunately if they do not withdraw their objections there will be further delays to the order as we</p>
--	--	--	---

		regarding my notification question.	<p>would be required to submit a report to the appropriate body who would then take a decision on whether to proceed with the order.</p> <p>Once we have any further updates on the proposal we will advise you accordingly.</p>
Objection		<p>I am writing to you in reference to the above order, letter dated 21st June 2017.</p> <p>I have been a resident for some twenty years and parked my vehicle in Sutton Valence Car Park. I have been to many of the parish council meetings over this proposed issue. However the parish council has not offered a reasonable resolution to this to date, during one of these meetings I had heard one of the councillors say to another “ What shall we charge them, £300 a year”, and as you can imagine the meeting didn’t go well.</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to the proposal of residents being charged, and state my reasons below.</p> <p>(1) The only time that this car park is full is when the W.I. meet at the village hall on the last Tuesday of the month between 0900hrs and 1230hrs when most residents are at work, I therefore do not see a problem, also these people do not reside.</p> <p>(2) On some Sundays when there are football matches on, and this sport is seasonal, those that attend to watch and</p>	<p>Thank you for your correspondence received in relation to the above proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>Your comments have been recorded and will be considered as part of the traffic regulation process and I will endeavour to clarify some of the parts you have raised.</p> <p>The Parish Council will authorise permits for the Permit Holders sections and undertake an annual review of allocation. Any changes to the allocation will be authorised by them. The Council may limit the number of permits issued to reflect the limited number of spaces, the area designated for Permit Holders is as per the attached map, however there are no plans to implement parking charges for non-residents.</p> <p>The Parish Council requested the restriction to deter long stay parking and therefore a 07:15 - 08:15 hour parking ban has been put forward, we are therefore conducted consultation on this proposal, however I regret we are unable</p>

		<p>play do not reside.</p> <p>(3) During Monday to Friday mornings and afternoons, the parents park in the car park to take and pick up their children as they are no longer allowed to park in or outside the primary school, hence using the car park, again they do not reside.</p> <p>(4) In answers to 1, 2 and 3 above I strongly feel that the residents living opposite the car park and using it are being targeted for financial gain and if anyone was to be charged it should all of the above.</p> <p>(5) As for your point of no parking between 07:15 and 08:15 I see this as another way of targeting those who pay local council tax. I would also like to know what happens to visitors of residents that may wish to stay overnight, have they got to pay as well?</p> <p>(6) The cost of £120 per year per vehicle is way above the average, I have a colleague that resides in Maidstone and a short walk to the town centre, he is paying £25 per year, per vehicle, which I am sure that you may be aware of.</p> <p>(7) As regards to a designated area for residents, yes that maybe true but at the cost to us, hence the £120 per year, per vehicle.</p> <p>(8) This designated area would hold 18 vehicles and not 25 as mentioned by the parish councillors.</p>	<p>to reply to each individual comment received, nevertheless once all replies have been collated a report will be presented to the Parish Council for them to consider, the Parish will provide their comments on the proposals, and a report may then be subsequently submitted to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transport Committee, who will make a final decision on the proposal.</p> <p>Thank you once again for taking the time to record your comments and I look forward to being able to update you on the progress of the proposed parking order in the near future.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Further to your correspondence received in the course of the consultation in relation to the above proposal.</p> <p>During the consulation period we received a number of letters raising Objection and as a result of the views expressed and concerns raised a Parish Meeting was held on 4th September 2017 and at the meeting it was resolved to amend the Closed Period from; The Proposed 07.15- 08.15 to 06.15 to 07.15, and to reduce the cost of the Permits from £120.00 to £96.00 per annum which can be paid in two half yearly instalments.</p> <p>The proposed Permit Holders section of the Car park was also subsequently resurfaced</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>With thanks in anticipation for your response.</p> <hr/> <p>No Response</p>	<p>and lined with numbered bays that can be allocated.</p> <p>Therefore I respectfully request that you consider withdrawing your objection which would enable us to continue with the proposal and if you are agreeable to withdrawing your objection this must be in writing, or if you wish to discuss the matter further please do not hesitate in contacting me.</p>
<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>I wish to object to the above order for the following reasons.</p> <p>Every week day I use the car park to drop my children off to Sutton Valence Primary School. The car park during these periods becomes very busy as many parents do the same. This method has always been endorsed by the school, as it's a safer way to drop off children.</p> <p>There are times when the car park is filled and vehicles then park in Southways Road, on the verges or in Sutton Valence Private school, until they fitted barriers. The school itself is understandably unable to cater for all the parents dropping off and collecting their children, so the car park is a vital community asset.</p> <p>There are 52 spaces where parents can park, excluding a chained off area, which was supposed to be for residents. I understand from taking to a local resident that they don't use this area as they have to pay for it.</p> <p>The car park and all its spaces are crucial to the safety of the children and in my opinion needs to be extended. To park on the main A274 Sutton Road and try and get the</p>	<p>Thank you for your correspondence received in relation to the above proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>Your comments have been recorded and will be considered as part of the traffic regulation process and I will endeavour to clarify some of the points you have raised.</p> <p>The Parish Council requested the restriction to deter long stay parking and therefore a 07:15 - 08:15 hour parking ban has been put forward, we are therefore conducting a consultation on this proposal, however I regret we are unable to reply to each individual comment received, nevertheless once all replies have been collated a report will be presented to the Parish Council for them to consider, the Parish will provide their comments on the proposals, and a report may then be subsequently submitted to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transport Committee, who will make a final decision on the proposal.</p>

		<p>children out and across the road safely would be treacherous. This is a primary school with children as young as five that may have to exit a vehicle on this road and in my opinion is a tragedy waiting to happen. You must have already undertaken a risk assessment to this affect, or have you not considered the consequences of reducing the car park facilities. If you have I would like to see a copy of the assessment.</p> <p>The car park needs to have the chained area removed and made fit for purpose, so that the all community can use it. I understand that you wish to prevent large vehicles entering the car park and preventing vehicles parked there for prolonged periods, but this scheme is completely ridiculous.</p> <p>This is Maidstone Council penny pinching, which could end with a fatality. The Council needs to talk to users of the car park and perhaps meet the needs of all rather than the few.</p> <hr/> <p>No Response</p>	<p>The Parish Council will authorise permits for the Permit Holders sections and undertake an annual review of allocation. Any changes to the allocation will be authorised by them. The Council may limit the number of permits issued to reflect the limited number of spaces, the area designated for Permit Holders is as per the attached map, however there are no plans to implement parking charges for non-residents.</p> <p>Please be advised if children are attending the breakfast club, you are permitted on the school grounds. However, if you are dropping off children they are only permitted to enter the school between 08:45 and 08:55. The proposed parking restriction is only for 1 hour between the hours of 07:15 and 08:15.</p> <p>Thank you once again for taking the time to record your comments and I look forward to being able to update you on the progress of the proposed parking order in the near future.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Further to your correspondence received in the course of the consultation in relation to the above proposal. During the consolation period we received a number of letters raising Objection and as a result of the views expressed and concerns raised a Parish Meeting was held on 4th September 2017 and at the meeting it was</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>resolved to amend the Closed Period from The Proposed 07.15- 08.15 to 06.15 to 07.15,</p> <p>The proposed Permit Holders section of the Car Park Car park was also subsequently resurfaced and lined with numbered bays that can be allocated.</p> <p>Therefore I respectfully request that you consider withdrawing your objection which would enable us to continue with the proposal and if you are agreeable to withdrawing your objection this must be in writing, or if you wish to discuss the matter further please do not hesitate in contacting me.</p> <p>I apologise for any inconvenience caused and I would like to thank you for your comments.</p>
Comments		<p>Received your letter regarding off road parking at Sutton Valence Village Hall.</p> <p>I would like to purchase a parking permit for £120.</p> <p>My address is [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Thank you for your correspondence regarding Sutton Valence village hall car park.</p> <p>Please be advised at present this is only a proposal going forward.</p> <p>Once we have received all correspondence from residents we will collate the information and send a further response advising.</p>
Objection		<p>I am concerned this will cause disruption on the A274 because some resident will park on the road.</p> <p>Minimum consultation from .MBC and the Parish council, not allowing meaningful discussion and compromise to be</p>	<p>Thank you for your correspondence received in relation to the above proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>Your comments have been recorded and will be considered as part of the traffic regulation process and I will endeavour to clarify some of</p>

		<p>met, just stubbornness of the Chairman of the Parish Council refusing to reduce the cost from £150 per annum to £100 per annum, which was what the residents would have been happy to pay before this parking order.</p> <p>It is seen as victimisation of specific parishioners who have Been ALLOWED to park in the village hall car park, thus earning an easement? (Myself for 25 years) This is seen not just to resolve a problem but for the parish council to increase revenue and, despite the residents already paying tax, they will have to pay more than the other parishioners.</p> <p>Are the residents in the centre of the village, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] having a parking order enforced upon them? Their parking causes me access problems, hardly seems fair.</p> <p>None the less, I will accept a space at £120 per annum, however, my concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Safety, [REDACTED], quite a dark walk in the winter and late at night, especially when groups of youths are congregating in the car park. I will hold the council, MBC and The Parish Council responsible for any frightening occasions when walking from my parked car to my home, quite a long walk for a female who lives alone. I have had issues in the past having had to call the police and seek help from MBC. 2. Overnight Visitors of residents. Where should they park? 	<p>the parts you have raised.</p> <p>The Parish Council requested the restriction to deter long stay parking and therefore a 07.15 - 08.15 hour parking ban has been put forward, we are therefore conducted consultation on this proposal, however I regret we are unable to reply to each individual comment received, nevertheless once all replies have been collated a report will be presented to the Parish Council for them to consider, the Parish will provide their comments on the proposals, and a report may then be subsequently submitted to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transport Committee, who will make a final decision on the proposal.</p> <p>Thank you once again for taking the time to record your comments and I look forward to being able to update you on the progress of the proposed parking order in the near future.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Further to your correspondence received in the course of the consultation in relation to the above proposal.</p> <p>During the consolation period we received a number of letters raising Objection and as a result of the views expressed and concerns raised a Parish Meeting was held on 4th September 2017 and at the meeting it was</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>On the A274?</p> <p>3. Securing my space to prevent others using it?</p> <p>4. Some Visitors to the school's AstroTurf, athletics track and The Nursing home all use the car park. Will this still be allowed is it just the residents opposite that have to pay?</p> <hr/> <p>Thank you for your message and news regarding the reduction in charges and time.</p> <p>However, not all my objections have been addressed or answered so I respectfully feel I have no alternative other than to uphold and maintain my objections which are:</p> <p>1. Safety, I live at 4 North Street, quite a dark walk in the winter and late at night, especially when groups of youths are congregating in the car park. I will hold the council, MBC and The Parish Council responsible for any frightening occasions when walking from my parked car to my home, quite a long walk for a female who lives alone. I have had issues in the past having had to call the police and seek help from MBC.</p> <p>2. Overnight Visitors of residents. Where should they park? On the A274?</p> <p>3. Securing my space to prevent others using it?</p> <p>4. Some Visitors to the school's AstroTurf, athletics track</p>	<p>resolved to amend the Closed Period from;</p> <p>The Proposed 07.15- 08.15 to 06.15 to 07.15, and to reduce the cost of the Permits from £120.00 to £96.00 per annum which can be paid in two half yearly instalments.</p> <p>The proposed Permit Holders section of the Car park was also subsequently resurfaced and lined with numbered bays that can be allocated.</p> <p>Therefore I respectfully request that you consider withdrawing your objection which would enable us to continue with the proposal and if you are agreeable to withdrawing your objection this must be in writing, or if you wish to discuss the matter further please do not hesitate in contacting me.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Thank you for your comments in response to our e-mail of 6th February.</p> <p>1, Although we appreciate your concerns in relation to safety issues, unfortunately it would be very difficult for us to mitigate this, I will however pass your concerns onto the Parish who may be able to place further measures such as improved lighting.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>and The Nursing home all use the car park. Will this still be allowed is it just the residents opposite that have to pay?</p>	<p>2, I have been advised that visitor permits would be available on requests therefore allowing them to utilise the Car Park.</p> <p>3, I believe that the bays will be allocated, although confirmation will need to be sought from the Parish.</p> <p>4, The Permit holders only parking section is being implemented to provide Parking for the Permit Holders, the only restrictions times will be from 06.15 to 07.15 the car park will therefore be unrestricted outside of these times.</p>
<p>Objection</p>		<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed new parking order at the village hall car park on the following grounds;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The overriding factor is that the residents who need to use the car park, as there is little other option, are being used as the fall guy for the greed and incompetence of Sutton Valence Parish Council. 2. Cost; I find the proposed cost for a Permit at £120 absolutely staggering as this is almost five times the price (£25) for residents in the central Maidstone area. On enquiry I have been told that this extortionate cost is to 	<p>Thank you for your correspondence received in relation to the above proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>Your comments have been recorded and will be considered as part of the traffic regulation process and I will endeavour to clarify some of the parts you have raised.</p> <p>The Parish Council requested the restriction to deter long stay parking and therefore a 07.15 - 08.15 hour parking ban has been put forward, we are therefore conducted consultation on this proposal, however I regret we are unable</p>

		<p>pay for tarmac cover over the overspill parking area. This is not for the residents to fund as we already pay the Parish Council handsomely enough via our Council Tax.</p> <p>3. Practicality; The designated parking area for residents is proposed to be at the North East end, as someone who lives at the South end of the car park this proposal is completely impractical.</p> <p>I have a business to run and need to load / unload my vehicle several times a day, and would be forced to park on the road under these new regulations, this would then cause gridlock with through traffic at busy times of the day. I should also point out that I live directly opposite the car park exit and therefore would nullify anyone from turning right and resulting in a lengthy detour.</p> <p>4. Poor management; The parking situation at the Village Hall has escalated in the last 8-10 months, before then there was generally plenty of available spaces. This issue has arisen down to the Parish Council double (or sometimes triple) booking events, they must be aware that the more people you invite then the bigger the problem. For three days a week, and weekends, the carpark is virtually empty. A better spread of events over the week, encouraging car-sharing and more usage of the overspill area would resolve the lack of parking space.</p> <p>5. The proposed introduction of a no parking period between the hours of 07:15 and 08:15 is quite ridiculous as</p>	<p>to reply to each individual comment received, nevertheless once all replies have been collated a report will be presented to the Parish Council for them to consider, the Parish will provide their comments on the proposals, and a report may then be subsequently submitted to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transport Committee, who will make a final decision on the proposal.</p> <p>Thank you once again for taking the time to record your comments and I look forward to being able to update you on the progress of the proposed parking order in the near future.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Further to your correspondence received in the course of the consultation in relation to the above proposal. During the consultation period we received a number of letters raising Objection and as a result of the views expressed and concerns raised a Parish Meeting was held on 4th September 2017 and at the meeting it was resolved to amend the Closed Period from; The Proposed 07.15- 08.15 to 06.15 to 07.15, and to reduce the cost of the Permits from £120.00 to £96.00 per annum which can be paid in two half yearly instalments. The proposed Permit Holders section of the Car park was also subsequently resurfaced and lined with numbered bays that can be</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>this is a key time for dog walkers and parents for the schools. Where else are they supposed to park?</p> <p>To sum up, I am not prepared to pay £120 for the dubious privilege of parking my car another [REDACTED] metres from my [REDACTED] at the north east end of the car park, however, I am prepared to pay around £25 for a residents parking space at the southern end of the car park.</p> <p>I hope these points will be taken into consideration when reaching your overall decision.</p> <hr/> <p>No Response</p>	<p>allocated.</p> <p>Therefore I respectfully request that you consider withdrawing your objection which would enable us to continue with the proposal and if you are agreeable to withdrawing your objection this must be in writing, or if you wish to discuss the matter further please do not hesitate in contacting me.</p>
--	--	---	--

**THE BOROUGH OF MAIDSTONE (OFF-STREET PARKING PLACES)
(VARIATION No. 9) ORDER 2017**

Notice is hereby given that MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL has made the above Order under section 35 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, having obtained the consent of the Kent County Council in accordance with Section 39(3) of the Act, and of all other enabling powers, and after consultation with the chief officer of police in accordance with Part III of Schedule 9 of the Act –

The Order was made on;
And will come into effect on the.

The Order will;

- (i) To introduce a maximum stay of 23 hours in the Sutton Valence Village Hall Car Park with a “Closed” period from 06.15 -07.15.
- (ii) Introduce a Permit Holders Section of the Car Park.

1 Item No.	2 Parking Place	3 Classes of Vehicles	4 Days of Parking	5 Hours of Parking	6 Duration of Parking (hours at any one time)
34	Sutton Valence Village Hall Car Park (A274 North Street, Sutton Valence)	(i) Passenger vehicles (ii) Motor cycle with or without side car (iii) Dual purpose vehicle (iv) Other vehicles with a maximum gross weight not exceeding one ton	All Days	07.15 hrs to 06.15 hrs the following day	23 hours No parking permitted between 06.15 hrs and 07.15 hrs during the “ Closed ” period
	Permit Holders only section Area situation in the north-east corner of the car park.	Season ticket holders only may use this area of the parking place.	All Days	All hours	24

A Copy of the made Order, and a statement of the Council’s reasons for proposing to make the Order may be examined at the Reception Desk The Gateway, Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone, ME15 6JQ during normal office hours.

A information pack will also be available in the (Kent County Council), County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1UZ.

Any person wishing to question the validity of an order or any of it’s provisions on the grounds that it is not within the powers of the relevant enabling Act or that a requirement of any such enabling Act or of any relevant regulations made thereunder has not been complied with, may within 6 weeks from the date on which the Order was made, make application for the purpose to the High Court.

If you have any questions concerning the Order or require further information please contact Maidstone Borough Council Parking Services (01622 602377) during normal office hours.

**STRATEGIC PLANNING,
SUSTAINABILITY &
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

10 April 2018

**Revised National Planning Policy Framework: consultation
Supporting housing delivery through developer
contributions: consultation**

Final Decision-Maker	Strategic Planning, Sustainability & Transportation Committee
Lead Head of Service/Lead Director	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning & Development
Lead Officer and Report Author	Sarah Lee, Principal Planning Officer (Strategic Planning) & Isabel Elder, Principal Planning Officer (Strategic Planning)
Classification	Public
Wards affected	All

Executive Summary

The Government is seeking views on proposed revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework which it published on 5th March. On the same date the Government published a further consultation document 'Supporting housing delivery through developer contributions' which is proposing some limited reform of both s106 and CIL. This report provides a summary of the key changes the Government is proposing, highlights some potential implications and also puts forward proposed responses to both consultations for the Committee's consideration.

This report makes the following recommendations to this Committee:

1. That the responses set out in paragraphs 1.5 to 1.37 be **AGREED** as a basis for the Council's consultation response to the revised National Planning Policy Framework; and
2. That the responses set out in paragraphs 1.40 to 1.53 be **AGREED** as a basis for the Council's consultation response to 'Supporting housing delivery through developer contributions'

Timetable

Meeting	Date
Strategic Planning, Sustainability & Transportation Committee	10 April 2018

Revised National Planning Policy Framework: consultation

Supporting housing delivery through developer contributions: consultation

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government is seeking views on proposed revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published on 5th March 2018. The revisions take forward a number of the measures previously signalled in the Housing White Paper (February 2017) and 'Planning for the right homes in the right places' (September 2017). The council submitted responses to both these consultation documents.
- 1.2 The Government has published a consultation document which summarises the changes it is proposing. It has also published a fully revised draft of the NPPF text itself which incorporates the proposed changes but also includes substantial re-structuring and re-ordering of the NPPF and a considerable number of more minor wording changes. In addition, select sections of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) have been published to illustrate how this document will be revised although these changes are not specifically open for consultation comments. A guide to how the Housing Delivery Test will be calculated has also been published. All the documents can be viewed here;
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/draft-revised-national-planning-policy-framework>
- 1.3 Consultation is also taking place on the document 'Supporting housing delivery through developer contributions'. Reforms were announced in the Autumn Budget 2017 in response to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Review and this consultation paper provides more detail with the overall objective of making the current system more transparent and accountable. The consultation document can be viewed here;
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/supporting-housing-delivery-through-developer-contributions>
- 1.4 Both these documents are highly relevant for the forthcoming Local Plan Review and for the Council's on-going approach to developer contributions and CIL. The following section presents the key changes which are being proposed so that the Committee can be kept up to date with the Government's 'direction of travel'. The report also sets out the key points which it is recommended form the content of the Council's response to the consultations.

Revised National Planning Policy Framework

Local Plan Preparation

- 1.5 **Updating Local Plans:** The Housing White Paper stated that Local Plans should be reviewed every 5 years. The draft NPPF clarifies that a review

must be completed within 5 years of the adoption date¹. On this basis, the Maidstone Local Plan Review would need to be adopted by November 2022 although the Local Plan Inspector set an earlier target date of April 2021. The draft NPPF goes on to indicate that “relevant strategic policies will need updating at least once every five years if their applicable local housing need figure has increased; and they are likely to require earlier review if local housing need is expected to increase in the near future”²

- 1.6 Whereas the current NPPF directs that plans should preferably have a 15 year time horizon³, the new draft NPPF takes a firmer stance, stating that that “strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption”⁴. Local Plans should also follow ‘an’ appropriate strategy rather than ‘the most’ appropriate strategy. In practical terms this may be of little consequence because the revised NPPF would still require an authority ‘to take into account the reasonable alternatives’ when selecting its Local Plan strategy and the Sustainable Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment process similarly requires that we test reasonable alternatives.
- 1.7 As announced in ‘Planning for the right homes in the right places’, Statements of Common Ground will be required between neighbouring authorities preparing Local Plans. These statements should demonstrate that cross-boundary strategic matters “have been dealt with rather than deferred”⁵. The need for Statements of Common Ground is an enhanced requirement which does not substitute for the Duty to Co-operate with other relevant bodies. Plan-making authorities must still demonstrate effective and on-going joint working with other relevant bodies, in particular in respect of future infrastructure requirements. The NPPG indicates that other relevant bodies can be additional signatories to a Statement of Common Ground, for example the county council, infrastructure providers or the local enterprise partnership, but that such bodies are not responsible for preparing or updating the Statement.
- 1.8 **Response:** The Government is clearly signalling particular urgency to get Local Plan reviews in place for areas where there is likely to be particular housing pressure, such as Maidstone. The Government appears to be confirming its support for a plan-led approach to the challenge of its ambitious national housing targets which, of itself, is something to be welcomed. However the drive for efficient plan production has not been matched by any significant curtailing of the evidential, examination or consultation requirements on plan-making authorities. Evidence must still be ‘proportionate’ but the revised National Planning Practice Guidance does not provide meaningful clarity on what this means in practice. The expectation that a plan will have at least a 15 year time horizon from adoption places further burden on the aspects of the plan reliant on future forecasts and site identification.
- 1.9 In respect of statements of common ground (SCG), the reference to them being required between ‘neighbouring’ authorities is welcomed in preference

¹ Paragraph 23

² Paragraph 23

³ Paragraph 157

⁴ Paragraph 22

⁵ Paragraph 36

to using housing market areas whose definition can be subject to differing opinions and debate. On the face of it, neighbouring authorities would be limited to those with a shared boundary.

- 1.10 There are however very real practical difficulties in preparing SCG with authorities at different stages in the plan-making process. Maidstone has an up to date local plan in place and will not be substantially progressed with a plan review when these new provisions come into force. Conversely some of our neighbours will be at, or approaching, submission. The authorities will not have a common position in terms of their plans' time horizons, evidence of their capacity for future development or the methodological basis for their housing need figure. These points were made previously and can be repeated in the current consultation.

Housing Numbers

- 1.11 **Standardised methodology for calculating housing need:** The Government has maintained its intention to standardise the way the 'objectively assessed need' (OAN) for new homes is calculated by local planning authorities. The proposed methodology, which will determine the minimum⁶ number of new homes needed, is unaltered from that signalled in 'Planning for the right homes in the right places'; it uses household projections plus an affordability uplift factor with the resultant figure capped to no more than 40% above an authority's current, adopted OAN figure. For Maidstone borough, using current data⁷, this would result in a figure of 1,236 dwellings/year compared with the current adopted target of 883 dwellings/year. In a significant change, a local planning authority should also take into account unmet needs from neighbours⁸ in establishing its OAN figure. The implication is that unmet needs from elsewhere must be actively considered by the council when it sets its own OAN in addition to responding to specific approaches from others under the Duty to Co-operate.
- 1.12 **Response:** The council has previously raised objections to the proposed standardised methodology and it is recommended that these concerns be restated. In summary, the methodology serves to perpetuate established patterns of household growth and to disproportionately load requirements on authorities such as Maidstone with the highest base populations and which have delivered good levels of housing in the past. The approach is considered to be demand-led with the outcome of increasing requirements in areas where there is considerable existing development pressure whilst reducing supply (principally in more northern authorities) where Strategic Housing Market Assessments have shown needs to be higher. The realism of achieving this rate of housebuilding is also at question on the grounds of the availability of sufficient labour, skills and materials (a point previously highlighted by this Committee), coupled with housebuilders' incentive manage build out rates to maintain house prices at or above current levels. Whilst Maidstone has had recent, strong rates of delivery - in 2016/17 there were 1,145 completions - there has to be real concern about the ability of the market to deliver these highly inflated requirements on a consistent

⁶ Paragraph 61

⁷ Housing projections are published every 2 years and affordability ratios are updated annually.

⁸ Paragraph 61

basis. The penalties for not meeting these targets would act on the council through its 5 year supply and the Housing Delivery Test.

- 1.13 The requirement to consider unmet needs from elsewhere at the point of establishing OAN has real practical difficulties. The revisions to the National Planning Practice Guidance indicates that plan making authorities need to 'draw down' (taken to mean 'calculate') its housing need figure at the start of the plan-making process, the implication being that the OAN figure is the basis of many other fundamental parts of the plan making process and needs to be established at an early point. At this point an authority will not have assessed their potential future housing supply so will not be in a credible position to establish whether, and to what extent, it could accommodate unmet needs from elsewhere. Also neighbouring authorities will be at differing stages in their own plan-making processes so there will be further uncertainty about the existence and scale of any unmet need.
- 1.14 The Guidance does not specify the date from when the 'new' OAN figure will apply when an authority is reviewing an existing, up to date Local Plan. The draft NPPF reasserts that the planning system 'should be genuinely plan-led'⁹. For this to be the case, authorities should be granted sufficient time to make positive provision for the new housing numbers through the allocation and identification of suitable sites and locations in its Local Plan before it could be penalised for having a shortfall against the (inflated) 5 year land supply requirement or failure of the Housing Delivery Test. It is suggested that the new OAN figure should apply for the purposes of these two tests at the date of a Plan's adoption and not before, provided this is no more than 5 years from the adoption date of the previous plan. This is a point that the Committee wanted to particularly highlight in its response to 'Planning for the right homes in the right places'.

Housing supply

- 1.15 **5 year land supply and the Housing Delivery Test:** The Government intends to introduce its Housing Delivery Test in the current financial year. The test is seen as a further way to maintain housing supply by measuring the progress on sites which have been granted planning permission. The number of new homes completed over the preceding 3 years is compared with the rate required in the adopted Local Plan. The presumption in favour of sustainable development will apply if the number of completions falls below 75% of the requirement (following a transition period). Future payments of New Homes Bonus could be linked to the Housing Delivery Test and the Government will consult further on this.
- 1.16 **Response:** The annualised housing targets in the Local Plan are the basis for the calculation of both the 5 year supply and the Housing Delivery Test. As explained elsewhere, the annual housing target could potentially increase to 1,236 dwellings/year for the Local Plan Review using the standard methodology. The new OAN figure should apply for the purposes of these two tests at the date of a Plan's adoption and not before.

⁹ Paragraph 15

- 1.17 **Density standards:** The government expects minimum density standards to be used in town centres and around transport hubs in areas where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified development needs. The draft NPPF seeks a significant uplift in prevailing densities, unless this would be inappropriate. Local planning authorities should refuse applications which they consider fail to make effective use of land in areas where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs.¹⁰
- 1.18 **Response:** National policy support for making the best use of land would be a welcome addition to the NPPF and is supported. The Council has previously indicated that densities are best set at the local level, based on local circumstances, character and the nature of housing needs, and this point can be reasserted in the consultation response.
- 1.19 **Small sites:** The government is requiring councils to ensure that at least 20% of allocated sites are small sites of under half a hectare.
- 1.20 **Response:** This measure will enable small and medium sized housebuilders to take an expanded role in bringing forward sites. This is a valuable means of maintaining housing land supply. The site size threshold is noticeably low (representing a development of just 15 dwellings at a density of 30 dwellings/hectare). The objective of increasing and diversifying the housebuilders operating in the market could be achieved more manageably with a higher site threshold, say a minimum of 1ha.
- 1.21 **Brownfield land:** The draft NPPF also includes a policy to make it easier to convert (non-allocated) retail and employment land to housing "where this would not undermine key economic sectors or sites"¹¹. More generally, the revisions strengthen the support for brownfield development. Whereas currently the NPPF encourages the effective use of brownfield land, the proposed revisions would require planning policies and decisions to give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs.
- 1.22 **Response:** The overall strengthened support for the use of brownfield sites in settlements is welcomed. The significance of the loss of an individual employment site could be difficult to demonstrate at planning application level but could ultimately result in a more critical cumulative impact. Local Plans may need to consider more widespread allocation or designation of existing employment sites, where justified, in parallel with the positive allocation of outdated commercial sites for housing redevelopment.

Other Notable Matters

- 1.23 **Green Belt:** Proposals for Green Belt releases would also need to be "informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities" about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for development. This implies that Green Belt authorities may approach authorities (such as MBC) to take their unmet needs before testing the release of Green Belt sites in their own areas.

¹⁰ Paragraph 123

¹¹ (Paragraph 121

- 1.24 **Response:** It is considered that selective release of Green Belt can be a more sustainable option than diverting unmet needs to other authorities and that, as a minimum, this should be tested through a fully considered Green Belt review. A Green Belt review will test sites for their contribution to the five purposes of the Green Belt to ensure development would not undermine the Green Belt's function. This analysis should be undertaken before approaches to other authorities are made, particularly as relying on other authorities' plans at differing stages of preparation may not be as conducive to boosting housing land supply in a timely way.
- 1.25 **Affordable Housing:** At least 10% of homes on major sites should be available for affordable home ownership. This will make up part of the overall affordable requirement on a site¹². The definition of affordable housing in the draft NPPF glossary includes 4 categories;
- affordable housing for rent (including social rent, Build to Rent, intermediate rent);
 - Starter homes (income restrictions will apply);
 - Discounted market sales housing (at least 20% below market value);
 - Other affordable routes to home ownership (including shared ownership, equity loans, rent to buy).
- 1.26 **Response:** The Government is maintaining its objective to widen the opportunities for people to access home ownership. Whilst in many ways this can be welcomed, the response might also want to re-state the previously expressed concern that this emphasis is likely to diminish the future supply of social rented properties which are needed by those in the most acute housing need. The limited supply of this type of affordable housing in London for example can result in placements being made in the surrounding authorities where rents are cheaper. This can mean that more vulnerable households are separated from their families and support networks.
- 1.27 **Neighbourhood plans:** Under the new provisions Local Plans should ideally set out a housing requirement figure for designated neighbourhood areas. The draft NPPG states that there is no set method for how this should be done; it "should be derived from the authority's housing need figure and take into consideration relevant policies and evidence such as the spatial strategy (or the emerging strategy if indicative figures are being set), the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, the population of the neighbourhood area and the role of the neighbourhood area in providing services".
- 1.28 **Response:** This proposal has the potential to provide consistency of approach and certainty for groups preparing neighbourhood plans. There will be some legitimate difficulties, however, in trying to establish a reasoned and reasonable figure at neighbourhood area level, in particular when trying to apportion a windfall allowance to a specific, local area. The Government should expand its guidance on this matter.

¹² Paragraph 65

- 1.29 **Design:** The 'Requiring good design' section of the NPPF is re-named 'Achieving well-designed places'. Proposed refinements include an appreciation that good design is founded in an understanding of local character and that local communities have particular key role in identifying an area's special qualities, in particular through their neighbourhood plans. Local authorities are also urged to pro-actively influence the design of schemes through the use of design advice and review panels and other assessment tools such as Building for Life.
- 1.30 **Response:** The proposed changes give a clearer articulation of key design considerations and the Government's expectation that good quality design is embedded in the development process. These changes should be supported in the council's consultation response.
- 1.31 **Town centre:** The sequential approach to town centre uses is amended to make clear that out-of-centre sites should be considered only if suitable town centre or edge-of-centre sites are unavailable or not expected to become available within a reasonable period. The draft says such sites do not have to be available immediately, in order to avoid prejudicing town centre or edge of centre sites that are in the pipeline.
- 1.32 **Response:** This is a welcome clarification.
- 1.33 **Environmental considerations:** Other new text in the draft NPPF says that plans should allocate land with the "least environmental or amenity value [...]; take a strategic approach to maintaining and strengthening networks of habitats and green infrastructure; and plan for the enhancement of natural capital at a catchment or landscape scale across local authority boundaries"¹³. The revisions also include strengthened protection of Ancient Woodland where loss should be 'wholly exceptional' and a high level of protection for aged and veteran trees¹⁴.
- 1.34 **Response:** These amendments are welcomed.
- 1.35 **Viability:** The draft NPPF introduces the expectation that all viability assessments accompanying planning applications will be made public and will follow a more standardised format (set out in the NPPG). It is also suggested that where viability has been established through a local plan, subsequent planning applications which are in conformity with the plan should not normally be accompanied by a further viability assessment¹⁵. This is often a contentious issue in the determination of planning applications, in particular in respect of affordable housing provision.
- 1.36 **Response:** This proposed approach is welcomed as a way of making viability assessment more transparent.
- 1.37 **Gypsies & Travellers:** The NPPG currently does not include any specific supporting guidance for Gypsies & Travellers and this could be rectified as part of the current revisions. In particular, this could include guidance on the application of the planning definition of Gypsies and Travellers.

¹³ Paragraph 169.

¹⁴ Paragraph 173c

¹⁵ Paragraph 58

Supporting housing delivery through developer contributions

- 1.38 This consultation paper proposes a number of amendments to reform CIL and S106. The government is not proposing to abolish CIL, rather this is the first step in the reform and there is hint of it ultimately setting a national non-negotiable levy in the future. The suggested reforms complement the proposed changes to viability in the NPPF.
- 1.39 The paper focuses on 5 main areas:
- Reducing the complexity of CIL
 - Changes to S106
 - Improving market responsiveness of CIL
 - Increasing transparency regarding the spend of contributions
 - Introducing a new Strategic Infrastructure Tariff
- 1.40 **Reducing the complexity of CIL:** The paper suggests that viability assessments which are used for plan-making should also to be used for determining the CIL charging schedule. The current process to set and revise a CIL (the same for both) is time consuming and involves two consultations and takes about 1 – 2 years. This can prevent councils from making changes to an adopted CIL. The consultation paper is proposing that where the funding gap is demonstrably greater than the anticipated CIL income, this is sufficient evidence of infrastructure need. Councils should then publish a statement on how they 'sought an appropriate level of engagement'.
- 1.41 Also proposed is changing the index used to calculate indexation from Building Cost Information service (BCIS) to House Price Index (HPI) on residential development and either a mix of HPI and CPI (Consumer Price Index) or just CPI for non-residential.
- 1.42 The consultation paper also advocates a more proportionate approach to administering exemptions. It suggests a grace period of two months if development starts without a commencement notice having been submitted. Currently if no such notice is submitted prior to commencement, the developer loses all rights to an exemption and must pay the full amount of CIL immediately.
- 1.43 **Response:** Aligning the CIL with the local plan will reduce costs to councils as there will not be a need for a long consultation process and the information gained for one can be used for both. Indeed, Maidstone ran the two concurrently when setting the CIL charging schedule and preparing the local plan. The proposal of a statement of engagement is welcomed as, should we wish to revise the CIL in the future, it will be less time consuming and will save potential Council resources.
- 1.44 The suggested use of HPI for residential would mean the CIL would reflect market changes and be more responsive to house price changes. HPI uses home sales data from the HM Land Registry and is calculated by the Office of National Statistics. It reflects current actual house prices, which can go up as well as down and as a result will be more accurate than the BCIS, this will be fairer to both developers and the Council. Being responsive to

current house prices might also result in the Council not needing to update the CIL charging schedule as it will accurately reflect the right amount that development can pay for CIL. This could save future Council resources as no revision will be required. The proposal of HPI and CPI or just CPI for non-residential needs an expert's opinion. With regard to S106's and indexation, Maidstone currently use a BCIS indexation figure.

- 1.45 The current exemptions policy penalises small scale developers and some planning authorities have found it hard to collect the full amount of CIL when the development has already been built. Officer time can be spent chasing money from developments that could have been made exempt but then had to pay because the correct procedure was not followed. A grace period for exemptions could be of benefit to the Council as less resources would be spent chasing money that small applicants do not have. Further information is required however, regarding the penalty to be imposed for this grace period; the proposal is for two months rather than 60 days; will it be a flat rate late fee or a percentage based on the number of days it is late?
- 1.46 **Changes to S106:** The paper proposes lifting the current pooling restriction on S106's where a council has an adopted CIL. For those councils who do not have a CIL, the lifting of the pooling restriction would only be possible if it were proven that CIL would not be viable in their area. However, if the CIL was withdrawn the restriction would be reinstated. The consultation also proposes that councils will be able to charge a fee for monitoring each S106 agreement. The Council has negotiated a one off monitoring fee in the past as it was justified in the circumstance but each case is assessed on a case by case basis and so only added when proven necessary. Councils can currently charge 5% for administering CIL but there is no charge for managing S106's. Further details will be requested as to how much could be charged for a monitoring fee as the paper does not provide details.
- 1.47 **Response:** The lifting of the pooling restriction is welcomed as it has the potential to bring significant benefits to the Council as it will allow more flexibility and potentially allow the Council to access additional funding from development to pay for infrastructure. Similarly, the ability to charge a S106 monitoring fee will help with the Council's administrative costs. More information would be welcomed on the charging rates of the proposed fee; a percentage of the total or a flat fee (with or without banding for different sized developments). Developers may say there is only a limited amount of money available and may want to take this from the infrastructure / contributions they provide.
- 1.48 **Improving market responsiveness of CIL.** It is proposed that CIL should take into consideration the existing use value of a site when the amount is being calculated. CIL is currently set at the lowest common denominator, so there are sites that could pay more.
- 1.49 **Response:** The Government wants to maximise the amount of CIL that can be charged but this could be very complicated for councils to calculate on a site by site basis as existing use values vary and there are other site specific circumstances which influence value such as contamination etc.

However, with regard to strategic sites, this could assist the bringing forward of a site as the CIL will accurately reflect what the site can pay and any remedial action required will be reflected in the existing use value.

1.50 *Increasing transparency regarding the spend of contributions:*

Nationally there is concern by the public as to how CIL and S106 contributions are spent. Annual reports are required for CIL but these vary and there are no expectations on S106. Officers currently prepare reports to planning committee on S106 spend and will continue to report on planning obligations once CIL has been introduced. The consultation paper suggests that the requirement of a Regulation 123 list, which often does not provide certainty or clarity, is replaced with an Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS). This will identify priorities for CIL and S106 for the next 5 years and be more accountable and detailed.

1.51 *Response:* Maidstone's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) identifies the schemes necessary to support the delivery of new development proposed in the local plan, which will be funded by a number of funding streams and delivered by a range of partners. The paper makes no reference to the relationship between the IDP and the IFS but the IDP informed the Regulation 123 list and the IFS is to replace this so clarity should be sought as to whether this relationship will continue. More details are required on the consultation required for this statement. The paper proposes that an IFS could identify what could be funded by CIL and S106 forecasted income and which of these would have priority for the Council. The statement will be useful as a tool for communicating the Council's proposals to the local community and providing transparency on what the CIL and S106 could be spent on.

1.52 *Introducing a new Strategic Infrastructure Tariff (SIT):* Based on the London Mayor's CIL, joint committees/planning authorities can join together to charge a Strategic Infrastructure Tariff, to pay for a specific piece of infrastructure. It also proposes that a proportion of the SIT could be used to fund local infrastructure priorities that mitigate the impacts of the strategic infrastructure.

1.53 *Response:* There could be significant benefits of having a SIT if there is a strategic piece of infrastructure that is needed such as a road junction improvement that would benefit more than one borough. Should the Council decide to introduce a SIT by working with neighbouring authorities there might have to be an amendment to the adopted CIL to accommodate it. The Council would welcome further clarity on the proposed governance arrangements for the SIT in particular regard to who would be the lead.

2. AVAILABLE OPTIONS

2.1 Option A: the Committee could decide that no consultation responses should be submitted.

2.2 Option B: the Committee could decide to submit responses to the Government consultations on the proposed changes to the National Planning

Policy Framework and to 'Supporting housing delivery through developer contributions'.

3. PREFERRED OPTION AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Option B is the preferred option. Submitting a consultation response will ensure that the Council's viewpoint can be taken into account as the Government finalises its proposed changes to the planning system, policy and guidance.

4. RISK

4.1 The risks associated with this proposal, including the risks if the Council does not act as recommended, have been considered in line with the Council's Risk Management Framework. We are satisfied that the risks associated are within the Council's risk appetite and will be managed as per the Policy.

5. NEXT STEPS: COMMUNICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISION

5.1 Subject the Committee's agreement, the consultation responses will be submitted on-line by the deadline of 10 May 2018. Thereafter the Government has indicated that changes to the NPPF will be published in the summer and the intention is for officers to run Councillor training on its content thereafter.

6. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS

Issue	Implications	Sign-off
Impact on Corporate Priorities	It is not expected that the recommendation will, of itself, materially affect achievement of corporate priorities. Contributing positively to the Government's consultation does nonetheless accord with the Council's overall priority of 'a home for everyone'.	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning & Development
Risk Management	Already covered in the risk section.	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning & Development
Financial	Responding to the Government consultation can be done within existing resources.	Section 151 Officer and Paul Holland,

	<p>The developer contributions consultation paper proposes a number of potential increased income streams for the Council (S106 monitoring fee; penalty for late commencement notice; revising CIL to reflect existing use value; lifting the S106 pooling restriction so we could get more from development).</p> <p>In respect of the Local Plan Review, a budget has been identified and forms part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.</p>	Senior Finance Manager (Client)
Staffing	Responding to the Government consultation can be done within existing staff resources.	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning & Development
Legal	There are no specific legal implications arising from the recommendations in this report. Should the proposals in the consultation drafts be taken forward there will be a need to review practices and protocols to accommodate them.	Cheryl Parks, Lawyer (Planning) Mid Kent Legal Services
Privacy and Data Protection	Responding to this consultation as recommended would not have specific implications for privacy and data protection.	Cheryl Parks, Lawyer (Planning) Mid Kent Legal Services
Equalities	Responding to this consultation as recommended would not have specific or differential implications for the different communities within Maidstone.	[Policy & Information Manager]
Crime and Disorder	Responding to this consultation as recommended would not have specific implications for Crime and Disorder in the borough	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning & Development

Procurement	Responding to this consultation as recommended does not require the procurement of any services, expertise or materials	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning & Development
--------------------	---	---

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS

National Planning Policy Framework consultation (March 2018) –
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/draft-revised-national-planning-policy-framework>

'Supporting housing delivery through developer contributions' (March 2018) –
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/supporting-housing-delivery-through-developer-contributions>

**STRATEGIC PLANNING
SUSTAINABILITY AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

10 April 2018

Alternative Sustainable Transport Measures Scope

Final Decision-Maker	Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee
Lead Head of Service/Lead Director	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning and Development
Lead Officer and Report Author	Tay Arnold, Planning Projects and Delivery Manager, Strategic Planning
Classification	Public
Wards affected	All

Executive Summary

Following the report to this committee on 22 January 2018 on the outcomes of both the Tri-study and the Park and Ride operational review, amongst other things the Tri- Study confirmed that the Park & Ride service currently requires £240k of subsidy per annum, and for this it encourages 165,000 vehicles not to enter the town centre each year. As a result of this, Committee resolved that "a full report be brought to this Committee by October 2018 which sets out the alternative sustainable transport options and which measures the success or otherwise of Park and Ride based on peak usage." This report outlines the proposed scope for the future report on alternative sustainable transport options. The purpose of this work is to identify what alternative sustainable transport measures are possible and what interventions or facilitation by MBC could increase uptake i.e. more vehicles out of the town centre (especially at peak time) and look to estimate the cost of any intervention for the same or less money. This report sets out a provisional schedule of what the alternatives might be, and how, if possible, they will be evaluated in terms of their likely cost and likelihood of success.

This report makes the following recommendations to this Committee:

1. That the scope for work be agreed and Officers be instructed to commence work.
2. That a report of the outcomes be brought to committee in December alongside the measures of the success or otherwise of Park and Ride.

Timetable

Meeting	Date
Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transportation Committee	10 April 2018

Alternative Sustainable Transport Measures Scope

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 On 22 January 2018 a report was brought to this committee on the outcomes and findings of both the tri-study (bus interchange study, parking strategy and strategic Park and Ride study) and the Park and Ride operational review. Amongst other things the Tri- Study confirmed that the Park & Ride service currently requires £240k of subsidy per annum, and for this it encourages 165,000 vehicles not to enter the town centre each year. As a result of this, it was resolved that “a full report be brought to this Committee by October 2018 which sets out the alternative sustainable transport options and which measures the success or otherwise of Park and Ride based on peak usage.” This report outlines the scope for the investigation of alternative sustainable transport options to inform this future report. The scope outlined below will not be a review of Park and Ride and not cover the details of how the success or otherwise of Park and Ride will be measured. However the outcomes of the outlined work below will be brought to SPST alongside the Park and Ride data in a future report. The purpose of this work is to identify what alternative sustainable transport measures are possible and what interventions or facilitation by MBC could increase uptake i.e. more vehicles out of the town centre (especially at peak time) and look to estimate the cost of any intervention for the same or less money. This report sets out a provisional schedule of what the alternatives might be, and how, if possible, they will be evaluated in terms of their likely cost and likelihood of success.
- 1.2 The Council has an important role to deliver the adopted Local Plan and Integrated Transport Strategy. Most importantly in the context of this report, to provide sustainable transport measures as outlined in Local Plan Policy SP23 (Sustainable Transport). Among other matters, Local Plan Policy SP23 commits to delivering modal shift “through managing demand on the transport network through enhanced public transport and the continued Park and Ride services and walking and cycling improvements”. It also commits the Council and highway authority to developing preference measures to improve journey times and reliability and make public transport more attractive, particularly on the Park and Ride routes and the radial routes into the town centre.
- 1.3 In his Local Plan Final Report, the Inspector noted that “the number of vehicles is unusually high in Maidstone because of the high levels of car use relative to other modes such as public transport, walking and cycling. Measures are therefore needed to encourage modal shift in the interests of both air quality and congestion”. The inspector went on to note that “the need to reduce emissions, additional measures are likely to be needed including...a review of the amount of parking provision in the town centre and its costs relative to other travel modes, especially bus travel...Park and Ride (or Park and train) may also be part of the solution if it result is fewer vehicles entering the town centre”.
- 1.4 The adopted Local Plan notes that the Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS) should aim for a reduction in the number of single-occupancy car trips into

Maidstone Town Centre by long-stay commuters – particularly during peak periods – which can be achieved through interventions such as enhanced public transport provision on the main radial routes, Park and Ride and walking and cycling infrastructure.

- 1.5 The report in January included WSP's Tri-study report and alongside other matters, the Park and Ride study investigated different strategies in terms of long term requirements for Park and Ride services. In particular, consideration was given to the introduction of micro Park and Ride sites, introduction of new Park and Ride sites, and closure of the Park and Ride sites.
- 1.6 Replacing existing dedicated P&R bus services with existing urban bus services was also reviewed as part of the WSP Tri-Study. The review confirmed that "the services near Willington Street are too few, not equally spaced and not close enough to provide an attractive service for P&R. Furthermore the service would probably require a small diversion since the site is approximately a 400 metre walk from the bus stops on the A20. While the services close to London Road are reasonably frequent, serving the P&R site would necessitate a small diversion of the current bus routing, thus increasing travel time for existing passengers." Micro Park and Ride was also dismissed as not being viable at the moment unless new sites can be identified.
- 1.7 It is not proposed that this investigation of alternatives focusses on the above options as they have already been dismissed, however if new evidence comes forward that changes the viability they will be considered.
- 1.8 It is proposed that the investigation concentrates on two key themes: available alternative sustainable transport options; and whether these options provide a suitable alternative for both current Park and Ride users as well as current peak time commuters who do not currently travel into Maidstone Town Centre by a sustainable method.
- 1.9 The ITS provides a framework and programme of schemes and interventions to support the Maidstone Borough Local Plan, taking account of the committed and predicted levels of growth in homes and jobs and detailing the transport infrastructure and services necessary to support and deliver this growth. Objective 1 of the ITS focusses on 'Enhancing and encouraging sustainable travel choices'. Of particular relevance to the scope of this work the ITS proposes:
 - The development, maintenance and enhancement of walking and cycling provision, through network improvements and encouraging uptake amongst the population
 - The development, maintenance and enhancement of public transport provision, including Park and Ride, encouraging uptake amongst the population;
- 1.10 The ITS outlines targets to monitor its success in achieving its objectives. Of particular relevance to the scope of alternative sustainable transport measures is the target to "To decrease car driver mode share in Maidstone

from 44.3% of all work trips to below 40% by 2021 and below 37% by 2031.”

- 1.11 It is proposed that the identification of alternative options focusses on those outlined in the ITS, specifically those relating to buses, rail, cycling, walking and other forms of transport such as car clubs. This will take in to account existing provision as well as exploring the action list outlined in the ITS such as PT2 to “Facilitate an improvement of bus services to ensure a good frequency of service is provided on all radial routes to the town centre within the Maidstone Urban Area”. This will then inform a list of potential sustainable options for the key Maidstone corridors. It is also proposed that potential future deliverable sustainable options are also identified. This work in turn will identify potential opportunities for Maidstone to support the uptake of current provision as well as facilitate the delivery of additional measures.
- 1.12 The second part of the work will look at profiling the current P&R users with a focus on understanding both their origin and destination and times of travel. This analysis will allow the current users to be classified into different groups based on their travel patterns and needs. This analysis will enable us to identify if Park and Ride in its current format offers the best sustainable transport option and whether a reasonable alternative sustainable method for those users can be identified. This will also help identify the main barriers to the current users transferring to an alternative, which in turn will inform the need for potential improvements or new sustainable alternatives to encourage modal shift.
- 1.13 To inform the overall work the current data will be reviewed, specifically in relation to understanding the travel patterns of existing Park and Ride users. It is also proposed that this work models the impact of closing Park and Ride using Webtag or similar; and applying the estimated resulting change in the number of cars on road, distance and congestion levels, to quantify the external benefits and dis-benefits, including financial quantification of congestion, accidents, and local Air Quality amongst others.
- 1.14 Due to the need to bring the report to this committee in October it is unlikely that this work will be able to capture any changes to the profiles of new Park and Ride users resulting from the change to pay to park. This is due to the limited time between the new payment method commencing (1 June 2018) and the report deadline. To fully explore the alternative options and the potential need to provide a suitable alternative to the users of Park and Ride it is important to understand accurately the current users.
- 1.15 Although it is not the purpose of this report to provide scope for the measurements of success of the Park and Ride, there is a comparable need for an appropriate volume of data to measure the changes to Park and Ride being implemented from 1 June and therefore this element of the work would also benefit from a change in reporting deadline to the December SPST Committee. This would also enable data to be collected that is not affected by the summer holidays.

2. AVAILABLE OPTIONS

- 2.1 That Committee agrees the proposed scope and instructs officers to commence work with a report brought to committee by October 2018. This option aligns with the previous committee resolution. It does limit the ability to incorporate data related to the profile of any new users, however it would provide sufficient time for a decision to be made on the future of Park and Ride before the current contract extension ends on 31st May 2019.
 - 2.2 That Committee agrees the proposed scope and instructs officers to commence work with a report brought to committee for December 2018, enabling the inclusion of data from users after the changes to Park and Ride have been implemented. This would enable any changes in Park and Ride user profiles to be incorporated in to the work there would still be opportunity to make an informed decision before the end of the current contract extension on 31st May 2019 and implement that decision.
 - 2.3 That Committee requests changes to the scope of the work and instructs officers to bring a future report to Committee outlining the new scope. This option is not recommended as it will delay commencing the work which will impact on the ability to provide a comprehensive report by October 2018.
 - 2.4 That Committee decides to proceed with the investigation of alternative sustainable transport measures. This option is not recommended as this would hinder the future decision on Park and Ride as the measurement of the success or otherwise of Park and Ride would therefore not be seen alongside and in the context of alternative options. This decision would also impact on the Council's ability to deliver the targets within the ITS and Local plan.
-

3. PREFERRED OPTION AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That Committee agrees the proposed scope and instructs officers to commence work with a report brought to committee December 2018, enabling the inclusion of data from users after the changes to Park and Ride have been implemented. This would enable any changes in Park and Ride user profiles to be incorporated in to the work and there would still be opportunity to make an informed decision before the end of the current contract extension on 31st May 2019 and implement that decision i.e. commence procurement for a new Park and Ride contract or begin preparation to close down the service. This change to the previously resolved deadline would apply to the entire report and so would also include the measures of the success or otherwise Park and Ride based on peak usage, which would also benefit from the change in deadline as October 2018 would only allow approximately 3 months of data on usage to be provided and these would also be affected by the Summer holiday period..
-

4. RISK

4.1 This report focusses only on the scope of work to be carried out. Risks related to this matter will be detailed in the future report relating to the decision on the future of Park and Ride.

5. CONSULTATION RESULTS AND PREVIOUS COMMITTEE FEEDBACK

- 5.1 No specific consultation has been carried out regarding the scope of the work.
- 5.2 This report is as a result of previous committee feedback regarding the need to investigate other sustainable transport options alongside Park and Ride.

6. NEXT STEPS: COMMUNICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISION

- 6.1 Following agreement of the scope officers will procure and appoint a consultant to review the current data and policies and conduct the webtag modelling to inform the evidence base for the future report on alternative sustainable transport measures.

7. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS

Issue	Implications	Sign-off
Impact on Corporate Priorities	Accepting the recommendations will materially improve the Council’s ability to achieve regeneration of the town centre as well providing a clean safe environment.	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning and Development
Risk Management	Already covered in the risk section	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning and Development
Financial	The proposals set out in the recommendation are all within already approved budgetary headings and so need no new funding for implementation. The work described in paragraphs 1.9 to 1.14 is currently estimated at a maximum of £10,000 and the cost will be met from within existing Strategic Planning budgets.	Section 151 Officer & Finance Team

Staffing	We will deliver the recommendations with our current staffing and by procuring specialist consultants to generate the required evidence base.	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning and Development
Legal	There are no legal implications arising from the report or recommendations	Cheryl Parks, Lawyer (Planning) Mid Kent Legal Services
Privacy and Data Protection	Care will be needed in handling any customer data, survey responses etc for the purposes of establishing evidence for this work. The Council's policies and procedures should be carefully adhered to in this respect.	Cheryl Parks, Lawyer (Planning) Mid Kent Legal Services
Equalities	The recommendations do not propose a change in service therefore will not require an equalities impact assessment	[Policy & Information Manager]
Crime and Disorder	N/A	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning and Development
Procurement	On accepting the recommendations, the Council will then follow procurement exercises for carrying out the work. We will complete those exercises in line with financial procedure rules.	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning and Development & Section 151 Officer

8. REPORT APPENDICES

N/A

9. BACKGROUND PAPERS

The previous report on Outcomes of Bus Interchange Study, Parking Strategy and Park and Ride Study, and Park and Ride Operational Review:

https://maidstone.gov.uk/home/primary-services/council-and-democracy/primary-areas/your-councillors?sq_content_src=%2BdXJsPWh0dHBzJTnBJTJGJTJGbwVIdGIuZ3MubWFpZHN0b25ILmdvdi51ayUyRmlITGIZdERvY3VtZW50cy5hc3B4JTNGQ0lkJTnENTc5JTI2TUIkJTnEMjk2MCZhbGw9MQ%3D%3D