

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Planning, Transport and Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 17 MARCH 2015

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

Also Present: Councillors Burton

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

RESOLVED: that all items on the agenda be webcast.

163. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor de Wiggondene.

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

164. NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

There were no substitute members.

165. NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS

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

166. DISCLOSURES BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

There were no disclosures by Members or Officers.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED: that the minutes of the meetings held on:

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

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

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

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

170. VERBAL UPDATE ON INVICTA BARRACKS

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

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

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

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

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

During the discussion the Committee raised the following concerns:

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

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

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

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

171. VERBAL UPDATE ON THE INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN

Councillor Burton left the meeting at 19:16hrs.

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

During discussion the Committee raised the following concerns:

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

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

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

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

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

172. ADOPTION OF INTERIM PARKING STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

174. FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED: That:

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

175. DURATION OF MEETING

18:30hrs to 21:20hrs.