

Maidstone Borough Council - Overview & Scrutiny Scoping Paper

Proposer Name	Cllr Claudine Russell
Proposed Topic (What?)	Planning Enforcement
Description and Reason for Review (Why?)	Planning enforcement is not currently an effective deterrent in Maidstone borough.
Link to: Council's Strategic Plan National/Regional priorities Executive Priorities	<p>This links into the strategic plan and corporate priorities of embracing growth and a thriving place. It also reflects on the confidence in the Council as a whole.</p> <p>The executive have listed "town and countryside strategies", "a resilient borough" and "community resilience" as key focus areas so it aligns with these and complements their aims.</p>
Desired Outcome(s) (Outcome)	<p>The review should achieve a benchmarking exercise for our current enforcement practices against other neighbouring authorities and should be able to offer improvements in areas of best practice that may be suggested for improvements to the Executive.</p> <p><i>To produce service improvements and manage public expectations of the service.</i></p>
Approach (How, When and Who)	<p>Lines of enquiry to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Examples of best practice from other authorities;</i> - <i>Establishing benchmarking, including sources of data;</i> - <i>How to manage public expectations; and</i> - <i>Helping to shape the revised local enforcement plan.</i> <p>Research</p> <p>Desk based research into current enforcement cases with a particular focus on long-standing cases. Examine information from other authorities to find good practice and benchmarking exercise against other authorities arrangements. Potential site visits. Examine associated costs of enforcement.</p> <p>Sources of Information Required</p> <p>Previous council reports. Enforcement dashboard.</p>

	<p>Appeals information. Public hearing records.</p> <p>Possible Participants</p> <p>Director of Regeneration and Place. Head of Development Management. Senior Enforcement Officers. Finance Director. Cabinet member for Planning Policy and Management. Cabinet member for Corporate Resources.</p> <p>Written and verbal evidence.</p> <p>Written evidence from other Local Authorities.</p> <p>Financial modelling for cost benefit analysis.</p>
<p>Review Timescale (When)</p>	<p>Suggested timeline 4 months.</p> <p>The review should take place at a combination of formal committee meetings and working groups.</p> <p>The Work Programme Impact will be: Medium</p>
<p>Link to CfPS effective scrutiny principles</p>	<p>The CfPS effective scrutiny principles would be met through conducting the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a constructive 'critical friend' challenge • Amplifies public voices and concerns • Is Independently led by Councillors • Drives Improvement in Public Services
<p>Officer Support</p>	<p>To include:</p> <p>DSO Officer Policy Officer Relevant HoS/Senior Officer</p>