

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 11 OCTOBER 2016

Present: Councillor D Burton (Chairman), and
Councillors English, Mrs Gooch, Mrs Grigg, D
Mortimer, Round, Springett, de Wiggondene and
Wilby

Also Present: Councillors Willis

74. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

It was noted that apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Munford and Prendergast.

75. **NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

The following Substitute Members were noted:

Councillor Gooch for Councillor Munford;
Councillor Ring for Councillor Prendergast.

76. **CHANGE TO THE ORDER OF BUSINESS**

RESOLVED: That item 19 – Additional Transport Modelling – Motorway Junctions be taken in advance of item 14 – River Medway Cyclepath, as it was put forward that consideration of item 19 would help inform later items.

77. **URGENT ITEMS**

There were no urgent items.

The Chairman agreed to take an urgent update to item 20 – Community Infrastructure Levy: Draft Charging Schedule, which removed erroneous references within the report and recommendations to a Schedule of Modifications.

78. **NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS**

It was noted that Councillor Willis was in attendance as a Visiting Member, and indicated a wish to speak on all items on the agenda except item 17 – Response to M20 Lorry Park Consultation, and item 20 – Community Infrastructure Levy: Draft Charging Schedule Submission.

79. DISCLOSURES BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

There were no disclosures by Members or Officers.

80. DISCLOSURES OF LOBBYING

There were no disclosures of lobbying.

81. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 13 SEPTEMBER 2016

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 September 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed.

82. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS (IF ANY)

There were no petitions.

83. NOTIFICATION OF STATEMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND QUESTIONS AND ANSWER SESSION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

There were no statements or questions from members of the public.

84. 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.

85. STRATEGIC PLANNING, SUSTAINABILITY AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

RESOLVED: That the committee work programme be noted.

86. REFERENCE FROM THE HERITAGE, CULTURE AND LEISURE COMMITTEE - AIR QUALITY WORKING GROUP

The committee considered the reference from Communities, Housing and Environment Committee which recommended the appointment of two Members of the committee to the newly established Air Quality Working Group.

RESOLVED: That Councillors Burton and English be appointed to sit on the Air Quality Working Group as representatives of the Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee.

87. OUTSIDE BODIES - STRATEGIC PLANNING, SUSTAINABILITY AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE - MEMBERS VERBAL UPDATES

The Chairman invited Members of the committee who were appointed to relevant outside bodies to provide an update on that body's work.

Updates were received on the Rail Steering Group, South East Rail Partnership, Quality Bus Partnership and Maidstone East Strategic Board.

RESOLVED: That the verbal updates be noted.

88. REPORT OF THE HEAD OF TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT - ADDITIONAL TRANSPORT MODELLING - MOTORWAY JUNCTIONS

The Senior Transport Planner introduced the report providing an update on the progress of work undertaken by Mott McDonald to model the impact of the submitted Maidstone Borough Council (MBC) Local Plan on M20 junctions 5 to 8.

It was explained that:

- Kent County Council (KCC) had raised the issue that the VISUM modelling did not depict traffic modelling on the M20.
- Highways England (HE) recommended localised modelling to be performed on this area, and put forward that developments in neighbouring boroughs should be factored into modelling.
- Mott McDonald were commissioned to undertake the work and produced modelling for the local plan period 2016-2031, taking into account both consented and non-consented developments.
- The results of modelling indicated that in 2031 all junctions would be over capacity, but that the impact of non-consented developments could be mitigated using high level approaches such as part signalisation and changes to road markings.
- A full technical report had been submitted to HE in September 2016. Feedback from this had been received and considered, and a statement of common ground between MBC and HE was expected to be made in November 2016.

Councillor Willis addressed the committee as a Visiting Member.

The committee discussed joint working between neighbouring boroughs during the development of local plans.

It was noted that a report on the Regulation 18 Consultation on the Tonbridge and Malling local plan was included at item 15 of the agenda.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

89. REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT - REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION ON THE TONBRIDGE AND MALLING LOCAL PLAN

The Planning Policy Manager introduced the report informing the committee that the Tonbridge and Malling Local Plan Regulation 18

consultation had opened, and notifying of the intention to present a draft response to the 8 November 2016 meeting for agreement.

Councillor Willis addressed the committee as a Visiting Member.

Member raised the following matters during discussion:

- Concern regarding highways pressure and congestion on Hermitage Lane, and the need for robust mitigation schemes such as an alternative route, should be included in the draft consultation response.
- Reassurance was required from neighbouring councils and the highways authority that non-strategic routes would be given due consideration. An example given was the A26 network, and the potential additional traffic on the Malling Road resulting from new developments at Kings Hill.
- Air quality, open space and other ecological issues should be included in the Council's response to the consultation.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

90. REPORT OF THE HEAD OF COMMERCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - RIVER MEDWAY CYCLEPATH

The Local Economy Project Officer presented the report providing an update on the scheme to create a cycle path along the River Medway from Aylesford to Barming Bridge, and requesting the committee's agreement to commence physical works in advance of the completion of the Cycle Tracks Conversion Order.

Members were advised that most landowners affected by the scheme were in support of the project, however some had requested movement of the path. Officers had considered this alternative and concluded that it would compromise the path's amenity and security.

In response to questions it was explained that:

- Vehicular access would be restricted by a locked gate stationed at the end of Unicomes Lane, accessible only to those with vehicular rights. There was enough width to allow pedestrians the space to move to the side of the path when a vehicle needed to pass.
- Signage would be used to encourage mutual respect between cyclists and pedestrians sharing the pathway.

RESOLVED: That the commencement of physical works to improve the existing public footpath, prior to the completion of the Cycle Tracks Conversion Order process, be agreed.

For – 9 Against – 0 Abstain – 0

91. REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT - KENT COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 4 - DELIVERING GROWTH WITHOUT GRIDLOCK 2016-2031 - CONSULTATION RESPONSE

The Planning Policy Manager spoke to the report setting out a draft response to Kent Council's (KCC) consultation on their Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4): Delivering Growth without Gridlock 2016-2031.

The committee was advised that:

- The emerging LTP4 covered the same time period as MBC's Local Plan.
- A Leeds/Langley relief road had been included in the LTP4 as a priority.
- It was felt that MBC's priorities had not been given prominence in the LTP4 and there may be a lack of synergy between the LTP4 and MBC policies.

Councillor Willis addressed the committee as a Visiting Member.

During discussion it was noted that a proposed Leeds/Langley relief road had been discussed at the Maidstone Joint Transportation Board, and there had been support for this option to be investigated. It was put forward that references in the draft response to question 7 of the consultation suggesting the de-prioritisation of the scheme should be omitted, namely:

- That the first two sentences of the draft response to Question 7 as set out at paragraph 4.17 be retained, and that the remainder of the paragraph be deleted.
- That the draft response to Question 7 as set out at paragraph 4.18 be deleted.

A Member raised the issue that there was a need for additional rail services to London, and that the borough would benefit in particular from a connection to London Cannon Street. It was put forward:

- That the first sentence of the draft response to Question 5 as set out at paragraph 4.10 of the report of the Head of Planning and Development be amended to read: "With respect to rail and bus improvements the document would benefit from clarification as to how KCC will work to influence the new Southeastern franchise from 2018 with regard to London services, in particular to prioritise services to London Cannon Street."

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the proposed response as set out in Section 4 of the report be agreed subject to the following amendments:

- a) That the first sentence of the draft response to Question 5 as set out at paragraph 4.10 of the report of the Head of Planning and Development be amended to read: "With respect to rail and bus improvements the document would benefit from clarification as to how KCC will work to influence the new Southeastern franchise from 2018 with regard to London services, in particular to prioritise services to London Cannon Street."

For – 9 Against – 0 Abstain - 0

- b) That the first two sentences of the draft response to Question 7 as set out at paragraph 4.17 be retained, and that the remainder of the paragraph be deleted.

- c) That the draft response to Question 7 as set out at paragraph 4.18 be deleted.

For – 9 Against – 0 Abstain - 0

- 2) That the response as amended be forwarded to Kent County Council as the Borough Council's formal response to the Local Transport Plan 4 consultation by the deadline of 30 October 2016.

For – 9 Against – 0 Abstain – 0

92. REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT - RESPONSE TO M20 LORRY PARK CONSULTATION

The Senior Transport Planner presented the report detailing the council's submitted response to a Highways England consultation on site options for a lorry park on the M20.

It was explained that the response made reference to KCC's emerging Local Transport Plan 4, and stated the need for smaller lorry parks and enforcement.

The committee was informed that the consultation was not open in time for a draft response to be presented to the September 2016 meeting of the committee for agreement, and therefore had been submitted under delegated authority.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

93. REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT - GOVIA THAMESLINK 2018 TIMETABLE CONSULTATION RESPONSE

The Senior Transport Planner introduced the report providing a proposed response to the Govia Thameslink Railway (GTR) for agreement. The consultation set out proposed changes to the GTR timetable in 2018, following the completion of the Thameslink Programme.

Councillor Willis addressed the committee as a Visiting Member.

During discussion the following points were raised:

- The number of stops proposed should result in a journey of less than an hour which was welcomed.
- The consultation requested that responses give a preference with regard to whether the route travelled via St Mary Cray or Swanley. There was a general preference towards Swanley.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the proposed 2018 Govia Thameslink Railway timetable consultation be noted.
- 2) That officers be given delegated authority to produce a response to the consultation questions set out in section 4 of the report, to include the Committee's preference towards a Swanley stop as sought by paragraph 4.3 of the report.
- 3) That officers be given delegated authority to submit the response to GTR as the Borough Council's formal response to the 2018 timetable consultation by the deadline of 8 December 2016.

For – 9

Against – 0

Abstain – 0

94. **REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT - COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY: DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE SUBMISSION**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report which sought approval for minor changes to the Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Regulation 123 List, and an urgent update to omit reference to a Schedule of Modifications which was not required. It was clarified that the altered recommendations in the urgent update report did not affect the submission document.

It was explained that there had been few responses received to the consultation that took place between 5 August and 16 September 2016. None of the responses suggested changes, and there was general support for the Draft Regulation 123 List.

In response to questions the committee was advised that:

- One developer with an interest in a specific site had queried the viability evidence.
- The charges outlined in the Draft Charging Schedule could be amended at any time. The Draft Regulation 123 List was a separate document and could be revised.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the revised Draft Regulation 123 List as set out in Appendix B to the report of the Head of Planning and Development be approved;
- 2) That the officer responses to the representations received on the Draft Charging Schedule as set out in Appendix C to the report of the Head of Planning and Development be noted;

For – 9 Against – 0 Abstain - 0

- 3) That the Council be recommended to approve the Community Infrastructure Levy: Draft Charging Schedule (set out in Appendix A), and Draft Regulation 123 List (Appendix B) for submission to the Planning Inspectorate in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).

For – 9 Against – 0 Abstain – 0

95. DURATION OF MEETING

6.31 p.m. to 8.40 p.m.