Appendix C – Planning, Transport and Development OSC

(A) Completed SCRAIPs

Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development – Priorities

Maidstone Borough Local Plan Public Consultation

(B) Incomplete

Maidstone Landscape Character Assessment

Maidstone Borough Local Plan Development Management Policies

Community Infrastructure Levy

(C) Other

Although not a SCRAIP, the minutes from Council (October, 2013) are attached, following scrutiny of the methodology and the judgements that need to be made in calculating the five year housing supply

Committee: Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Meeting Date: 18 June 2013

Minute №: 8

Topic: Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development - Priorities for the Municipal Year 2013/14.

Recommendation	Cabinet Member	Response	Timetable	Lead Officer
It was resolved that:	Councillor Paine	Noted – to feedback at Committee meeting		N/A
 a) The Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development would champion the transport needs of rural communities with KCC, in particular: 				
 Bus Services and improved use of Community transport; and Maintenance of access to rural transport links i.e. footpaths; 				
b) The Cabinet Member for Planning Transport and Development ensuring that a process is put in place that ensures all ward Councillors have an early opportunity to feed into the pre planning discussions on strategic site allocations, including	Councillor Paine	Noted – to feedback at Committee meeting		N/A

Appendix C

Recommendation	Cabinet Member	Response	Timetable	Lead Officer
commercial sites.				

Committee: Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Meeting Date: 20 August 2013

Minute №: 19

Topic: Maidstone Borough Local Plan Public Consultation

	Recommendation	Cabinet Member	Response	Timetable	Lead Officer
	With regards to the consultation methods in the Council's Consultation Plan: Meetings with Parish councils – at meetings with designated Parish Councillors, these meetings should also include the relevant Borough and County Councillor(s) to ensure a comprehensive viewpoint is sought and provided;	Cllr Stephen Paine	Recommendation accepted. Where meetings with parish councils are proposed, the consultation plan is to be amended to extend the invitation to the relevant borough and county councillor(s).	6 September 2013	Emma Boshell
b)	With regards to the consultation methods in the Council's Consultation Plan: Meetings with designated neighbourhood areas - at meetings in non-parished areas with representatives from designated neighbourhood areas, these meetings should also include representatives from relevant residents and amenity groups, as well as	Cllr Stephen Paine	Recommendation accepted. Where meetings in the non-parished areas are proposed, the consultation plan is to be amended to extend the invitation to representatives of relevant residents and amenity groups, as well as the relevant borough and county councillor(s).	6 September 2013	Emma Boshell

	Recommendation	Cabinet Member	Response	Timetable	Lead Officer
	the relevant Borough and County Councillor(s) to ensure a comprehensive viewpoint is sought and provided;				
c)	Where appropriate, officers find opportunities to link wards and parishes together at meetings as part of its consultation process;	Cllr Stephen Paine	Recommendation accepted. There is a large number of meetings proposed in the consultation plan, so where appropriate, and particularly in the non-parished areas, wards and parishes will be linked together and joint meetings will be held. The consultation plan is to be amended to make this clear.	6 September 2013	Emma Boshell
d)	In order to overcome the perceived perception that developers representations are listened to ahead of those of residents; when the findings of the consultation are presented, the representations should be presented in a similar way to a planning application committee report i.e. clearly stating the number of representations made 'for' and 'against' with a comment from the developer;	CIIr Stephen Paine	Recommendation accepted. Whilst this is not an issue for the consultation plan itself, the report to Cabinet Member is to be amended to explain how the results of the consultation are to be presented.	6 September 2013	Emma Boshell
e)	It be communicated on the website and all forms of council communications that all representations will be considered but the council cannot guarantee that it will agree or disagree with individual representations;	Cllr Stephen Paine	Recommendation accepted. Managing the expectations of the public is important, so the message that all representations will be considered but the council cannot guarantee that it will agree or disagree with individual representations is to be communicated on the council's website, on acknowledgement letters and on other	6 September 2013	Emma Boshell

R	ecommendation	Cabinet Member	Response	Timetable	Lead Officer
rela Boi in t	at the public notice in ation to the Maidstone rough Local Plan is placed the Downs Mail as well as e Kent Messenger; and	Cllr Stephen Paine	consultation material. Recommendation accepted. The consultation plan is to be amended to include the placing of advertisements in the Downs Mail and the Kent and Sussex Courier as well as the Kent Messenger, to ensure that the consultation is advertised	6 September 2013	Emma Boshell
req	e following information quests be provided: The number/percentage of people who attended meetings during the public consultation in 2011 be provided to the Committee; and Copies of the consultation documents be circulated to ALL members of the Council.	Cllr Stephen Paine	i. Recommendation accepted. The council keeps records of all consultation events and this information is to be provided to the committee. ii. Recommendation accepted. The report to Cabinet Member is to make clear that all members of the council will receive copies of the consultation documents.	6 September 2013	Emma Boshell

Committee: Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Meeting Date: 18 June 2013

Minute №: 9

Topic: Maidstone Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (2013 amended version)

Recommendation	Cabinet Member	Response	Timetable	Lead Officer
It was resolved that the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development adopts the Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (2013 amended version).	Councillor Paine			Rob Jarman/Deanne Cunningham

Committee: Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Meeting Date: 20 August 2013

Minute №: 20

Topic: Maidstone Borough Local Plan Development Management Policies

	Recommendation	Cabinet Member	Response	Timetable	Lead Officer
a)	Further thought be given to the environmental net gain of Development Management Policies;	Councillor Paine			Rob Jarman
b)	Further thought and investigation be given to ways in which to incentivise the development of brownfield sites for regeneration in the borough;	Councillor Paine			Rob Jarman
c)	The appropriate Development Management Policies be explored and developed to include explicit reference to, and criteria for, the following: • Windfarms • Live work units and the expansion of existing units in rural areas; and • Car Parking Standards.	Councillor Paine			Rob Jarman

Committee: Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Meeting Date: 15 October 2013

Minute №: 48

Topic: Community Infrastructure Levy

Recommendation ⁱ	Cabinet Member ⁱⁱ	Response ⁱⁱⁱ	Timetable ^{iv}	Lead Officer ^v
RESOLVED	Councillor			Rob
	Paine			Jarman/Darren
That the Committee agree the				Bridgett
recommendations, as set out at				
1.2.2 and 1.2.3 of the report,				
subject to the following amended				
rewording of recommendation 2:				
'That the PTD OSC recommends				
that the Cabinet Member for				
Planning, Transport and				
Development approves the				
methodology for guidelines for				
determining which infrastructure is				
included on the list of relevant				
infrastructure as follows:				
 If it is strategic 				
infrastructure;				
 If the cost of the 				
infrastructure is significant;				
 If the number of 				
development sites that				
should contribute to specific				
infrastructure exceeds the				
s106 pooling limit;				
 If infrastructure 				
contributions are determined				
by set standards;				
 If the delivery of 				
infrastructure is necessary				

Recommendation ⁱ	Cabinet Member ⁱⁱ	Response ⁱⁱⁱ	Timetable ^{iv}	Lead Officer ^v
before development proceeds; and If applications are being submitted that require infrastructure based mitigation before the adoption of CIL.				
The Committee requests that further information be provided to it on the percentage distribution of CILs payments across the borough and how this will be managed equitably and fairly, especially with regards the relationship between those areas covered by ward councillors, parishes and/or residents associations and those areas where the only representation is through ward councillors Furthermore, the Committee recommends the dissemination of accurate information on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), by the Council, particularly in areas of the borough where there is no parish council, neighbourhood, resident or community group representation.	Councillor Paine			Rob Jarman/Darren Bridgett
That a progress update on CIL be provided to the Committee at its meeting on 21 January 2014. This should include further information on what the CIL rate may be and comparable rates from other areas.	Councillor Paine			Rob Jarman/Darren Bridgett
That a training session on CIL be provided to the Committee in preparation of its January meeting	Councillor Paine			Rob Jarman/Darren Bridgett

Notes on the completion of SCRAIP

- **If the recommendation is rejected** an explanation for its rejection should be provided. The 'timetable' and 'lead officer' boxes can be left blank
- **If the recommendation is accepted** an explanation of the action to be taken to implement the recommendation should be recorded in this box. Please also complete the 'timetable' and 'lead officer' boxes.

ⁱ Report recommendations are listed as found in the report.

ii Insert in this box the Cabinet Member whose portfolio the recommendation falls within.

ⁱⁱⁱ The Officer/Cabinet Member responsible for responding to the recommendation should indicate in this box either the acceptance or rejection of the recommendation.

^{iv} The Officer/Cabinet Member responsible for responding to the recommendation should indicate in this box when the action in indicated in the previous box will be implemented.

^v The Officer/Cabinet Member responsible for responding to the recommendation should indicate in this box the Officer responsible for the implementation of the action highlighted in the 'response' box.