

## SCRUTINY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ACTION AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (SCRAIP)

**Committee: Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

**Meeting Date: Tuesday 18 February 2014**

**Minute No: TBC**

**Topic: Maidstone Borough Local Plan Public Consultation Draft (Reg 18)**

Recommendation <sup>i</sup>	Cabinet Member <sup>ii</sup>	Response <sup>iii</sup>	Timetable <sup>iv</sup>	Lead Officer <sup>v</sup>
<p>That Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommend that Cabinet:</p> <p>Approves the draft Maidstone Borough Local Plan, as amended by the urgent update items 1-4, for public consultation (Regulation 18) subject to consideration of the following recommendations (a-p):</p>	<p>Councillor Stephen Paine</p>			
<p>a) That Cabinet does not consider future sites on Grade 1 agricultural land and that H1(19) Fant Farm, Maidstone be removed from the local plan as a proposed site for development on the basis that it is Grade 1 agricultural land</p>	<p>Councillor Stephen Paine</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>		
<p>b) That H1(18) Cross Keys, Bearsted be removed from the local plan as a proposed site for development on the basis that it is liable to severe flooding</p>	<p>Councillor Stephen Paine</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>		
<p>c) That Cabinet give serious consideration to the possibility of removing Yalding and Coxheath as rural service centres and re-classifying them as larger villages prior to public consultation as the specific focus on employment in</p>	<p>Councillor Stephen Paine</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>		

SP3 is not considered to be relevant to these villages				
d) That consideration be given to rewording the development criteria noted in Appendices A to E so that it reads 'planning permission (either) <b>may/is likely to</b> be granted if the following criteria are met' (ie replacing the word 'will' with 'may')	Councillor Stephen Paine	Reject. The plan should provide clear guidance on where new development is and isn't acceptable. The National Planning Policy Framework (para 14) states that local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area. The site allocation policies in the local plan are worded in a positive manner and the policy criteria are in place to control development and ensure it is acceptable.		
e) That under 14.7 and Policy ID1 – <b>Infrastructure priorities for residential development</b> – transport be moved to the top of the list of priorities and affordable housing moved to second on the list	Councillor Stephen Paine	Agreed in part, under the Infrastructure priorities for residential development, Transport should stay where it is. However, paragraphs 14.11 and 14.12 (Community Infrastructure Levy) should better reflect the importance of CIL in delivering transport infrastructure schemes.		
f) That additional information be requested from Kent County Council to enable individual transport assessments for developments effecting Sutton Road, Marden and Hermitage Lane areas to demonstrate how proposed mitigation measures address the cumulative impacts of all the sites in each area	Councillor Stephen Paine	It is already agreed that further transport modelling will be undertaken in the near future based on the full amount of development proposed for the plan period.		
g) That the word 'significant' be removed from paragraph 1 of policy SP5 (grey box bottom of page 41 of Draft Local Plan)	Councillor Stephen Paine	Agreed. Paragraph 1 will read "Provided <del>there is no significant</del> <i>proposals do not</i> harm to the character and appearance of an area, the following types of development will be permitted in the		

		countryside.”		
h) That due to concerns regarding road congestion at site H1(7) North of Bicknor Wood, Gore Court Road, Otham, consideration be given to access being provided only via Sutton Road with no access via Gore Court Road and consideration be given to making footpath and traffic flow improvements along Brishing Lane	Councillor Stephen Paine	<p>Agree in part.</p> <p>The site allocation policy specifies access to the North of Bicknor Wood site be taken through the neighbouring allocated strategic site H1(6) North of Sutton Road. With respect to improvements to Gore Court Road, the criterion should clarify that the improvements should be limited to the section of the road between White Horse Lane and the junction with the North of Sutton Road site.</p> <p>New criterion 13 (v) should be amended to:...”widening Gore Court Road to a suitable width to accommodate contra-flow traffic and a footway on the eastern side of the carriageway between White Horse Lane and <del>A274, Sutton Road</del> <u>the access into the North of Sutton Road site.</u>”</p> <p>With both these measures in place, stopping up Gore Court Road between Sutton Road and the site could be explored through the Traffic Impact Assessment for any planning application that comes forward for this site.</p> <p>For consistency, this amendment should be repeated in each of the site allocation policies for the south east sites.</p> <p>To avoid duplication, remove criterion 11 of site allocation policy H1(7). Improving the safety of Brishing Lane</p>		

		can be added as a transport scheme in the IDP.		
i) That the community infrastructure wording for site H1(11) Springfield, Royal Engineers Road and Mill Lane Maidstone should include reference to the provision of health and education facilities	Councillor Stephen Paine	Reject. The policy already includes a criterion (11) that addresses community infrastructure.		
j) That consideration be given by Cabinet to removing site H1(13) Medway Street, Maidstone from the draft local plan to preserve car parking in the town centre	Councillor Stephen Paine	Reject. Subject to public car parking requirements, this brownfield site would enable the Council as landowner to deliver much needed housing in a highly sustainable location.		
k) That further information be provided to Cabinet regarding site H1(17) Barty Farm, Roundwell, Thurnham to enable an informed decision to be made about access to this site, and in particular the impact on listed properties, and if no adequate solution for access be found this site should be removed from the draft local plan for consultation	Councillor Stephen Paine	Reject. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kent Highways has advised that this site is suitable for housing and has provided the following comments as part of the SHLAA process: Potential for access from Roundwell and/or Water Lane, although KCCs preference would be for the primary vehicular access to be taken from Roundwell given the restricted nature of Water Lane.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing. It enjoys good access to the A20 Ashford Road via Roundwell, which has a good crash record. A continuous footway link to the centre of Bearsted is provided on Roundwell.</li> </ul>		
l) That the wording on pages 9 of the draft local plan (Key Local Issues/NPPF 1) be updated to read: <i>'Ensuring that applications for development adequately address: (a) the impact of climate change, especially the issues of flooding and</i>	Councillor Stephen Paine	Agreed.  Subject to the components being separated out as follows:-  (a) the impact of climate change (b) the issues of flooding and water		

<i>water supply, and; (b)ensure dependable infrastructure is included for the removal of sewage and waste water'</i>		supply; and (c) ensure dependable infrastructure is included for the removal of sewage and waste water		
m) That HI(51) Cripple Street, Loose, be removed from the draft local plan due to the impact on the conservation area and countryside	Councillor Stephen Paine	Agreed.		
n) That the evidence for Boughton Monchelsea be reviewed by Cabinet. If the criteria for being a larger village is not met, site H1(55) Heath Road, Boughton Monchelsea should be removed as the site would not be sustainable	Councillor Stephen Paine	Boughton Monchelsea to stay in the Plan but the rejected brownfield sites offered for site allocation should be reviewed again.		
o) That site H1(58) Ware Street, Thurnam be removed from the draft local plan because the development would be too close to the AONB and would put more pressure on the already limited spaces in local schools	Councillor Stephen Paine	Agreed.		
p) That Cabinet remove site GT1(3) The Chances, Lunghorse Lane, Hunton from the draft local plan as planning permission has previously been refused and appeal upheld by the Planning Inspector	Councillor Stephen Paine	Reject. The proposed allocation site gained a temporary, personal permission at appeal in 2007. Since then, the Council has renewed this temporary permission and permitted an additional mobile home on the site. Since the 2007 appeal decision, the landscaping of the site has matured, helping to effectively screen the existing development. The proposed allocation policy requires the natural landscaping of the site to be further enhanced.		
That Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommend that Cabinet:  Rejects the designation of land at Junction 8 of the M20 motorway as a	Councillor Stephen Paine	Agreed.		

strategic location for employment use				
That Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommend that Cabinet:  Approves a further call for housing sites and sites for Gypsy and Traveller pitches, as part of the public consultation on the Maidstone Borough Local Plan	Councillor Stephen Paine	Agreed.		

### Notes on the completion of SCRAIP

<sup>i</sup> Report recommendations are listed as found in the report.

<sup>ii</sup> Insert in this box the Cabinet Member whose portfolio the recommendation falls within.

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

**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.

<sup>iv</sup> 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.

<sup>v</sup> 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.