

## KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

---

### ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT CABINET COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Environment & Transport Cabinet Committee held in the Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Friday, 8 July 2016.

PRESENT: Mrs P A V Stockell (Chairman), Mr C R Pearman (Vice-Chairman), Mr M J Angell (Substitute for Mr M A Wickham), Mr M Baldock, Mr D L Brazier (Substitute for Mr A H T Bowles), Mr L Burgess (Substitute for Mr B E MacDowall), Mr C W Caller, Mr B E Clark, Dr M R Eddy, Mr P J Homewood, Mr R A Marsh (Substitute for Mr J M Ozog), Mr C Simkins, Mrs C J Waters and Mr M E Whybrow

ALSO PRESENT: Mr M A C Balfour and Mr P M Hill, OBE

IN ATTENDANCE: Mrs B Cooper (Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport), Mr R Wilkin (Interim Director of Highways, Transformation and Waste), Mr A Loosemore (Head of Highway Operations), Mr R Fitzgerald (Performance Manager), Mr P Lightowler (Head of Public Transport), Ms R Mort (Principal Transport Planner - Delivery), Ms C McKenzie (Sustainability and Climate Change Manager), Mr M Overbeke (Head of Public Protection), Mr J Ratcliffe (Principal Transport Planner - Strategy), Mrs S Thompson (Head of Planning Applications Group), Ms N Hood (Waste Business Partnership Manager (interim)), Mr R Clark (Street Light LED Programme Manager), Mrs K Moreton (Drainage and Flood Manager) and Ms C A Singh (Democratic Services Officer)

### UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

#### **183. Apologies and Substitutes**

*(Item A2)*

Apologies were received from Mr Bowles, substituted by Mr Brazier, Mr Chittenden, substituted by Mr Clark, Mr MacDowall, substituted by Mr Burgess, Mr Wickham substituted by Mr Angell and Mr Ozog, substituted by Mr Marsh.

#### **184. Declarations of Interest by Members in items on the Agenda**

*(Item A3)*

There were no declarations of interest received.

#### **185. Minutes of the meeting held on 4 May 2016**

*(Item A4)*

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 4 May were correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

#### **186. Verbal updates**

*(Item A5)*

1. The Cabinet Member for Community Services, Mr Hill, introduced this item advising that he and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Procurement, Mr

Simmonds, and the Deputy Cabinet Member, Miss Carey, met with the newly elected Kent Police and Crime Commissioner, Mr Matthew Scott, and had a positive discussion on how they would work closely to support him with his Police and Crime Plan.

2. Mr Hill advised that the Kent School Games were held on 30 June and the Deputy Cabinet Member for Community Services, Mrs Hohler, and the Cabinet Member, Mr Balfour were in attendance. The event was well attended with 7000 young people present.

3. Mr Hill noted comments and responded to questions by Members as follows:

- Dr Eddy considered that it was useful to have an open dialogue with the new Kent Police and Crime Commissioner and was hopeful that changes that needed to be made would be seen specifically at Deal Police Station.
- Mrs Waters raised the issue of schools from deprived areas not participating in the Kent School Games. Mr Hill said that every encouragement was given to schools but required the support of the Headteacher of the school. He advised that gradually over time more schools were participating.

4. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Mr Balfour, tabled a copy of his verbal update notes, as requested at the last meeting. The notes are appended to these Minutes.

5. Mr Balfour advised that the Government had announced that Operation Stack lorry park was to go ahead at the Stanford West site, off the M20. He added that considerable effort was being made by Kent County Council (KCC) officers for Highways England to move at a pace. It was expected that by the end of July a six week consultation would be held on how the site would be managed and landscaped. KCC would be recommending HE employ local contractors. It was anticipated that the site would start to be operational next year.

6. Mr Balfour responded to comments and questions by Members as follows:

- Mr Balfour agreed to Mr Baldock's request to meet with him at the waste tip at Mill Lane, to discuss concerns that he had.
- Members commented on the uncertainty of government spending following the national referendum result to leave the European Union.
- Mr Balfour advised that there had been agreement for TAP to remain at Dover and for the blanket 40 miles per hour speed limit to be reviewed. He advised that following discussions with representatives of Port of Dover they were of the same opinion.
- Mr Balfour advised that there were plans for part of the Operation Stack lorry park site to be used for overnight lorry parking. This area of the site was hidden from the main road
- Mr Balfour agreed to report back on the A2 café site that was currently being repaired but was being occupied by caravans.
- Mr Balfour advised that the Maidstone Joint Transport Board was nearing an agreement on the principles of its Integrated Transport Strategy.

7. RESOLVED that the comments and responses to questions by Members be noted with thanks.

### **187. Performance Dashboard**

*(Item B1)*

1. The Business Intelligence Manager, Mr Fitzgerald, introduced the first of the regular reports on the performance against targets for the Key Performance Indicators for the 2016/17 financial year.

2. Mr Fitzgerald highlighted that the report covered the performance in April and May for the year and, to date, was ahead of target for the indicators for Highways and Transportation with one indicator, streetlights repaired in timescale behind target for the month, partly due to repairs being postponed for those lights due to be converted to LED. He considered that the indicator shown as red for the removal of dangerous and hazardous goods from the market under Trading Standards was unfair as this figure could vary greatly month by month. He advised that a more appropriate phasing would be considered.

3. Mr Fitzgerald and Mr Balfour received comments and responded to questions by Members as follows:

- Mr Balfour noted the frustrations regarding the reduction in funding for the Public Rights of Way (PROW) advising that any more funding would mean taking funding from other service budget such as Education and Social Services. There would need to be changes in how PROW operated across the County within the budget constraints.
- Mr Wilkin considered that there was merit to the suggestion of focussing on reducing waste to landfill as an indicator.
- Mr Balfour confirmed that contractors were currently carrying out a blitz on potholes across the County. He advised that the contractors were carrying out the job well and were also cleaning road signs when needed. Mr Wilkins advised that the blitz on potholes was funded by the Government and KCC.
- Mr Wilkin advised that 11,000 LED conversions had successfully taken place. One of the providers of the lanterns had been unable to provide the lanterns on time however contingency measures were in place and there were three other providers in the County that could provide the lanterns so this was covered. He had confidence that the programme would be delivered on time.
- Mr Balfour advised that contrary to reports there had been no intention of KCC selling off county parks in the County. The intention was for them to be managed as well as they could be regardless of who owned them. He agreed to the request for a future report.

4. RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the responses to questions by Members and the report be noted; and
- (a) a report on Country Parks be submitted to a future meeting of this Cabinet Committee.

## **188. Local Growth Fund Round 3 and Large Local Major Schemes**

*(Item C1)*

1. The Kent and Medway Economic Partnership's Strategic Programme Manager, Mrs Nurden, introduced a report on the government launch of two new calls for project proposals that would help unlock economic growth in local areas.

2. In the first call, Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) were invited to bid for a share of the third Tranche of the Local Growth Fund, worth £1.8 billion across England. Mrs Nurden advised that the Kent and Medway Economic Partnership met and endorsed the business cases for 21 Schemes. The total value of the 21 schemes was in the region of £75 million. 1 of the 21 business cases has subsequently been withdrawn by the applicant (East Kent Spatial Development Company).

3. In the second call, LEPs were invited to bid for a share of the Large Local Major Schemes (LLMS) funding, worth £475 across England. To bid for LLMS, LEPs are required to submit large scale transport business cases to the DfT, which are compliant with the Department's business case development methodology (known as WebTAG). There are very few large scale projects with a WebTAG-compliant business case already developed, due to the high cost of undertaking this type of project development work and none at present in Kent and Medway. The DfT is therefore allocating some of the £475m to support LEPs in developing WebTAG-compliant business cases. The Cabinet Committee noted that the KMEP, at its meeting on 14 June, endorsed the submission of a LLMS bid to develop a WebTAG-complaint business case for Junction 7 of the M2 (known locally as Brenley Corner).

4. The Cabinet Committee was asked to endorse the proposed record of decision. This decision states that Kent County Council will endorse the bid submission, act as the accountable body for projects within its geographical boundaries and delegate authority to the section 151 Officer to sign a grant offer letter or equivalent.

5. On concerns raised and questions asked; Mrs Nurden, Ms Mort, Mr Balfour and Mrs Cooper made the following responses:

- Mr Balfour advised that he had discussed the rising costs of Ashford Spurs with the Minister for Transport, Mrs Claire Perry. Ashford Spurs was a priority.
- Mrs Cooper advised that KMEP, Ashford Borough Council and KCC were supporting the Ashford Spur project.
- Ms Mort assured Members that the projects for cycling and walking were included but were often hidden by their titles. There were also bids for Ashford Town Centre and Dartford Town Centre for pedestrian improvements. The Government had also announced access funds for walking and cycling.
- Mrs Nurden advised that KMEP firmly supports the proposal for a new Lower Thames Crossing to the east of Gravesend and Tilbury. This will place additional traffic capacity demands on the M2. The narrative to accompany the bid submission would stress the need for investment in a package of measures on the strategic road network to support the new

crossing, and the package includes reconfiguration of the Duke of York's Roundabout on the M2 (1 of the 20 LGF bids).

- A comment was made that much investment was required in local infrastructure to generate the desired economic growth.

6. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the recommendation in the report the votes cast were as follows: 9 votes for, 2 against and 2 abstained. The proposal was carried.

7. RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the comments and responses to questions by Members be noted;
- (b) Ms Mort was given thanks for all her hard work carried out on the projects by Mr Balfour.
- (c) the Cabinet Committee endorsed, the proposed decision to be taken by the Leader of the Council for Kent County Council to:
  - Endorse the Local Growth Fund Round 3 (LGF3) and Large Local Major Scheme (LLMS) bid submissions to Government proposed by the Kent & Medway Economic Partnership & the South East Local Enterprise Partnership.
  - Act as the accountable body for projects within Kent County Council's geographical boundaries that are selected by the Government to receive LGF3 and LLMS funding.
  - Delegate to the Section 151 Officer the authority to sign on KCC's behalf a grant offer letter or equivalent, where this is required to draw down funds following business case approval

## **189. KCC Bus Funding Review - Report into Public Consultation and Recommended Actions**

*(Item C2)*

1. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Mr Balfour, introduced a report that sought Members endorsement or recommendations to the proposed decision to implement the package of supported bus service initiatives as set out in paragraph 2.3 of the report.

2. The Head of Public Transport, Mr Lightowler, highlighted the findings of the consultation that ran between 21 March and 15 May 2016 advising that there were 424 responses received; 276 responses were to specific initiatives in the consultation document and 63% of the respondents used the services affected and 175 of the respondents identified themselves as being in a protected group as per the EQiA. He advised that the key message was the need for change. However there were some concerns that may have reflected a lack of understanding of exactly what the proposed changes entail suggesting a need to reassure users – including providing reassurance around alternative provision.

3. Mr Lightowler agreed to provide information about the alternative timetables for those services where that was not included in the consultation.

4. Concerns and questions were responded to by Mr Lightowler and Mr Balfour as follows:-

- Mr Caller questioned what was being proposed in the recommendation of the report as the revised timetables had not been received by the public as part of the consultation. He considered that he might vote against the recommendation as it stood. Mr Balfour expressed his regret that Mr Caller did not feel properly informed. He suggested that Members had the opportunity to ask him or the Corporate Director, Mrs Cooper questions before the meeting.
- Mr Lightowler in response to the question of what efficiencies would be used to ensure that the budget for supported bus in 2016/17 would be delivered, explained that Public Transport had built up a reserve, through efficient management of spend and by delivering a BSOG surplus. Mr Lightowler explained that when BSOG was devolved from DfT to Kent, for supported services, rather than just pay the same amounts to the operators as DfT, Kent re-ran the BSOG calculations in conjunction with the operators and this generated a surplus, Operators were happy with this arrangement and under the devolved ruled any BSOG surplus could be re-invested in Public Transport. It was this reserve said Mr Lightowler which would be used to fund any gap.
- Mr Lightowler confirmed that the EQiA, both for the whole package and for each individual route was produced by working closely with the Equalities Team, using their advice, and had been reviewed by them.
- Mr Lightowler explained, in response to a question re reputational issue with the operator (service 12RL alternative provider) that in the case of service 12, the alternative to service 12RL the service had reliability issues in the past; running late and breaking down. There was now a strong programme with new engineers to resolve the vehicle issues. The problem was that bus services were like retail, once a service got a reputation it was hard to remove, even when it was working correctly. Mr Lightowler was working closely with the operator concerned and the timetable would improve in the coming months.
- Referring to those with limited mobility or a disability, Mr Lightowler referred to the Kent Karrier scheme, which provided a door to door service. Mr Lightowler pointed out that by the end of 2017 the bus fleet of Kent would be fully accessible as per the legislation, which had opened up travel for those with limited mobility or a disability. He pointed to the example of Stagecoach in Kent that recently introduced 30 new accessible double deckers, with another 25 to come.
- Dr Eddy was pleased to see that services 541 and 542 had received a substantial response as they served a very deprived remote village. He noted that there were 26 responses relating to the service 14A Canterbury to Deal. He had concerns regarding the Deal Dover to Sandown as it would not extend to Sandown beyond 4.55 pm. In the afternoon there were people who worked in Deal and lived in Sandown so need to look at timing of those buses. There were plenty of residents in those areas that did not have cars. Mr Lightowler confirmed that officers would look at how the plan would work for residents. He also agreed to speak with the operator regarding the 540 group.

- Mr Lightowler confirmed that the 123 Nu-Venture service timetabled to arrive five minutes before the train was due to leave the station, worked well if it was used by a ticket holder, but did accept that if you had to buy a ticket it would be a rush. Mr Lightowler said that he believed that many of the users were regular rail commuters and so already had their tickets.

5. RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted; and
- (b) the Cabinet Committee endorsed the proposed decision to be taken by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to implement the package of support bus service initiatives as outlined in paragraph 2.3 in the report.

**190. Progress in the development of an integrated Kent Community Safety Team**

*(Item D4)*

*(The Chairman agreed to bring this item forward to allow the Cabinet Member for Community Services to attend another meeting)*

1. The Cabinet Member for Community Services, Mr Hill, introduced a report that set out the background and the progress made in creating an integrated Community Safety Team involving personnel in KCC, Kent Police and Kent Fire and Rescue Service. He highlighted that feedback and discussions with the Kent Police Chief Constable suggested that this initiative was making community safety a great success. The Group Head Public Protection, Mr Overbeke, advised that a successful Community Safety Conference was held and those present were happy with the position of the initiative.
2. RESOLVED that the progress and the plans to develop integration of the Community Safety Team further be noted.

**191. Local Transport Plan 4: Delivering Growth without Gridlock (Consultation Draft)**

*(Item D1)*

1. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Mr Balfour, introduced a report highlighting that this is a refreshed Local Transport Plan (LTP) that included the nationally important strategic priorities such as the new Lower Thames Crossing and a solution to Operation Stack, countywide priorities and priority transport schemes in each district.
2. Mr Pearman, Chairman of the Task and Finish Group, advised that the Group looked at road safety in particular, detailed on page 10 of the draft LTP4 headed "Outcomes for Transport". The draft LTP4 would be subject to a statutory 12 week

public consultation. He thanked the Transport Strategy Manager, Lead officer for the LTP, Mr Ratcliffe, for all his work.

3. Mr Ratcliffe added that the LTP included a list of priorities that would be used to bid for future funds as and when they became available. He advised that following the 12 week public consultation a report on the outcomes would be brought back to a future meeting of this Cabinet Committee.

4. Concerns and questions by Members were responded to by Mr Balfour and Mr Ratcliffe as follows:

- Mr Caller said that he could not endorse the document as recommended in the report as the LTP contained the Lower Thames Crossing which would be going through Gravesend.
- Mr Whybrow advised that he was a Member of the Task and Finish Group and commended this method of getting Members involved and this should be encouraged. Mr Whybrow said that he could not endorse the document.
- Mr Baldock, also a Member of the Task and Finish Group said that he had problems with the priorities noted and considered that the priorities were not aimed at the people that lived in Kent but was for those people that wanted to travel across Kent which he considered was the wrong approach. He then suggested that the recommendation in the report be altered to read “...consider and note the draft content...” He then referred to the title of the draft consultation suggesting that this could not be delivered without gridlock.
- Mr Balfour agreed with the suggestion for the recommendation to be altered to read “... consider and note...”
- Dr Eddy commented on the following:
  - The document could possibly bring contention as it dwelled on management of traffic.
  - The issue of road safety was wider than the document suggested. There were priority differences between road safety ie education programmes and asset management aspects such as white lines on roads being painted and signage.
  - He was delighted with the potential schemes listed, in particular, the A2 and A58.
  - He suggested that the recommendation in the report could be changed to “...issue it .”
  - The maintenance of road signs on the highways needed to be carried out and properly funded as part of the road safety measures.
- Mr Balfour suggested that there was a need for care regarding the issue of safety on roads as there tended to be many reasons behind road accidents including driver error. The assistance of Kent and Medway Police and local communities would be required as well as continued education of drivers on safety.
- Mr Ratcliffe apologised to Mr Angell, Local Member for Ashford Rural South, that he had not been advised on some of the Transport Priorities Schemes listed on page 42 of the LTP4 draft consultation document. He gave an assurance that he would be informed in future. Mr Ratcliffe advised Mr Angell that the schemes had been agreed by Ashford Borough Council. He further advised that the future schemes were a direct input by Ashford Borough Council. The priorities in blue were identified joint schemes; and the funding

for Ashford Spurs had not been secured as additional funding was being sought.

- Mrs Waters endorsed comments by Mr Angell regarding local Members being kept informed on local issues. Mrs Waters considered that the LTP4 highlighted the issues of congestion in New Romney. She had concerns that Kent residents may presume the listed Transport Priorities for each district or borough were confirmed as they were in the Plan. Mr Balfour explained that the content of the document was going out for consultation and during this time the districts and borough councils would have the opportunity to give their views/comments.
- Members agreed to replace the word “endorse” with the word “note” in the recommendation set out in the report.

5. RESOLVED that the comments and responses to questions by Members; and the draft content of Kent County Council’s Local Transport Plan 4: Delivering Growth without Gridlock (2016-2031) for public consultation be noted.

## **192. Kent Environment Strategy Implementation Plan and new 5-year environment targets**

*(Item D2)*

1. The Head of Sustainable Business and Communities, Mrs McKenzie, introduced a report that summarised the actions where KCC was the lead in the implementation plan; the rationale for the targets; and a summary of progress against the corporate environment targets set for the period 2011-2015. She advised that the action plan was key in allowing flexibility and the ability to deliver strategic outcomes specifically economy, health and wellbeing. The Cabinet Member, Mr Balfour, commented on how this could be incorporated when proposals such as planning proposals for a road scheme were being considered by Members to maximise the benefits for the residents who were going to live there ie open spaces.

2. Mrs McKenzie and Mr Balfour received comments and responded to questions by Members as follows:

- Mr Whybrow made the following comments:
  - He considered the report contained too much jargon.
  - He would like future reports to include some examples of how the outcome achievements were met.
  - He considered that the targets were underwhelming and suggested that they go beyond what was proposed and gave the suggestion of a target for zero waste to landfill.
  - He noted that the target regarding street lighting converting to LED had been exceeded and suggested that there should be a target for street signs which were also lit and needed to be addressed.
  - He would like to see a more ambitious target for the reuse of recycling.
- Mr Balfour and Mrs McKenzie explained that there were issues with the measuring of waste as KCC had a corporate estate and it did not have access to figures on waste. The Total Facilities Management were operating the scheme. Improvements had been made on carbon reductions and that was why there was caution with the targets.

- Mrs McKenzie advised that 'reduce water use' was issued to Kent County Council as a target although it was not able to be measured. There were 1000 buildings across the estate and were paper based. Efforts were being made to retrieve data in a simpler way as water companies were now going electronic.
- Mrs McKenzie explained that in terms of reducing business miles travelled by car, it was a matter of how people work. She agreed to discuss this with Human Resources.
- A suggestion was made that KCC estate could convert to water meters.
- A comment was made that we should not have targets that could not be measured.
- Referring to page 74, paragraph 3.4 a comment was made that there were targets listed but it was unclear what they were for. A request was made for this information to be in numerical form. Mrs McKenzie advised that paragraph 3.3 indicated the progress against the last five-year targets and paragraph 3.4 were the new targets. She added that corporate waste used to be measured by rule of thumb but was now measured by load which was as precise as it was as a target.
- A suggestion was made that it would be helpful to have a table in future reports that identified the energy used in previous years for a comparison to identify areas where KCC was least energy efficient.
- Mrs McKenzie explained that paragraph 1.3 on page 72 referred to KCC's 66 actions that were detailed in Appendix 1. The rest of the report referred to areas where KCC should be playing a role.

3. RESOLVED that the comments and responses to questions by Members and the Kent Environment Strategy implementation plan and new five year targets, committing KCC resources to deliver them be noted.

### **193. Highway, Transportation and Waste Kent Resource Partnership - Joint working**

*(Item D3)*

1. The Interim Deputy Director of Highways Transportation and Waste, Mr Loosemore, introduced a report that gave an update on the work undertaken by the Street Scheme Project Group, a sub group of the Kent Resource Partnership, in the last 12 months and the key projects identified for 2016/17. This included collecting data on; fly tipping across the districts and boroughs, dealing with abandoned vehicles and litter collection on the highways where roads had to be closed. The Cabinet Member, Mr Balfour, commented that this was a success story of working together with the districts and borough councils; and Highways England and Network Rail. He added that KCC continued to try to gain support from the government in tackling HGV fly parking by both foreign and British HGV drivers and stressed the need to continue to support the education campaigns against littering.

2. In response to comments and questions by Members, Mr Balfour and the Director of Highways Transportation and Waste, Mr Wilkin, responded as follows:

- KCC and the District and Borough Councils shared a lot of data on fly tipping and KCC assisted with prosecutions where possible. Overall fly tipping was carried out by a small amount of people and often related to rogue trading and there had been successes in prosecuting the culprits.

- There was an agreement in place between KCC and, the district and borough councils which made it clear who collected what and where regarding fly tipping.
- A comment was made that having a better Framework meant that KCC and the district and borough councils could work together and achieve more.
- Mr Wilkin accepted points raised regarding the historic litter problems in rural lanes and that overgrown hedgerows often hid litter. He stated that KCC had a statutory duty to ensure that the highways were safe and the integrity of that asset needed to be maintained.

3. RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted; and
- (b) the Cabinet Committee endorsed Highways, Transport and Waste's continued working with the Kent Resource Partnership in the key areas identified in section 3 of the report and also any future appropriate related projects identified by the Partnership.

**194. Review of Streetlight Trial Switch Off Sites**  
(Item D5)

1. The Commissioning and Contract Support Manager, Mr Robert Clark, introduced a report that set out the review of phase 1 – Trial Switched Off Surplus Lights and presents recommendations for the closure of the Safe and Sensible Street Lighting (SSSL) project.

2. Mr Clark advised that there was an error on page 110 in the papers recommending Romney Marsh to be switched on and paragraph 7.2.8 was to be removed. He then sought Members recommendation of either Option 1 or Option 2 as set out in the report advising that he had attended all the Joint Transport Boards during the winter of 2015 and all agreed the proposals bar Dover JTB that opted to switch the lights back on.

3. Mr Wilkin and Mr Clarke responded to comments and questions by Members as follows:

- Dr Eddy, Local Member for Dover, spoke on why Dover JTB asked for the lights to be switched back on advising that there were outstanding decisions on the areas where the light columns were on land developments related to economic regeneration projects and the removal of the columns may be detrimental to those opportunities.
- Dr Eddy proposed Options 2 – “that was similar to Option 1, but the sites in Dover would be switched back on and the columns would not be removed”.
- Mr Wilkin stated that he understood the concerns of Local Members and that it had been a bold decision to switch off the lights which had enabled officers to learn a great deal amounting to very few of the lights needing to be turned back on. The evidence pointed to this being a great success and had not impacted on community safety. He stressed that if there were changes the light column could be reinstated at the cost of the developers.

- Mr Clark explained that where districts/boroughs were not mentioned in the lists this was because they did not have sites that took part in the switch off. There were 2,500 lights across the 12 districts 1,200 across 9 districts put forward.
- Mr Baldock raised concerns of light columns being removed in his local district Swale and the way the list of sites was evaluated. He said that the only option he could support was Option 3 –“to return the entire trial switch off in the County back on....” as set out in the report. Mr Clarke stated that this had been assessed during the trial for 2 years and at no time was there a request to switch the lights back on. Mr Wilkin assured Members that the Options were part of the evidence gathered over the trial.
- Mr Caller advised that officers had listened to comments made at his local JTB meetings. He suggested that it was worth considering what might happen in the future particularly for Dover.
- Mr Caller seconded Dr Eddy’s proposal for Options 2 as set out in the report.

4. The Chairman asked Members to vote on Option 2 as set out on page 111 in the report. The votes cast were as follows: 7 votes for and 3 against. The proposal was carried.

5. Mr Balfour advised that he would revisit the issues for Dover in the coming months.

6. RESOLVED that:-

(a) the comments and responses to questions by Members be noted; and

(b) the Cabinet Committee recommended the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport proceed with Option 2 as detailed in section 8 of the report.

## **195. Adoption of the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-30**

*(Item D6)*

1. The former Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Mr Brazier, introduced a report on the outcome of the examination into the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan (KMWLP) 2013-2020 by the Government-appointed Inspector that sought the Cabinet Committee’s endorsement of the Plan for adoption by the County Council. He spoke on the work carried out by officers over the years that should not be underestimated. He then sought clarification of why the report was at this Cabinet Committee meeting as this was a decision to be taken by the County Council.

2. Mr Balfour concurred with Mr Brazier’s comments and commended the Head of Planning Applications, Mrs Thompson and her Team for their work on the Plan.

3. Mr Balfour and Mrs Thompson responded to comments by Members as follows:

- Mr Whybrow extended his congratulations to the officers on their perseverance with the Plan. He said that he did not agree with parts of the report but would endorse the Plan.

- Mr Baldock commented that there was a need to protect Kent's assets. He then questioned why there were no safeguards regarding the KMWLP.
- The Plan was a Policy Framework Document which constitutionally had to be submitted for consideration by the relevant Cabinet Committee's before it was considered by the County Council.

4. Mrs Thompson considered this a good news story as Kent had achieved something that other Local Authorities did not have, an adopted Development Plan. This would advise developers on how to take out minerals and states when and where development can take place.

5. RESOLVED that the comments and responses to questions by Members be noted; and the Cabinet Committee endorsed the report to County Council that it:-

1. Notes the Main Modifications to the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013- 30 (KMWLP) and the responses to their consultation;
2. Notes the contents of the Inspector's Report and his conclusion that with the Main Modifications (Appendix 3 to the report), the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan is sound and legally compliant;
3. Notes the minor non-material modifications made to the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan (Appendix 5 to the report); and
4. Adopts the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan, incorporating the Main Modifications and minor modifications (Appendix 1 to the report);

In addition, the Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee endorse the proposed decision, for approval by the County Council, that the Corporate Director for Growth, Environment and Transport be authorised to:-

- (i) make any further minor modifications which may be needed, such as formatting changes and typographical errors in order to publish the Development Plan; and
- (ii) approve and publish the adoption statement and the Strategic Environmental Assessment Adoption Statement.

## **196. Our approach to maintaining highway assets**

*(Item D7)*

1. The Chairman of the Asset Management Task and Finish Group, Mr Pearman, introduced the report that updated Members on the work of the Asset Management Task and Finish Group and sought endorsement of "Our Approach to Asset Management in Highways". He thanked the Members of the Task and Finish Group for all the work they had undertaken.

2. The Drainage and Interim Structures Asset Manager, Mrs Moreton, advised that this would focus on life cycle planning ie carriageways lifecycle planning to understand the different levels of investment. Mrs Moreton advised that a further report would be submitted to the Cabinet Committee. She sought Members endorsement of the two sided document "Our Approach to Asset Management in Highways". This would then be incorporated in the Implementation Plan.

3. The following comments were noted
  - Let us jump through the necessary hoops to receive this investment.
  - Paragraph 4 of the report should be borne in mind regarding the EQiA.
4. RESOLVED that the comments made by Members be noted; and the document “Our Approach to Asset Management in Highways” be endorsed and recommended to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for approval and publication on the County Council website.

### **197. Work Programme 2016**

*(Item D8)*

1. The Cabinet Committee received a report on the proposed work programme for 2016/17 that sought any additional items Members might like to add for consideration at the Agenda setting meetings.
2. Members agreed to the following items being added to the Work Programme:
  - Volunteer Wardens Pilot
  - Permanent Footpath in Thanet District
  - Country Parks
  - Bus Funding Review (*Since the meeting this item had been removed as there is to be a Select Committee on Bus Transport*)
  - Local Transport Plan 4: Delivering Growth without Gridlock
3. RESOLVED that the draft work programme be agreed subject to the proposed agenda items listed in paragraph 2 above being added for consideration at the agenda setting meetings.