



Direct Dial/Ext: 03000 414286  
e-mail: Hayley.savage@kent.gov.uk  
Ask for: Hayley Savage  
Date: 1 July 2025

Dear Member

**POLICY AND RESOURCES CABINET COMMITTEE - TUESDAY, 8 JULY 2025**

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at next Tuesday, 8 July 2025 meeting of the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee, the following report(s) that were unavailable when the agenda was printed.

**Agenda Item No**

- 6                    **Minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2025** (Pages 1 - 16)
- 7                    **Medium Term Financial Plan Update** (Pages 17 - 26)
- 8                    **Performance Dashboard for the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department** (Pages 27 - 54)

Yours sincerely

Benjamin Watts  
General Counsel

This page is intentionally left blank

## KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

---

### POLICY AND RESOURCES CABINET COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Wednesday, 5 March 2025

PRESENT: Mr D L Brazier (Chairman), Mr M Dendor (Vice-Chairman), Mr P Bartlett, Mr T Bond, Mr A Brady, Mr N J D Chard, Mr P C Cooper, Ms M Dawkins, Mr A J Hook, Mr J A Kite, MBE, Rich Lehmann, Mr H Rayner and Mr P Stepto

ALSO PRESENT: Mr P J Oakford

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr D Shipton (Head of Finance Policy, Planning and Strategy), Mr M Scrivener (Head of Risk and Delivery Assurance), Mrs R Spore (Director of Infrastructure), Mr D Whittle (Director of Strategy, Policy, Relationships and Corporate Assurance), Ms L Gannon (Director of Technology), Ms C Maynard (Head of Commercial and Procurement) and Ms P Blackburn-Clarke (Delivery Manager - Engagement & Consultation)

### UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

#### **247. Apologies and Substitutes**

*(Item 2)*

Apologies were received from Mr Barrington-King, Mr Cooke and Mr McInroy, for whom Mr Webb was in attendance as a substitute.

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

*(Item 3)*

Mr Kite declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 8 of the agenda, 25/00004 – Council Tax Collection Subsidies and Incentives, as Leader of Dartford Borough Council.

Mr Brady declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 8 of the agenda, 25/00004 – Council Tax Collection Subsidies and Incentives, as Councillor for Canterbury City North.

#### **249. Minutes of the meeting held on 15 January 2025**

*(Item 4)*

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 15 January 2025 were a correct record and that they be signed by the Chair.

#### **250. Risk Management: Chief Executive and Deputy Chief Executive Departments**

*(Item 5)*

*Mark Scrivener (Head of Risk & Delivery Assurance), Alison Petters (Risk & Delivery Assurance Manager) and David Whittle (Director of Strategy, Policy, Relationships and Corporate Assurance) were in attendance for this item.*

1. Mr Gough highlighted the strategic risks that had impacted each respective directorate's portfolios. The additional risk of CRR0065 related to the implementation of the Oracle cloud programme was noted as having reached a critical phase of implementation.
2. Further to questions and comments from Members, the discussion covered the following:
  - In response to the queries raised against the medium risk rating for CRR0065 – implementation of the Oracle Cloud Programme, given the significance of its implementation, officers advised that implementation of a not-fit for purpose system would score highly in terms of risk. There were however mechanisms in place and extensive testing to ensure that was mitigated at all costs. For this reason, the risk was rated as medium. However, the risks did not capture the cost of the programme, and this would require a separate risk rating and further conversations should additional funding be required to support the successful implementation of the programme.
  - With regard to the high-risk rating for CRR0053 and the associated policy that had facilitated this originally, it was asked if the new policy was able to mitigate a repeat of the past issues that had been previously observed. Mrs Spore explained that the previous asset management strategy of warm, safe and dry (WSD) past implementations. It was stated that increased maintenance would not exceed the current WSD strategy. Commitment to key buildings would adhere to statutory regulations. No significant undertakings of maintenance work across the KCC estate would occur. Mrs Spore emphasised the budgetary challenges that had be faced in clearing the backlog of maintenance issues.
  - As to whether the upcoming targeted move from the strategic headquarters had been captured on the risk register, officers clarified that the report had only captured a top-level risk view. Future asset management risks had covered some aspects relating to the move from SHQ. Mr Scrivener confirmed that he would be happy to discuss further with officers and members if required.
  - In response to concerns raised regarding risk CRR0009 and the wording that had been used in regard to the proposed funding from central government, officers acknowledged the concern and added that the metric discussed had remained static at its highest level for a notable period of time. The associated wording for the risk discussed had not reflected current funding concerns.
  - Members enquired about the current risks around cyber security and the impacts KCC had faced. Further queries were raised in relation to staff training on cyber risks and whether mechanisms were in place to measure success rates. Supply chain compromises with 3rd party partners such as

Microsoft and Oracle were also discussed as was how current data was stored geographically. The Chair deferred the question to item 20 on the agenda on 'Cyber Security Update' which would be held in closed session and which the press and public be excluded from on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

RESOLVED to consider and comment on Risk Management: Chief Executive and Deputy Chief Executive Departments.

## **251. Contract Management Review Group update**

*(Item 6)*

*Clare Maynard (Head of Commercial and Procurement) Paige Edwards (Commercial Policy and Governance Lead) and Katie Smith (Commercial Policy and Governance Officer) were in attendance for this item.*

1. Mr Oakford prefaced the update by highlighting the exceptional work that had been completed by Mr Rayner and Mrs Maynard since the inception of the group in 2016. £25 million pounds worth of contracts had been reviewed in the past year alone.
2. Mrs Maynard noted the importance of the report as being a key part of the informal commercial governance. Gold and Silver contracts had been reviewed at their respective mid-points and also prior to extension. The associated paper focussed on the four contracts reviewed since July. Bi-monthly meetings had occurred, but Mrs Maynard explained this did limit the review scope.
3. The reviewed four contracts had an cumulative cost of £45 Million pounds. Mrs Maynard further commented on the level of maturity that had been seen in contracts submitted to the meeting. Any concerns that were raised had been passed onto the respective directorates.
4. Social value elements had seen an increased presence. Joint works had been completed alongside commissioning to ensure that lessons learnt would be shared with the commissioning pipeline. Mrs Maynard highlighted that these improvements was an aspect of continuous improvement that would better aid contract management in the future.

RESOLVED to consider and note the Contract Management Group update.

## **252. Commercial and Procurement Performance Report - Quarters 2 and 3, 2024 / 2025**

*(Item 7)*

*Clare Maynard (Head of Commercial and Procurement) Paige Edwards (Commercial Policy and Governance Lead) and Katie Smith (Commercial Policy and Governance Officer) were in attendance for this item.*

1. Mr Gough highlighted the achievements and how KCC was delivering on areas such as savings, social value transparency and compliance. Mr Gough

proposed that the report be returned on a 6-month cycle so that monitoring of the remarkable work that had been undertaken continued.

2. Mrs Maynard explained that the supplied overview had encompassed the totality of the council working together and how contracts had achieved the respective requirements. The four key priorities listed were: financial benefit and return on investments, wider public benefits, supply and management partnering, and transparency and compliance. It was further noted how these four elements had aligned with the recently introduced National Policy procurement Statement that had been implemented in February 2025 to co-align with the Procurement Act.
3. Section 2.2 detailed financial benefits and savings, Mrs Maynard highlighted the error in dates and clarified that the reports actual start date was from September 2023 and not September 2024. £19 million worth of savings had been observed on contract activities, this indicated an observed average of 4.3% against contracts that were able to accommodate a saving.
4. Mrs Maynard highlighted that the 4.3% saving had been driven by aspects such as negotiation, benchmarking against other authorities, Pré-extension reviews and specification reviews. Due to the positive savings that had been observed a request was received to work alongside Adult Social Care and aid the Brokerage and Placement Teams in improving those respective teams negotiating skills.
5. Section 2.4 raised the discussion around the added values of social value, carbon reduction and recycling. Mrs Maynard added that contracts would be evaluated to ensure that they had captured those required aspects. Feedback received from CMT members regarding the quality of service had been implemented, providers that had not been able to meet the quality threshold was not to be considered for progression.
6. Further achievements were summarised such as the updated KNET pages in aid of the new procurement act, The observed 62% spend associated with Kent suppliers and market analysis had enabled the right mix of suppliers to be engaged. Improvements on cost with the largest providers in Adult Social Care had been explored as had work with VCSE and SME providers on spending the council's money progressed.
7. It was discussed that the No PO, No Pay policy had been implemented. A significant benefit was observed with the reduction of retrospective PO's. Mrs Maynard added that the report would be delivered in a 6-month cycle.
8. Further to questions and comments from Members, the discussion covered the following:
  - Mrs Maynard confirmed that all providers had to adhere to KCC requirements to support effective oversight. Requirements had also been inserted into previous contracts and in turn those measures would be passed down from prime contractors to subcontractors.

- Concerns were raised on the numeric figure of 30% retrospective POs being realised since the implementation of the No PO No Pay policy. Since, a formal policy that was implemented and endorsed by CMT. Mrs Maynard noted that a downward trajectory had already been observed in the realisation of POs.
- On the issue of subcontracting, further clarification was sought on why KCC had not directly engaged with those smaller providers and explored potential savings. Members also asked for clarity on added social value, partnership working benefits and in-house opportunities.
- Mr Gough responded that KCC had remained open minded on the subject of inhouse solutions and noted the completed works that had taken place within the domiciliary care contract as an example.
- Mrs Maynard addressed the Members' concerns on sub-contracting and indicated that there had been no incidents of a prime contractor having passed on the entirety of the workload to a subcontractor. Effective lotting had enabled KCC to retain a high number of Kent suppliers within the portfolio.
- Prime contractors that had managed the supply chain were subjected to a 10% overhead and reviewed at the cost monitoring evaluation stage. SIPs Branch had also continued to review Kent wide contracts.
- Mrs Maynard responded to further Member questions and explained that there had been a decline in waivers with additional work undertaken to address retrospective waivers.
- Some Members endorsed the drive to bring SMEs more in line with contracting arrangements and it was suggested that the provisions of Adult and Children's Service's was on a sound financial footing. Some Members commented that the current statistic of 80% commissioned services was too high.

RESOLVED to consider and note the report; and approve a six-monthly reporting frequency to the Committee on these matters.

**253. 25/00004 - Council Tax Collection Subsidies and Incentives**  
(Item 8)

*Dave Shipton (Head of Finance - Policy, Planning & Strategy) was in attendance for this item.*

1. Mr Oakford introduced the item of council tax subsidies and advised that a decision had been taken by Full Council to agree the Capital Programme 2025-35 and Revenue Budget 2025-26 (including Council Tax Setting 2025/26) and that this included savings to be achieved via this proposed decision.
2. Further to questions and comments from Members, the discussion covered the following:

- Regarding queries about future reviews on the impact of the decision, Mr Oakford responded that any future reviews would be the responsibility of a new administration post May elections.
- Members highlighted that the local taxation equalisation reserve was £11.95 million and had a drawdown of £1.8 Million. It was estimated that in 2025/26 an additional draw down of £3.48 Million may be observed and leave £6.67 million for March 2026. Clarification was sought as to whether this use of reserves was sustainable.
- Mr Shipton advised that there was an assumption on collection surpluses of an average of £7 million per annum. This had been the position for a number of years - if a higher surplus was to be observed, normal policy meant that it had been paid into the smoothing reserve.
- Mr Shipton explained that in the last two years the council tax surplus was lower the £7 Million. Mr Shipton added that the drawdown for 2025-26 had been related to the collection surplus for 2024-25 and not related to the proposed decision.
- Clarification was sought on paragraph 1.6 and the return of investment being set at 400% with regard to a subsidy paid to three Kent districts. It was further added that paragraph 1.7 stated that there was no evidence for CTRS payments. It was suggested by Members that this sentence was misleading.
- Members flagged that paragraph 1.8 stated that no billing authority had proposed or implemented any changes to discounts or premiums. However, it was highly likely that authorities would not impose any changes prior to a decision being made by the County Council. Concerns were therefore raised regarding the implications of progressing with the decision.
- Mr Oakford highlighted the discussions that had taken place during the previous budget debates as part of the budget development process. Mr Oakford commented that the concerns were speculative and it was unknown what collection rates would look like going forward. He explained that Districts had a statutory duty to collect council tax, and they had responsibilities to prevent collection failures.
- Responding to queries from the Chair, Mr Watts confirmed that the decision had not been taken and that there was still an opportunity for Members to comment and put forward recommendations to the Cabinet Member for consideration prior to the decision being taken.
- In response to queries raised regarding the consultation period for any changes should the grant be reinstated, Mr Shipton confirmed that in terms of the Council's medium term financial plan this had been assumed to be a sustainable saving. However, it was only a plan and there would be an opportunity to review and make the necessary changes for the 2026-27 budget.



- Clarification was sought on paragraph 2.3 on the subject of proposed recovery costs of unpaid council tax and the financial responsibility to bodies other than themselves. Mr Shipton responded that it was the legal responsibility of District and Borough authorities to recover unpaid council tax.
  - It was highlighted that subsidies to District and Borough authorities were discretionary and it was suggested that the subsidies no longer represented value for money for the taxpayer.
3. Mr Lehmann proposed that recommendations be made to the Cabinet Member to the effect that he be asked to explore a possibility of an option of incentive payments for pre-agreed target for councils.
  4. Members debated the procedural considerations of progressing specific recommendations beyond endorsement of the decision.
  5. The Chair accepted the motion put forward by Mr Lehmann and seconded by Mr Brady that a recommendation be made to the Cabinet Member to consider the following: :  
  

“To explore the possibility of incentive payments for pre-agreed targets for those affected councils to reduce the risk of large amounts of council tax not being recovered”
  6. Mr Oakford stated that he would take into consideration any recommendations made by Members, however, he would not be prepared at that moment in time to amend a decision that had been agreed at the Budget County Council meeting. Further decisions on the matter would require resolution by the next administration.
  7. Mr Watts clarified the current position, that comments and recommendations had been made during the debate which the Cabinet Member could take into account and they would be recorded in the minutes.
  8. The Chair, in light of the debate suggested that Mr Lehmann withdraw his motion and this was accepted.
  9. Mr Rayner proposed, and Mr Webb seconded the motion that the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee endorse the proposed decision. The motion was carried.

RESOLVED, that the proposed decision be endorsed. Namely, that the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services agree to:

- a) Cease the current arrangement with the Billing Authorities pursuant to which the Council provides financial support and incentive payments towards the cost of setting up and administering local Council Tax Reduction Schemes (CTRS) with effect on and from 1st April 2025.
- b) Cease the current arrangements with the Billing Authorities pursuant to which the Council makes incentive payments to support the removal of

- local discretionary empty property discounts and the charging of empty property premiums with effect from 1st April 2025.
- c) Delegate authority to Interim Corporate Director Finance to formally notify the Billing Authorities that payments will cease from 2025-26 financial year and to take any actions or make any decisions deemed necessary to the Interim Corporate Director Finance to implement the decisions of the Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services in (a) and (b) above

*Mrs Dawkins asked for their vote against the recommendation be noted in the minutes.*

**254. 25/00033 - Extension of Domestic Abuse Act Framework and KIDAS contract**  
(Item 9)

*Tricia Pereira (Strategic Advisor for Principle Social Work and Safeguarding Adult Social Care and Health), Sam Spiller, Rachel Westlake (Senior Commissioner), Iona Hunter-Whitehouse (Senior Project Officer for Domestic Abuse) and David Whittle (Director of Strategy, Policy, Relationships and Corporate Assurance) were in attendance for this item.*

1. Mr Gough presented the proposed decision. One aspect was related to the further Tranche of safe accommodation grant funding and the extension of the domestic abuse framework into 2025-2027. The second aspect encompassed the Kent Integrated Domestic Abuse Service Contract (KIDAS) which was due to end in March 2026. The proposed action was to extend beyond 2026.
2. Mrs Pereira explained the reasoning for extending the abuse act framework and the integrated domestic abuse service contract. Mrs Pereira shared the current statistics of one in five crimes reported to Kent Police had involved domestic abuse. It was noted that 60,000 people in Kent had experienced domestic abuse annually.
3. Mrs Pereira discussed the long-term impacts of domestic abuse. Aspects discussed were the struggle to remain in employment, instability of home life and long-term emotional effects. It was added that 33% of all suicides in Kent and Medway had been linked to past domestic abuse. It was highlighted that for the first time the figure for suicides had overtaken intimate partner homicides.
4. Mr Spiller discussed the statutory duties that had been set out to provide support to those residing in safe accommodation. The Domestic Abuse Duty Safe Accommodation Grant allocation of 2025-26 had been announced and KCC would receive £4,310,222. Current domestic abuse framework was in place until March 2025 with the proposal looking to extend until 2027.
5. Framework end dates would be in line with the proposed KIDAS extension, and all proposals would adhere to MHCLG guidance. The KIDAS contract had been in place from 2017 and had continued to be successful.
6. Further to questions and comments from Members, it was noted that

- Members acknowledged the robust framework and highlighted the male refuge aspect that had been captured within the report. Tribute was paid to the team for their hard work
- Clarification was sought on the Domestic Abuse Safe Accommodation grant and whether would it encompass wider supported needs. Mrs Westlake responded that the extension of the KIDAS Contract would be all encompassing.
- In response to concerns regarding ongoing education disruption that had impacted young persons that had moved into safe accommodation, it was explained that the priority had always been to remove a young person from harm and that unfortunately some disruption to schooling had to be expected.

RESOLVED that the proposed decision be endorsed, namely that the Leader of the Council agree to:

1. APPROVE extension of the framework arrangements set out in the report for ongoing management of the DA Act Funding 2025-27.
2. AGREE extension of the KIDAS contract and additional services up until March 2027 (12 months), permissible by PCR 2015 72(1)(b) and to continue to utilise this contract to support delivery of the requirements of the Act until the end of the contractual term.
3. CONFIRM the arrangements put in place via Officer Decision OD-23-0002, taken under delegated authority by the Chief Executive, arising from Key Decision 22/00040 to delegate acceptance of any future monies to the Corporate Director of Finance, providing funding is given on similar terms and to enter into relevant agreements with Government as required to accept the funding (2025-2026).
4. DELEGATE acceptance of any future monies (2026 onwards) to the Corporate Director of Finance, providing funding is given on similar terms and to enter into relevant agreements with Government as required to accept the funding.
5. DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director Adult Social Care and Health to, in consultation with the Leader, Corporate Director for Finance and Corporate Director for Children, Young People and Education, revise and amend the arrangement set out in the framework details, subject to the scope of the terms and conditions of the grant funding.
6. DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director Adult Social Care and Health, in consultation with the Corporate Director for Children, Young People and Education where applicable.

**255. 25/00003 - Disposal of land at Stanhope Road, Ashford TN23 5RA.**  
(Item 10)

*Rebecca Spore (Director of Infrastructure), Mark Cheverton (Head of Real Estate Services), Dan Parkes (Disposals Acquisitions & Investments), Niral Patel (Acquisition and Investment Surveyor, Investment & Disposals), Jason Harris (Assistant Surveyor) were in attendance for this item.*

1. Mrs Spore introduced the report which set out the planned disposal of land in Stanhope Road, Ashford.
2. Further to questions and comments from Members, the discussion covered the following:
  - Assurance was sought that the green spaces would be protected. The Member updated on the current consultation of the Oakfield aspect of the site. Mrs Spore suggested that the green spaces future would be determined as part of any planning application that had been submitted. Ashford Borough Council had determined authority onsite and would be considering the terms very carefully. Any relocations would be supported by KCC if required.
  - The consultation for the site would end on March the 25th.
  - It was noted that the land was not formally designated as an open space, however, it is space that was utilised by members of the community, and it was therefore important that the correct consultation took place. The Cabinet Member would have full information available to them for consideration prior to taking the decision.
  - Mrs Spore responded to queries about monitoring future use of land by a purchaser, explaining that due diligence was undertaken in regard to bidders plans for the site, however responsibility for and control of the asset sat with the developer. Mr Cheverton explained that any potential buyer's ability to complete a project was also considered.

RESOLVED that the proposed decision be endorsed, namely that the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services agree to:

1. the disposal of land at Stanhope Road, Ashford TN23 5RA; and
2. delegate authority to the Director of Infrastructure, in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services, to finalise the terms of the disposal and execution of all necessary or desirable documentation required to implement the above.

**256. 24/00107 - Disposal of land adjacent to Stourmouth Road, Preston CT3**  
**1HP**  
*(Item 11)*

*Rebecca Spore (Director of Infrastructure), Mark Cheverton (Head of Real Estate Services), Dan Parkes (Disposals Acquisitions & Investments) and David Oyler (Disposals Acquisitions & Investments) were in attendance for this item.*

RESOLVED that the proposed decision be endorsed: namely that the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services agree to:

1. the disposal of land adjacent to Stourmouth Road, Preston CT3 1HP; and
2. delegate authority to the Director of Infrastructure, in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services, to finalise the terms of the disposal and execute all necessary or desirable documentation required to implement the above.

**257. 25/00026 - Disposal of surplus land at Broomhill Bank school (North), Puddledock Lane and Rowhill Road, Hextable BR8 7RP**  
*(Item 12)*

*Rebecca Spore (Director of Infrastructure), Mark Cheverton (Head of Real Estate Services), Dan Parkes (Disposals Acquisitions & Investments) and David Oyler (Disposals Acquisitions & Investments) were in attendance for this item/*

RESOLVED that the proposed decision be endorsed: namely that the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services agree to:

1. the disposal of surplus land at Broomhill Bank School (North), Puddledock Lane and Rowhill Road, Hextable BR8 7RP; and
2. delegate authority to The Director of Infrastructure, in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services, to finalise the terms of the disposal and execution of all necessary or desirable documentation required to implement the above.

**258. 25/00013 - Freehold disposal of Former Aylesford CTS Workshops, Landscape Services Depot and Rear of Danepack located at Forstal Road, Maidstone (Herein referred to as Aylesford Depot)**  
*(Item 13)*

*Consideration of item 13 was moved to the closed session of the meeting as Members wished to refer to information within the exempt appendix.*

*Rebecca Spore (Director of Infrastructure), Mark Cheverton (Head of Real Estate Services), Dan Parkes (Disposals Acquisitions & Investments), Niral Patel (Acquisition and Investment Surveyor, Investment & Disposals), and Jason Harris (Assistant Surveyor) were in attendance for this item.*

1. The Cabinet Member and officers responded to questions of detail from the committee.

RESOLVED that the proposed decision be endorsed: namely that the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services agree to:

1. the disposal of Former Aylesford CTS Workshops, Landscape Services Depot and Rear of Danepack located at Forstal Road, Maidstone.

2. delegate authority to the Director of Infrastructure, in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services, to finalise the terms of the disposal and execution of all necessary or desirable documentation required to implement the above; and
3. note that the implementation of this decision is subject to any additional approvals or consents (such as Asset of Community Value, open space consultation, etc) as required by law.

**259. 25/00027 - Formal Lease for an Electricity Sub Station within grounds of the former Walmer Science College, Deal - to serve The Beacon and the Southwood Centre, Deal**  
(Item 14)

*Rebecca Spore (Director of Infrastructure), Mark Cheverton (Head of Real Estate Services) and Andrew White (Principal Estates Manager - Education Estate) were in attendance for this item.*

1. Mr Oakford noted that the duration of the lease exceeded the twenty-year threshold and required a key decision.

RESOLVED that the proposed decision be endorsed: namely that the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services agree to:

1. authorise the granting of a Lease in excess of 20 years to UK Power Networks in order that a new electricity substation can be built within the grounds of the former Walmer Science College site to serve new buildings for use by The Beacon and the County Council's operational Southwood Centre; and
2. delegate authority to the Director of Infrastructure, in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services to take necessary actions, including but not limited to entering into relevant contracts or other legal agreements, as required to implement this.

**260. 25/00024 - Granting of Formal Lease for a Solar Panel installation within the grounds of St Nicholas' School, Canterbury.**  
(Item 15)

*Rebecca Spore (Director of Infrastructure), Mark Cheverton (Head of Real Estate Services), Andrew White (Principal Estates Manager - Education Estate) and Julianna Munoz (Community and Domestic Energy Support Officer) were in attendance for this item.*

1. Chairman sought agreement from members that item 15 and 16 be discussed together on the basis that the proposals were the same across two school sites. Members agreed.
2. Further to questions and comments from Members, the discussion covered the following:
  - Members endorsed the recommendation, noting that 38 Kent schools were currently on the pathway. Mrs Dawkins also asked for it to be noted that

supported the scheme as a local member for St Nicholas School in Canterbury.

- Mr White explained the fixed term grant and the decisions made once the lease had expired. A decision would be made in 25 years' time on options to renewal with the County Council and associated operator. Mrs Menez clarified that schools had been encouraged to work with Laser Energy (KCC owned) in the procurement of solar panels, however, this would have required additional investment from the schools at a time when schools were not in a financial position to invest additional capital spend. In response to Members questions it was noted that heat pumps had currently not been part of the programme but could be an aspect to explore at a later date.
- Members queried whether any incentives would be available for the school. Mrs Menez responded that schools had to make an initial capital investment and would look to make a longer term saving and recuperate costs within 25 years.
- In response to queries about available loan schemes, Mrs spore confirmed that KCC has had a loan system for schools in place for a number of years. However, this came with associated risks for both the school and the Council.

RESOLVED that the proposed decision be endorsed, namely that the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance agree to:

1. authorise the granting of a Lease in excess of 20 years to Solar for Schools in order that a new solar panel installation can be built within the grounds of St. Nicholas' School, Canterbury to serve the school; and
2. delegate authority to the Director of Infrastructure, in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services to take necessary actions, including but not limited to entering into relevant contracts or other legal agreements, as required to implement this.

**261. 25/00025 - Granting of Formal Lease for a Solar Panel installation within the grounds of Brunswick House Primary School, Maidstone**  
(Item 16)

*Rebecca Spore (Director of Infrastructure), Mark Cheverton (Head of Real Estate Services), Andrew White (Principal Estates Manager - Education Estate) and Julianna Munoz (Community and Domestic Energy Support Officer) were in attendance for this item.*

1. Chairman sought agreement from members that item 15 and 16 be discussed together on the basis that the proposals were the same across two school sites. Members agreed.

RESOLVED that the proposed decision be endorsed, namely that the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services agree to:

1. authorise the granting of a Lease in excess of 20 years to Solar for Schools in order that a new solar panel installation can be built within the grounds of the Brunswick House Primary School to serve the school; and
2. delegate authority to the Director of Infrastructure in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services to take necessary actions, including but not limited to entering into relevant contracts or other legal agreements, as required to implement this.

**262. 25/00028 - Construction of new office building at Henwood Highways Depot - Disposal of surplus office building**  
*(Item 17)*

*Rebecca Spore (Director of Infrastructure), Jo Taylor (Head of Capital) and Hugh D'Alton Acting Strategic Programmes Manager) were in attendance for this item.*

1. Mr Oakwood explained that the asset had deteriorated and therefore disposal of surplus land and the construction of a new office building was the proposed option.

RESOLVED that the proposed decision be endorsed, namely that the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services agree to:

1. APPROVE the Henwood Project and NOTE the contribution towards Corporate Landlord Medium-Term Financial Plan savings targets.
2. APPROVE the allocation of £1.5m from the Capital Programme Budget 2024-34 as approved by County Council on 19 February 2024 for the delivery of the proposed capital works at the Henwood Depot site
3. APPROVE the disposal of the Existing Henwood Office building following delivery of the Henwood Project; and
4. DELEGATE authority to the Director of Infrastructure, in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services, to enter into the necessary contracts and legal agreements to facilitate the implementation of the decisions.

**263. 24/00101 - Contact Centre Procurement**  
*(Item 18)*

*Amamda Beer (Chief Executive) and Pascal Blackburn-Clarke (Customer Experience and Relationship Manager) were in attendance for this item.*

1. Mr Jeffrey presented the proposed decision on the call centre procurement. KCC had continued to receive around half a million calls a year. The current contact centre had been extended the maximum numbers of times allowed under relevant procurement arrangements and it was due to expire in December 2025. It was explained that greater savings would be made if call volumes decreased year on year. Contract value would be between £17.5 to £21 million range.



2. Further to questions and comments from Members, the discussion covered the following:
- Members acknowledged how valuable and important it had been to keep the facility in place and enquired if an additionality had been added to the contract in terms of KPIs improvements and deliverables. Mrs Blackburn-Clarke explained the Market tests on technological solutions would be explored and KPI reviews that could be measured against historical performance had also been discussed. Further detail would be available as the tender process progressed.
  - Members raised concerns about call response times and suggested that a notable improvement would be required in tandem with a strong KPI monitoring to deliver an efficient service. Mrs Blackburn-Clarke highlighted that the current contract in place prioritised emergency calls. Non-Emergencies had to wait longer. Penalties had been in place if KPIs were not be met on the existing contract.
  - Member concerns were noted by the Cabinet Member and Officers, the latter commenting that technological solutions would be explored but these had been subjected to the same financial constraints and resourcing demands aspects of the contract.

RESOLVED that the proposed decision be endorsed, namely that the Cabinet Member for Communications and Democratic Services agree to:

1. APPROVE the commissioning of a Contact Centre contract for up to 7 years (December 2025 – December 2032). Initial 4-year term, with the option of 3x one-year extensions
2. DELEGATE authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communications and Democratic Services, to take relevant actions, including but not limited to, awarding, finalising the terms of and entering into the relevant contracts or other legal agreements, as necessary, to implement the decision; and
3. DELEGATE authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communications and Democratic Services, to award extensions of the contract in accordance with the relevant clauses within the contract.

## **264. Work Programme** (Item 19)

RESOLVED that the work programme be noted.

### **EXEMPT ITEMS** (open access to minutes)

RESOLVED that, under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following business on the grounds

that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

**265. Cyber Security Update**  
*(Item 20)*

*Lisa Gannon (Director of Technology) and James Church (Chief Information Security Officer) were in attendance for this item*

1. Mr Oakford acknowledged the hard work the Mrs Gannon and Mr Church had completed throughout the last few years. Mr Oakford added how robust KCC had become to Cyber-attacks and had been performing above other councils in this respect. KCC internal securities had moved to an above average position and improvements had been noted.
2. Further to questions and comments from Members, the discussion covered the following:
  - Members discussed KCC response to cyber attacks and received relevant assurances of the current security arrangements. Mrs Gannon highlighted the good work undertaken by the Council but advised that they were not and should not be complacent.
  - Members were updated on progress in relation to Officer training in relation to cyber-security.
  - Responding to questions, Mr Church gave assurances that all data that had been stored within servers were compliant with GDPR guidelines as all Microsoft environments were stored in the UK or EU.

RESOLVED to note the Cyber Security Update.

From: Brian Collins, Deputy Leader  
John Betts, Interim Corporate Director – Finance

To Policy & Resources Committee 8<sup>th</sup> July 2025

Subject **Medium Term Financial Plan Update**

Classification: **Unrestricted**

### **Summary:**

#### **This paper sets out:**

- the purpose of the Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP)
- the proposed process and timetable to update and revise the current plan
- the latest announcements and consultation on the government funding settlement.

The current plan represents the previous Administration's priorities, based on a number of assumptions on funding levels (including council tax increases), spending forecasts in line with current policies, and savings/income necessary for a balanced plan. The plan for revenue spending (day to day services) was broadly balanced over the three- year period. The savings for the latter two years were not worked up in the same level of detail as 2025-26 and the plan for 2026-27 and 2027-28 was identified as "illustrative for planning purposes".

The capital programme covers spending on asset investment and is set out over a longer planning horizon over 10 years. The programme includes rolling annual programmes, (such as the modernisation of assets, which occur every year) and specific individual projects which are often phased over a number of years. Only those projects that are fully funded are included in the capital programme (funding principally coming from government departmental grants, external sources including developer contributions, affordable borrowing over the lifetime of the assets, revenue contributions and receipts from sale of surplus assets).

#### **Recommendations:**

**Policy and Resources Committee is asked to NOTE and COMMENT on the proposed process and timetable to update and revise the MTFP.**

## **1. Purpose of Medium-Term Financial Planning**

1.1 Having a thorough understanding of the financial outlook and the associated impact on the Council's ability to achieve its statutory obligations and strategic objectives is an essential starting position for future financial planning and sustainability.

1.2 The aim of a medium-term financial plan (MTFP) is to pull together in one place all known factors affecting the financial standing and sustainability of the Council over the medium term. It should be considered alongside the annual County Council budget meeting and the annual statement of accounts. This information is available on the finance and budget section on the Council's website [kent.gov - finance and budget](https://kent.gov.uk/finance-and-budget). The

MFTP needs to balance the financial implications of the Council's objectives and policies against resource constraints, to provide the basis for future decision making.

1.3 The information in the plan is compiled by the Council's finance team but needs to be owned by those responsible for decision making. Difficult decisions will need to be made to meet the statutory obligations and strategic ambitions of the Council, given the likely funding constraints. The MFTP should be the foundation upon which decisions are made to ensure resources are used effectively.

1.4 The plan for revenue spending (covering the provision of day-to-day services) sets out a high-level, Council-wide view over three years. It sets out forecast changes in spending and the principal factors driving spending (for example, annual contractual price uplifts, forecast demands due to changes in population and use of services, legislation, financing requirements for capital programme) and other drivers affecting costs such as market sustainability.

1.5 The three-year plan includes Council wide funding projections (including the future council tax base and household charges which together form the tax precept, retained business rates, and local government finance settlement) and expected changes in contributions to and drawdowns from reserves. The plan is balanced through existing planned savings and other income, as well as new savings which need to be developed and agreed to achieve the balanced position. Further work is needed in adult social care, if the current objective of containing spending within the specific resources from council tax and government grants plus a pro rata share of general resources is to be maintained.

1.6 The three-year whole Council revenue plan and one year directorate revenue plans<sup>1</sup> are shown as "net spend" (that is, total spending offset by income and specific grants). Net spend is effectively the spend over which the council has direct control. Net spend is funded from local taxation and a range of general/service grants from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government's (MHCLG) annual Local Government Finance Settlement. The three-year plan includes a separate analysis for wholly externally funded activities. Individual key service plans are one year only (2025-26) and include separate detail showing gross spend (split between staffing and non-staffing), income and specific grants, and resultant net spend.

1.7 The MFTP does not just encompass current day to day revenue spending but also includes capital investments through the 10-year capital programme<sup>2</sup>. The Council has a substantial asset base, and it is important these assets are used in a way to maximise value to the council including regular rationalisation and seeking improved returns. The capital investment strategy sets out the investments of the Council as required by statutory guidance. The asset management plan represents an inventory of assets, their utilisation and the ongoing maintenance and investment requirements. The capital programme represents the medium-term plan for investment within affordability and capacity constraints.

1.8 It is recognised that forecasts become more uncertain the further out into the future they go. This uncertainty makes it important to have a plan for the future, with a clear understanding of the assumptions and key risks associated with the forecasts. A separate

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendices D & E to the County Council report/sections 6 & 7 of the budget book

<sup>2</sup> Appendices A & B to the Council report/sections 3 and 4 of the budget book

sensitivity analysis provides an assessment of the accuracy of forecasts and alternative funding scenarios.

## **2. Key Features of Medium-Term Financial Planning**

### *Stakeholder Consultation*

2.1 Early consultation with key stakeholders helps to refine priorities. It is important that residents and businesses understand that resources are limited and that decisions have to be made between the relative priority of different services and the balance between free or subsidised services, paid for services and taxation levels.

2.2 KCC has undertaken an annual consultation on the overall budget strategy early in each year's budget cycle. This has focussed on the broad areas of service prioritisation and local taxation, without going into the granular detail of individual savings proposals. In the past, the Council has used a variety of quantitative and qualitative approaches, including face-to-face market engagement exercises, although recent consultations have relied on low-cost digital means through social media campaigns and on-line surveys.

### *Service Planning*

2.3 Local government exists to provide services to residents and customers. Effective medium-term forecasts need to be based on clear service strategies that reflect the implications for future demand and resources. KCC's incremental approach to budget planning relies on service managers making an assessment of the resources required to maintain current policies, as the initial starting point.

2.4 Many of the Council's services are impacted by demographic changes and the MTFP has to take into account the forecast impact of an increasing population and changing age profile, as well other changes that are key drivers for service demand. In many cases, future forecasts are based on the continuation of recent trends. These demographic factors impact on revenue plans and capital programme (for example, in planning for school places).

2.5 Council services are sensitive to many external influences and must be sufficiently adaptable to changing demands of the communities they serve. Whilst it is important to keep plans up to date, the budget planning cycle currently only includes two updates to medium term plan assumptions, an initial update towards the start of the cycle and a final update at the end of the cycle. There is no intermediate monitoring of MTFP assumptions.

### *Service Provision*

2.6 The Council's services are provided through a range of different delivery vehicles ranging from in-house provision to wholly outsourced provision. The majority of the council's spending is commissioned through external contracts. These contracts are of varying duration and generally include contractual price uplift clauses. There may also be the need to build in forecast service volume changes and allow for potential termination clauses and the cost impact of retendering. Each of these are separate and individual cost drivers affecting the Council's ability to manage spending pressures in the short to medium term.

### *Funding*

2.7 Revenue spending is funded from a combination of external income, central government grants and local taxation. The most significant sources of income are charges for services users (the most significant being adult social care client charges),

contributions from health and other public bodies, investment income, company dividends and leases/lettings of council buildings. Grants are either specific grants from the main government departments (Department for Education, Department for Transport, Department for Health & Social Care, Home Office, etc.) or are grants included in the annual MHCLG Local Government Finance Settlement.

2.8 Information on the core grants in Local Government Finance Settlement is provided in appendix K to the Council report/section 13 of the budget book. The potential changes to both the quantum of future grant settlement and the distribution to individual authorities are outlined in section 4 of this report. The current three-year plan is based on an assumed overall neutral impact for these. That is, the Council will receive the same cash as 2025-26 in individual grant allocations (other than those grant that currently have an inflationary uplift). This assumption will be reviewed when the Government publishes its consultation on funding reforms.

2.9 Council tax is the most material source of funding towards the net revenue budget requirement (accounting for 65% of net revenue). Council tax is levied on all non-domestic dwellings. Dwellings have been assigned into 8 different bands (with the highest band H paying 3 times the amount of the lowest band A). The Council does not determine either the banding for individual dwelling or the differential weightings for each band. The annual council tax precept for 2025-26 is a combination of:

- the tax base (the total number of dwellings liable for council tax after adjustments for disabled occupancy, exemptions, discounts and assumed collection rates)
- the estimate determined by collection authorities (district and borough councils)
- the household charge approved annually by the County Council.

The household charge is set in accordance the referendum principles approved annually by Parliament as part of the local government finance settlement<sup>3</sup>. The forecasts for future year's council tax income in the MTFP are based on KCC estimates of future year's tax base growth and assumed referendum levels. The forecasts for future years council tax income in the MTFP is currently based on KCC estimates of future year's tax base growth and assumed referendum levels.

2.10 Capital spending is funded by a combination of external and internal sources. External sources include government departmental grants, contributions from housing developers towards local infrastructure (section 106 contributions) and other external sources (often bids to organisations such as Arts Council, Heritage Lottery Fund, etc). Internal sources include borrowing (this can include external borrowing from Public Works Loans Board or banks but in recent years KCC has serviced capital borrowing requirements with internal borrowing), proceeds from the sale of surplus assets, revenue contributions to capital, use of renewals reserves and recycling from repayments on previous capital loans. Government departmental grants are the most material source of capital funding. There is also a separate schedule of projects in the pipeline where funding has not yet been secured, which is not part of the capital programme, but is part of the overall medium-term financial plan and is called "Potential Capital Projects".

### *Savings and Income*

---

<sup>3</sup> [gov.uk - Referendum Principles](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/referendum-principles).

2.11 Since the Covid-19 pandemic, KCC like other Councils has had to plan for a rapid growth in spending through a combination of higher prices and increased demand. The spending growth has been in excess of the funding available from central government and local taxation. This has meant that the legal duty to set a balanced budget has only been met through a combination of transformation, efficiency, financing and policy savings, as well as increased income.

2.12 Progress on delivering savings plans of this magnitude has not always gone to plan and subsequent medium-term planning has had to be realigned. This realignment is shown in the removal/rephasing of previously planned savings and removal of temporary savings and income.

### *Assessment of Financial Resilience*

2.13 The assessment of the financial resilience of the Council is an important part of the medium-term planning process. This is a function undertaken by the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and finance staff on behalf of the Council<sup>4</sup>. Their judgement is reported in a Section 25 assurance report to the County Council budget meeting, where all councillors must have due regard to the contents when considering the proposed budget.

2.14 There “four pillars” of resilience upon which the CFO and finance team should focus on in a resilient organisation – getting routine financial management right; benchmarking; savings delivery plans; managing reserves. These four pillars are reflected in the core work of the finance team.

### *Budget Risks*

2.15 A budget risk register is included in the MFFP<sup>5</sup>. This identifies and quantifies the likelihood and potential impact of the most significant budget risks which could affect delivery of the MTFP. The level of risks is a significant factor in assessing the adequacy of the council’s reserves.

### *Treasury Management Strategy*

2.16 The Treasury Management Strategy<sup>6</sup> the management of the Council’s cash flows, borrowing and investments together with the associated risks. The Council has borrowed and invested substantial sums and thus is exposed to financial risks including losses on invested funds and revenue consequences of exposure to changing interest rates. Most cash inflows are predictable with set dates or the receipt of government grants and tax precepts from collection authorities. These generally precede the dates for major outflows. Regular bi-annual reports of treasury management performance are made to Governance and Audit Committee and full Council.

## **3. Updating and Revising the Current Plan**

3.1 It is proposed that the existing three-year revenue plan will be updated by the end of July. The current plan was developed before the proposals for devolution and local

---

<sup>4</sup> A range of tools are available to the CFO in making this judgement, appendix I of the Council budget report/section 11 of the budget book demonstrates one of these tools through self-assessment against the key symptoms of financial stress identified by Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) in their publication “building financial resilience”.

<sup>5</sup> (appendix J to Council budget report/section 12 of the budget book)

<sup>6</sup> (appendix M to Council budget report/section 15 of the budget book)

government reorganisation were announced by central Government and at this stage it is anticipated that a three year plan will still be required for continuing KCC up to 2028-29. Local government reorganisation will not in itself change the most significant financial pressures on council services such as adult social care, special educational needs and children's services. It is a risk that, in terms of capacity, that will be considered as part of budget setting. The updated 2026-28 plan will form the basis for revised 2026-29 plan to be developed and agreed over the following months leading up to publication of draft budget and MTFP proposals for scrutiny, prior to final update ahead of approval by full County Council in February 2026. The government has announced its intention to restore multi-year settlements for local government although it's unlikely these will be available for the July update. The July update will include the following:

- a) unavoidable price increase estimates
- b) costs drivers for spending growth based on recent trends and progress on transformation programmes. The multi-year calculations will also be more refined than current assumptions
- c) any other cost increases kept to a minimum
- d) consideration of an assumption that some spending can be absorbed or avoided
- e) revised savings targets required to achieve a balanced plan with details to be worked up in the subsequent months in conjunction with the new Administration's priorities.

3.2 As part of revising the MTFP we will look to enhance access to supporting financial information, provide opportunity to challenge of spending growth predictions, explore alternative funding scenarios, put a greater focus on efficiencies and productivity savings, and align policy savings with the Administration's priorities. This will require an open approach towards identifying savings options alongside a more disciplined approach towards considering the scope of "statutory services" (for example, by being specific about which piece of legislation is being cited as underpinning any statutory piece of activity) and reconsideration of minimum statutory requirements.

3.3 It is proposed that the update to the Capital Programme follows the governance process set out in the current approved capital strategy, with the following steps undertaken between June and December:

- Invite business cases for new projects (bids) for consideration in the budget setting process.
- Review of business cases by the Capital Officer Group (COG) to take options forward to Corporate Management Team (CMT) and Corporate Board.
- Review projects in the current 10-year capital programme and refresh of business cases for any projects that have been in the budget for 2 years or more which have not yet started.
- Any implications of changes in borrowing in the capital programme to be fed into the revenue MTFP (i.e. borrowing costs).

3.4 It is acknowledged that the new Administration is currently producing its new strategic statement, but this has not yet been finalised. So, it is sensible at this point in time to plan the budget on the basis of an incremental rollover of existing budgets and service plans and to then review once any strategic priorities have been agreed.



## 4. Spending Review and Funding Reforms

### *Spending Review*

4.1 The Chancellor of the Exchequer published the Spending Review 2025 on 11th June 2025. This set out the Government's spending plans up to 2029-30, including individual departmental plans, providing more detail than previous budget statements. Overall public spending is still planned to be managed within the fiscal rules set out in the Autumn 2024 Budget. These include the stability rule to balance day-to-day spending with government revenues (taxation), and the investment rule to reduce the accumulated government debt as a proportion of economic output (gross domestic product – GDP).

4.2 The Spending Review includes the Government's plans for local government finance settlement as well as a recommitment to simplify local government funding arrangements by consolidating funding across government departments into the settlement and to reform the system to ensure funding is targeted to places and services where it is most needed and allocated in a way to empower local leaders to deliver against local priorities. This included a commitment to multi-year settlement and more up-to-date assessment of needs from 2026-27.

4.3 The local government spending plans include an average annual 2.6% real terms (£9.9bn in cash terms) increase in core spending power over the three years 2026-27 to 2028-29. Core spending power (CSP) includes council tax and the general, social care and other grants in the local government finance settlement. Approx 60% of this CSP increase is planned to come from council tax increases up to the referendum levels (3% general plus 2% adult social care) leaving some of the increase to come through additional grants in the settlement. At this stage there is not sufficient detail to determine whether these grant increases will come through the general settlement grant for all authorities, or whether it will be targeted either for specific services e.g. social care or targeted via measures of deprivation/relative tax base.

4.4 The Spending Review states there will be an increase of over £4bn in funding for adult social care, although how much of this will come from the NHS contribution through Better Care Fund and how much is within the local government finance plans is not provided. Similarly at this stage there is insufficient detail over how much increases for children's social care reform would come through departmental grants from Department for Education and how much is already factored into local government finance settlement. The Spending Review does not include any further detail on reforms to tackle Special Education needs deficits and further detail will not be released until autumn. The Spending Review has no specific detail on Public Health spending plans although any funding would have to come from the non-NHS element of the Department for Health and Social Care settlement (which is increasing by 2.7% in real terms).

4.5 Until we have more detail on the government's funding reform plans and which grants will increase it is difficult to predict whether the grant settlement will be better or worse than the current assumptions in the medium-term financial plan. The council tax referendum levels are the maximum increases allowed without holding a formal ballot, although the increases for individual authorities remain a local democratic decision.

### *Fair Funding 2.0*

4.6 The government launched consultation on substantial reforms to the funding arrangements for the local government sector on 20<sup>th</sup> June 2025. The consultation runs

until 15<sup>th</sup> August. The consultation seeks views on updating and simplifying the funding arrangements through redesign of the relative needs formula (RNF) used in the existing settlement funding assessment (SFA) and social care grants within the MHCLG local government finance settlement. The consultation proposes fewer service specific relative needs elements with the existing RNF for adult social care, children and young people services and fire and rescue retained (albeit redesigned and updated) and new RNF for highway maintenance, home to school transport and temporary accommodation. Many of the smaller RNFs are proposed to be abolished and replaced with a simpler foundation formula RNF.

4.7 The simplification is proposed through rolling in a number of the separate grants within the MHCLG settlement into the new and updated SFA calculation as well as rolling in a number of specific grants from other government departments. The proposals include changes to area cost adjustment (ACA) as well as updating and reforming SFA. The consultation also confirms that the government intends to include an element of council tax equalisation “the objective of equalisation is to make funding available in such a way as to enable all local authorities to provide the same level of service to their residents” but does not include any exemplifications of precisely how this equalisation will apply.

4.8 The consultation confirms that the reforms will include a full reset of the business rate baseline within the formula to reflect revaluations as well as recalculation of relative spending needs. The consultation seeks views on transitional support arrangements to smooth the impact of changes in funding.

4.9 The current override and Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) deficit will be extended for a further two years to the end of 2027-28. More detail on reforms to the funding for SEND will not be published until later in the year.

## **5. Conclusions**

5.1 Robust medium term financial planning is one of four key elements in public sector financial management (the others being execution, monitoring and reporting). The medium-term plan is more than the financial forecasts for the future and is the full suite of appendices published in the papers for full County Council budget meeting and included in the budget book. The plan should be considered alongside the annual statement of accounts.

5.2 The medium-term financial plan must be owned by those responsible for decision making and should be the foundation upon which decisions are made to ensure resources are used effectively.

5.3 The medium-term financial plan includes spending on day-to-day services (revenue spend) and investment in assets (capital spend).

5.4 The further into the future the forecasts become more uncertain and unpredictable. It is this uncertainty and unpredictability that make medium term financial planning essential alongside an ability to be agile to adapt to changing circumstances.

5.5 A sound plan is based on identifying the resources necessary to fulfil current policies as a starting point before then considering changes necessary to achieve a balanced and affordable plan.

5.6 The current plan will be updated on the existing approach by the end of July which will then form the basis to develop new revised plan reflecting the Administration's priorities whilst ensuring the Council can continue to fulfil its statutory obligations

## **6. Contact details**

Report Authors:

Dave Shipton (Head of Finance Policy, Planning and Strategy)  
03000 419418  
[dave.shipton@kent.gov.uk](mailto:dave.shipton@kent.gov.uk)

Cath Head (Head of Finance Operations)  
03000 416934  
[cath.Head@kent.gov.uk](mailto:cath.Head@kent.gov.uk)

Relevant Corporate Director:

John Betts (Interim Corporate Director of Finance)  
03000 410066  
[john.Betts@kent.gov.uk](mailto:john.Betts@kent.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

**From:** Linden Kemkaran, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Communications and Democratic Services

Brian Collins, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services  
Amanda Beer, Chief Executive Officer

**To:** Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee – 8 July 2025

**Subject:** Performance Dashboard for the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department

**Classification:** Unrestricted

### **Summary:**

The Performance Dashboard for the Chief Executive's Department (CED) and Deputy Chief Executive's Department (DCED), shows performance against targets set for Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).

22 of the 27 KPIs achieved target for the last month of 2024/25 and were RAG (Red/Amber/Green) rated Green, one was below target but did achieve the floor standard (Amber), and four did not achieve the floor standard (Red).

### **Recommendation:**

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE the performance position for the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department, and COMMENT on the KPIs and targets proposed for 2025/26.

## **1. Introduction**

1.1. Part of the role of Cabinet Committees is to review the performance of the functions of the Council that fall within the remit of the Cabinet Committee. To support this role performance dashboards are regularly reported to each Cabinet Committee throughout the year, and this is the third and final report for the 2024/25 financial year.

## **2. Performance Dashboard**

2.1. The last Performance Dashboard of 2024/25 for CED and DCED provides results up to March 2025 and is attached in Appendix 1.

2.2. The Dashboard provides a final report on performance against target for the 27 KPIs for 2024/25. The Dashboard also includes a range of activity indicators which help give context to the KPIs.

2.3. KPIs are presented with RAG alerts to show progress against targets. Details of how the alerts are generated are outlined in the Guidance Notes, included with the Dashboard in Appendix 1.

2.4. Of the 27 KPIs, the latest RAG status is as follows:

- Twenty-two are rated Green (the same as the last report) – the target was achieved or exceeded.
- One is rated Amber (the same as the last report) – performance achieved or exceeded the expected floor standard but did not meet the target for Green.
- Four are rated Red (the same four as the last report) – performance did not meet the expected floor standard. These are:
  - FN06: Percentage of sundry debt due to KCC under 6 months old
  - CS07: Complaints responded to in timescale
  - GL02: Freedom of Information Act requests completed within 20 working days.
  - GL03: Data Protection Act Subject Access Requests (SARs) completed within statutory timescales.

### **3. KPIs and targets for 2025/26**

- 3.1 KPIs and targets recommended for 2025/26 are shown in Appendix 2. The majority of KPIs and activity indicators are proposed to remain the same as in 2024/25. Four new KPIs are proposed, and one target has been lowered in-line with a new contract agreement. All indicators were agreed by the relevant Cabinet member and Directors/Heads of Service before the County Council elections in May. The new Cabinet members and Cabinet Committee members are invited to comment on these before reporting commences for the current financial year.

### **4. Recommendation**

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE the performance position for the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department, and COMMENT on the KPIs and targets proposed for 2025/26.

### **5. Contact details**

Report Author:

Matthew Wagner  
 Chief Analyst  
 Chief Executive's Department  
 03000 416559  
[Matthew.Wagner@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Matthew.Wagner@kent.gov.uk)

Relevant Director:

David Whittle  
 Director of Strategy, Policy, Relationships & Corporate Assurance  
 03000 416833  
[David.Whittle@kent.gov.uk](mailto:David.Whittle@kent.gov.uk)

# **Performance Dashboard for the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department**

**Financial Year 2024/25**

**Results up to March 2025**

**Produced by Kent Analytics**

## Guidance Notes

### Key Performance Indicators

All Key Performance Indicators are provided with RAG (Red/Amber/Green) ratings.

RAG ratings are based on Targets and Floor Standards brought before the Cabinet Committee in May 2023.

Where relevant, RAG ratings are given for both the latest month and year to date (YTD).

### RAG Ratings

GREEN	Target has been achieved
AMBER	Floor Standard* achieved but Target has not been met
RED	Floor Standard* has not been achieved

\*Floor Standards are the minimum performance expected and if not achieved must result in management action

### Activity Indicators

Activity Indicators representing demand levels are also included in the report. They are not given a RAG rating, instead where appropriate, they are tracked within an expected range represented by Upper and Lower Thresholds. The Alert provided for Activity Indicators is whether results are within the expected range or not. Results can either be in expected range (**Yes**) or they could be **Above** or **Below**. Expected activity thresholds are based on previous years' trends.

When activity indicators do not have expected thresholds, they are shown in the report to provide context for the Key Performance Indicators. In such cases the activity indicators are simply shown with comparison to activity for the previous year.



## Key Performance Indicator Summary

Finance	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
FN06: Percentage of sundry debt due to KCC under 6 months old	RED	N/A
FN07: Invoices received by Accounts Payable within 30 days of KCC received date	GREEN	GREEN
FN08: Invoices received on time by Accounts Payable processed within 30 days	GREEN	AMBER
FN11: Percentage of financial assessments completed within 15 days of referral	AMBER	AMBER
FN12: Percentage of working days aggregate bank balance is in credit	GREEN	AMBER
FN13: Percentage of working days average credit rating for internally managed cash portfolio is no lower than AA	GREEN	GREEN
FN14: Percentage of third-party insurance claims resolved within the designated timescales	GREEN	GREEN
Governance, Law & Democracy	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
GL01: Council and Committee papers published at least five days before meetings	GREEN	AMBER
GL02: Freedom of Information Act requests completed within 20 working days	RED	RED
GL03: Subject Access Requests (SARs) completed within statutory timescales	RED	RED

Marketing and Resident Experience	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
CS01: Callers who rate the advisors in Contact Point as good	GREEN	GREEN
CS04a: Daytime calls to Contact Point answered	GREEN	GREEN
CS04b: Out of hours calls to Contact Point answered	GREEN	GREEN
CS06a: Daytime calls achieving 85% of quality scorecard	GREEN	GREEN
CS06b: Out of hours calls achieving 85% of quality scorecard	GREEN	GREEN
CS07: Complaints responded to in timescale	RED	RED

Human Resource and Organisational Development	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
HR09: Training evaluated by participants as having delivered stated learning outcomes	GREEN	GREEN

Health and Safety	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
HR25: Completed corporate themed Health and Safety audits sent within timescale	GREEN	GREEN

Technology	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
ICT01: Calls to ICT Help Desk resolved at the first point of contact	GREEN	GREEN
ICT02: Positive feedback rating with the ICT help desk	GREEN	GREEN
ICT03: Working hours where Kent Public Sector Network is available to staff	GREEN	GREEN
ICT04: Working hours where ICT Services available to staff	GREEN	GREEN
ICT05: Working hours where email is available to staff	GREEN	GREEN

Infrastructure	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
PI01: Rent due to KCC outstanding over 60 days	GREEN	N/a
PI05: Percentage of scheduled Planned Preventative Maintenance completed by due date	GREEN	GREEN
PI06: Percentage of reactive help desk tasks completed by due date	GREEN	GREEN
PI07: Percentage of help desk calls answered within timescale	GREEN	GREEN

## Chief Executive's Department

Service Area	Director (interim)	Cabinet Member
Finance	John Betts	Brian Collins

## Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Month RAG	YTD	YTD RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
FN06	Percentage of sundry debt due to KCC under 6 months old	41%	31%	50%	34%	RED	n/a		70%	65%	73%
FN07	Invoices received by Accounts Payable within 30 days of KCC received date	86%	82%	78%	87%	GREEN	85%	GREEN	85%	80%	81%
FN08	Percentage of invoices received on time by Accounts Payable processed within 30 days*	99%	98%	99%	99%	GREEN	96%	AMBER	98%	95%	98%
FN11	Percentage of financial assessments completed within 15 days of referral	90%	89%	87%	86%	AMBER	86%	AMBER	90%	85%	86%
FN12	Percentage of working days aggregate bank balance is in credit (Incl. £1m agreed overdraft)	100%	100%	100%	100%	GREEN	99%	AMBER	100%	90%	97%
FN13	Percentage of working days average credit rating for internally managed cash portfolio is no lower than AA	100%	100%	100%	100%	GREEN	100%	GREEN	100%	90%	100%
FN14	Percentage of third-party insurance claims resolved within the designated timescales	100%	100%	100%	100%	GREEN	99%	GREEN	95%	85%	99%

\*Annual performance of all invoice payments can be found here: [Annual performance of payments - Kent County Council](#)

FN06 – There are currently 31 outstanding invoices over £100,000 which are over 6 months overdue, these 31 invoices total £13,684K - 72% of debt value over 6 months; of these, 26 relate to health debt. The Kent & Medway Integrated Care Board faces severe financial challenges and KCC is exploring how best to obtain payment, including the option of arbitration, as there are issues relating to KCC as both creditor and debtor.

FN08 - ICT issues in late July and August resulted in a backlog of invoices which took time to recover from and is why the year-to-date figure is below target. Monthly performance has remained above target since October.

FN11 – Performance this year was impacted by the diversion of resources for Changes to Charge project and the Annual Uplift process involving in the region of 15,000 financial assessments.

FN12 – On 4 October there was one incident of an overdrawn balance of £4.6m when a maturity bond was not settled as expected the day before. This has resulted in performance of 99% over the year, rather than the target of 100%.

### Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Year to date	Previous Year
FN06b	Value of debt due to KCC (£000s)	34,120	29,974	45,426	29,002	N/a	21,288
FN07b	Number of invoices received by KCC	7,087	10,420	7,607	10,347	<b>103,730</b>	98,834
FN11b	Number of financial assessments received	535	657	662	777	<b>8,400</b>	9,871
FN14b	Number of insurance claims resolved	60	89	69	123	<b>1,767</b>	2,177

Service Area	Director	Cabinet Member
Governance, Law & Democracy	Ben Watts	Linden Kemkaran

### Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Month RAG	YTD	Year RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
GL01	Council and Committee papers published at least five clear days before meetings	100%	100%	100%	100%	GREEN	99%	AMBER	100%	96%	100%
GL02	Freedom of Information (FOI) / Environmental Information Regulation (EIR) requests completed within 20 working days	82%	80%	89%	87%	RED	80%	RED	92%	90%	76%
GL03	Data Protection Act Subject Access Requests (SARs) completed within timescales	57%	49%	71%	56%	RED	56%	RED	90%	85%	43%

GL01 – The Amber RAG for the year overall, was caused by one Cabinet Committee meeting in July which involved late publication due to it being organised at short notice to consider only the Election of Chair. Publication fell on the same day as other key agendas and limited resourcing led to the publication being delayed to the following day. There was no negative impact.

GL02 – Despite the continued Red RAG rating, recent performance is some of the highest in over four years. This is due to a concerted effort by staff and a greater awareness across KCC of outstanding requests following the reintroduction of a weekly report to the Corporate Management Team. No Directorate achieved target over the year, with the best performing being the Chief Executive's Department with 85% completed in timescale. The highest number of requests (953) was received by the Growth, Environment and Transport directorate. The total number of requests remains historically high.

GL03 – Over the year, more than 80% of requests came under the Children, Young People and Education directorate. Reasons for delays in responding to requests include lack of resources, particularly in some operational teams, as well as delays in updating information on specific systems. The total number of requests also remains historically high.

## Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	YTD	In expected range?	Expected YTD Activity Upper   Lower		Previous Year YTD
GL01b	Committee meetings	12	18	12	14	151	N/a			143
GL02b	Freedom of Information requests responded to	164	168	204	197	2,344	Above	2,120	1,720	2,160
GL03b	Data Protection Act Subject Access requests responded to	72	65	70	62	769	Above	600	480	531

## Deputy Chief Executive's Department

Service Area	Head of Service	Cabinet Member
Marketing and Resident Experience	Christina Starte	Linden Kemkaran

## Key Performance Indicators - Monthly

Ref	Indicator description	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Month RAG	YTD	YTD RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
CS01	Percentage of callers who rate the advisors in Contact Point as good	97%	97%	97%	97%	GREEN	97%	GREEN	97%	90%	98%
CS04a	Percentage of daytime calls to Contact Point answered*	97%	97%	98%	94%	GREEN	92%	GREEN	90%	85%	91%
CS04b	Percentage of out of hours calls to Contact Point answered*	93%	94%	97%	97%	GREEN	95%	GREEN	95%	90%	92%
CS06a	Percentage of daytime calls achieving 85% of quality scorecard	75%	78%	77%	77%	GREEN	75%	GREEN	70%	65%	74%
CS06b	Percentage of out of hours calls achieving 85% of quality scorecard	79%	79%	75%	76%	GREEN	77%	GREEN	70%	65%	75%

\* CS04a/b - Please note that these figures can vary to those reported for the Agilisys contract, as that contract allows for days of exceptionally high call volumes to be discounted from the KPI calculation.

## Key Performance Indicator – Quarterly

Ref	Indicator description	Jun-24	Sep-24	Dec-24	Mar-25	Qtr RAG	YTD	YTD RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
CS07	Percentage of complaints responded to in timescale	66%	71%	71%	70%	RED	69%	RED	85%	80%	63%

CS07 – For the final quarter in 2024/25, collectively we responded to 70% of complaints in the KPI target timescale, this is an improvement on last year's figure of 56% in the same quarter, and a minor decrease on the previous quarter. The complaints team continues to work with services and managers to support their teams in responding to complaints, particularly where there are areas with backlogs. In terms of Directorate performance, the majority of complaints were received by the Growth, Environment and Transport Directorate who responded to 92% within timescale, the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department, together achieved 82%, just below the 85% target. ASCH responded to 53% of complaints within timescale, however it must be noted that any agreed extensions to investigate complex cases, while agreed with the customer, will be recorded as late. CYPE saw varying levels of performance for Quarter 4 across different services, Children's Services responded to 76% of complaints within timescale, however the SEN division achieved only 9% in timescale.



## Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Year to Date	In expected range?	<u>Expected Range</u> Upper   Lower		Prev. Yr YTD
CS08	Number of calls answered by Contact Point	32,114	26,436	26,437	26,438	26,439	<b>383,505</b>	Yes	460,000	383,000	425,480
CS12	Number of visits to the KCC website, kent.gov (000s)	487	442	585	487	633	<b>6,820</b>	Yes	7,750	6,350	7,182
CS13	Average speed of answer (ASA) by Contact Point - priority services (seconds)	44	32	22	13	25	<b>44</b>	Yes	120	30	43
CS14	Average speed of answer (ASA) by Contact Point - all services (seconds)	63	35	37	25	61	<b>88</b>	<b>Below</b>	300	180	105

CS14 – Speed of answer below the lower threshold for this indicator shows calls are being answered promptly.

Service Area	Director	Cabinet Member
Human Resources and Organisational Development	Paul Royel	Brian Collins

### Key Performance Indicators – Monthly

Ref	Indicator description	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Month RAG	YTD	YTD RAG	Target	Floor	Prev Year
HR09	Training evaluated by participants as having delivered stated learning outcomes	98%	99%	99%	99%	GREEN	99%	GREEN	97%	95%	99%

### Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	In expected range?	Expected Range Upper Lower		Prev. Yr
HR12	Number of current change activities being supported	70	53	52	52	49	Below	90	80	82
HR13	Total number of e-learning training programmes completed (YTD)	56,604	63,455	72,913	79,922	86,707	Above	75,000	60,000	70,016
HR16	Number of registered users of Kent Rewards	22,766	22,773	22,893	22,886	22,974	Below	28,000	24,000	27,654
HR21	Number of current people management cases being supported	157	156	153	155	152	Above	100	90	140
HR23	Percentage of staff who have completed all 3 mandatory learning events	90%	91%	93%	93%	93%	Above	90%	80%	89%

HR12 – Although the volume of change activity was lower than anticipated this year, the scale and complexity required a similar level of resources. Change activity is driven by the wider business and fluctuates monthly, with some activities spanning multiple months. The complexity of these activities varies significantly, requiring different levels of resources and knowledge.

## Appendix 1

HR13 – E-learning completions were higher than anticipated throughout the year. This was due to a significant uptake of 'The Role of the Evacuation Marshal' course and the launch of the Adults Competency Framework for Statutory Responsibilities - a mandatory learning programme across Adult Social Care that includes several e-learning courses. Additionally, Commercial Services Group launched multiple mandatory courses for their staff on Delta this year.

HR16 – The number of registered users for Kent Rewards dropped due to data cleansing exercises undertaken during the year to remove user accounts which were no longer eligible to have access to the site.

HR21 - Case activity is driven by requests from Managers and fluctuates from month to month. The high level indicates that managers are taking a robust approach and managing cases through the appropriate channels with HR support and advice.

Service Area	Interim Head of Service	Cabinet Member
Health and Safety	Maria Kelly	Brian Collins

### Key Performance Indicators – Quarterly

Ref	Indicator description	Jun-24	Sep-24	Dec-24	Mar-25	Qtr RAG	YTD	YTD RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
HR25	Percentage of corporate themed Health and Safety audits sent in 7 days	100%	100%	100%	100%	GREEN	100%	GREEN	95%	85%	100%

Service Area	Director	Cabinet Member
Technology	Lisa Gannon	Brian Collins

### Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Month RAG	Year to Date	Year RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
ICT01	Calls to ICT Help Desk resolved at the first point of contact	86%	87%	87%	<b>87%</b>	GREEN	<b>79%</b>	GREEN	70%	65%	78%
ICT02	Positive feedback rating with the ICT help desk	96%	95%	96%	<b>96%</b>	GREEN	<b>96%</b>	GREEN	95%	90%	95%
ICT03	Working hours where Kent Public Sector Network is available to staff	100%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>	GREEN	<b>100%</b>	GREEN	99.8%	99.0%	100%
ICT04	Working hours where ICT Services are available to staff	99.8%	100%	99.8%	<b>99%</b>	GREEN	<b>99.7%</b>	GREEN	99.0%	98.0%	99.9%
ICT05	Working hours where email is available to staff	100%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>	GREEN	<b>100%</b>	GREEN	99.0%	98.0%	100%

### Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Year to Date	Previous Year YTD
ICT01b	Calls to ICT Help Desk	5,185	6,661	5,737	<b>5,342</b>	<b>89,186</b>	102,394
ICT02b	Feedback responses provided for ICT Help Desk	932	1,170	1,023	<b>1,021</b>	<b>16,770</b>	12,790

Service Area	Director	Cabinet Member
Infrastructure	Rebecca Spore	Brian Collins

### Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Month RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
PI01	Percentage of rent due to KCC outstanding over 60 days (including rent deferment invoices)	4.7%	2.5%	0.0%	2.2%	3.1%	GREEN	5%	10%	23.0%

### Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Year to Date	Previous Year YTD
PI01b	Total rent invoiced (£000s)	442	423	18	266	367	4,728	3,115
PI03c	Capital receipts banked (£000s)	6,200	1,340	30	6,000	2,955	28,531	13,185

Service Area	Director	Cabinet Member
Infrastructure	Rebecca Spore	Brian Collins

### Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Month RAG	YTD	YTD RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
PI05	Percentage of scheduled Planned Preventative Maintenance completed by due date	97%	99%	99%	99%	GREEN	98%	GREEN	90%	80%	99%
PI06	Percentage of reactive help desk tasks completed by due date	93%	87%	90%	91%	GREEN	93%	GREEN	90%	80%	96%
PI07	Percentage of help desk calls answered within timescale	99%	99%	97%	97%	GREEN	99%	GREEN	90%	80%	99%

### Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Year to Date	Previous Year YTD
PI05b	Number of Planned Preventative Maintenance tasks responded to	2,350	2,768	2,350	2,232	2,271	29,923	30,549
PI06b	Number of reactive tasks responded to	958	706	991	744	799	9,206	9,104
PI07b	Number of help desk calls responded to	442	255	483	302	307	3,847	4,488

## Proposed KPIs and Activity indicators for 2025/26

### Key

KPIs, their targets and floors, and Activity indicators are the same as in 2024/25 unless otherwise stated. Any changes to targets and floors are shown by the previous value being crossed through (e.g. ~~80%~~).

### Chief Executive's Department

#### Key Performance Indicators – Finance

Ref	Indicator Description	2024/25 Year end	2025/26 Target	2025/26 Floor
FN06	% of outstanding debt due to KCC under 6 months old	34%	70%	65%
FN07	% of invoices received by accounts payable within 30 days of KCC received date	85%	85%	80%
FN08	% of invoices received by accounts payable on time processed within 30 days	96%	98%	95%
FN11	% of financial assessments fully completed within 15 working days of receipt of the referral	86%	90%*	85%*
FN12	% of working days aggregate central bank balance is within approved overdraft limit.	99%	100%	90%
FN13	% working days average credit rating for internally managed cash portfolio is no lower than AA	100%	100%	90%
FN14	% third-party insurance claims resolved within the designated timescales	99%	95%	85%
FN15 (New)	Publication of accounts deadlines met for draft and final statements	N/a	Deadlines met	N/a
FN16 (New)	Publication of budget deadlines met for draft and final proposals	N/a	Deadlines met	N/a

\* April & May target is 60%, Floor 45% due to the Annual Reassessment process

#### 2025/26 Review

The above KPIs have been reviewed with the Accountable Managers with two new additions for 2025/26.

Activity indicators – Finance

Ref	Indicator Description
FN06b	Value of debt due to KCC (£000s)
FN07b	Number of invoices received by KCC
FN11b	Number of financial assessments received
FN14b	Number of third-party insurance claims resolved

Rationale

The activity indicators provide additional information which help to explain and contextualise the KPIs and are reported against previous year actuals for comparison.

Key Performance Indicators - Governance and Law

Ref	Indicator Description	2024/25 Latest (Q3)	2025/26 Target	2025/26 Floor
GL01	Council and Committee papers published at least five clear days before meetings	99%	100%	96%
GL02	Requests for information under FOI/EIR* completed within 20 working days	84%	92%	90%
GL03	Data Protection Act Subject Access requests, completed within one month	60%	90%	85%

\*FOI/EIR stands for Freedom of Information / Environmental Information Regulations

Rationale and review for 2025/26

The above KPIs cover core, measurable statutory requirements that fall under the Governance & Law Division, i.e. that we are performing well in terms of publishing Council and Committee papers and processing FOI/EIR and SARs to statutory timescales.

- GL01, is a statutory requirement and supports the smooth running of the democratic process. The current target of 100% published on time is proposed to remain.
- GL02 & 03, are statutory requirements; adherence with the Act reduces the risk of enforcement action against KCC by the Information Commissioner who oversees and monitors compliance. Targets are already challenging and will remain at the same level for 2024/25.



Activity indicators – Governance and Law

Ref	Indicator Description	Threshold	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	2025/26 Total
GL01b	Number of Committee meetings	Actuals reported against last year's figures					
GL02b	FOI/EIR requests completed	Upper	560	560	560	560	2,240
		Lower	460	460	460	460	1,840
GL03b	Data Protection Act Subject Access requests	Upper	160	160	160	160	640
		Lower	130	130	130	130	520

Rationale

These show level of expected demand for each of these activities and help contextualise the KPIs.

**Deputy Chief Executive's Department**Key Performance Indicators – Marketing and Resident Experience

Ref	Indicator Description	2024/25 Year End	2025/26 Target	2025/26 Floor
CS01	Percentage of callers to Contact Point who rated the advisor who dealt with their call as good	97%	97%	90%
CS04 (a)	Percentage of daytime calls to Contact Point which were answered	92%	90%	85%
CS04 (b)	Percentage of out of hours calls to Contact Point which were answered	95%	95%	90%
CS06 (a)	Percentage of daytime calls to Contact Point achieving 85% of quality scorecard	75%	70%	65%
CS06 (b)	Percentage of out of hours calls to Contact Point achieving 85% of quality scorecard	77%	70%	65%
CS07	Percentage of complaints responded to in timescales	69%	85%	80%

Rationale

The first five KPIs above relate to our contract with Agilisys for the provision of Contact Point. They cover the core elements of good performance, i.e. that calls are answered, and then that the service provided is of good quality. The last KPI relates to the key area of complaints response.

- CS01, monitors public satisfaction with the service they receive from Contact Point Advisors in dealing with their calls – to provide an element of the voice of the service user in the assessment of overall performance, and to capture performance of the advisors specifically.

- CS04a & b, monitor the performance of Contact Point in respect of answering calls. There are separate performance measures covering daytime and out of hours calls, so that the Committee is able to gain the assurance that a high proportion of calls to Contact Point are being answered regardless of whether they are placed during or outside of core working hours noting however the differing types of operation with Out Of Hours being an emergency line only.
- CS06a & b, are contractual KPIs with Agilisys to monitor the quality of the Contact Point service provided to the public via a quality scorecard that covers aspects of how calls are handled (information gathered, advice given, data protection and customer service). There are separate performance measures covering daytime and out of hours calls, so that the Committee is able to gain the assurance that callers receive a high-quality service, regardless of whether they contact us during or outside of core working hours.
- CS07, monitors our performance around complaint handling through the extent to which KCC is meeting complaint service standards as advertised to the public. These are that complaints are answered within 20 days, which is a service standard in the KCC customer feedback policy.

### 2025/26 Review

In 2023/24 KCC, like many other councils, recognised the limitations of measuring percentage of calls answered (CS04a&b) and introduced average speed of answer (ASA). Targets of between 3 and 5 minutes are now being widely used as a measure of ASA for all services and in April 2023 this measurement was added to the activity indicators (CS13 and CS14). CS14 is an indicator for all KCC services, and CS13 is an indicator of the average speed of answer for the priority services combined (adult social care, children's social care, highways emergency and death registrations). The current contract end date is 31<sup>st</sup> March 2026 and the Marketing and Resident Experience team are in the process of procuring a replacement service.

### Activity Indicators - Marketing and Resident Experience

Ref	Indicator Description	Threshold	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	2025/26 Total
CS08	Number of calls answered by Contact Point	Upper	118,000	121,000	108,000	113,000	460,000
		Lower	96,000	102,000	89,000	96,000	383,000
CS12	Number of visits (sessions) to KCC website (000s)	Upper	2,150	2,130	1,690	1,780	7,750
		Lower	1,750	1,750	1,390	1,460	6,350
CS13	Average speed of answer (ASA) by Contact Point – priority services (NEW)	Upper	2 mins				
		Lower	30 secs				
CS14	Average speed of answer (ASA) by Contact Point – all services (NEW)	Upper	5 mins				
		Lower	3 mins				

### Rationale

Activity indicators provide the relevant context around the volume of demand being seen by services covered by the performance indicators, as well as providing oversight of activity and demand levels in the key services falling under the Marketing and Resident Team. Expected activity levels are articulated through upper and lower values, which provide an aid to interpretation of demand levels versus expectations.

- CS08, provides context for the Contact Point performance indicators (particularly CS04a & b), and shows demand for the service vs expectations
- CS12 measures how many visits (sessions) the website receives so that the council can monitor digital take-up and web traffic vs expectations
- CS13 and CS14 provide context for the Contact Point performance (particularly CS04a & b) and sets expectations for average call wait time.

### 2025/26 Review

The activity indicators remain relevant and so no changes to these measures are proposed. Thresholds are based on past trends and future expectations.

### Key Performance Indicator – Human Resources and Organisational Development

Ref	Indicator Description	2024/25 Year End	2025/26 Target	2025/26 Floor
HR09	Percentage of live learning events evaluated by responding participants as having delivered stated learning outcomes	99%	97%	95%
HR10 (NEW)	Percentage of e-learning training programmes evaluated by responding participants as having delivered stated learning outcomes	99%	97%	95%

### Rationale

The above KPI relates to our performance in the key area of training.

- HR09, provides assurance around the quality and purposefulness of the live learning events delivered to staff, by monitoring the extent to which staff feel that each piece of training they have received meets the stated learning outcomes of the course/activity.
- HR10 provides assurance around the quality and purposefulness of the e-learning available to staff, by monitoring the extent to which staff feel that each piece of e-learning training they have completed meets the stated learning outcomes of the course/activity.

### 2025/26 Review

The Human Resources and Organisational Development Division reviewed the current KPIs and targets and deemed them suitable to be carried forward to 2025/26. Additionally, a new KPI has been introduced to evaluate e-learning training programmes, allowing the Division to monitor the quality of all training undertaken by staff.

### Activity Indicators - Human Resources and Organisational Development

Ref	Indicator Description	Threshold	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	2025/26 Total
HR12	Number of current change activities being supported	Upper	90	90	90	90	90
		Lower	80	80	80	80	80
HR13	Total number of E-learning training programmes completed	Upper	21,250	21,250	21,250	21,250	85,000
		Lower	17,500	17,500	17,500	17,500	70,000
HR16	Number of registered users of Kent Rewards	Upper	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000
		Lower	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
HR21	Number of current people management cases being supported	Upper	100	100	100	100	100
		Lower	90	90	90	90	90
HR23	Percentage of staff who have completed all 3 mandatory learning events	Upper	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%
		Lower	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%
HR24 (NEW)	Total number of live learning events delivered	Upper	375	375	375	375	1,500
		Lower	250	250	250	250	1,000

#### Rationale

The indicators provide oversight of activity, uptake and demand levels in the key services falling under the Human Resources and Organisational Development Division. Expected activity levels are articulated through the upper and lower thresholds, which provide an aid to interpretation of demand levels versus expectations.

#### 2025/26 Review

The activity indicators remain relevant, with the only change being the addition of a new indicator to monitor the number of live learning events delivered. This allows the Division to monitor the availability and uptake of all training available to staff.

Thresholds are based on past trends and future expectations for HR13, HR16 and HR23. For HR12 and HR21 these are based on levels of demand which can be adequately supported by the Human Resources and Organisational Development Team. However, it is recognised that the volumes may not fully capture or reflect the complexity and required resources for each case or piece of change activity.

Key Performance Indicator – Health and Safety

Ref	Indicator Description	2024/25 Year End	2025/26 Target	2025/26 Floor
HR25	Percentage of completed Health and Safety audits sent to recipients within 7 working days	100%	95%	85%

Rationale

- HR25, monitors our performance around Health & Safety audits through the extent to which audits are communicated within 7 working days of completion of the audit. Ensuring the outcomes of health and safety audits are communicated quickly, provides assurance that any issues highlighted can then be acted upon in a timely way.

2025/26 Review

The current KPI and target was reviewed by the Department Management Team and considered appropriate to be carried forward to 2025/26.

Key Performance Indicators – Technology

Ref	Indicator Description	2024/25 Year End	2025/26 Target	2025/26 Floor
ICT01	Calls to ICT Help Desk resolved at the first point of contact	78%	70%	65%
ICT02	Positive feedback rating with ICT help desk	96%	95%	90%
ICT03	Working hours where Kent Public Sector Network available to staff	Over 99.9%	99.8%	99.0%
ICT04	Working hours where ICT Service available to staff	99.7%	99.0%	98.0%
ICT05	Working hours where email is available to staff	100%	99.0%	98.0%

Rationale

The above KPIs relate to our performance around ICT, some aspects of which are included within our Service Level Agreement with Cantium. They cover the core elements of good performance, i.e. that the help desk is performing well (in terms of resolving issues and securing positive feedback) and that core ICT services/systems are available to staff.

- ICT01, measures to what extent service disruptions to staff and KCC are minimised by issues being dealt with at first point of contact.
- ICT02, measures to what extent the service provided to our customers is of a high quality, by enabling them to appraise the service received at point of ServiceNow ticket closure.

- ICT03, measures the quality of service provided by a third party, which is fundamental to the provision of data and voice networking to all KCC and many partner buildings. As a key foundation to ICT services, monitoring network availability is critical.
- ICT04, ICT service availability is fundamental to the delivery of many of the services that KCC provides and as such, this indicator is a measure of how effectively ICT are able to support the Council.
- ICT05, Email is a business-critical communications tool that supports the whole of KCC's operations in delivering their strategic objectives.

### 2025/26 Review

These KPIs still reflect key service delivery and remain the same as in 2024/25.

### Activity indicators – Technology

Ref	Indicator Description
ICT01b	Calls to ICT Help Desk
ICT02b	Feedback responses provided for ICT Help Desk

These show the level of demand for each of these activities and help contextualise the KPIs, and are reported against previous year actuals for comparison.

### Key Performance Indicators – Infrastructure

Ref	Indicator Description	2024/25 Year End	2025/26 Target	2025/26 Floor
PI01	Invoiced Rent Outstanding at 60 Days	6.6%	5%	10%
PI05	Planned Preventative Maintenance Tasks completed by due date	98%	90%	85%
PI06	Reactive Help Desk Tasks completed by due date	93%	90% 80% (NEW)	71%
PI07	Help Desk Telephone Response Times	99%	90%	85%

### Rationale

The above KPIs support monitoring of the delivery of the Asset Management Strategy, i.e. that we are performing well in terms of securing rent receipts and meeting SLA standards on task completion.

- PI01, supports monitoring of theme 3 of the Asset Management Strategy – effective asset and estate management

- PI05/6/7, supports monitoring of the Asset Management Strategy, specifically, theme 1 – innovation and customer focus, theme 2 – safe, warm, dry and proactively compliant, and theme 3 – effective asset and estate management.

### 2025/26 Review

The KPIs and targets have been checked to ensure that they align with the current facilities management contract. With regards to PI06, the previous target of 90% is the stretch target for the contractor (exceeds expectations), whereas the standard target they are required to meet is 80% (meets expectations). For this reason, the target has been amended to reflect the standard target they are required to achieve within the current contract.

### Activity indicators – Infrastructure

Ref	Indicator Description
PI01b	Total rent invoiced
PI03	Capital receipts
PI05b	PPM tasks completed
PI06b	Reactive tasks completed
PI07b	Telephone calls handled

### Rationale

- PI01b, provides context for PI01.
- PI03, supports monitoring of theme 4 of the Asset Management Strategy – an efficient, adequate and appropriate estate, as well as KCC's capital programme.
- PI05b, PI06b, PI07b provide context for their respective performance indicators.

This page is intentionally left blank