



AGENDA

CABINET SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 21st March, 2007, at 2.00 pm Ask for: **Peter Sass**
Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Telephone **01622 694002**
Maidstone

Refreshments will be available from 1.45 pm. County Councillors who are not Members of the Committee but who wish to ask questions at the meeting are asked to notify the Chairman of their questions in advance.

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)

A. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

- A1 Substitutes
- A2 Minutes - 20 February 2007 (Pages 1 - 8)
- A3 Informal Member Group on Budgetary Issues - 8 March 2007 (Pages 9 - 10)
- A4 Cabinet Scrutiny Committee - Standing Report to March 2007 (Pages 11 - 16)

B. CABINET/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS AT VARIANCE TO APPROVED BUDGET OR POLICY FRAMEWORK

No items.

C. CABINET DECISIONS

No Cabinet decisions have been proposed for call in but any Member of the Committee is entitled to propose discussion and/or postponement of any decision taken by the Cabinet at its last meeting.

(Members who wish to exercise their right under this item are asked to notify the Head of Democratic Services of the decision concerned in advance.)

D. CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS

- D1 Children's Centres - Approval to Name Next Nine Sites (Decision 07/00942)
(Pages 17 - 22)

Mr J D Simmonds, Cabinet Member for Education and School Improvement; Mrs A Gamby, Head of Early Years/Childcare; Mr K Abbott, Director, Finance and Corporate Services; and Ms J Smith, Quality Assurance Co-ordinator, Early Years and Childcare, Children, Families and Education Directorate, will attend the meeting at 2.05 pm to answer Members' questions on this item.

D2 Cancellation of Kent-Virginia Direct Flights Project (previous Decision 06/00799)
(Pages 23 - 28)

Mr P B Carter, Leader of the Council; Mr A J King, Cabinet Member for Policy and Performance and Deputy Leader; Mr P Gilroy, Chief Executive; and Mr P Raine, Managing Director, Environment and Regeneration, will attend the meeting at 3.05 pm to answer Members' questions on this item.

E. OFFICER AND COUNCIL COMMITTEE DECISIONS

No Officer or Council Committee decisions have been proposed for call in but the Committee may resolve to consider any decision taken since its last meeting by an Officer or Council Committee exercising functions delegated to it by the Council.

(Members who wish to propose that the Committee should consider any Officer or Council Committee decision are asked to inform the Head of Democratic Services of the decision concerned in advance.)

EXEMPT ITEMS

(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)

Peter Sass
Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership
(01622) 694002

Tuesday, 13 March 2007

Please note that any background documents referred to in the accompanying papers maybe inspected by arrangement with the officer responsible for preparing the relevant report.

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

CABINET SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee held at Invicta House, County Hall, Maidstone on Tuesday, 20 February 2007.

PRESENT: Dr M R Eddy (Chairman), Mr D Smyth (Vice-Chairman), Mr A R Bassam, Mr J R Bullock MBE, Mr C J Capon, Mr A R Chell (substitute for Mr A H T Bowles), Mr L Christie (substitute for Mrs M Newell), Mr B R Cope, Mrs T Dean, Mr J B O Fullarton, Mr C Hart, Mr E E C Hotson, Mr P W A Lake, Mr C J Law, Mr M J Northey (substitute for Mr J E Scholes), Mr R J E Parker, Mrs P A V Stockell and Mr R Tolputt (substitute for Mr C T Wells).

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr J Wale, Assistant to the Chief Executive and Mr S C Ballard, Head of Democratic Services.

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

54. Minutes
(Item A2)

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meetings held on 24 January and 2/7 February 2007 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

55. Informal Member Group on “Kent – What Price Growth?” – 22 January 2007
(Item A3)

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the recommendations of the Informal Member Group in note 2(9)(b) that:-
 - (i) the KCC Planning Applications Unit should be requested to include heads of terms for developer contributions in reports to the Planning Applications Committee on all relevant planning applications;
 - (ii) the Regeneration and Economy Team should be supported in their efforts to encourage District Councils to include heads of terms for developer contributions in reports to their Planning Committees on all relevant planning applications;
 - (iii) KCC Directorates should be requested to consult local Members (either individually or through Local Boards) on the details of the facilities to be provided in accordance with their provision planning policies from developer contributions,

be endorsed;

- (b) the Regeneration and Economy Team be asked to advise Kent Police Authority and Kent and Medway Fire and Rescue Authority of KCC’s publication of the Developers’ Guide and invite them to adopt a similar approach to developer contributions;

- (c) the remaining notes of the meeting of the Informal Member Group on “Kent – What Price Growth?” held on 22 January 2007 be noted.

56. Informal Member Group on Budgetary Issues – 2 February 2007
(Item A4)

RESOLVED that the notes of the meeting of the Informal Member Group on Budgetary Issues held on 2 February 2007 be noted.

57. Cabinet Scrutiny Committee – Standing Report to February 2007
(Item A5 – Report by Assistant to the Chief Executive)

(1) An updated Table 2, reflecting the outcome of the Policy Overview Co-ordinating Committee meeting on 15 February, was tabled at the meeting.

(2) RESOLVED that the report on the actions taken as a result of the Committee’s decisions at previous meetings, and the updated report on progress with Select Committee Topic Reviews, be noted.

58. The Kent Commitment
(Item E1)

(1) Mr P B Carter, Leader of the Council, and Mr P Gilroy, Chief Executive, attended the meeting to answer Members’ questions on this item.

(2) At the outset, Mr Carter explained that the signing of the Kent Commitment marked the start of a journey which would take between two and five years. The purpose of this journey was clear – to use the good relations between the County Council and the Kent District Councils to build on the existing two-tier arrangements in order to give Kent the best local government in the UK. This in turn would enable KCC and the Kent Districts to face the challenge of the difficult financial settlements from Government expected over the next few years. However, the detailed arrangements were still to be worked out in discussions between KCC and the Kent Districts as the journey progressed. Mr Carter said that he would publish a bi-monthly update for all Members on progress with the Kent Commitment. Mr Gilroy agreed to provide details of the Kent Commitment work streams being worked on by the Kent Chief Executives.

Medway Council

(3) In answer to a question from Mr Parker, Mr Carter said that he was keen to involve Medway Council but they had not felt able to sign up to The Kent Commitment at this stage. Nevertheless, discussions would continue.

Devolution of Front-line Services

(4) In answer to a question from Mr Parker, Mr Carter confirmed that there had been preliminary discussions with the Kent Districts about the potential for the devolution of services both from KCC to the Kent Districts and vice versa, but there were no immediate plans for this. If and when any service – front-line or back-office – was considered for devolution, a detailed business plan would be required in order to demonstrate that devolution offered best value.

(5) Mr Gilroy added that only 16% of KCC services were provided direct by KCC employees. The bulk were provided by the private sector through procurement.

(6) In answer to a question from Mr Law, Mr Gilroy agreed that, in talking about devolution, it was important to distinguish between political governance issues and service delivery issues. When KCC services were delegated to another provider, or procured from a private contractor, it was important to appreciate that responsibility for those services remained with KCC. This had implications for two-tier working in terms both of political governance and managerial monitoring.

Provision of Services to other Councils

(7) In answer to a question from Mr Christie, Mr Gilroy said that there was nothing new about KCC providing services to other councils. He offered to circulate details of the services which KCC currently provided to other councils.

Public Impact of The Kent Commitment

(8) In answer to a question from Mr Parker, Mr Carter said that a large part of the gain from closer working between KCC and the Kent Districts would be in terms of greater efficiency through the sharing of back-office functions. This would allow the councils to maintain quality services at a lower cost than would otherwise be the case. Greater co-operation between councils would also lead to improvements in the way in which societal problems, such as teenage pregnancy, were tackled. While both of these types of improvement were measurable, Mr Carter accepted that neither was likely to be very noticeable to the public.

(9) Mr Gilroy said that as a result of The Kent Commitment he expected that, by 2012, every major town would have a Gateway, providing public access to a wide range of public services (KCC, District Council, central Government and other public agencies). The possibility of having a single phone – and possibly also web – portal to all public services in Kent was also being explored.

(10) In answer to a question from Mr Fullarton, Mr Carter agreed that improved communications were required to engage the public and to improve their understanding of the way in which Council services were provided. The KCC Cabinet had already decided to re-launch 'Around Kent' to help with this and the Kent TV initiative should also assist.

(11) In answer to a suggestion from Mr Fullarton that public understanding would be improved if there was just one elected Councillor for each area, Mr Carter pointed out that there was a democratic deficit in England, where the public had fewer elected representatives than in other European states. Mr Gilroy added that the current multi-tier local government system (county council, district council, parish/town council) provided checks and balances in its civic structure.

Recycling of Savings

(12) In answer to a question from Mr Lake, Mr Carter said that he very much hoped that the cost savings arising from The Kent Commitment could be recycled within Kent local authorities because this was the only way in which quality services could be maintained. The Kent Districts had estimated that savings of £25-30m could be made through sharing of back-office functions. Mr Gilroy added that he had been invited by Government to take part in discussions on multi-area agreements. Multi-area agreements offered opportunities for savings to be made in the way in which £8bn of public expenditure was spent.

(13) RESOLVED that:-

- (a) Mr Carter and Mr Gilroy be thanked for attending the meeting and answering Members' questions;
- (b) the agreement by the Leader of the Council to publish a bi-monthly update on progress with the Kent Commitment to all Members, be welcomed;
- (c) the Chief Executive's agreement to provide:-
 - (i) details of the services which KCC currently provides to other Councils;
 - (ii) details of the Kent Commitment work streams being worked on by Kent Chief Executives,be welcomed.

59. Free Travel for 11-16 Year Olds
(Item C1)

(1) Mr K A Ferrin, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste, and Mr D Hall, County Transportation Manager, Kent Highway Services, attended the meeting to answer Members' questions on this item, which covered the following issues:-

(a) Eligibility for Scheme

In answer to questions from Mr Christie and Mr Lake, Mr Ferrin explained that any child aged 11-16 who lived in Kent and attended any of the schools listed in Appendix 2 to the report to Cabinet was eligible to purchase a pass for £50 which would entitle them to free bus travel anywhere in the pilot areas at any time on any day. There would be no reduction for those children who already received free home to school transport.

In answer to a question from Mr Christie, Mr Ferrin said that it would be for the Children, Families and Education Directorate to decide whether or not to purchase passes for Looked After Children but he hoped that they would.

In answer to a question from Dr Eddy, Mr Ferrin said that the 11-16 age group had been chosen rather than the 13-18 age group because it was the age range for compulsory secondary school attendance. It would obviously be a matter for parents to decide what use of the scheme their children should make.

(b) Charge for Pass

In answer to a question from Mrs Stockell, Mr Ferrin said that the possibility of a means test for the £50 charge, and of offering an instalment payment scheme, had both been considered but had been rejected because they would dramatically increase the administrative cost of the scheme. Mr Ferrin said that he hoped that schools might be willing to assist by, for example, accepting payments in cash from parents who had no bank account.

(c) Choice of Areas to be Included in Pilot Scheme

In answer to questions from Mr Hart and Mr Christie, Mr Ferrin explained that Canterbury had been chosen because much of the work of the Select Committee on Home to School Transport was based on Canterbury. Canterbury was served by Stagecoach and he had been keen to include an area served by the other major Kent bus operator, Arriva. Of the areas served by Arriva, Tonbridge/Tunbridge Wells had been selected because school travel patterns were relatively complex and thus the area was likely to provide useful lessons for the pilot. Mr Ferrin added that the areas had not been chosen because of their relative affluence. It had been necessary to limit the pilot scheme to two areas because of the capacity issue. It was clear that additional bus seats would be needed during the morning peak as a result of increased demand generated by the scheme. Bus operators would therefore need to bring in additional vehicles, provide garaging facilities for them, and recruit additional drivers. The capacity issue also meant that, if the pilot scheme was successful, any extension to the rest of the County would have to be done in phases.

(d) Costs of Pilot Scheme

In answer to questions from Mrs Dean, Mr Hall said that the number of children eligible for the pilot scheme was 9,000 in Canterbury and 14,000 in Tonbridge/Tunbridge Wells. Mr Ferrin explained that the detailed costings for the pilot scheme were at present subject to commercial confidentiality but agreed to provide them to Members of the Committee in confidence. Mr Ferrin explained that once the scheme was up and running, the agreement with the bus operators involved use of an open-book accounting system so there would be complete transparency. He agreed to provide half-yearly financial reports to Members of the Committee.

Mr Ferrin said that the pilot scheme was not expected to have any impact on KCC's costs in providing free home to school transport, but if the scheme was extended County-wide, the consultants predicted that the scheme would offset the home to school transport budget by some £3m.

Mr Ferrin said that there might also be savings to KCC on supported bus services because the increase in demand generated by the scheme could lead to some supported services becoming commercially viable.

Mr Hall added that the pilot scheme was expected to increase bus operators' profits and the operators had said that they would plough this profit back into improving local bus services.

(e) Length of Pilot Scheme

In answer to a question from Mrs Stockell, Mr Ferrin said that the pilot scheme would run for two years because the bus operators required a commitment that the scheme would run for at least this length of time before they could commit themselves to bringing in the additional buses and drivers needed. However, the success of the scheme should be capable of being judged well within two years and, if it was successful, the scheme could be extended before the two year period expired.

(f) Inclusion of Independent Schools in Pilot Scheme

In answer to a question from Mr Christie, Mr Ferrin explained that parents who lived in Kent and sent their children to independent schools were as entitled to benefit from the scheme as parents who sent their children to publicly-funded schools. Furthermore, one of the main purposes of the scheme was to reduce traffic congestion caused by the school run and parents of independent school pupils contributed to this in just the same way as other parents.

(g) Congestion

In answer to questions from Mrs Dean, Mr Ferrin said that there were a number of different methods of measuring congestion and a method would need to be selected shortly in order to measure the impact of the pilot scheme on reducing congestion. Mr Hall pointed out that bus journey times were already monitored and these could give an indication of changes in the level of congestion.

(h) Impact on Parents' Choice of Schools

In answer to a question from Mrs Dean, Mr Ferrin emphasised that the bus pass scheme did not involve any changes in the current arrangements relating to eligibility for free home to school transport. Nevertheless, he accepted that the availability for £50 of a pass offering free bus travel might have the effect of increasing parents' choice of schools for their children where this might otherwise be constrained by transport costs. Mr Ferrin said that he had urged headteachers to point out to parents that they should not make their choices of school on the basis of the pilot scheme, because it might not be renewed after the initial two year period.

(2) RESOLVED that:-

- (a) Mr Ferrin and Mr Hall be thanked for attending the meeting and answering Members' questions;
- (b) the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste be recommended to change the title of the scheme to "**Assisted** Travel for 11-16 Year Olds";
- (c) the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste be urged to determine a means of measuring congestion without delay, so that the success or otherwise of the scheme in terms of reducing congestion could be judged;
- (d) the Managing Director, Children, Families and Education be advised of the possible impact of the scheme on secondary school admission applications;
- (e) the Managing Director, Children, Families and Education be recommended to make clear in all information to parents about secondary school admissions for September 2007 and 2008 that, in making their choice of school, parents should not rely on the assisted travel scheme continuing beyond the two-year pilot period;

- (f) the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste's agreement to provide Members of the Committee, in confidence, with detailed costings for the pilot scheme, be welcomed;
- (g) the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste's agreement to provide Members of the Committee with half-yearly reports on costs and take-up of the scheme, be welcomed.

60. Lorry Parking Issues
(Item C2)

(1) Mr R W Gough, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Supporting Independence; Mr K A Ferrin MBE, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste; and Mr P Raine, Managing Director, Environment and Regeneration, attended the meeting to answer Members' questions on this item which covered the following issues:-

(a) **Replacement for Operation Stack**

(i) Site Search

In answer to a question from Dr Eddy, Mr Raine explained that a site of up to 100 acres would be required. 100 acres would cope with the worst possible Operation Stack scenario, so a smaller site could be used which would deal with all but the worst scenarios. A site search was currently taking place and was due to be completed by the end of April.

(ii) Site Acquisition

In answer to a question from Dr Eddy, Mr Raine said that once a suitable site had been identified, it would need to be acquired by the County Council or the Highways Agency, both of which had compulsory purchase powers which could be used if necessary.

(iii) Planning and Technical Issues

In answer to questions from Dr Eddy, Mrs Stockell and Mr Parker, Mr Raine said that once a suitable site had been identified the planning issues would need to be discussed with the District Council concerned. Technical solutions were being explored but it was inevitable that some engineering works would be required to make the site suitable for use as an emergency lorry park, and to provide satisfactory access. However, it was hoped that a technical solution could be adopted that would allow the site to continue in agricultural use, perhaps for grazing, when not required for lorry stacking.

(iv) Lessons from Elsewhere

In answer to a question from Mrs Stockell, Mr Raine said that disruption to cross-Channel traffic did not appear to cause the same problem in northern France as in Kent, presumably because there was more space around Calais where lorries could wait.

(v) EU Funding

In answer to a question from Mr Smyth, Mr Ferrin said that a meeting had been arranged with one of the MEPs for the South East, who also held a senior position in the European Parliament, to explore the possibility of obtaining assistance from the EU.

(vi) Costs

In answer to a question from Mr Chell, Mr Ferrin said that the permanent solution to Operation Stack was expected to cost some £20m whereas the Quick Moveable Barrier (QMB) under consideration by the Highways Agency was estimated to cost £10m and would deal only with Phase 1 of Operation Stack (850 lorries out of a total of 4,500 catered for by Phases 1 and 2).

(b) **Permanent Overnight Lorry Parks**

In answer to a question from Mr Cope, Mr Ferrin said that, completely separate from Operation Stack, there was a need for a number of permanent overnight lorry parks in Kent to deal with the detrimental effect of lorries parking casually in inappropriate places. Problems were particularly acute around Dover, Folkestone and Ashford.

(2) **RESOLVED that:-**

- (a) Mr Gough, Mr Ferrin and Mr Raine be thanked for attending the meeting and answering Members' questions;
- (b) the Cabinet Members for Regeneration and Supporting Independence and Environment, Highways and Waste be recommended to:-
 - (i) obtain information about the actions taken by the French authorities to deal with the effects of disruption to cross-Channel transport services to see whether any lessons can be learned;
 - (ii) actively and urgently seek EU funding towards the costs of providing an emergency lorry parking site to replace Operation Stack;
 - (iii) urgently investigate the planning issues relating to provision of an emergency lorry parking site to replace Operation Stack;
- (c) the Managing Director, Environment and Regeneration be asked to provide Members of the Committee with further information about the issue of the Police not always separating out flows of lorries heading for different ports and the Channel Tunnel quickly enough, particularly as it seemed that 80% of lorries had transferable ferry/tunnel bookings, and about the action being taken to try to overcome this problem.

NOTES of a meeting of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee's Informal Member Group on Budgetary Issues held on Thursday, 8 March 2007

PRESENT: Mr D Smyth (Chairman), Mr C J Capon and Mrs T Dean.

ALSO PRESENT: Mr N J D Chard, Cabinet Member for Finance.

OFFICERS: Mr A Wood, Head of Audit and Risk; Mrs C Head, Chief Accountant; Mr J Wale, Assistant to the Chief Executive; and Mr S C Ballard, Head of Democratic Services

1. Notes of Previous Meeting
(Item 1)

Noted.

2. Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring Exception Report
(Item 2 – Report to Cabinet)

(1) Mr Chard gave a brief summary of the current position. Members' questions then covered the following issues:-

Clusters (para 2.1.2)

(2) In answer to a question from Mr Smyth, Mr Wood said that there was no headroom on the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) because it had all been committed. There was an underspend on services funded from DSG in the cluster budget and because DSG was ring fenced this underspend would need to be rolled forward for spending within the DSG rules.

School Reserves

(3) In answer to a question from Mr Capon, Mr Chard said it had been thought that Government would bring in rules allowing school reserves to be clawed back. However, the Government had eventually decided to take a much softer line and, provided schools could show that they were planning to use their reserves, they would be allowed to keep them.

(4) Mr Chard added that it was difficult to say why some schools managed to accrue large reserves while others did not. The size of reserves did not appear to relate to type of school, geographical location, or any other obvious factors. He was concerned that, in the coming years, there would be a real financial squeeze on schools and those with low reserves, especially if combined with falling schools rolls, would suffer most.

(5) **RESOLVED that Cabinet Scrutiny Committee be recommended to request the Cabinet Member for Finance to commission work to identify the reasons why some schools were much more financially successful than others, so that the lessons could be disseminated more widely within Kent schools.**

Waste Management (para 2.3.1)

(6) The IMG asked for an explanation of the issues relating to the waste management budget, with particular reference to how much waste was going to the Allington Waste to Energy Plant; how much to landfill; how much to recyclates, and what impact the opening of Blaise Farm was expected to have on this. **(Action: SCB)**

Adult Services (para 2.2)

(7) Mrs Dean asked for a more detailed description of the further management action to achieve savings of £1.112M. **(Action: CH)**

Physical Disability (para 2.2.3)

(8) Mrs Dean asked for an assurance that the reduction in the pressure was genuinely due to over-forecasting and that there was not any element of suppression of demand. **(Action: CH)**

KHS Emergency Reserve (para 2.3.2)

(9) In answer to questions from Mr Smyth and Mrs Dean, Mrs Head confirmed that the Emergency Reserve included what was formerly known as the 'Winter Reserve'. Mr Chard said that the amount of the Emergency Reserve was believed to be a sufficient reserve for the risk, based on experience in previous years. Mr Wood added that the level of reserves was considered carefully by the external auditors each year and thus was subject to independent scrutiny.

Kent Works (para 2.5.2)

(10) Mr Smyth asked whether the full funding for Kent Works would transfer to the CFE Directorate with the service in 2007/08 or whether CFE would be expected to meet the shortfall. **(Action: CH)**

REPORT TO: CABINET SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 21 MARCH 2007
BY: ASSISTANT TO THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

CABINET SCRUTINY AND POLICY OVERVIEW
Standing Report to March 2007

Summary

1. The report summarises in Table 1 outcomes of the most recent Cabinet Scrutiny Committee (CSC) meeting held on 20 February 2007. Cabinet Members and Chief Officers were provided with a copy of the action sheet and asked to respond as appropriate. The report includes any subsequent responses and actions by Cabinet Members and Senior Officers up to and including the meeting of Cabinet held on 12 March 2007.
2. Additionally, in Table 2 the report provides an updated report on the current programme for Select Committee Topic Reviews. This programme was originally agreed at Policy Overview Co-ordinating Committee on 15 February 2007.

Recommendations

3. Members are asked to note:
 - (i) progress on actions and outcomes from the meeting of Cabinet Scrutiny Committee held on 20 February 2007 as set out in Table 1;
 - (ii) the current position on Select Committee Topic Reviews.
-

Contact Officer: **John Wale 01622 694006**

ACTIONS FOR CABINET AND DIRECTORATES FROM CABINET SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 20 February 2007

Item/Issue	Actions and Outcomes from Cabinet Scrutiny Committee
A2 Minutes of Cabinet Scrutiny Committee 24 January, 2 February and 7 February 2007.	(a) Dr Eddy asked how any change in the cost of Turner Contemporary would be reported to Members. {Minute 53(4)(d)} Action: Ms L McMullan (b) Minutes were agreed.
A3 IMG on “Kent-What price Growth?” 22 January 2007	(a) Noted and recommendations agreed. (b) Regeneration and Economy Team to be asked to advise Kent Police Authority and Kent and Medway Fire and Rescue Authority of KCC’s publication of the Developer’s Guide and to invite them to adopt a similar approach to Developer Contributions. Action: Nigel Smith
A4 IMG on Budgetary Issues 2 February 2007	Noted.
A5 Cabinet Scrutiny Committee: Actions and Outcomes to February 2007	Noted.
C1 Free Travel for 11-16 Year-Olds	Mr KA Ferrin and Mr D Hall attended and were thanked for answering Members’ questions. Cabinet Scrutiny Committee recommended that the Decision can now be implemented, and also concluded as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways, and Waste be recommended to change the title of the scheme to Assisted Travel for 11-16 Year Olds. (Action: Mr Ferrin/Mr Hall) (ii) The Cabinet Member be urged to determine a means of measuring congestion without delay, so that the success or otherwise of the scheme in terms of reducing congestion can be judged; (Action: Mr Ferrin/Mr Hall) (iii) The Managing Director, Children, Families and Education be advised of of the possible impact of the scheme on secondary school admissions; (Action: Mr Ian Craig)

ACTIONS FOR CABINET AND DIRECTORATES FROM CABINET SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 20 February 2007

Item/Issue	Actions and Outcomes from Cabinet Scrutiny Committee
	<p>(iv) The Managing Director, Children Families and Education be recommended to make clear in all information to parents about secondary school admissions for September 2007 that, in making their choice of school, parents should not rely on the assisted travel scheme continuing beyond the two-year pilot period; (Action: Ian Craig)</p> <p>(v) The Cabinet Member's agreement to provide Members of the Committee, in confidence, with detailed costings for the pilot scheme be welcomed; (Action: David Hall)</p> <p>(vi) The Cabinet Member's agreement to provide Members of the Committee with half-yearly reports on costs and take-up of the scheme be welcomed. (Action: David Hall)</p>
<p>C2 Lorry Parking Issues</p>	<p>Mr R Gough, Mr K A Ferrin and Mr P Raine attended for this item and were thanked for answering Members' questions. The Committee agreed that the Decision can now be implemented and concluded as follows:</p> <p>(i) the Cabinet Members be recommended to:</p> <p>(a) obtain information about the actions taken by the French authorities to deal with the effects of disruption to cross-Channel transport services to see whether any lessons can be learned; (Action: Mick Sutch)</p> <p>(b) actively and urgently seek EU funding towards the costs of providing an emergency lorry parking site to replace Operation Stack ;(Action: Mick Sutch)</p> <p>(c) urgently investigate the planning issues relating to provision of an emergency lorry parking site to replace Operation Stack. (Action: Mick Sutch)</p>

ACTIONS FOR CABINET AND DIRECTORATES FROM CABINET SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 20 February 2007

Item/Issue	Actions and Outcomes from Cabinet Scrutiny Committee
	<p>(ii) the Managing Director (E and R) be asked to provide Members of the Committee with further information about the issue of the Police not always separating out flows of lorries heading for different ports and the Channel Tunnel quickly enough, particularly as it seemed that 80% of lorries had transferable bookings, and what action was being taken to try to overcome this problem. (Action: Mick Sutch)</p>
<p>E1 The Kent Commitment</p>	<p>Mr P Carter (Leader) and Mr P Gilroy (Chief Executive) attended for this item and were thanked for answering Members' questions.</p> <p>Members of the Committee concluded as follows:</p> <p>(i) the agreement of Mr Carter to publish a bi-monthly update on progress with the Kent Commitment to all Members be welcomed Action: Mr P Carter</p> <p>(ii) the Chief Executive's agreement to provide the following information be welcomed:</p> <p>(a) details of the services which KCC provides to other councils;</p> <p>(b) details of the Kent Commitment work streams being worked on by Kent Chief Executives. Action: Peter Gilroy</p>

Table 2

**Select Committee Topic Reviews:
Programme following Policy Overview Co-ordinating Committee 15 February
2007* (*Subject to confirmation of Minutes by Chairman and Spokespersons)**

Policy Overview Committee/ Topic Review/Chair	Current Topic Review status and other topics (in no particular order*) agreed for the period February 2007 to July 2008
<p>Children Families and Education :</p> <p>PSHE-Children’s Health: Chair Ms CJ CRIBBON</p> <p>Developing the Creative Curriculum</p> <p>Primary School Attainment</p> <p>Young People’s Spiritual, Moral, Social and Cultural Development</p>	<p>Inaugural meeting of the Select Committee was held on 5 October. Hearings and visits were held during November. It is anticipated that the Select Committee report will be submitted to Cabinet in April 2007. (Research Officer: Gaetano Romagnuolo)</p> <p>Dates to be agreed*</p> <p>POCC agreed that this issue was being dealt with through a cross-party mechanism. It was therefore removed at the request of CFE POC.</p> <p>Dates to be agreed*</p>
<p>Communities</p> <p>Accessing Democracy</p> <p>Student Voice –Consultation and Participation with Young People</p> <p>Provision of Activities for Young People</p>	<p>Dates to be agreed* Preliminary discussions are being held to assess how this work will compliment the work of the “Going Local” Informal Member Group.</p> <p>Dates to be agreed.*</p> <p>Dates to be agreed.*</p>

<p>Policy Overview Committee/ Topic Review/Chair</p>	<p>Current Topic Review status and other topics (in no particular order*) agreed for the period February 2007 to July 2008</p>
<p>Communities/Public Health (to be agreed) Alcohol and Related Issues</p>	<p>To start in Spring 2007.</p>
<p>Adult Services Carers in Kent Transition from Childhood to Adulthood: MR A BOWLES</p>	<p>Dates confirmed as Spring to Autumn 2007. Inaugural meeting of the Select Committee was held on 9 October 2006; hearing sessions commenced on 26 October and are due to end on 20 December 2006. It is anticipated that the Select Committee report will be submitted to Cabinet in May 2007. (Research Officer: Susan Frampton).</p>
<p>Environment and Regeneration Impact of Supermarkets, Out of Town Shopping Malls and Retail Parks on Businesses in Kent</p>	<p>Dates to be agreed.*</p>

jhw/sc 6 March 2007

** To be discussed at the meeting of the POCC in June and September 2007*

CABINET SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 21 MARCH 2007

Report Title: **Children’s Centres – Approval to Name Next Nine Sites (Decision 07/00942)**

Documents Attached: (a) Report to Cabinet Member for Education and School Improvement published on 26 February 2007.
 (b) Record of Decision taken by Cabinet Member for Education and School Improvement on 6 March 2007.

Purpose of Consideration: (a) to explore the process for deciding the locations for Children’s Centres;
 (b) to explore how funding is allocated to each new Children’s Centre;
 (c) to ascertain the financial rules relating to the provision of Children’s Centres;
 (d) to ascertain the eligibility rules relating to the running of Children’s Centres.

Possible Decisions: The Constitution (*Appendix 4 Part 8*) requires the Committee to take one of the following decisions:-
 (a) make no comments; or
 (b) express comments but not require reconsideration of the decision; or
 (c) require implementation of the decision to be postponed pending reconsideration of the matter by the Cabinet Member in the light of the Committee’s comments; or
 (d) require implementation of the decision to be postponed pending reconsideration of the matter by full Council.

Previous Consideration: None directly but Children’s Centres were discussed at the 12 September 2006 meeting (Minute 26(1)(b)).

Background Documents: None.

This page is intentionally left blank

BY: Ian Craig, Director - Operations
TO: John Simmonds, Cabinet Member for Education and School Improvement
SUBJECT: Children's Centres – Approval to Name Next Nine Sites

Summary: Request for approval for the naming of the proposed next 9 Round 2 Children's Centres to be sent to the DfES for their approval.

Background

1. (1) Following our delivery of 20 Children's Centres in Phase 1 of the Government's programme (conversion of 9 Sure Start Local Programmes, plus 11 additional Centres – Appendix 1), Kent was tasked with delivering 52 new Centres in Phase 2, by September 2008.

(2) Along with most local authorities, capital funding has been an issue, with a total of £9.1m being allocated for the 52 centres, an average of £177k each.

(3) An exercise was carried out in early 2006 with multi agency partners to identify where the 52 Centres should be built, bearing in mind the requirement that at the end of this phase all children in the wards in Kent that fall within the national 30% most deprived should have access to Centres. An additional issue that was to be taken into consideration was that capacity identified as surplus to requirements as a result of the Kent Primary Strategy was to be used wherever possible. An initial list of 64 sites was produced in April/May and feasibility studies carried out on the sites.

Proposal

2. (1) 29 of the 52 sites have now been agreed and sent to the DfES for approval. A further 9 are now identified below (taking the total to 38). They are:

<u>Site</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Local Members</u>
1. Lawn Primary	Gravesham	Leslie Christie/Raymond Parker
2. Morehall	Shepway	Robert Bliss
3. Grove Park	Swale	Keith Ferrin
4. Homewood	Swale	Brenda Simpson/Roger Truelove
5. Aycliffe	Dover	William Newman/Keith Sansum
6. Birchington	Thanet	Charles Hibberd
7. Bysing Wood	Swale	Thomas Gates
8. Darenth	Dartford	Bertie Bassam
9. East Stour	Ashford	George Koowaree

Resource Implications

3. (1) A budget of £9.1m has been identified to deliver the 52 Centres (£177k each on average) and all these proposals have been costed within that envelope.

Recommendation

4. The Cabinet Member is requested TO AGREE:

(a) Sending the list of 9 sites to the DfES for approval and subsequent building.

Ian Craig
Director (Operations)
Tel: (01622) 69**4173**

Background Documents:

None.

Appendix 1

Children's Centre Programme – Round 1

No.	Round	Site	District	Cumulative number of Children's Centres for each district	Cluster	KCC Approval	SSU Approval for capital build	State of Build	Designation	Core Offer Status
1	SSLP	Millmead, Margate	Thanet	1		N/A	Approved	Completed	Designated 7/04	COS 03/06
2	SSLP	The Village, Folkstone	Shepway	1	Shepway 1	N/A	Approved	Completed	Designated 7/04	COS 03/06
3	SSLP	St Radigund's, Dover	Dover	1	Dover	N/A	Approved	Completed	Designated 8/05	COS 03/06
4	SSLP	Temple Hill	Dartford	1	Dartford West	N/A	Approved	Completed	Designated 8/05	COS 03/06
5	SSLP	The Willows	Ashford	1	Ashford 1	N/A	Approved	Completed	Designated 9/05	COS 03/06
6	SSLP	Riverside, Gravesend	Gravesham	1	Gravesham	N/A	Approved	Completed	Designated 11/05	COS 11/05
7	SSLP	Seashells, Sheerness	Swale	1	Swale Urban	N/A	Approved	Completed	Designated 11/05	COS 11/05
8	SSLP	Riverside, Canterbury	Canterbury	1	Canterbury City and Country	N/A	Approved	Completed	Designated 3/06	COS 03/06
9	SSLP	Six Bells, Margate	Thanet	2		N/A	Approved	Completed	Awaiting designation	By 03/10
10	Round 1	Aylesham Neighbourhood Project	Dover	2	Deal and Sandwich	N/A	N/A	N/A	Designated 7/05	COS 03/06

No.	Round	Site	District	Cumulative number of Children's Centres for each district	Cluster	KCC Approval	SSU Approval for capital build	State of Build	Designation	Core Offer Status
11	Round 1	Hawkinge	Shepway	2	Shepway 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Designated 1/06	COS 03/06
12	Round 1	Ray Allen	Ashford	2	Ashford 1	N/A	Approved	Completed	Designated 3/06	By 12/06
13	Round 1	Bell Wood	Maidstone	1	Maidstone 2	N/A	Approved	Completed	Designated 4/06	Awaiting COS
14	Round 1	Buckland	Dover	3	Dover	N/A	Approved	Completed	Designated 4/06	COS 04/06
15	Round 1	Tower Hamlets	Dover	4	Dover	N/A	Approved	Completed	Designated 4/06	COS 04/06
16	Round 1	Milton Court, Sittingbourne	Swale	2	Swale Urban	N/A	Approved	Completed	Designated 9/06	COS 9/06
17	Round 1	Newlands, Ramsgate	Thanet	3	Thanet 2	N/A	Approved	Completed	Designated 9/06	COS 9/06
18	Round 1	Oakfield	Dartford	2	Dartford West	N/A	Approved	Completed	Designated 9/06	COS 9/06
19	Round 1	Swanscombe	Dartford	3	Dartford East	N/A	Deferred from Round 1		By 3/08	By 3/10
20	Round 1	Newington	Thanet	4	Thanet 2	N/A	Deferred from Round 1		By 3/08	By 3/10

RECORD OF DECISION



DECISION TAKEN BY Mr John Simmonds –
Cabinet Member for
Education and School
Improvement

DECISION NO.

07/00942

If decision is likely to disclose exempt information please specify the relevant paragraph(s) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972

Subject:

CHILDREN’S CENTRES – APPROVAL TO NAME NEXT NINE SITES

Decision:

AGREED to sending the list of 9 sites to the DfES for approval and subsequent building.

Any Interest Declared when the Decision was Taken

No

Reason(s) for decision including alternatives considered

As set out in the report.

Background Information:

None

.....
signed

.....
date

FOR COUNCIL SECRETARIAT USE ONLY

Decision Referred to Cabinet Scrutiny			
YES		NO	

Cabinet Scrutiny Decision to Refer Back for Reconsideration			
YES		NO	

Reconsideration Record Sheet Issued			
YES		NO	

Reconsideration of Decision Published			

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 21 MARCH 2007

Report Title:	Cancellation of Kent-Virginia Direct Flights Project
Documents Attached:	(a) Note from Leader of Council to all KCC Members and Kent MPs dated 12 July 2006 announcing taking of decision (06/00799) to proceed with project (Record of Decision itself exempt). (b) Note of discussion on 27 February 2007 when decision taken not to proceed any further with project.
Purpose of Consideration:	(a) to explore the reasons for the cancellation of the project; (b) to ascertain the total costs already incurred or committed by KCC on the project.
Possible Decisions:	The Committee can take one of the following decisions:- (a) make no comments; or (b) comment to the Leader of the Council; or (c) report to the Council.
Previous Consideration:	None.
Background Documents:	None.

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Paul Carter, Leader of Kent County Council
To: All County Council Members, Kent MPs
Date: 12 July 2006
Briefing Note: Exciting new development for Kent International Airport

Today, on behalf of Kent County Council, I authorised Pete Raine, Managing Director for Environment & Regeneration to finalise agreements with Cosmos and Norfolk Airport Authority to secure the introduction of direct transatlantic flights between Kent International Airport and Norfolk International Airport, Virginia.

Subject to confirmation of advance ticket sales, the proposal is for Cosmos to operate a weekly Airbus A-330 or Boeing 767 charter flight initially operating over a 26-week period from the beginning of May 2007 to the end of October 2007. Cosmos will be responsible for chartering the aircraft, marketing the flight programme, including selling the seats either directly itself or through other UK tour operators.

A leading tour operator in Virginia, CI Travel, will promote the flight programme in the US working closely with the Kent Tourism Alliance. Dedicated UK and US brochures and a website will be produced during August, with a formal launch of the programme by Cosmos at the Hop Farm in early September. The US brochure will strongly feature Kent and will be the only brochure of any US tour operator to give Kent such prominence.

It is normal industry practice for operators to seek financial support when establishing new routes. The financial support needed by Cosmos to cover its financial exposure up to the end of January 2007 is £800,000 (\$1.5 million).

Norfolk Airport Authority is prepared to fund 50% of the start-up costs but requires its funding to be paid through a publicly accountable body. The County Council together with its coalition of Kent partners will provide the remaining 50%. That coalition consists of Norfolk Airport Authority in Virginia and a consortium of Kent organisations, including SEEDA, Infratil Airports Europe Ltd., Kent Attractions LLP, East Kent Partnership, Thanet District Council, Canterbury City Council and Gravesham Borough Council. Kent County Council's contribution is limited to £150,000 from the Kent Regeneration Fund, which is income derived from its Kings Hill commercial and residential development. The County Council will act as a facilitator between Cosmos and the funding partners. In this role it is entering into agreements with Norfolk Airport Authority and Cosmos.

The marketing of the flight programme will be kept under continuous review with risk assessments carried out in November 2006 and January 2007. In the event that the flight programme is cancelled there would be a financial cost to the County Council and its funding partners as the set up costs are non-refundable. Of course, any passenger booking fees would be fully refundable in the event of flight cancellation as Cosmos is fully ABTA/ATOL secured.

The introduction of direct flights between Kent and Virginia forms part of the Memorandum of Understanding that was signed with the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia in June 2005.

The introduction of direct flights between Kent and Virginia would support the US Campaign being conducted by Kent Tourism Alliance that has been targeted towards the eastern seaboard of the US and the forthcoming 400th anniversary commemorations in 2007.

The direct flights being proposed between Kent and Virginia would bring inbound passengers to Kent providing economic benefits both in terms of supporting employment across the East Kent region and by increasing tourism opportunities across Kent, particularly in the heritage, leisure and retail sectors. There is the potential to link inbound tourists to the cruise market operating out of the Port of Dover. The flights could also open up further business and inward investment opportunities between Kent and Virginia.

This is a high risk venture, but one which funding partners in Kent and Virginia and Cosmos and Monarch believe is worth pursuing. Cosmos are interested in improving their presence in their local (Kent) community and are keen to develop new routes where there is little existing competition. Cosmos are clearly placing their reputation at stake if the project does not proceed.

Given the high profile of this venture, Kent County Council's Managing Director for Environment and Regeneration, Pete Raine, will be in regular contact with Cosmos and as such is the main point of contact for any questions that Members might have.

Note of Meeting 27 February 2007

Present: Mr P Carter, Mr A King, Mr A Marsh, Peter Gilroy, Pete Raine, Geoff Wild, Keith Abbott

Subject: Direct Flights To Virginia

The meeting was held to discuss the position on the programme, looking at the benefits and risks of continuing with the work to establish the direct link with Norfolk, Virginia in light of the latest information available in respect of ticket sales and the draft proposal from Cosmos.

The main benefits were:

- Securing direct jobs at Kent International Airport and indirect jobs across the region.
- An economic benefit to Kent from inbound US tourists that has been estimated at around £5 million based on 3,000 US tourists.

The main risks were:

- This is a new and untried route in a competitive market.
- Under Federal Aviation Authority rules, Norfolk Airport Authority is prevented from sharing the risk with KCC. Cosmos is also unwilling to share the risk with KCC, arguing that it was approached to operate the flight programme rather than initiating it itself.
- No other partners are willing to share the risk and therefore the flight programme could only proceed if KCC is prepared to underwrite the commercial risk on its own

Latest information:

- The marketing of the flight programme has been kept under regular review. In mid-February 2007 ticket sales amounted to around 10% of the maximum of 8,000 seats that would be available over the proposed 26-week period of the flight programme. This contrasts with the earlier indication given by Cosmos that the programme had a chance of being successful if ticket sales had reached around 20% by the end of January 2007. The current UK/US exchange rate has clearly had an impact on the US market with only 200 of the 800 tickets sold being bought by US customers.
- KCC's total potential liability under the new proposed agreement from Cosmos could be in the region of £4m. The worst case scenario based on no further seats being sold would result in a liability to KCC of around £2.3m. This is unrealistic as seat sales would continue and a decision to proceed with the flight programme would provide added confidence. On that basis a more likely scenario is that the operator would apply discounts to achieve high occupancy of the flights. Depending on the level of discount applied, KCC's liability in 2007/08 could be between £500,000 and £1 million in addition to costs already incurred.

At the end of the discussion Paul Carter decided that the programme could not proceed for the following reasons:

- The lower than expected ticket sales at the end of February.
- The fact that no other partners were prepared to share the risks.
- The potential cost to KCC and council tax payers.

This page is intentionally left blank