

**The decisions set out in these minutes will come into force, and may then be implemented at 12 noon on the fourth working day after the publication of the decision, unless the decision is subject to call-in.**

**Date of publication: 27 June 2008**

**CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL  
EAST KENT (JOINT ARRANGEMENTS) COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of a meeting held on Wednesday, 25th June, 2008  
at 10.30 am in The Guildhall, Westgate, Canterbury**

Present: Councillor J Gilbey (Chairman) (Canterbury CC)  
  
Councillor R Bliss (Shepway DC)  
Councillor J Gideon - substitute for Councillor S Ezekiel (Thanet DC)  
Councillor J Law (Canterbury CC)  
Councillor N Kenton - substitute for Councillor F Scales (Dover DC)  
Councillor A Marsh - substitute for Councillor P Carter (Kent CC)  
Councillor D Monk (Shepway DC)  
Councillor S Tomlinson – substitute for Councillor R Latchford (Thanet DC)  
Councillor I Ward – substitute for Councillor P Watkins (Dover DC)

Officers: Matthew Archer- Canterbury CC  
Nadeem Aziz- Dover DC  
John Bunnett- Thanet DC  
Mark Bursnell- Canterbury CC  
Colin Carmichael- Canterbury CC  
Linda Davies- Kent CC  
Mark Ellender- Canterbury CC  
Nick Hughes- Canterbury CC  
Dominic MacDonald-Wallace- Kent Improvement Partnership  
Lyn McDaid- Canterbury CC  
Jim McDonald- Canterbury CC  
Richard Samuel- Thanet DC  
Alistair Stewart- Shepway DC  
Roger Walton- Dover DC  
Peter Wignall- Shepway DC

**UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

**1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**  
*(Item. 2)*

Councillor John Gilbey was confirmed as Chairman of this Committee for the remainder of the Council year 2008/09.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**  
*(Item. 1)*

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Paul Carter (KCC), Sandy Ezekiel (TDC), Alex King (KCC), Roger Latchford (TDC), Frederick Scales (DDC), and Paul Watkins (DDC).

### **3. DECLARATIONS OF ANY INTERESTS**

*(Item. 3)*

There were none made.

### **4. PROCEDURE RULES**

*(Item. 5)*

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services (CCC) outlined his report on the Procedure Rules of the East Kent (Joint Arrangements) Committee. He asked the Committee to agree the terms of reference; the procedure rules and to note the operating arrangements and terms of reference of the East Kent (Joint Scrutiny) Committee.

A Member asked the Head of Legal and Democratic Services whether it was possible to have named substitutes for both this Committee and the East Kent (Joint Scrutiny) Committee. The Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised that the procedure rules had been designed in order to be flexible. However this Committee could introduce the practise of having named substitute Members, but this would not be binding. This Committee could recommend to the East Kent (Joint Scrutiny) Committee it have named substitute Members.

The Committee then debated the issue of Substitute Members.

RESOLVED –

- a) That the terms of reference in the Schedule to Appendix 1 of the report now submitted be accepted.
- b) That the committee procedure rules detailed in Appendix 2 of the report now submitted, be adopted.
- c) That the operating arrangements and terms of reference of the East Kent (Joint Scrutiny) Committee detailed in Appendix 3 of the report now submitted.
- d) That this Committee have named substitute Members where it is expedient to do so and that the East Kent (Joint Scrutiny) Committee be recommended to adopt the same practice for their committee to ensure continuity.

### **5. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES - EAST KENT (JOINT ARRANGEMENTS) COMMITTEE AND EAST KENT (JOINT SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE**

*(Item. 6)*

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services (CCC) outlined his report on the Administrative Processes of the above two Committees. He asked Members to agree to review the arrangements of both Committees after six months. The Committee were informed that it had been suggested that the time of future meetings be

amended to 10.00am. The report contained details of suggested speaking rights and proposed dates for both meetings. It was possible that the dates for future “Joint Scrutiny” committee meetings might be amended. The report also included arrangements for recommending items to the Leaders of the respective Councils for inclusion in their Forward Plans.

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services answered a question from a Member explaining that if the administrative arrangements were to change significantly they would need to be approved by the constituent Councils.

RESOLVED –

a) That the operational arrangements of the East Kent (Joint Arrangements) Committee and the East Kent (Joint Scrutiny) Committee be reviewed by officers of the respective host authorities in six months and a report be taken to a future meeting of the Committees.

b) That the Committee may, by invitation of the Chairman invite the Chairman of the East Kent Joint Scrutiny Committee or other persons to attend and speak to items on its Agenda.

c) That the dates for the Joint Committee Meetings as set out in Appendix 1 of the report subject to the time of this Committee being amended to 10.00am. Meetings to be set according to these arrangements.

d) That the Committee adopt the arrangements as set out in Appendix 3 of the report now submitted for recommending items to the Leaders of the respective Councils for inclusion on their Forward Plans

## **6. PROPOSAL FOR THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EAST KENT CLUSTER SHARED SERVICES PROGRAMME** *(Item. 7)*

The Head of Policy and Improvement (CCC) outlined his report and asked that the guiding principles, project initiation process, measuring of success and the core programmes for shared service projects, be approved.

The Chief Executive of (CCC) in response to a Members query confirmed that Revenues and Benefits were to be treated as two separate services initially as it was not always the case that they were a combined service in all authorities. Members queried whether it would be possible to change any of the Officers that had been designated as project managers. The Chief Executive (CCC) confirmed to Members, it would not be advisable to change those project managers where work had already been started. However, the Chief Executives Group could change the Project Managers on those projects that had not already been started.

RESOLVED – That the guiding principles, project initiation process, measures for success and the core programme for shared services projects be approved and that the programme of shared service projects could commence.

## **7. UPDATE ON THE WASTE MANAGEMENT PROJECT** *(Item. 8)*

The Committee received a presentation from the Corporate Director and Deputy Chief Executive (TDC) updating Members on converging the waste and recycling facilities of East Kent. The presentation covered the background and goals of the project, an overview of the principles agreed so far and outlined the next steps and the budget required to fund them.

The Corporate Director and Deputy Chief Executive (TDC) answered Members questions. He advised that Kent County Council would be providing the majority of the funding requested in the report. It would be recommended to the district Councils that the balance of the budget required would be divided between them on the basis of waste spend. He further advised that at the February 2009 meeting of this Committee, there would be a report covering the recommended Notional Optimum Model.

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services (CCC) reminded the Committee that under their agreed terms of reference the Committee would ask the constituent Member Councils to allocate it funding for a project. When the funding was allocated, it would then become a joint budget under the control of this Committee.

RESOLVED – That in order that external legal and technical support can be procured and the waste management project managed, each Council in the East Kent group, be requested to;

a) Note the report

b) That approval is given to spend £200,000 of Waste Collection Authority and Waste Disposal Authority resources to be divided between the five authorities on a waste spend basis. (Underpinned by £100,000 from the Kent Waste Partnership)

**8. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS TO BE DEALT WITH IN PUBLIC**  
*(Item. 9)*

**9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH FALLS UNDER THE EXEMPT PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 OR THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 OR BOTH**  
*(Item. 10)*