

**REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
POLICY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, 18th January, 2011**

**2.00 pm**

**Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone**

**Members are asked to bring with them to the meeting a  
copy of the Draft Budget and Medium Term Financial  
Plan documents circulated on 6 January 2011**







## AGENDA

# REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 18th January, 2011, at 2.00 pm      Ask for:      Theresa Grayell  
Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall,      Telephone      01622 694277  
Maidstone

*Tea/Coffee will be available 30 minutes before the meeting*

### Membership (12)

Conservative (11):      Mr M C Dance (Chairman), Mr J R Bullock, MBE, Mr A R Chell,  
Mr K A Ferrin, MBE, Mr P J Homewood, Mrs J P Law, Mr K H Pugh,  
Mrs J A Rook, Mr K Smith, Mr M V Snelling and Mrs E M Tweed

Liberal Democrat (1):      Mr I S Chittenden (Vice-Chairman)

### Webcasting Notice

Please note: this meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site – at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed.

By entering the meeting room you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes. If you do not wish to have your image captured then you should make the Clerk of the meeting aware.

### UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

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

#### Item No

#### **A. COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

- A1 Introduction/Webcasting
- A2 Substitutes
- A3 Declarations of Members' Interest relating to items on today's Agenda
- A4 Minutes of the meeting held on 17 November 2010 (Pages 1 - 14)

#### **B. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

- B1 Presentation - Draft Kent Forum Housing Strategy (Pages 15 - 18)

- B2 Presentation - Tourism and Progress of the Kent Contemporary Campaign (Pages 19 - 22)
- B3 Designing out Risk - Building in Safety (Pages 23 - 28)
- B4 Feedback Report from REDPOSC District Visits (Pages 29 - 36)
- B5 Growth Without Gridlock - A Transport Delivery Plan for Kent (Pages 37 - 40)
- B6 Supporting Community Infrastructure (Pages 41 - 46)
- B7 Financial Monitoring 2010/2011 (Pages 47 - 52)
- B8 Draft Revenue and Capital Budgets 2011/12 and Medium Term Financial Plan 2011- 2013 - TO FOLLOW
- B9 Update on Major Projects, including Core Monitoring (Pages 53 - 62)

**C. SELECT COMMITTEE WORK**

- C1 Update on Select Committee Work (Pages 63 - 64)

**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

**Monday, 10 January 2011**

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

**KENT COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

**REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

MINUTES of a meeting of the Regeneration and Economic Development Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Wednesday, 17 November 2010.

PRESENT: Mr M C Dance (Chairman), Mr I S Chittenden (Vice-Chairman), Mr A R Chell, Mr K A Ferrin, MBE, Mr P J Homewood, Mrs J P Law, Mr K H Pugh, Mrs J A Rook, Mr K Smith, Mr M V Snelling and Mrs E M Tweed

ALSO PRESENT: Mr K G Lynes, Mr M J Whiting and Mr M A Wickham

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr D Cockburn (Executive Director, Strategy, Economic Development & ICT), Mr N Smith (Head of Development Investment), Mr M Bodkin (Head of Urban Regeneration), Mrs T Bruton (Head of Regeneration Projects) and Miss T Grayell (Democratic Services Officer)

**UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

**45. Minutes of the meeting held on 23 September 2010**  
*(Item A3)*

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 23 September 2010 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

**46. Update on District Visits**  
*(Item B1)*

*Mr M J Whiting, Member for Swale Central, was present for this item and spoke on it with the permission of the Chairman.*

*Mr M Bodkin, Head of Urban Regeneration, Mrs T Bruton, Head of Regeneration Projects, Mr P Champion, Development Contributions Manager, Mrs H Coleman, Economic Development Manager, Mr R Hancock, Regeneration and Projects Manager, Mr D Hughes, Regeneration and Projects Manager, Mr I Lewis, Growth Areas Manager, and Mr K Mackenney, Regeneration and Projects Manager, were in attendance for this item.*

*The Chairman, Mr M C Dance, declared an interest as a Trustee of Sheppey Academy, having previously served as an elected Member of Swale Borough Council, and Mrs J A Rook declared an interest as her family business has retail premises in a number of Kent towns.*

*Mr K A Ferrin declared a prejudicial interest due to his involvement with Kent Science Park in Sittingbourne, although, as this site was not referred to specifically during the discussion, he was able to remain in the room and take part in the general discussion on the item.*

1. Mr N Smith introduced the report and explained the criteria against which the priorities arising from each district visit had been assessed and awarded a provisional rating of High, Medium or Low. He emphasised that the exercise had been an independent assessment, and assured Members that the criteria had been applied consistently across all districts. Priorities listed were those which had been identified at the visit, within the context of the Regeneration Framework. The report also included an update on any change to the projects in the time since the visit.

2. Members were asked to consider the priorities listed, identify any priority which they thought had been omitted from the list, and decide if they agreed the rating awarded to each priority. Members discussed what they had seen and heard at each visit, and the officer team answered questions of detail. Points highlighted by questions and comments were as follows:-

General Comments on the assessment process:-

- Members would need to consider how each District's priorities link with the KCC's priorities;
- The priorities listed must be achievable;
- Members would need to consider the likely county-wide effects of the new Local Enterprise Partnerships; and
- KCC should stimulate economic growth as an underlying theme, in all areas.

ASHFORD

- the town centre is a joint priority with the Borough and County Councils;
- it is right that Ashford's status as a growth point has a High rating. The Regional Spatial Strategy will set ambitious growth targets;
- 'Ashford's Future' is a good driving force and a big advantage for Ashford. If this were to be discontinued, it would need to be replaced with something as dynamic;
- Local Development Framework assumptions made in 2008 were driven by Ashford's status as a growth point; if one thing were to change, it would change the basis of other things;
- KCC has delivered over £30million of transport schemes in and around Ashford. Future programme management will be done jointly with the Borough and County Councils; and
- 'Supporting the development of Higher Education/Further Education Learning and Skills provision' should be increased to a High priority rating.

CANTERBURY

- since the visit, Herne Bay had benefitted from £26million of private investment and £4½million from the City Council for sports provision;
- a High rating for Higher and Further Education is good, as the area has three Universities. The student population is very important;
- cultural investment in Canterbury (eg, Marlowe, Beaney Institute) will benefit the wider area of East Kent;
- Whitstable has been a great success story and is still moving forward with good momentum;
- attitudes to joint working have changed much for the good over the years, and some East Kent districts have grouped together in a new way which would not have been possible six months ago;
- an additional priority – transport links – was suggested, with a High rating (*although it was not agreed to add this as a priority*).

- the Freedom Pass has been a big advantage in helping secondary school students travel to Canterbury schools, and there are successful initiatives which must be retained;
- the Freedom Pass needs to make more difference to access in rural areas; and
- transport is the key to regeneration in all areas; the Committee must ensure that discussions are ongoing. There are issues around the range of types of transport which need to be addressed.

## DOVER

- since the visit, much work has been done in Dover, and the District Council is looking at three priorities; developing a new town at Whitfield, building up maritime training at the Port of Dover to help promote links between learning and skills and jobs, and it is also hoping to attract Hadlow College to boost its rural economy;
- a new priority to add to the grid should be 'Essential joint working across District Councils to make a healthy economy for East Kent', and this should have a High rating;
- the Building Schools for the Future priority should now be deleted. This will be a big loss for Dover, but Dover will recover;
- priorities should emphasise Dover's status as a growth point;
- the importance of promoting Dover Town Centre should be emphasised;
- Dover has had much success so far, eg with HighSpeed1, with KCC's help, and neighbouring towns like Deal and Sandwich have benefitted too; and
- Dover's improvements should be celebrated, and successes used as case studies as examples of new ways of working.

## KENT THAMESIDE – DARTFORD AND GRAVESHAM

- the visits to these two areas were very encouraging, and had shown good examples of how to manage regeneration well;
- the need to address the community needs of the huge residential development at Ingress Park had been the reason for the KCC adopting its present S106 policy;
- Dartford presents a fascinating case study of how to balance a town centre with surrounding retail areas, the former able to offer independent retailers and the latter large generic stores. Achieving a thriving town centre depended on people being able to live there;
- Bluewater's approach to apprenticeships and skills training had been enlightening, and a good example to use elsewhere;
- the changing economic climate would inevitably lead to a change in priorities, as previous priorities had been based on assumptions around levels of home ownership;
- Gravesend has potential to make use of its wharfage as a cruise terminal, and it would need to look at what heritage and cultural attractions the town could offer to cruise tourists. Once a wharf area had been given over to housing it could not be recovered;
- Gravesend has very recently opened a maritime centre of excellence to address the need for maritime training and ship building and repair;
- Crossrail had not been included in the current priorities as there is no funding available yet, but this would be held in reserve for the future; and
- a large development at Victoria Park in Dartford is much anticipated.

## MAIDSTONE

- the Maidstone Southern Relief Road should be included as an aspiration (*although it was not agreed to add this as a priority*);
- Maidstone's status as an economic hub is an essential priority, as the town will potentially lose many public sector jobs in the near future. The priority to 'maximise Maidstone's potential as an economic hub' should be increased to a High rating;
- Maidstone's retail premises are of very high quality;
- road and rail links to the town are an issue to be addressed, and 'Lobbying Government for rail links' and 'Ensuring no adverse effects of congestion' should both be increased to a High rating. Public transport should be improved, as it is cheaper and easier to drive to Maidstone in a private car than it is to use public transport;
- regenerating deprived areas should be increased to a Medium rating; and
- Maidstone is a 'maturing' town and needs to look ahead to the next five years.

## SEVENOAKS

- the visit to Sevenoaks had shown up areas of great economic and geographic diversity;
- it had become apparent that the Barnfield gypsy site had been spruced up in anticipation of the Committee's visit;
- New Ash Green had appeared to be a good coherent community but did not have the local facilities which it needed. Residents do not shop locally, and addressing the problems presented by the shopping centre is a major challenge; and
- the Sevenoaks area has a number of Independent Schools – 18% of schoolchildren in Kent are educated at Independent Schools – and KCC needs to know more about these schools.

## SHEPWAY

- Shepway has the great benefit of a committed local entrepreneur and benefactor in the De Haan Trust;
- Members would need to consider the impact of the Local Enterprise Partnership on the issue of which Kent airport/s to develop;
- Lydd and Manston airports each have different roles, Lydd offering business flights and Manston being used mainly for freight;
- 'Supporting the development of Lydd airport' should be lowered to a Medium rating. *By 6 votes to 3, Members decided that Lydd should be prioritised below Manston;* and
- 'Supporting Shepway District Council in lobbying for Dungeness C power station' should be increased to a High rating, *by a unanimous vote.*

## SWALE

- priorities should concentrate on supporting people and communities;
- KCC particularly needs to support Swale Borough Council, as the latter is one of the least well-off Councils in the county;
- money is extremely limited and efforts should concentrate on what is achievable. A major issue would be to consider what could be done in the interim before larger plans could start; and

- it is crucial that development at Queenborough and Rushenden is of good quality.

Mr M J Whiting, Local Member for Swale Central, supported the comments made by the Committee. He added that Sittingbourne was seen by local companies as a good area to locate their business, and the regeneration of Sittingbourne would benefit the rest of Swale.

#### THANET

- 'Providing jobs for local people' should be increased to a High rating;
- Margate has the potential to be a top destination for tourism;
- it is important to learn a lesson from the effect which the Westwood Cross development had had on Thanet's town centres. Members were advised that both the KCC and Thanet District Council had fought against the development but it had been allowed on appeal;
- Westwood Cross had brought good quality shops to the area, as well as jobs; Thanet's shopping had previously been poor;
- traffic networks in Thanet had developed in a haphazard way, with no coherent plan; and
- Thanet needs an economic climate which will attract private sector investment and high quality development. This investment could be attracted by a high speed rail link to bring Thanet within one hour's journey time to London.

#### TONBRIDGE AND MALLING

- 'Changing the image of the district as universally affluent' should be deleted from the priorities list.

#### TUNBRIDGE WELLS

- 'Addressing localised problems of congestion on the A26 and at North Farm and the need to dual the A21' should be increased to a High rating;
- the Local Enterprise Partnership (Tunbridge Wells, with Tonbridge and Malling, was part of the East Sussex LEP) might be able to put some weight behind raising the priority of the A21 dualling; and
- to address congestion and keep traffic moving freely would help both town centre and out-of-town shopping.

3. The Cabinet Member, Mr K G Lynes, commented that the discussion of priorities had given him a valuable opportunity to take an overview of the regeneration and economic development concerns across the county. Major economic and political changes would inevitably have an effect as they had altered funding streams and freedoms. He said he saw the KCC's future role being largely one of encouraging businesses and partners.

4. For each area, Members either agreed the provisional priorities as listed in the report or agreed changes to them. These are set out below:-

#### **1. Ashford (date of visit: 30 April 2010)**

<b>Priority identified by REDPOSC</b>	<b>Agreed Rating</b>	<b>Update since visit</b>
Maintaining the critical nature of	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>LDF Core Strategy adopted July 2008.</b></li> <li>• <b>Ashford's town centre and commercial quarter have</b></li> </ul>

Ashford as a growth point		<p>now been identified as the top priority in the Ashford LIP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good progress by KHS on M20 Junction 9, M20 footbridge and Drivers roundabout improvements.</li> <li>• Victoria Way under construction by KHS but likely to extend beyond funding window.</li> <li>• DTZ has completed a report on HE and FE provision in Ashford and KCC is looking at the implications for the 14-19 age group and for secondary school provision. This should be finished at the end of the year.</li> </ul>
Supporting the development of HE/FE learning and skills provision	<b>H Increased from M</b>	
Making provision for the future maintenance requirements of high quality public realm	L	

## 2. Canterbury (26 February 2010)

Priority identified by REDPOSC	Agreed Rating	Update since visit
Supporting joint working with the east Kent district councils in regeneration and economic development	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>LDF Core Strategy Options report published in January 2010.</b></li> <li>• East Kent LIP being prepared by HCA, KCC and districts recognises importance of HE/FE sector to local economy</li> <li>• City Council's proposed Technology Park will help to develop that HE/FE potential.</li> <li>• Visit Kent is developing a cultural tourism programme for 2011, with a strong focus on East Kent.</li> </ul>
Capitalising on Canterbury's pivotal role as a major centre for HE / FE in the county	H	
Maximising the opportunities for cultural regeneration across east Kent	M	

## 3. Dover (15 December 2009)

Priority identified by REDPOSC	Agreed Rating	Update since visit
Assisting the development of the White Cliffs Business Park (WCBP) through innovative financing mechanisms, and supporting the growth of Whitfield	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>LDF Core Strategy adopted in February 2010</b></li> <li>• Port expansion looks likely to be delayed until 2015.</li> <li>• KCC working with DHB and FE college to look at opportunities for maritime skills provision</li> <li>• KCC has set up an officer working group to advise and support Dover DC and prospective developers about community infrastructure needs for Whitfield</li> <li>• KCC is undertaking a feasibility study for a Bus Rapid Transit scheme that would connect the existing town with the port and growth areas of Whitfield and Farthingloe</li> <li>• Scope for major new build under BSF programme is very limited although Archers Academy new build is under review by government.</li> <li>• The BSF grammar school proposal at Whitfield has been discontinued.</li> <li>• Dover Construction Centre at Whitfield is being well used (caters for 16-19 age group)</li> </ul>
Supporting port development at the Western Docks and related mixed use regeneration opportunities	M	
Assisting the district council and	M	

Dover Pride to make the case for transport investment		
Making the most of KCC's commissioning role for learning and training provision in the 14-19 age group	M	
Making the most for Dover of the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme	DELETE	
<b>ADD: Essential joint working across District Councils to make a healthy economy for East Kent</b>	H	

#### 4. Kent Thameside (12 March 2010)

Priority identified by REDPOSC	Agreed Rating	Update since visit
Balancing new growth at Ebbsfleet with town centre regeneration in Dartford and Gravesend	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Dartford LDF Core Strategy is expected to be submitted in September/October 2010</b></li> <li>GBC is assessing the development potential of all key town centre sites (including Heritage quarter &amp; Northfleet Embankment) through emerging LDF</li> <li><b>Interim consultation on draft Gravesham Core Strategy expected in late autumn 2010</b></li> <li>Most of REDPOSC priorities for area are included in North Kent LIP approved by districts in September 2010</li> <li>Promising results from BSF Employment and Skills Plan in terms of work placements to date</li> <li>Decision awaited on the Strategic Transport Programme ('Homes and Roads') in light of the recent Comprehensive Spending Review</li> </ul>
Ensuring that skills provision in the area is sustainable	H	
Knitting urban growth and early infrastructure provision with community development needs	M	
Integrating old and new communities by ensuring that new developments are not isolated in brownfield sites	M	
Ensuring that there is continued close and successful working between KCC, DBC and GBC	M	

#### 5. Maidstone (1 October 2010)

Priority identified by	Agreed	Update since visit
------------------------	--------	--------------------

<b>REDPOSC</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Maximising Maidstone's potential as an economic hub and balancing population growth and employment opportunities	<b>H Increased from M</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Maidstone BC consulting on LDF Core Strategy in Jan/Feb 2011</b></li> <li>• Maximising Maidstone town centre's economic potential, linked to the development of key sites and highway &amp; public transport improvements, are identified as priorities in the West Kent LIP.</li> <li>• Otherwise no further progress to report</li> </ul>
Ensuring that town centre regeneration is not adversely affected by congestion	<b>H Increased from M</b>	
Improving the FE and HE presence in the town	<b>M</b>	
Lobbying government over better rail connections to London	<b>H Increased from L</b>	
Regenerating deprived neighbourhoods such as High Street, Parkwood and Shepway	<b>M Increased from L</b>	

## 6. Sevenoaks (25 May 2010)

<b>Priority identified by REDPOSC</b>	<b>Agreed Rating</b>	<b>Update since visit</b>
Agreeing a joint approach to delivering a sustainable community at Fort Halstead	<b>M</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Adoption of LDF Core Strategy anticipated in December 2010</b></li> <li>• The regeneration of Swanley and New Ash Green town centres are identified as priorities in the West Kent LIP</li> <li>• Otherwise no further progress to report</li> </ul>
Working with the district council to identify options for regenerating Swanley Town Centre	<b>M</b>	
Working with SDC to identify options for regenerating New Ash Green Shopping Centre	<b>M</b>	
Working with the district to assist continued integration of Barnfield Park Gypsy and Traveller site into the local community	<b>L</b>	

## 7. Shepway (1 September 2010)

<b>Priority identified by REDPOSC</b>	<b>Agreed Rating</b>	<b>Update since visit</b>
Supporting the master planning and	<b>H</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Submission of LDF Core Strategy to government in July 2011</b></li> </ul>

development of Folkestone Sea Front		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recent announcement by government that Dungeness 'C' has not been included in its list of new nuclear power stations</li> <li>Otherwise no further progress to report</li> </ul>
Supporting the development of Lydd Airport	<b>M Reduced from H</b>	
Supporting SDC in lobbying for Dungeness 'C' power station	<b>H Increased from M</b>	
Improving the future competitiveness of the local workforce through education and skills provision	M	

### 8. Swale (2 November 2009)

Priority identified by REDPOSC	Agreed Rating	Update since visit
Developing a multi agency approach to people based regeneration at Sheppey	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>First consultation on LDF Core Strategy in January / February 2011</b></li> <li>Multi agency approach to development of Queenborough &amp; Rushenden well underway, including housing retrofit programme, scoping work for a new community hub and a number of community environmental projects.</li> <li>Planned cycle routes on Sheppey to be completed by KCC in June 2011</li> <li>Scope for significant KCC involvement through S106 work and developing Q&amp;R as exemplar development with housing and employment sites linked to new opportunities at Sheerness</li> <li>Completion of Rushenden Link Road in summer 2011 will enable Q&amp;R development to happen</li> <li>Initial design of route options for Southern Relief Road (SSR) linked to a new junction off the M2 were completed in July 2010</li> <li>Phasing &amp; implementation plan being developed for SRR (completion Dec 2010)</li> <li>Highways Agency about to publish its assessment of short term options for traffic capacity improvements at junction 5 of M2</li> <li>KCC has worked with partners to rescue the underperforming Kent Science Resource Centre and has taken over responsibility from Mid Kent College for promoting science courses at KSP</li> <li>Construction of SNRR Milton Creek crossing started in early 2010. Expected completion in autumn 2011.</li> <li>Consultation on SNRR Bapchild link completed and report on findings likely to be made available at end of 2010</li> <li>Elements of Swale Parklands project are now underway</li> <li>Development north of Sittingbourne town centre subject to a preferred development partner competition led by Swale BC</li> <li>Deep Dive project looking at use of public sector assets in Sittingbourne town centre has started</li> </ul>
Working with SBC to get the most out of Kent Science Park's contribution to science based jobs	H	
Working with Swale BC to develop Sittingbourne Town Centre	M	

## 9. Thanet (26 July 2010)

Priority identified by REDPOSC	Agreed Rating	Update since visit
Supporting the Task Force approach to tackling deprivation and benefit dependency in Central Margate and Cliftonville West (CMCW)	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>LDF Core Strategy to be submitted mid 2011</b></li> <li>• Thanet Offshore launched 23 September 2010</li> <li>• London Array facilities now being built at Ramsgate port</li> <li>• Turner Contemporary will be completed in December 2010 and will be handed over to the Trust</li> <li>• Thanet DC's sea defence proposals for Margate accepted by Environment Agency</li> <li>• Turner and Townsend, working with consultants BBP and DTZ, appointed as project managers for housing intervention work at Central Margate / Cliftonville West.</li> <li>• Draft DTZ report has shown that improving accessibility and addressing housing issues in Cliftonville will have most impact on deprivation in Thanet</li> </ul>
Encouraging economic development at Central Island and Ramsgate	H	
Improving accessibility to Thanet via HS1 and a Manston Parkway	H	
Providing jobs for local people	<b>H Increased from M</b>	
Changing Margate's image to improve its wider regeneration prospects	M	

## 10. Tonbridge and Malling (28 September 2010)

Priority identified by REDPOSC	Agreed Rating	Update since visit
Supporting the regeneration of Tonbridge town centre	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>LDF Core Strategy adopted in 2007</b></li> <li>• Regeneration of Tonbridge town centre, increasing affordable housing provision and support for West Kent Partnership are included as priorities in the West Kent LIP</li> <li>• No further progress to report</li> </ul>
Developing key strategic sites to increase affordable housing provision	M	
Dealing with local deprivation in Snodland, East Malling and Trench	M	
Supporting the development of the West Kent Partnership to deliver economic development	M	
Changing the image of the district as universally affluent	DELETE	

## 11. Tunbridge Wells (28 September 2010)

Priority identified by REDPOSC	Agreed Rating	Update since visit
Regenerating the urban centres in the district	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Current local plan adopted in June 2010, and borough council will shortly be reviewing LDF</b></li> </ul>

<i>through the joint venture between TWBC and John Laing plc</i>		<p><b>Core Strategy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The redevelopment of the Sherwood Estate and the Kent &amp; Sussex hospital site are identified in the West Kent LIP as the key regeneration priorities in Tunbridge Wells</i></li> </ul>
<i>Addressing localised problems of congestion, particularly along the A26 and at North Farm, and the need to dual the A21</i>	<p><b>H Increased from M</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No further progress to report</i></li> </ul>

5. Members then offered the following as their overall priorities for the whole of the county:-

- a Third Thames Crossing
- dualling of the A21
- a high speed rail link to Thanet
- Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road
- attracting private investment into the county
- improving the Tourism offer across the whole county
- creating a system to raise aspirations in training, skills and jobs
- transport links of all types (planes, trains and automobiles)
- Broadband, particularly in rural areas
- Town Centre regeneration.

6. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the priorities listed in paragraph 4 above represent the agreed priorities identified from the year-long programme of visits;
- b) a feedback report be produced which responds to the comments made by Members during debate and the changes made to the priorities, and this be submitted to a future meeting of the POSC; and
- c) Regeneration and Economic Development officers be thanked for accompanying each of the visits, for preparing notes and updated information since each visit, and for attending the meeting to answer Members' questions.

**47. Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)**  
(Item B2)

*Mr R Gill, Economic Strategy and Policy Manager, was in attendance for this item.*

1. Mr Gill introduced the report and explained that an interim board would be established in early December and would meet several times before April 2011. The role and operation of the LEP were not yet clear, and views and proposals were being sought from each area so its local LEP would be individually tailored. The aim was that each LEP would be run with minimal bureaucracy, although a core work programme document would probably be needed to set out the priorities for each new LEP. The Government has also launched a new Regional Growth Fund (RGF), worth £1.4 billion over three years. This is significantly less than the funds previously available via the Regional Development Agencies and other Government bodies, and competition for funding will be high.

2. Mr Gill answered questions from Members, and points arising from Members' questions and comments were as follows:-

- a) the LEP board would potentially be very large, if other areas matched Kent's 14 representatives. The interim board would need to decide if it felt this size was right;
- b) bids to the RGF could be made by private concerns and private/public concerns (but not public sector-only);
- c) Medway Council had not formally signed up to the LEP, but the LEP catchment area did include the geographical areas of Medway and the Essex Unitary Authorities;
- d) the LEP would have to decide on its unique selling point, and this could be 'Gateway to England', emphasising its ports and transport infrastructure. The LEP area's growth potential is also highly significant, especially in Kent and Essex;
- e) District representation on the LEP board will be determined by the Kent Forum. It is envisaged that business representation on the interim board will be determined by the Business Advisory Board of the Kent Economic Board, although once established, the LEP board could develop a different mechanism for identifying its membership; and
- f) the political mix of the LEP's membership had not yet been decided.

3. RESOLVED that the information given in the report and in response to Members' questions be noted, with thanks.

#### **48. Update on Major Projects**

*(Item B3)*

1. Mr Smith and Mrs Bruton introduced the report and updated Members on changes which had emerged since writing the report, as follows:-

- a) the Ashford Station forecourt project was now under review and was unlikely to proceed in the near future;
- b) landscaping at the Dover Priory Station project was mostly complete, and the project was ready to hand to Network Rail to run;
- c) discussions were underway with project partners on possible uses of the Rendezvous/Winter Gardens site in Margate; and
- d) the 'No Use Empty' initiative had recently celebrated its 5<sup>th</sup> anniversary and had been commended nationally, having exceeded its targets. More District Councils were now on board.

2. Points highlighted by questions and comments were as follows:-

- a) cross-Directorate work was always to be encouraged, and Members were assured that links would be made where appropriate; and
- b) KCC still had links with Business Support Kent, a Community Interest Company, which had previously run Business Link Kent. Although the company had subsequently lost the Business Link contract, it had continued its other areas of work.

3. The Cabinet Member, Mr Lynes, commented that the offshore wind power industry needed to appear welcoming to potential new trainees, and the KCC could influence the skills agenda in this very lucrative industry. Swale Skills Centre had commenced training a first intake of thirty young people in the specialist skills required.

4. RESOLVED that the information given in the report and in response to Members' questions be noted, with thanks.

#### **49. Financial Monitoring 2010/11**

*(Item B4)*

*Mr D Shipton, Finance Strategy Manager, was in attendance for this and the following item.*

1. Mr Shipton introduced the report and explained that the only change which had arisen since last reporting to the POSC was that two extra posts had become vacant.

2. RESOLVED that the information given in the report be noted, with thanks.

#### **50. Budget 2011/12 and Medium Term Financial Plan 2011/12 to 2012/13**

*(Item B5)*

1. Mr Shipton introduced the report and reminded Members that, as he had reported to the September meeting, the Local Authority Business Growth Incentive Scheme (LABGI) grant had been removed this year and the impact accommodated, so no reduction in income would yet be apparent.

2. RESOLVED that the information given in the report be noted, with thanks.

Members did not offer priorities for delivering the indicative cash limits as the picture of available funding was not yet clear enough for Members to be able to make an informed judgement.

#### **51. Change to Keep Succeeding**

*(Item B6)*

*Mr J Hawkins, Transformation Project Manager, was in attendance for this item.*

1. Mr Hawkins introduced the report and set out the process, explaining that consultation on the proposals would end on 1 December. Thereafter, the Group Managing Director would make a recommendation on the new structure to the

County Council on 16 December. Mr Hawkins answered questions from Members, and the points highlighted by questions and comments were as follows:-

- a) in the current proposals, the delivery of regeneration projects had been placed within the Enterprise Directorate; and
- b) Members expressed a range of views about the value and timing of the restructuring exercise, and, on balance, the prevailing mood of the meeting was that this was the right thing to do and the right time to do it. Members commended the savings to be made.

2. The Cabinet Member, Mr Lynes, paid tribute to the commitment and passion of KCC Members and officers and said that KCC was a very good local authority.

3. Mr Hawkins responded to Members' comments by explaining that the aim of the restructuring was to start at the top to set out the framework of a smaller organisation, to better handle future change. He said that the savings would be around £800,000 initially, and, as each of the new Directorates shaped its services, there would be further savings. The existing Managing Directors had been fully involved in the design principles.

4. RESOLVED that the information given in the report and in response to Members' questions be noted, with thanks.

## **52. Update on Select Committee Work** *(Item C1)*

1. The Chairman and Mr K Smith referred to the Select Committee on the Student Journey and said that this would be a good example of cross-Directorate working, as the project would bring together Regeneration, Learning and Development and Communities.

2. RESOLVED that the information set out in the report be noted, with thanks.

**By:** Kevin Lynes, Cabinet Member for Regeneration  
David Cockburn, Executive Director for Strategy, Economic Development and ICT

**To:** Regeneration and Economic Development Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee 18 January 2011

**Subject:** Draft Kent Forum Housing Strategy

**Classification:** Unrestricted

---

**Summary:** This report provides an update for Members on the development of the draft Kent Forum Housing Strategy.

---

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 An initial consultation draft of the Kent and Medway Housing Strategy was circulated to over 300 stakeholders in May this year. That draft was written prior to the General Election and further work was undertaken to reflect the changes in the external environment, the comments received during that consultation and the direction given by Kent & Medway Leaders.
- 1.2 A second consultation draft of the Strategy was taken to the Kent and Medway Leaders' Group on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2010, where Leaders' agreed to the document being issued for a further 2-month consultation.
- 1.3 That consultation period ended on 24<sup>th</sup> November. Positive responses were received from amongst others, Districts and Boroughs, Housing Associations, the Homes and Communities Agency, the Environment Agency, Southern Water, private sector developers, PCTs and the Kent Rural Board. Some concerns on points of detail which were raised have been addressed in the latest draft.
- 1.4 The draft has been revised to reflect consultees' comments including strengthening the sections on supporting people and mental health and the inclusion of a new section on standards in the private sector, and to highlight recent government proposals, which came forward as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review and the Decentralisation and Localism Bill.
- 1.5 This latest draft is due to be considered by the Kent Forum on 28<sup>th</sup> January.

## 2. Context

- 2.1 In developing the Strategy we commissioned a Kent and Medway Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Through this, we identified 5 key housing challenges for Kent and Medway that must be tackled. These are:
  - The need to secure the **delivery** of new homes.
  - The imperative to achieve **regeneration** of key brownfield sites across the County.
  - The need for **renewal** of existing homes and the return to use of **empty homes**.

- The challenge and opportunity of improving the **energy efficiency** of existing homes.
- The need to consider the needs of **vulnerable groups** and the support services they require.

## 2.2 **Themes and ambitions**

The Strategy is designed around 5 themes, which set out to meet these challenges. Each theme has an ambition we are seeking to deliver through the Strategy. These are:

### **Theme 1 – Managed Growth and Infrastructure**

**Our Ambition:** The continued delivery of key infrastructure to support managed growth and housing delivery across the County.

### **Theme 2 – Place-making and Regeneration**

**Our Ambition:** The continued regeneration of our disadvantaged neighbourhoods to bring them in line with more affluent parts of the County.

### **Theme 3 - Affordability and Choice**

**Our Ambition:** The provision of choice and affordability in housing for the citizens of Kent and Medway, including rural communities, which meets their needs and aspirations.

### **Theme 4 - Housing Renewal**

**Our Ambition:** The managed improvement and retrofit of existing homes to make them fit for now and the future.

### **Theme 5 - Housing Need**

**Our Ambition:** To support vulnerable people in housing need to fulfil their potential and live a high quality life through the provision of excellent housing and support services.

## 2.3 **Proposed actions to be taken forward**

Underpinning each challenge is a series of more specific recommendations. These recommendations are not binding on any organisation that signs up to the Strategy, as not every recommendation will have relevance to every area. Instead, we expect local authorities to seek to implement only those recommendations which are appropriate for them.

### **3. External Environment**

- 3.1 The external environment that impacts upon this Strategy, particularly around housing and planning, has recently been the subject of many proposed changes by the Coalition Government.
- 3.2 The majority of these proposals are still in the initial development phase. It is expected, particularly as the Decentralisation and Localism Bill is debated in Parliament that these proposals will be subject to further revision and clarification. Their potential impacts are currently unknown and it would be unwise for the Strategy to attempt to take a position on these or second guess government's intentions before the details are finalised.
- 3.3 Despite this, there has been a lot of goodwill and momentum building up across the County around the Housing Strategy and there would be merit in taking the opportunity to capitalise on that by publishing the Strategy, rather than waiting for the details to emerge as there could be a considerable time lag before the positions are clear.
- 3.4 There is also a window of opportunity to use the Strategy to influence government thinking and ensure that the changes put in place are of benefit to the County.
- 3.5 However, given the significant changes to the environment expected over the next 12 months, it is proposed that the Strategy is refreshed to ensure it remains contemporary and fit for purpose and is able to provide a strong Kent narrative on the new housing and planning landscape

### **4. Implementation**

- 4.1 It is the intention that implementation of the Strategy will be delivered by Kent Housing Group (KHG) on behalf of the Kent Forum and its subsidiary bodies, working together with other cross-Kent networks such as Kent Planning Officers Group, the Joint Policy and Planning Board for Housing, Supporting People Commissioning Body and Kent Developers Group
- 4.2 KHG will develop an implementation plan for the Strategy, working with those organisations and Local Authorities which have already shown an interest in taking forward some of the recommendations.
- 4.3 As the Strategy is not a "one size fits all" approach, there will no obligation on any organisation or Local Authority to deliver any aspect of implementation they feel would not be appropriate for their local area. It is hoped that organisations and Authorities will embrace those recommendations that they feel will help to deliver their overall housing or business objectives or will be of benefit to their local communities.
- 4.4 Kent Housing Group will monitor and regularly report back on progress against the Strategy to the Kent Forum. Updates on progress against the Strategy will be reported to REDPOSC.

### **5. Next steps**

- 5.1 Subject to the endorsement of the Kent Forum, this version of the Housing Strategy will be launched in March 2011, with a refreshed version of the Strategy developed over the next 12 months and launched by March 2012.

## **6. Recommendation:**

6.1 Members are asked to note progress update in the report.

### **Author contact details:**

Name: Joanne Purvis

Officer title: Housing Strategy Manager

Email: [joanne.purvis@kent.gov.uk](mailto:joanne.purvis@kent.gov.uk)

Tel: 01622 696937

### **Background Documents:**

None

**By:** Kevin Lynes, Cabinet Member, Regeneration  
David Cockburn, Executive Director Strategy, Economic  
Development and ICT

**To:** Regeneration and Economic Development Policy Overview  
and Scrutiny Committee, 18<sup>th</sup> January 2011

**Subject:** Tourism and Progress of the Kent Contemporary  
Campaign

**Classification:** Unrestricted

---

**Summary:** To provide an overview of activity to promote the visitor  
economy in Kent and in particular a progress report on the  
Kent Contemporary and related MyKent campaigns  
launched in summer 2010.

---

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The visitor economy has been a recognised key sector for some time currently welcoming annually more than 45 million visitors contributing £2.5 billion to the wider Kent economy which in turn supports more than 3,000 SME's and over 50,000 jobs.
- 1.2 Visit Kent was formed (initially as Kent Tourism Alliance) as a not for profit public/private sector partnership to take responsibility for boosting the Kent and Medway area as visitor destinations and growing tourism businesses backed up by research, development and training provided by KCC's tourism team. All of this activity has been promoted to the industry under the single 'Visit Kent' umbrella for some time. This year sees the original two elements (KCC team and Visit Kent Ltd.) drawn together under a single business plan and all activity will now be reported and monitored by the Visit Kent Board where KCC holds two seats.

KCC investment into the whole Visit Kent operation for 2010/11 is £636,627 which includes £164k core funding into Visit Kent Ltd (Service Level Agreement), £275k from original T2010 targets funding and £197,627 for core (KCC) staff costs. In 2010/11 this leveraged £1,315,702 from other sources, including EU Interreg - £746k, other public sector - £98,200, private sector - £324,502 and other sources - £147,000, plus around £500k of "in kind" support from the industry. Similar levels of leverage are forecast going forward. This provides a total turnover for whole operation of almost £2.5m (including in kind support) with KCC's contribution being around 25%. In addition there has been a one off investment of £400k this year into the Kent Contemporary campaign which is explained further below.

## 2. Future Activity

***“Tourism presents a huge economic opportunity. Not just bringing business to Britain but right across Britain, driving new growth in the regions and helping to deliver the rebalancing of our national economy that is so desperately needed.”*** Prime Minister David Cameron, August 2010.

- 2.1 With the sector forecast nationally to be contributing 4.1% of UK GDP by 2020, making it one of the best performing sectors with above 3.5% in GVA terms<sup>1</sup>, those working to promote and support the visitor economy need to constantly evolve to remain responsive to local, national and international influences and alive to new opportunities as and when they present themselves. Kent is benefiting from major infrastructure improvements including Southeastern’s HS1 service and a growing number of routes from Manston, Kent’s International Airport. 2011 will be a key year with high profile cultural and sporting events including the opening of Turner Contemporary in Margate, Folkestone Triennial and the Open Golf at Sandwich. The London Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2012, then present a huge opportunity to showcase Kent.
- 2.2 With a public / private sector board, 80 business investors, current EU funding in excess of £3m secured and 350 members, Visit Kent has a wide range of initiatives and campaigns aimed specifically at growing Kent’s share of the UK visitor economy market. These include Greet the World (in readiness for the Olympics), Coastal Kent, Cruise Connection partnerships, Quality Assurance scheme, Pride Awards, Celebrating Kent campaign, B2B website, newsletters and Business Barometer, ‘2 for 1’ attraction tickets for rail travellers, the Kent Greeters programme (being the first outside of New York City), the Big Day Out and a range of bespoke activity aligned to one-off or annual events such as Kent 2020 and KEiBA business awards. Visit Kent’s new business plan continues to adapt and expand this programme of work and Sandra Matthews-Marsh, Chief Executive Visit Kent, will present more detail at the meeting and focus in particular on the Kent Contemporary Campaign and the associated MyKent initiative.

## 3. Kent Contemporary and MyKent

- 3.1 Having already embarked upon its own review of the Kent visitor destination brand in consultation with investors, partners and industry experts Visit Kent was invited by KCC to develop a new approach to marketing Kent to visitors that would help change traditional perceptions and, over time, increase our share of the UK visitor market. Following a rigorous tender process with support from Board Members and wider industry experts Visit Kent selected M&C Saatchi to deliver the creative elements of the ‘Kent Contemporary’ Campaign aimed primarily at the London market at a cost of £400k. This campaign was launched over the Summer with a high profile poster campaign and will continue into future years through a variety of mediums with additional funding and support garnered through Visit Kent’s relationship with its investors, partners and industry.

- 3.2 As a complimentary activity to Kent Contemporary, the Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Economic Development asked Visit Kent develop an innovative user-generated web-site specifically aimed at residents, providers and visitors sharing their 'discoveries' and experiences of Kent as a further guide for potential visitors. This concept is also being developed further through specific initiatives with and through the local media where the overall ambition is to capitalise on local pride as a powerful mechanism for 'selling' Kent as a visitor destination of choice into the future. The initiative has been expanded to embrace social networking tools including Twitter, Facebook and YouTube to extend its reach both geographically and in terms of visitor profile.
- 3.3 For both campaigns it was an absolute condition that Kent residents and Kent business people were featured. Early provisional, results from the post-campaign research conducted on Visit Kent's behalf by Tourism South East are now being collated. These indicate that the campaigns have generated over 93,000 additional overnight stays in the county resulting in a trip expenditure of over £12.4 million. Whilst there is still more analysis to do on day visits we are advised that the return on investment for the campaign has already reached 30:1. More details will be covered in the presentation.

#### **4. Conclusions**

##### 4.1 Members are asked to:

Note the background and progress so far since the launch last summer of the Kent Contemporary campaign and associated MyKent initiative; and

Consider if they wish reports on progress to be brought to the Committee in future years along with the formal outcome of the analysis of impact of the campaigns.

##### **Author Contact Details:**

Name: Theresa Bruton  
Officer Title: Head of Regeneration Projects  
Directorate: Chief Executive's

Email: [Theresa.bruton@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Theresa.bruton@kent.gov.uk)

Tel: 01622 221957

##### **Background Documents:**

None

This page is intentionally left blank

By: Ann Millington - Chief Executive Kent Fire and Rescue Service  
To: Regeneration and Economic Development Policy Overview and  
Scrutiny Committee – 18 January 2011  
Subject: DESIGNING OUT RISK - BUILDING IN SAFETY  
Classification: Unrestricted

**FOR INFORMATION**

**SUMMARY**

The development of the built environment in Kent and Medway continues to be of considerable importance and interest to the Fire and Rescue Authority. In March last year a report was given to this Committee on the achievements of Kent and Medway Fire Authority (KMFRA) in reducing risk in the built environment and the areas for future focus. I am pleased to report that considerable progress has been made since March and an update is given in this report.

The Authority is committed to supporting the economic development and regeneration of the County; economic prosperity is a key factor in reducing risk across the board. It is, therefore, one of our key strategic objectives for the next five years. Through the efforts of Fire Service staff and partners we have seen a dramatic reduction in the number of fires in commercial type premises and we want this to continue. In 2008 there were 442 fires in commercial buildings in Kent; in 2010 this had dropped to just 359.

We do, however, have continuing concerns about both the sustainability and vulnerability of many modern methods of construction, as well as the variable quality of aspects of the wider planning and regulatory framework applied to the built environment.

## **Background**

1. In March 2010 a report was presented to this Committee on designing out risk and building in safety. The report highlighted how, through prevention and protection activity, the KMFRA has been working to improve safety and reduce risk in the built environment. This report gives an update on progress since that report and gives details of the activity to influence and attempts to address the issues that future construction practices and development plans are presenting to the Authority.
2. The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) has calculated that the average cost of a fire in a commercial building is estimated at £43,800, of which the cost of fire damage to property represents £27,700. This is supported by the insurance industries latest figures which show that the cost of a home fire insurance claim has increased from £3,403 to £7,898 and the average commercial fire claim from £10,543 to £20,530.
3. Reducing the impact of fires on the economy of Kent is, therefore, one of our key strategic objectives for the next five years. We have seen a dramatic reduction in the number of fires in commercial type premises. In 2008 there were 442 fires; by 2010 this had dropped to just 359.

## **Kent Design Guide**

4. The Kent Design Guide Appendix on Fire Safety (Safer Places), which includes building out risk and designing in safety, is now finalised. The process of consultation on the document has now commenced and the guide will be formally launched at the Kent Design Initiative Forum (KDIF) on the evening of 27 January.
5. Safer Places will act as a supplementary appendix to the Kent Design Guide by providing signposts and guidance on how to improve safety for all in Kent's future built environment. Safer Places acts as a reference point for developers, architects, other building specifiers and planning consultants at an early stage of the planning process. Safer Places is provided as a professional guidance document and therefore supports existing planning guidance and building regulations. It is intended to provide guidance to support safe, effective design, construction and sustainable use of the built environment.
6. The guidance focuses on the public realm, spaces and environments both inside and outside of buildings. It has been developed to prompt discussion and consideration of the flexible design options that may be available to building designers. Specific elements such as the effect of fire on the environment are included to support

sustainability and CO2 reduction targets, whilst consideration to disabled escape is promoted as part of inclusive place-making. The document also contains advice on the cost of fires and the ways in which businesses can reduce the financial impact of fire.

7. The growing risks to vulnerable people and the impact of life styles on the built environment have previously been reported to this Committee and these continue to be a concern. The design of any new building or adaptation to existing buildings needs to consider the type of people that will use or reside within the premises.
8. The guide has been designed to provide information on how to improve building design for the vulnerable and ensure they are adaptable through the full life cycle of ownership. For this to be successful the guide highlights the need to protect people as they become more vulnerable from fire because of age or disability and also to consider this at the design stages of any development.
9. Once the consultation phase has been concluded a number of seminars and briefings, for groups such as planning Committees and building designers, will be undertaken. Considerable support has been given by Kent County Council in developing and launching the document and their assistance and guidance has been much appreciated.

### **Kent and Medway Housing Strategy**

10. Following the attendance at the March 2010 Committee meeting greater engagement in the overall planning and design of the built environment has been achieved. The Authority's priorities for improving the safety of the built environment have now been included in the Kent and Medway Housing Strategy, and Fire Service personnel have attended a number of housing practioner design workshops, which, has influenced the content of the Kent and Medway Housing Strategy.
11. The recommendation in the Strategy will ensure that KMFRA, Kent Housing Group and The Kent Joint Policy and Planning Board identify shared priorities for multi-agency assessment of fire risk and delivery of services aimed in particular at vulnerable households who are in the greatest risk from fire. A similar approach is also being followed for reducing flood risk and the impact of flooding.

### **National Issues**

12. Work continues to highlight the importance of sustainable development and building out risk nationally. There has been further progress in reducing the risks to firefighters posed by timber framed construction. Following discussions with DCLG and other interested groups an analysis of the risk of fire on timber framed construction was undertaken. The report, issued in August 2010, indicates that fires in occupied timber buildings have on average a greater area of fire and heat damage

recorded. This correlation is also confirmed for those timber framed buildings under construction. This analysis has already been reported in various local and national journals and it will be used to influence key stakeholders.

### **Future Changes to Building Regulations**

13. On 24 November 2010 the Welsh Assembly Government gave its unanimous support to the Legislative Competence Order (LCO) which proposed an amendment to the Welsh building regulations. The amendment means that every new residential scheme will have to incorporate active fire protection in the form of fire sprinkler systems. We are obviously pleased that there have been further inroads into making homes safer; however, the improvements in Wales haven't been reflected in England.
14. The Department for Communities and Local Government launched, at the end of July 2010, an exercise to identify what changes are needed to ensure the Building Regulations continue to operate effectively in the future. They invited ordinary people, businesses and local authorities to submit their ideas about what needs to be done. The aim of this was not only to establish where it is absolutely necessary for regulation to be changed or updated, but also to look for areas where it could strip away regulation - either because it is unnecessary or because there are other ways to achieve the same outcomes.
15. Kent and Medway Fire and Rescue Authority were one of a number of organisations that responded to the issue of improving safety in the built environment. The areas highlighted include the greater use of sprinklers and water suppression systems in both domestic and non-domestic situations. It was argued that this would improve safety and protection of property with consequent economic benefits and sustainability benefits (by reducing the environmental impact of fire).
16. The Department for Communities and Local Government concluded that the submissions had not produced any significant new evidence on the benefits of greater sprinkler provision. The Department will not, therefore, be considering this as part of next year's programme of work.
17. The Department for Communities and Local Government noted the view that greater sprinkler use would afford additional property protection and thereby reduce burdens on businesses. However, they believe that it is for businesses to make a decision as to the approach they favour in the same way that they make decisions on other areas of potential risk. They concluded that it is for the proponents for the use of sprinklers to set out the benefits associated with these products to support businesses in making properly evidenced business decisions. On that basis, the Department does not believe that there is a case for regulation.

## **Influencing rather than Legislating**

18. The omission from the review of Building Regulations of sprinkler systems for certain high risk premises is obviously disappointing. However, we are keen to continue to promote the benefits of sprinklers and the cost reduction and design freedoms they can bring.
19. Following the part funding, by the Fire Authority, of seven sprinkler installations in recovery centres across Kent three case studies have been produced. The case studies, developed in association with the building control officer and the architects for the schemes (John Floyd and Associates), concluded that there has been substantial benefit following the installation of sprinklers in the three properties. Not only has there been a net saving of £87,000 on the overall build cost, it is also apparent from the case studies that the installation of sprinklers has added to the life safety benefits for the residents and care staff and provided substantially better mobility around the buildings. The case studies will now be used at various forums to influence key building designers and specifiers.

## **Conclusion**

20. Real and sustainable progress, based on joint working, has been made. The Fire and Rescue Authority wants to continue to support the business economy of Kent. More than ever we know that regeneration and supporting the economy of Kent are important. We will continue to support business and economic sustainability, help with business continuity, and exercise our regulatory role proportionately and sensitively.
21. The Authority, supported by other partners, has started to promote smart design for those vulnerable households most at risk. It is hoped that with the continued support of organisations across Kent this work will continue.

This page is intentionally left blank

**By:** Kevin Lynes, Cabinet Member for Regeneration  
David Cockburn, Executive Director for Strategy, Economic  
Development and ICT

**To:** Regeneration and Economic Development Policy Overview  
and Scrutiny Committee, 18 January 2011

**Subject:** Feedback Report from REDPOSC District visits

**Classification:** Unrestricted

---

**Summary:** The report identifies the high priority activities identified by REDPOSC Members in their November 2009 meeting, and suggests next steps for taking these forward in the context of the Kent Regeneration Framework and supporting strategies.

---

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 At their meeting on 17 November, following a thorough and detailed discussion of district wide priorities identified from the programme of visits to Kent districts between September 2009 and September 2010, REDPOSC Members agreed their overall regeneration priorities for the whole of the county.
- 1.2 The purpose of this report is to set out the proposed next steps for taking forward the high priority activities.

## 2. Proposed next steps

- 2.1 Members agreed a revised list of 43 priorities across the county. Of these, 21 were given a High rating, 20 were given a Medium rating and just 2 priorities were given a Low rating. The revised list is presented in the official minutes for the November meeting. Members also agreed their overall priorities (10 in total), and these are also set out in the minutes.
- 2.2 As our report to the November meeting of REDPOSC indicated, most of the activities identified during the visits are already established priorities for KCC directorates. Indeed, as the appendix to this report shows, many are also consistent with the corporate regeneration themes and proposed actions identified in the Kent Regeneration Framework and its supporting strategies.
- 2.3 Some activities are identified as priorities in the emerging Local Investment Plans being prepared for the Homes and Communities Agency in partnership with the county and district councils in Kent. However, with tighter constraints on public sector budgets, implementation will become increasingly difficult.
- 2.4 The emerging public expenditure landscape means that any new regeneration

priorities identified would be unlikely to be accommodated in our future work programme. Nevertheless, these will be given consideration alongside our existing regeneration priorities, as our business plan work programme for 2011-12 and beyond is developed against the backdrop of available resources.

- 2.5 A number of the high priority activities could be for other KCC directorates and external organisations, such as the district councils, to consider taking forward. The appendix to this report suggests how and by whom the 21 high priority activities identified during the district visits, and the overall priorities agreed by REDPOSC at its November meeting, might be taken forward.
- 2.6 It is recommended that the next steps should be to propose to KCC directorates, via their respective Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committees and their representatives on the Regeneration Board, and where appropriate other external partners, that they consider taking forward the priority activities in their own work programmes from 2011-12 onwards.

### **3. Recommendation**

- 3.1 The Committee is asked to endorse the proposed next steps outlined in paragraph 2.6 above.

#### **Author Contact Details:**

Name: David Hughes  
Directorate: Chief Executive's

Email: [dave.hughes@kent.gov.uk](mailto:dave.hughes@kent.gov.uk)

Tel: 01622 221942

#### **Background Documents:**

None

## REDPOSC High Priority activities and proposed next steps

**Ashford**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Link with Kent Regeneration Framework actions and supporting strategies</b>	<b>Proposed next steps</b>
<i>Maintaining the critical nature of Ashford as a growth point</i>	<i>Action 1.5 – Investing in new business infrastructure 1.10 – Maximising opportunities for development Theme 3 – Embracing a growing &amp; changing population Theme 4 – Building homes and communities, not estates Theme 5 – Delivering growth without transport gridlock 6.4 – Establishing local investment plans with partners</i>	<i>This activity is already in CED R&amp;E's 2010-11 business plan, and is the top priority for local partners in the draft Ashford Local Investment Plan.</i>
<i>Supporting the development of HE/FE learning and skills provision</i>	<i>Action 1.4 – Encouraging an enterprise culture through learning Theme 2 – Unlocking talent to support the Kent economy 6.5 – Using powers to better join up learning offer</i>	<i>CFE directorate to work with K College on shaping future provision to meet local aspirations and the emerging skills agenda.</i>

**Canterbury**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Link with Kent Regeneration Framework actions and supporting strategies</b>	<b>Proposed next steps</b>
<i>Supporting joint working with the east Kent district councils in regeneration and economic development</i>	<i>Theme 1 – Building a new relationship with Kent business Theme 2 – Unlocking talent to support the Kent economy Theme 5 – Delivering growth without transport gridlock Action 6.4 – Establishing local investment plans with partners</i>	<i>CED R&amp;E is working with east Kent district councils in drawing up light touch proposals for driving forward regeneration and economic development covering pan east Kent issues.</i>
<i>Capitalising on Canterbury's pivotal role as a major centre for HE/FE in the county</i>	<i>Action 1.4 – Encouraging an enterprise culture through learning Theme 2 – Unlocking talent to support the Kent economy 6.5 – Using powers to better join up learning offer</i>	<i>CED R&amp;E is supporting the Regional Growth Fund bid by the University of Kent and private sector partners to develop a Green Technology Park.</i>

**Dover**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Link with Kent Regeneration Framework actions and supporting strategies</b>	<b>Proposed next steps</b>
<i>Assisting the development of White Cliffs Business Park (WCBP) through innovative financing mechanisms, and supporting the growth of Whitfield</i>	<i>Action 1.5 – Investing in new business infrastructure 1.10 – Maximising opportunities for development Theme 4 – Building homes and communities, not estates Theme 5 – Delivering growth without transport gridlock</i>	<i>CED R&amp;E is working with Dover Pride on development planning for Whitfield, and with other KCC directorates in relation to S106 requirements. Whitfield is one of the East Kent LIP strategic priorities, and a potential future Regional Growth Fund bid is also being considered for WCBP.</i>
<i>Essential joint working across the district councils to make a healthy economy for east Kent</i>	<i>Theme 1 – Building a new relationship with Kent business Theme 2 – Unlocking talent to support the Kent economy Theme 5 – Delivering growth without transport gridlock Action 6.4 – Establishing local investment plans with partners</i>	<i>CED R&amp;E is working with east Kent district councils in drawing up light touch proposals for driving forward regeneration and economic development covering pan east Kent issues.</i>

**Kent Thameside**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Link with Kent Regeneration Framework actions and supporting strategies</b>	<b>Proposed next steps</b>
<i>Balancing new growth at Ebbsfleet with town centre regeneration in Dartford and Gravesend</i>	<i>Action 1.5 – Investing in new business infrastructure 1.10 – Maximising opportunities for development Theme 3 – Embracing a growing &amp; changing population Theme 4 – Building homes and communities, not estates Theme 5 – Delivering growth without transport gridlock</i>	<i>CED R&amp;E is working with partners to implement an interim strategic roads programme utilising HCA and private sector funding focusing on Dartford and Gravesend town centres, and in the longer term on Ebbsfleet (which is the top regeneration priority in the North Kent LIP).</i>
<i>Ensuring that skills provision in the area is sustainable</i>	<i>Action 1.4 – Encouraging a culture of enterprise Theme 2 – Unlocking talent to support the Kent economy 6.5 – Using powers to better join up learning offer</i>	<i>CFE continues to work with TGK partners to implement the Employment and Skills Plan in north Kent</i>

**Maidstone**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Link with Kent Regeneration Framework actions and supporting strategies</b>	<b>Proposed next steps</b>
<i>Maximising Maidstone's potential as an economic hub and balancing population growth and employment opportunities</i>	<i>Action 1.5 – Investing in new business infrastructure 1.10 – Maximising opportunities for development Theme 3 – Embracing a growing &amp; changing population Theme 4 – Building homes and communities, not estates Theme 5 – Delivering growth without transport gridlock 6.4 – Establishing local investment plans with partners</i>	<i>Maximising Maidstone's economic potential, linked to the development of key sites and highway &amp; public transport improvements, are identified as priorities in the West Kent LIP, although funding will be very limited.</i>
<i>Ensuring that town centre regeneration is not adversely affected by congestion</i>	<i>Theme 5 – Delivering growth without transport gridlock</i>	<i>EHW KHS continues to work with the borough council to improve traffic circulation in the town centre</i>
<i>Lobbying government over better rail connections to London</i>	<i>Theme 5 – Delivering growth without transport gridlock</i>	<i>EHW KHS continues to work with the borough council and other partners to identify solutions for Maidstone and its surrounding area.</i>

**Shepway**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Link with Kent Regeneration Framework actions and supporting strategies</b>	<b>Proposed next steps</b>
<i>Supporting the master planning and development of Folkestone sea front</i>	<i>Action 1.10 – Maximising opportunities for development 5.3 – Maximising the potential of HS1 services as a catalyst for regeneration 6.4 – Establishing local investment plans with partners</i>	<i>CED R&amp;E continues to support work with the Creative Foundation and district council in support of this activity, including a potential future RGF bid.</i>
<i>Supporting Shepway DC in lobbying for a new Dungeness 'C' power station</i>	<i>Action 1.13 – Working with local partners to lobby central government and EU 1.16 – Developing Kent's potential in low carbon industries</i>	<i>EHW is supporting the district council and other partners, including East Sussex CC, in lobbying for a new power station (this is also identified as a strategic priority in East Kent LIP)</i>

**Swale**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Link with Kent Regeneration Framework actions and supporting strategies</b>	<b>Proposed next steps</b>
<i>Developing a multi agency approach to people based regeneration at Sheppey</i>	<i>Action 1.10 – Maximising opportunities for development Theme 3 – Embracing a growing and changing population Theme 4 – Building homes and communities, not estates</i>	<i>CED R&amp;E continues to support work with other KCC directorates and external partners to develop Queenborough and Rushenden, linked to new opportunities at Sheerness.</i>
<i>Working with Swale BC to get the most out of Kent Science Park's contribution to science based jobs</i>	<i>Action 1.4 – Encouraging an enterprise culture through learning 1.5 – Investing in new business infrastructure 1.16 – Developing Kent's potential in low carbon industries Theme 2 – Unlocking talent to support the Kent economy</i>	<i>CED R&amp;E will continue to support work with other KCC directorates, the district council and private sector partners to realise KSP's potential.</i>

**Thanet**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Link with Kent Regeneration Framework actions and supporting strategies</b>	<b>Proposed next steps</b>
<i>Supporting the task force approach to tackling deprivation and benefit dependency in central Margate and Cliftonville West</i>	<i>Action 1.10 – Maximising opportunities for development Theme 3 – Embracing a growing and changing population 4.5 – Returning empty homes to use</i>	<i>CMY directorate will continue to lead KCC's support for the Margate Task Force.</i>
<i>Encouraging economic development at Eurokent, Manston Park and Ramsgate</i>	<i>Action 1.4 – Encouraging an enterprise culture through learning 1.5 – Investing in new business infrastructure 1.10 – Maximising opportunities for development 1.16 – Developing Kent's potential in low carbon industries</i>	<i>CED R&amp;E continuing to work with other KCC directorates and the district council. The development of the area is also a strategic priority in the East Kent LIP</i>
<i>Improving accessibility to Thanet</i>	<i>5.3 – Maximising the potential of HS1 services as a</i>	<i>EHW Planning is supporting the private</i>

<i>via HS1 and a parkway at Manston</i>	<i>catalyst for regeneration 5.4 – Further development of Manston Airport 6.4 – Establishing local investment plans with partners</i>	<i>sector and district council in preparing a potential RGF bid. Area is also part of the Central Island / Manston strategic priority in the East Kent LIP.</i>
<i>Completing the Thanet Work and Skills Plan so that new jobs can be taken up by local people</i>	<i>Theme 2 – Unlocking talent to support the Kent economy</i>	<i>CMY directorate continuing to work with the Margate Task Force and CFE directorate</i>

### **Tunbridge Wells**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Link with Kent Regeneration Framework actions and supporting strategies</b>	<b>Proposed next steps</b>
<i>Regenerating the urban centres in the district through the joint venture between the borough council and John Laing plc</i>	<i>Action 1.10 – Maximising opportunities for development</i>	<i>Identified as a priority in the West Kent LIP, and being implemented through borough council as a public / private sector partnership.</i>
<i>Addressing localised problems of congestion, particularly along the A26 and at North Farm, and the need to dual the A21</i>	<i>Action 5.2 – Lobbying for smarter ways of funding road schemes 5.5 – Securing funding for major schemes</i>	<i>EHW KHS will continue to work with West Kent local authorities and the Highways Agency to identify local solutions as part of the West Kent LIP, although availability of potential future funding is very limited.</i>

### **Overall priorities agreed by REDPOSC**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Link with Kent Regeneration Framework actions and supporting strategies</b>	<b>Proposed next steps</b>
<i>Third Thames Crossing</i>	<i>Theme 5 – Delivering growth without transport gridlock</i>	<i>Already identified as a key priority in KCC's "Growth without Gridlock" strategy and in LEP proposal for Kent, Greater Essex and East Sussex.</i>
<i>Dualling of A21</i>	<i>Theme 5 – Delivering growth without transport gridlock</i>	<i>EHW KHS working on potential solutions</i>

		<i>with West Kent local authorities and the Highways Agency (see also under the Tunbridge Wells section)</i>
<i>High speed rail link to Thanet</i>	<i>Theme 5 – Delivering growth without transport gridlock</i>	<i>EHW Planning working with the private sector, other KCC directorates and the district council. Part of the Central Island / Manston strategic priority in the East Kent LIP (see also under Thanet section)</i>
<i>Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road</i>	<i>Theme 5 – Delivering growth without transport gridlock</i>	<i>Sections of SNRR are already under construction. Refer to EHW KHS for remaining road scheme sections</i>
<i>Attracting private investment into Kent</i>	<i>Action 1.11 – Marketing Kent as a location for inward investment</i>	<i>CED R&amp;E will ensure that the service level agreement with Locate in Kent continues to focus on KCC priorities</i>
<i>Improving the tourism offer across Kent</i>	<i>Action 1.12 – Developing and promoting Kent as a visitor destination</i>	<i>CED R&amp;E will ensure that the service level agreement with Visit Kent continues to focus on KCC priorities</i>
<i>Raising aspirations in training, skills and jobs</i>	<i>Theme 2- Unlocking talent to support the Kent economy</i>	<i>Refer on to CFE POSC</i>
<i>Transport links of all types (planes, trains and automobiles)</i>	<i>Theme 5 – Delivering growth without transport gridlock</i>	<i>Refer on to EHW KHS as part of their consultations in relation to Growth without Gridlock and draft LTP3.</i>
<i>Broadband, particularly in rural areas</i>	<i>Producing a Digital Strategy for Kent</i>	<i>CED R&amp;E continues to work closely with CED ISG to work up specific proposals for broadband provision, and will consider potential for securing other sources of funding.</i>
<i>Town centre regeneration</i>	<i>Action 1.10 – Maximising opportunities for development</i>	<i>This priority is included in all of the Kent LIPs. CED R&amp;E will take up with relevant local regeneration partnerships, district councils and other bodies.</i>

**By:** Nick Chard  
Cabinet Member for Environment Highways & Waste

Paul Crick  
Interim Director of Integrated Strategy and Planning

**To:** Regeneration and Economic Development Policy Overview and  
Scrutiny Committee

18th January 2011

**Subject:** Growth Without Gridlock – A Transport Delivery Plan for Kent

**Classification:** **Unrestricted**

---

**Summary:**

This report informs Members about the recent launch of Growth without Gridlock, KCC's landmark transport delivery plan for the county and invites comments on the proposed innovative ways of delivering the programme.

---

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 In October 2009, KCC published *Unlocking Kent's Potential*, a framework for regeneration which set out the opportunities and challenges facing the County over the coming decades. This was followed by *21st Century Kent: A Blueprint for the County's Future*, which was launched in January 2010 to provide a longer-term, visionary view of Kent. It was identified during the preparation of *Unlocking Kent's Potential* that it would inform the development of a series of further strategies and implementation plans, including an Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS) for Kent.

**2. An Integrated Transport Strategy for Kent**

- 2.1 Between March and November 2009, a draft ITS was prepared by the County Council's Transport Policy Team, overseen by the Kent Economic Board Transport Task Group. Consultation on the ITS was launched on 19th November 2009 and closed on 12th February 2010. The consultation generated over 150 responses and comments received were generally favourable, with the overall vision of an integrated transport network particularly welcomed. This ITS was re-drafted during early 2010 with a particular emphasis on ensuring consistency and linkages with the emerging Environment and Housing Strategies.

### **3. Growth Without Gridlock – A Transport Delivery Plan for Kent**

- 3.1 During the summer of 2010, in response to the changing political and economic landscape and an emphasis on local decision making and increased flexibility for local councils, the ITS was revised into a groundbreaking 20 year Transport Delivery Plan. This became a document which KCC could submit to the Coalition Government, highlighting those schemes that could be delivered by KCC and its partners, asking for greater powers and flexibilities and calling on the Government to progress those schemes of national importance including a Lower Thames Crossing, a long-term solution to Operation Stack and a scheme of foreign lorry road user charging.
- 3.2 *Growth without gridlock – A transport delivery plan for Kent* was successfully launched at a well attended media event on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2010 at County Hall and an executive summary was made available to attendees. At this event, KCC also launched two reports on the Lower Thames Crossing which looked at the feasibility of various crossing locations and the business case and regeneration benefits of a crossing to the east of Gravesend. It has received national press coverage, and the proposed schemes and the innovative ways of delivering them have generated private sector and media interest.
- 3.3 A full version of the 20 year Transport Delivery Plan is now available on the KCC website and hard copies will be sent to all stakeholders and partners. The link to this document is:

[http://www.kent.gov.uk/news\\_and\\_events/news\\_archive/growth\\_without\\_gridlock.aspx](http://www.kent.gov.uk/news_and_events/news_archive/growth_without_gridlock.aspx)

### **4. Future Plans**

- 4.1 Members and officers will be meeting with Ministers to press for the freedoms to implement this Transport Delivery Plan and also seek a commitment to hypothecate new money raised from foreign lorry charging etc to Kent. The Kent, Greater Essex and East Sussex Local Enterprise Partnership will provide an opportunity to secure funding and deliver strategic transport infrastructure and the County Council will work with all its partners to maximise the benefits for Kent and its communities.

### **5. Recommendations**

- 5.1 Members of the Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee are asked to:
1. Note the publication of KCC's *Growth without gridlock - A transport delivery plan for Kent*

2. Submit views on the proposed innovative ways of delivering the programme. This programme is set out in the executive summary of the delivery plan, which can be accessed by using the link included in paragraph 3.3 above. Members will be sent an additional paper copy of the executive summary with their Committee papers.

**Author Contact Details:**

Paul Crick - Interim Director of Integrated Strategy and Planning

Email: paul.crick@kent.gov.uk

Tel: 01622 221527

Rob Smith – Senior Transport Planner

Email: robert.smith3@kent.gov.uk

Tel: 01622 221050

**Background Documents:**

Kent County Council, *Growth without gridlock – A transport delivery plan for Kent*, December 2010

Kent County Council, *Growth without gridlock – A transport delivery plan for Kent (Executive Summary)*, December 2010

This page is intentionally left blank

**By:** Kevin Lynes, Cabinet Member for Regeneration  
David Cockburn, Executive Director for Strategy, Economic  
Development and ICT

**To:** Regeneration and Economic Development Policy Overview  
and Scrutiny Committee 18 January 2011

**Subject:** Supporting Community Infrastructure

**Classification:** Unrestricted

---

**Summary:** In June 2003, KCC published *Kent – What Price Growth?*, which set out the approximate costs of community infrastructure to support the housing targets set by the former Government. In the Regeneration Framework, we made a commitment to revise *What Price Growth?* using a more robust and transparent approach to investment requirements and costings and considering more innovative approaches to funding.

This report sets out the progress we have made to date in taking this work forward, particularly through the joint development of an Integrated Infrastructure and Finance Model, by Corporate Finance and Regeneration & Economy. It explains the Model and the timescales for completion; presents the issues relating to future community infrastructure provision and financing in the context of changing Government policy and reductions in public spending; and sets out measures that KCC is taking to address these.

---

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1** The original *Kent – What Price Growth?* (WPG) was produced several years ago in the context of a major expansion of Government expenditure accompanied by a heightened pressure to deliver new housing as part of the former Government's Sustainable Communities Plan. The intention was to set out what the costs to Kent would be of delivering the community infrastructure to support that growth agenda, while at the same time safeguarding quality of life.
- 1.2** The original WPG only sought to make ballpark estimates of strategic requirements and costs. However, it did serve as an important basis in attracting significant public investment under the Sustainable Communities Plan. It also provided a starting point for a more robust and credible assessment of the county's needs and the implications for KCC services. Since the production of WPG, we have in particular:
- Strengthened our joint working with Districts, particularly in the preparation of their Infrastructure Delivery Plans, associated with the Local Development Frameworks;

- Worked closely with groups of districts in taking forward Local Investment Plans, highlighting priorities for investment from the Homes and Communities Agency and other bodies;
- Sought to maximise development contributions to KCC services (securing some £3.4 million in 2009/10 from sites under 500 units);
- Progressed innovative approaches to new community infrastructure provision to reduce overall capital and running costs and provide a better service to the public (for example, the integrated community and education provision at The Bridge in Dartford).

**1.3** Following this progress and in the context of a sharp reduction in future public sector funding, the 2009 Regeneration Framework committed KCC to a comprehensive revision of *What Price Growth?* There are three main elements in taking this forward:

- Firstly, developing an infrastructure planning framework for KCC services (CFE, CMY and KASS) for the purposes outlined in this paper;
- Secondly, addressing the ‘gap’ in community infrastructure funding by taking advantage of emerging funding mechanisms and new approaches to service delivery; and
- Thirdly, considering how this approach is integrated with wider infrastructure priorities and requirements.

## **2. Developing an infrastructure planning framework**

**2.1** In December 2009, we commissioned URS (now URS Scott Wilson) to develop an Integrated Infrastructure and Finance Model (IIFM). This will provide the evidence base for a planning framework for KCC’s community infrastructure provision.

**2.2** The development of the IIFM has drawn together key assumptions for assessing demand for and supply of KCC services, ensuring that these are based on a consistent and shared data set and approach. The KCC services covered by the model are Education (Primary and Secondary), Adult Social Services and Communities (Libraries, Community Learning and Youth). The model is however designed to add other types of infrastructure, including those provided by agencies other than KCC.

**2.3** In overview, the model provides a framework for provision on a district-by-district basis, based on:

- An estimate of the needs arising from population living in the existing housing stock allocating any existing surplus capacity (such as surplus school places) to this category first.
- Assessments of the net need arising from the likely population make up arising from new housing.

- An estimated overall capital and revenue cost of new infrastructure, in five-year period phases.

**2.4** Where there is a net demand arising from new housing development(s), service providers identify the specific projects needed to meet this demand. Capital and revenue cost assumptions are incorporated into the model so that once projects are identified their associated project costs are automatically calculated. Alongside project costings, service providers can list any actual or potential funding streams to identify potential funding gaps.

**2.5** The model then yields results for each district giving details of:

- Each KCC community infrastructure project
- When it is needed to be delivered (within 5-year phases)
- Total capital cost and potential capital funding
- Total capital funding gap
- Total revenue cost and potential revenue funding
- Total revenue funding gap

**2.6** Service directorates are continuing to provide information to support the model, which will ultimately yield 'total cost' and 'total anticipated gap' figures on a scheme, district and service basis. At present, information is still being collated, but the Model will provide initial output in February.

### **3. Filling the gap: Future community infrastructure provision & funding**

**3.1** Until the recent recession, the funding environment for new community infrastructure was relatively positive. Local authorities gained from the contributions of developers in a buoyant housing market, Government funding schemes designed to facilitate growth (such as that available in Ashford and the Thames Gateway), and national comprehensive service redevelopment programmes (such as Building Schools for the Future). The original WPG was formed in the context of this environment.

**3.2** However, the current situation is very different, given sharp reductions in public expenditure and the reduced viability of many major developments. This will mean increased pressure to build greater efficiency into community infrastructure provision. By revisiting and providing greater consistency to the assumptions used to inform community infrastructure planning, the IIFM is helping service directorates to reduce overall infrastructure costs.

**3.3** This is consistent with KCC's existing approach. For some time, we have been striving with partners to find more innovative, cost effective solutions, including models such as 'The Bridge', Dartford. However, the recession and current economic climate have clearly served to increase the importance of this work in protecting future service delivery and addressing the issue of reduced viability. Along with solutions combining the use of space / integrating services and the use of more flexible innovative financial models, greater efficiency in community infrastructure provision could be delivered

through new revenue and/or technology based solutions. For example by building into new developments the ability to access services via new technology (such as providing high-speed broadband connections rather than fixed facilities).

- 3.4** It is therefore envisaged that alongside the IIFM as the basis for securing funding (and identifying any funding gaps), KCC's current Guide to Development Contributions and Community Infrastructure will be revised accordingly and, act as the commentary for the County Council's approach as we move forward.
- 3.5** In filling the remaining gap, we know that the Government is seeking to introduce measures to incentivise housing delivery. In particular, within the recent Local Growth White Paper, Government announced the creation of a New Homes Bonus, intended to incentivise local authorities to support housing growth by matching the additional council tax gained from each new home for six years from completion. Given the Government's wider reduction of ringfencing, we assume that local authorities will have flexibility in the use of New Homes Bonus monies (although it is unclear what arrangements will exist in two-tier areas), offering the potential for investment in community infrastructure to support housing growth. A range of additional incentive measures to promote economic development (such as tax increment financing and business rate retention) are also proposed in the White Paper and are discussed further elsewhere on the agenda.
- 3.6** Government policy is also increasingly focused on the development of greater diversity and choice in service provision, with an emphasis on the ability of voluntary and community organisations (as well as the private sector) to provide services in addition to – and potentially in place of – those provided by the public sector. This is encompassed by the Government's 'Big Society' agenda, and reflects the increased responsiveness that greater diversity of provision can deliver and the potential for overall cost savings.
- 3.7** KCC has always recognised the need to integrate our own service provision with that of other organisations based around community need. Following the completion of the IIFM, and through revisions to the Developer's Guide to Contributions, we will consider further opportunities to provide services through different mechanisms, according to local demand.

#### **4. Towards an understanding of community infrastructure requirements and funding**

- 4.1** The infrastructure planning framework relates only to community infrastructure provided by KCC. However, it will provide a robust basis on which we can plan for future requirements and consider how anticipated gaps in funding can be bridged (whether through alternative funding mechanisms or by flexing service provision). It will be possible to build additional forms of community infrastructure into the model over time, including for example district community provision or emergency services, meeting much of the original intention behind the revision of *What Price Growth?* The proposed revision of the County Council's Guide to Development Contributions and Community Infrastructure as referred to at 3.4 will further set out our approach and, in this respect, reflect development of the Big Society agenda.
- 4.2** Nevertheless, there are strategic infrastructure requirements that are essential to the county's future wellbeing, but which will not be possible to integrate into the IIFM (for example, the strategic transport priorities highlighted in *Growth Without Gridlock*, or schemes associated with unlocking employment sites). The Local Growth White Paper recognises this, highlighting the potential for local authorities may work together to prepare strategic infrastructure plans taking these wider priorities into account. While there is a need for greater clarity, the development of such a strategic infrastructure plan could provide a useful link between the requirements emerging from the infrastructure planning framework and the evidence base contained in the county's strategic delivery plans.

#### **5. Recommendations:**

**5.1** Members are asked to:

Endorse the approach to infrastructure planning being undertaken in the development of the IIFM.

Consider the implications of changes in the national funding framework to the planning and provision of community infrastructure; and

Consider the potential value of a strategic infrastructure plan in linking community infrastructure and wider strategic requirements.

#### **Author contact details:**

Name: Theresa Warford  
Officer title: Principal Regeneration Officer  
Directorate: Chief Executive's

Email: [theresa.warford@kent.gov.uk](mailto:theresa.warford@kent.gov.uk)

Tel: 01622 221927

This page is intentionally left blank

BY: Kevin Lynes, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Economic Development  
David Cockburn, Executive Director Strategy, Economic Development & ICT

TO: Regeneration and Economic Development Policy Overview & Scrutiny Committee – 18<sup>th</sup> January 2011

SUBJECT: Financial Monitoring 2010/11

Classification: Unrestricted

---

### **Summary:**

Members of the POSC are asked to note the impact of the second quarter's budget monitoring report for 2010/11 reported to Cabinet on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2010 and the latest exception report reported on 10<sup>th</sup> January 2011.

### **FOR INFORMATION**

---

#### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This is a regular report to this Committee on the forecast outturn for Regeneration and Economic Development as reported within Chief Executives Department budget.

#### **2. Forecast Outturn**

- 2.1 A detailed quarterly budget monitoring report is presented to Cabinet, usually in September, December and March, and a draft final outturn report in June. These reports outline the full financial position for each portfolio and are reported to POSCs after they have been considered by Cabinet. In the intervening months an exception report is made to Cabinet outlining any significant variations from the quarterly report.
- 2.2 The second quarter's monitoring report for 2010/11 was presented to Cabinet on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2010. An extract from the annex for the Chief Executives Department pertaining to the Regeneration and Economic Portfolio is attached as appendix 1. An exception report was presented to Cabinet on 10<sup>th</sup> January 2011.
- 2.3 *Revenue Budget*
- 2.3.1 In the second quarter's report an overall net saving of £65,000 was reported. This arose due to not filling 2 staff vacancies pending the re-shaping of the division in its effort to align its future priorities and meet the challenges of the

emerging economic and financial landscape and the savings identified in the 2010-13 MTP.

2.3.2 In the exception report an additional £24,000 saving was reported following the departure of another two members of staff.

2.3.3 These staff savings are required to deliver the revised 2011-12 and 2012-13 MTP savings.

#### 2.4 *Capital Budget*

2.4.1 No overall variance was reported for the current year's spending.

- a re-phasing of £660,000 on the Euro Kent project to 2011/12 due to slower than anticipated Land Compensation Act (LCA) part 1 claims received.
- Additional work funded from securing a grant of £225,000 from SUSTRAN on the Swale Parkland project.
- A reduction of £9,000 on grant of £3.7M from The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) for the Dover Sea Change project. This reduction is met from additional external contributions

### **3 Recommendations**

3.1 Members of the POSC are asked to note the projected outturn for the Regeneration and Economic Development Portfolio for 2010/11 based on the second quarter's monitoring report to Cabinet.

#### Background Documents:

- 1) Cabinet 29<sup>th</sup> November 2010 – Revenue and Capital Budgets, Key Activity and Risk Monitoring
- 2) Cabinet 10<sup>th</sup> January 2011 – Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring Exception Report

#### Officer Contact:

Dave Shipton  
Finance Strategy Manager  
Ext. 4597

## REGENERATION & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY OCTOBER 2010-11 FULL MONITORING REPORT

### 1. FINANCE

#### 1.1 REVENUE

1.1.1 All changes to cash limits are in accordance with the virement rules contained within the constitution, with the exception of those cash limit adjustments which are considered “technical adjustments” ie where there is no change in policy, including:

- Allocation of grants and previously unallocated budgets where further information regarding allocations and spending plans has become available since the budget setting process.
- Cash limits have been adjusted since the last full monitoring report to reflect a number of technical adjustments to budget.
- The inclusion of new 100% grants (ie grants which fully fund the additional costs) awarded since the last full monitoring report. These are detailed in Appendix 2 of the executive summary.

1.1.2 **Table 1** below details the revenue position by Service Unit:

Budget Book Heading	Cash Limit			Variance			Comment
	G	I	N	G	I	N	
	£'000s	£'000s	£'000s	£'000s	£'000s	£'000s	
<b>Regeneration &amp; Economic Development portfolio</b>							
Supporting Business	2,468	-590	1,878	-25	0	-25	Staff vacancy savings
Growth Areas	1,694	-466	1,228	-40	0	-40	Staff vacancy savings
Kent wide & Strategic Projects	4,222	-1,011	3,211	-30	0	-30	Mgmt savings to meet costs of R&I Group restructuring
Research & Intelligence Group	435	-101	334	73	-43	30	Service restructuring costs
Kent Film Office	110		110	0	0	0	
Resources	604	-137	467	0	0	0	
<b>TOTAL Regen &amp; ED</b>	<b>9,533</b>	<b>-2,305</b>	<b>7,228</b>	<b>-22</b>	<b>-43</b>	<b>-65</b>	
<b>Total Directorate Controllable</b>	<b>9,533</b>	<b>-2,305</b>	<b>7,228</b>	<b>-22</b>	<b>-43</b>	<b>-65</b>	
<b>Assumed Management Action:</b>							
- L&P portfolio						0	
- CS&PM portfolio						0	
- Finance portfolio						0	
- PH&I portfolio						0	
- Regen & ED portfolio						0	
<b>Forecast after Mgmt Action</b>				<b>-22</b>	<b>-43</b>	<b>-65</b>	

1.1.3 **Actions required to achieve this position:**

N/A

1.1.4 **Implications for MTP:**

N/A

1.1.5 **Details of re-phasing of revenue projects:**

N/A

## 1.2 CAPITAL

1.2.1 All changes to cash limits are in accordance with the virement rules contained within the constitution and have received the appropriate approval via the Leader, or relevant delegated authority.

The capital cash limits have been adjusted since last reported to Cabinet on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2010, as detailed in section 4.1.

1.2.2 **Table 3** below provides a portfolio overview of the latest capital monitoring position excluding PFI projects.

	Prev Yrs Exp £000s	2009-10 £000s	2010-11 £000s	2011-12 £000s	Future Yrs £000s	TOTAL £000s
<b>Regeneration &amp; Economic Development Portfolio</b>						
Budget	15,312	11,996	4,230	3,242	2,980	37,760
Additions:						
-						0
Revised Budget	15,312	11,996	4,230	3,242	2,980	37,760
Variance		-443	659	0	0	216
<b>split:</b>						
- real variance		+217	-1	0	0	+216
- re-phasing		-660	+660	0	0	0
<b>Regeneration &amp; Economic Development Portfolio Total</b>						
Revised Budget	15,312	11,996	4,230	3,242	2,980	37,760
Variance	0	-443	659	0	0	216
<b>Real Variance</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>216</b>
<b>Re-phasing</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-660</b>	<b>660</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### 1.2.3 Main Reasons for Variance

Table 4 below, details all forecast capital variances over £250k in 2010-11 and identifies these between projects which are:

- part of our year on year rolling programmes e.g. maintenance and modernisation;
- projects which have received approval to spend and are underway;
- projects which are only at the approval to plan stage and
- projects at preliminary stage.

The variances are also identified as being either a real variance i.e. real under or overspending which has resourcing implications, or a phasing issue i.e. simply down to a difference in timing compared to the budget assumption.

Each of the variances in excess of £1m which is due to phasing of the project, excluding those projects identified as only being at the preliminary stage, is explained further in section 1.2.4 below.

All real variances are explained in section 1.2.5, together with the resourcing implications.

There are no variances over £250k

### 1.2.4 Projects re-phasing by over £1m:

There is no re-phasing over £1m

**1.2.5 Projects with real variances, including resourcing implications:**

**Regeneration & Economic Development Portfolio**

**Swale Parklands +£0.225m** (+£0.226m in 2010-11 and -£0.001m in 2011-12): KCC has assumed the lead role in delivering this project as a constituent element to a larger programme funded by Communities and Local Government (CLG) and Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) for the adjoining areas of Milton Creek of £2.3m. The project comprises of two distinct components:

- Sheppey Cycle Routes with an overall budget of £0.725m, of which £0.225m is funded from Sustrans.
- Churchfield Wharf with an overall budget is £0.250m.

**Dover Sea Change** there is a small real variance of £0.009m (reduction of funding from CABE) which is met from additional external contributions

**1.2.6 General Overview of capital programme:**

(a) Risks  
N/A

(b) Details of action being taken to alleviate risks  
N/A

This page is intentionally left blank

**By:** Kevin Lynes, Cabinet Member, Regeneration  
David Cockburn, Executive Director Strategy, Economic  
Development & ICT

**To:** Regeneration and Economic Development Policy Overview and  
Scrutiny Committee 18 January 2011

**Subject:** Update on Major Projects (including Core Monitoring)

**Classification:** Unrestricted

---

**Summary:** This report provides Members with an update on the progress of  
major regeneration projects.

---

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1** This report provides Members with a quarterly update on the progress of major regeneration projects being delivered by Regeneration and Economy. **This report also includes core monitoring as part of our updating.**
- 1.2** The tables that follow present progress against projects in Thanet, Dover, Kent Thameside and Ashford and for Backing Kent Business, Backing Kent People, Swale and No Use Empty.

Project	Summary of project outcome	Cost of Project KCC/Partners £	Progress since last quarter January – March 2011	Actions planned for next quarter April – June 2011
<b>Ashford Growth Area - Lead Officer: Mike Bodkin (01622 221960)</b>				
Ashford Growth Area	Delivery of the Ashford Programme to support sustainable economic growth	Total Programme value: £53.5m public sector funding (of which £22m GAF 3 and £5.5m KCC funding).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M20 Footbridge, M20 Junction 9 and Drovers Roundabout to be completed by end of March 2011.</li> <li>• Gateway+ construction ongoing – scheduled for completion June 2011.</li> <li>• Victoria Way under construction.</li> <li>• New delivery arrangements for Ashford to be considered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M20 Footbridge, M20 Junction 9 and Drovers Roundabout completed</li> <li>• Gateway+ opens.</li> <li>• Victoria Way completed</li> <li>• New delivery arrangements for Ashford in place.</li> </ul>
<b>Kent Thameside – Lead Officer: Mike Bodkin (01622 221960)</b>				
Homes and Roads	To deliver 11 major transport schemes to support growth of 20,000 homes and 50,000 jobs	Total cost - £200m (at 2009). (Price base varies for funding commitments) Regional Transport Programme (DfT) £46m (at 2008) HCA £23m (at 2008) DfT £26m (at 2007) Eastern Quarry £40m (at 2007) Developer Contributions £63m (at 2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Options Appraisal work carried out for CLG to support HCA/DfT funding bids for the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review.</li> <li>• HCA contribution of £7.5m (from £13m allocated for period up to 31 March 2011) received.</li> <li>• Additional £10m from HCA not allocated in next CSR period (2011/12 to 2013/14) but subject to further review.</li> <li>• £26m DfT funding provisionally allocated for 2017/18 onwards but subject to further review.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendment to Funding Agreement with HCA.</li> <li>• Initial Delivery Programme agreed with HCA to utilise £13m allocation.</li> <li>• Further discussions with Land Securities regarding Deed of Variation in respect of Eastern Quarry.</li> <li>• Discussions with DfT and partners to secure additional public sector funding potentially through Regional Growth Fund.</li> <li>• Governance and management arrangements for the Programme agreed.</li> <li>• Partnership agreement between KCC/DBC/GBC finalised.</li> </ul>

Project	Summary of project outcome	Cost of Project KCC/Partners £	Progress since last quarter January – March 2011	Actions planned for next quarter April – June 2011
Ebbsfleet Valley (including Eastern Quarry)	To deliver 11,000 homes and new community adjacent to Ebbsfleet station	In an excess of an estimated £100m worth of infrastructure secured by KCC and DBC to support the development of Eastern Quarry.	Existing Ebbsfleet S.106 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GBC have considered Land Securities (LS) application to vary some of the original S.106 triggers. GBC have agreed some of the variations but have requested further additional information for the remainder.</li> <li>Discussions are ongoing regarding revision of S.106 terms.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue liaison with GBC and agree revised triggers.</li> <li>Continue negotiations regarding revised S.106 terms.</li> <li>Obtain details from LS of proposed development programme for the remainder of Ebbsfleet Valley.</li> </ul>
<b>Swale – Lead Officer: Mike Bodkin (01622 221960)</b>				
Swale Parklands:- Sheppey cycle routes	Provision of new cycle/multi-access routes on Sheppey as part of developing green tourism on island	Total project cost £724,000. KCC- £500k; Sustrans- £225k	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete bulk of implementation of Sheerness route.</li> <li>Signing of majority of Leysdown and Sheerness routes.</li> <li>Preparation of publicity material, brochures, website information etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final snagging and completion of routes</li> <li>Public Launch of routes – June</li> <li>Publication/distribution of publicity material</li> <li>Installation of art features (subject to successful Leader bid).</li> </ul>
Swale Parklands- Milton Creek	Creation of major new country park running along Creek in Sittingbourne on brownfield/ waste land. KCC project is to landscape site adjoining new NNR road in 2011/12.	Total project cost: £2.95m. CLG- £2.3m; SBC - £400k; KCC- £250k	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete structural surveys.</li> <li>Re –start reptile mitigation.</li> <li>Produce detailed design for site.</li> <li>Draw up final legal agreement with Swale BC.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalise design for Churchfields Wharf with partners</li> <li>Complete reptile re-location</li> <li>Prepare for tendering subject to completion of NRR</li> <li>Maximise benefits from exit from road scheme for new access routes within park and on this site.</li> </ul>
Queenborough/ Rushenden Regeneration	Overall scheme to deliver 2000 new homes and related community/road infrastructure over	Estimated cost of £26.4m of community infrastructure to be secured from	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEEDA starting work to level and raise site to make it fit for new development.</li> <li>Completion of community needs audit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete Rushenden Relief Road</li> <li>Continue work to raise site levels</li> <li>Revisit s 106 allocations to Q/R</li> <li>Further development on new skills/employment/community</li> </ul>

Project	Summary of project outcome	Cost of Project KCC/Partners £	Progress since last quarter January – March 2011	Actions planned for next quarter April – June 2011
	10 years	S.106  CLG funding of £390k; KCC £15k to carry out environmental works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completion of Rushenden Environmental programme.</li> <li>Implementation of first phase of environmental/community project at Queenborough Castle Mound (subject to successful HLF bid).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>centre at Rushenden to find funding</li> <li>2<sup>nd</sup> phase of works at Queenborough Castle Mound</li> </ul>
Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road	Completion of relief road from existing route to A2 at Bapchild. Development of Outline design and public consultation on route.	Total Project cost estimated between £15m to £45m, dependant on final route option selected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation completed – report being prepared for Cabinet Member.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report to Swale JTB for local Member input.</li> <li>Report to Cabinet Member for future action.</li> </ul>
Sittingbourne Southern Relief Road / M2 Junction 5	Completion of Overall Transportation Strategy for Sittingbourne, including solution to congestion / safety problems at M2 Junction 5	Total Project Cost estimated between £120m to £150m. (Preliminary costs only at this stage).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment work developed for M2 J5 in partnership with Swale Borough and Highways Agency.</li> <li>Short term solution identified for capacity improvement at Junction. Inclusion of Southern Relief Road (and M2 J5a) in LDF strategic development assessments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outline Design work of short term Solution to be pursued with Highways Agency. Longer Term solution for junction (including potential for Southern Relief Road and M2 J5a) to be assessed using new Transportation Model.</li> <li>Phasing Strategy for Southern Relief Road (including facilitation of development at Kent Science Park) to be developed with partners.</li> </ul>
Sittingbourne Town Centre	Remodelling / regeneration of Town Centre Retail Core and local road network.	Costs being borne by developers (Tesco / Spenhill).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Master planning of development and initial transport assessment carried out. To be submitted as part of planning application process.</li> <li>Preferred Development Partner Competition under way managed by Swale BC.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment of planning submission and negotiation over impacts on local network and town centre retail offer. Key element to regenerating Sittingbourne.</li> <li>Assessment of development partner options using LDF Model.</li> </ul>

Project	Summary of project outcome	Cost of Project KCC/Partners £	Progress since last quarter January – March 2011	Actions planned for next quarter April – June 2011
<b>Dover - Lead Officer: David Hughes (01622 221942)</b>				
Dover Priory Station Approach Environmental Improvements	Improvements to public realm next to Station and along part of Folkestone Road towards town centre	Total project cost - £2m. Funded by KCC (£1.1m), Network Rail (£0.7m), SEEDA (£0.1m), INTERREG (£0.12m) and Dover DC (£0.05m)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Complete.</li> </ul>	
Dover Sea Change Programme	Programme comprises improvements to 4 tourist attractions within Dover Castle, environmental improvements to Esplanade, upgrading of Bleriot Memorial, cable car feasibility study and multi faceted community	Total project cost - £7.75m. Funded by DCMS (£3.85m), English Heritage (£2.5m), KCC (£0.65m), DHB (£0.34m), Dover DC (£0.3m) and SEEDA (£0.11m)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secret Wartime Tunnels project under construction by English Heritage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue with SWT project construction (anticipated completion in May 2011).</li> </ul>
Whitfield	Development of Whitfield of up to 5,700 new homes and associated community infrastructure	Significant Private Sector Investment in build out of site and the provision of infrastructure. KCC Officer time in R&E/KHS in terms of masterplanning and infrastructure provision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop business case for Bus Rapid Transit project.</li> <li>Dover District Council decision on Whitfield SPD pending (not known at time of print).</li> <li>Continue S106 negotiations with developers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further work on developing Bus Rapid Transit business case.</li> <li>Anticipate early development phases to begin.</li> <li>Continue negotiations with developers on remaining land parcels.</li> </ul>

Project	Summary of project outcome	Cost of Project KCC/Partners £	Progress since last quarter January – March 2011	Actions planned for next quarter April – June 2011
<b>Thanet – Lead Officer: Theresa Bruton (01622 221957)</b>				
East Kent Opportunities LLP Theresa Bruton	Limited liability partnership created by KCC and Thanet DC to develop land holdings at Manston Business Park and Euro Kent adjacent to Westwood Cross. EuroKent spine Road opened November 2008.	KCC purchased Manston Park landholdings in June 2006 £5.35m. Now sits alongside TDC equivalent landholding at EuroKent in the LLP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed negotiations underway with one potential land sale interest.</li> <li>• Other sound enquiries being followed up as a result of Savills initial activity in the market following their appointment as agents.</li> <li>• Greener credentials being built into the Eurokent planning application.</li> <li>• Links established with Employ Kent Thameside to support development of the jobs and skills brokerage initiative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued promotion of the Manston site in anticipation of completing on at least one sale.</li> <li>• Finalise Eurokent Planning Application for early summer submission.</li> </ul>
<b>Margate - Lead Officer: Keith Mackenney (01622 221912)</b>				
Rendezvous site development	On the seafront site adjacent to Turner Contemporary development work is underway to bring forward a planning application for a quality mixed-use development at the eastern end of the Rendezvous site that is sympathetic to the Turner gallery and provides strong and effective linkages to the Old Town and the Winter Gardens. R&E are working with Thanet District Council (TDC), to	Total cost will be determined by the eventual direction of the project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KCC and TDC officers to produce a planning brief for the Rendezvous site.</li> <li>• Discussions to continue for improvements to the Winter Gardens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The creation of a planning brief for the Rendezvous site</li> <li>• Agreement on a way forward for the improvement of the Winter Gardens.</li> </ul>

Project	Summary of project outcome	Cost of Project KCC/Partners £	Progress since last quarter January – March 2011	Actions planned for next quarter April – June 2011
	transform the Grade 2 listed, Winter Gardens into a successful, modern operation.			
Development on the Dreamland site	To work with the Margate Renewal Partnership and site owners to deliver the Dreamland Entertainment Complex & Heritage Amusement Park on a 10 acre site around the listed cinema and scenic railway.	£12.4m (Phase 1) including: SeaChange £4m HLF £3m TDC £0.75m Developer £4m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work to conclude to transfer the land required for the Heritage Amusement Park from the owners to TDC.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land transfer arrangements must be agreed and design and restoration proposals finalised.</li> </ul>

**Countywide - No Use Empty Lead Officer: Steve Grimshaw (01622 221906)**

	Initiative launched in 2005 as part of its PSA 2 commitments to examine better ways of delivering services and working more effectively with district councils by returning long term empty properties back into use.	£5m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>£3.6M awarded since start of Initiative, pulling in £7M leverage to date (Dec 2010).</li> <li>Further applications for loans with a value of £0.8M currently being processed.</li> <li>Progressing discussions with Tunbridge Wells, Tonbridge &amp; Malling and Swale on joining loan scheme</li> <li>Gravesham have also expressed interest in joining loan scheme.</li> <li>Follow up work regarding recovery of the £1M of Loan Fund which is scheduled to be recovered by March 2011.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalise the number of units returned at Q4 for 2010-11.</li> <li>Target for 2011-12 to return a further 200 units</li> <li>Finalise arrangements with those councils wishing to participate in the Loan Scheme.</li> <li>Commence processing loan applications for those properties identified for funding from 2011-12 allocation of funds. Provisional value £1.5M</li> <li>Monitor on-going schedule of monitoring visits to ensure projects are completing within agreed timescales.</li> </ul>
--	---	-----	--	---

Project	Summary of project outcome	Cost of Project KCC/Partners £	Progress since last quarter January – March 2011	Actions planned for next quarter April – June 2011
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achieved 210 units versus a Yearly Target of 200 at Q2 (Apr-Sep 2010) – Q3 currently being verified.</li> <li>• Provide feedback on behalf of the Initiative in relation to Government Consultation of New Homes Bonus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further case studies to be uploaded to Website.</li> </ul>
<b>Countywide – Backing Kent People Lead Officer: Rob Hancock (01622 221347)</b>				
<b>Backing Kent People</b>	The campaign brings together partners from across the public and voluntary sectors to help Kent people whether the recession and make it easier for them to get the help they need.	<p>£40k allocated for initial campaign. £5k for first edition design, production, printing and distribution of Money Box Magazine. Second edition £7k contribution by KCC with increased distribution.</p> <p>Kent Credit Union original KCC development budget of £100k plus £250k allocated to Kent Savers. £4k allocated the creation of the Kent &amp; Medway Financial Inclusion Partnership.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree Kent Benefits Partnership proposals to become a social enterprise.</li> <li>• BKP part funding of the Area Based Fuel Poverty Programme with EHW.</li> <li>• KentSavers progress towards as targets to date: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 402 members</li> <li>○ 170 instant savers</li> <li>○ 15 save as you borrow loans</li> <li>○ 11 flexi loans</li> <li>○ Value of loans £198,429.54</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal to be commenced.</li> <li>• Kent Benefits Partnership to be launched as a social enterprise with KCC support over 3 years.</li> <li>• BKP part funding of the Area Based Fuel Poverty Programme with EHW ongoing.</li> <li>• Distribution of publication to initial 30,000 residents in RSL housing.</li> </ul>

**Countywide – Backing Kent Business Lead Officer: Theresa Bruton (01622 221957)**

Project	Summary of project outcome	Cost of Project KCC/Partners £	Progress since last quarter January – March 2011	Actions planned for next quarter April – June 2011
<p><b>Backing Kent Business</b></p>	<p>To support Kent businesses through the recession via KCC 10 Commitments and to develop a new relationship with business</p>	<p>£120,000</p>	<p>BKB Partners – accredited Chambers of Commerce, Institute of Directors, Federation of Small Businesses and Business Link have identified some capacity and mechanisms to take the private sector lead in taking forward the Backing Kent Business campaign with KCC support.</p> <p>Progress on current initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Further developing the on-line business supply chain directory for the off-shore wind industry following its launch in 2010.</li> <li>· Implementing the successful 2 Seas European funded project to develop international markets as a route for growth for Kent businesses</li> <li>· Developing a new on-line communications portal for the Kent business community in support of BKB.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· KCC R&amp;E will continue to support the business sector lead for BKB as it develops.</li> </ul>

## **2. Recommendation:**

**2.1** Members are asked to note progress against each of the projects.

### **Lead Contact Officer:**

Director of Economic Development  
Barbara Cooper

Email [Barbara.cooper@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Barbara.cooper@kent.gov.uk)

Tel: 01622 221856

By: Overview, Scrutiny and Localism Manager

To: Regeneration and Economic Development Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee - 18 January 2011

Subject: **UPDATE ON SELECT COMMITTEE WORK**

Classification: Unrestricted

---

Summary: This report updates Members on current and future Select Committee work and invites suggestions for future Select Committee Topic Reviews.

---

**Select Committee work now completed - Renewable Energy and Extended Services**

1. The final reports of both of these Select Committees were considered by the County Council on 16 December 2010.

**Work currently underway – Dementia Select Committee**

2. ASSPOSC is the ‘parent’ committee for this review. By the time of the POSC meeting, the Select Committee will have met to elect its Chairman (the Chairman Designate is Trudy Dean) and agree its Terms and Reference, scope and way forward. There will then be briefings and visits in January and February to give Members a grounding in the subject, and formal evidence-gathering hearings are planned for March. The contacts in Democratic Services for this Select Committee are: Research Officer Sue Frampton (01622 694993) and Democratic Services Officer Christine Singh (01622 694334).

**Future Select Committee Work**

3. **The Student Journey.** The proposal for this review arose from the programme of visits to District Councils undertaken in 2010 by REDPOSC and Learning and Development CFEPOSC Members. REDPOSC will be its ‘parent’ Committee but its work will cut across REDPOSC, L&D CFEPOSC and Communities POSC. Membership is not yet confirmed. Background research is going on, and the review proper is due to start in Spring 2011, when a related piece of work being undertaken by the CFE Directorate is due to be completed. The contacts in Democratic Services for this Select Committee are: Research Officer Gaetano Romagnuolo (01622 694292) and Democratic Services Officer Theresa Grayell (01622 694277).

4. **Educational Attainment of Pupils and Schools in Areas of High Deprivation –** starting work now. The contacts in Democratic Services for this Select Committee are: Research Officer Pippa Cracknell (01622 694178) and Assistant Democratic Services Manager Denise Fitch (01622 694269).

## Suggestions for Select Committee Topic Reviews

5. If Members have any suggestions of topics they would like to put forward for consideration for inclusion in the future topic review work programme, they should contact the Democratic Services Officer for this POSC.

### **Recommendation:-**

6. Members are asked to note the successful completion of the work of the Renewable Energy and Extended Services Select Committees and the new Topic Review work which is now starting, or soon to start, and to advise the Democratic Services Officer of any topics which they would like to put forward for consideration for inclusion in the future Select Committee Topic Review Work Programme.

Theresa Grayell  
Democratic Services Officer

Background Information: *Nil*

telephone: 01622 694277  
e-mail: [theresa.grayell@kent.gov.uk](mailto:theresa.grayell@kent.gov.uk)