

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of a meeting of the Kent County Council held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 18 September 2014.

PRESENT:

Mr P J Homewood (Chairman)
Mr M J Harrison (Vice-Chairman)

Mrs A D Allen, MBE, Mr M J Angell, Mr M Baldock, Mr M A C Balfour, Mr R H Bird, Mr H Birkby, Mr N J Bond, Mr A H T Bowles, Mr D L Brazier, Mrs P Brivio, Mr R E Brookbank, Mr L Burgess, Mr C W Caller, Miss S J Carey, Mr P B Carter, CBE, Mr N J D Chard, Mr I S Chittenden, Mr B E Clark, Mrs P T Cole, Mr G Cooke, Mr G Cowan, Mrs M E Crabtree, Ms C J Cribbon, Mr A D Crowther, Mrs V J Dagger, Mr D S Daley, Mr M C Dance, Mr J A Davies, Dr M R Eddy, Mr J Elenor, Mrs M Elenor, Mr T Gates, Mr G K Gibbens, Mr R W Gough, Mr P M Harman, Ms A Harrison, Mr M Heale, Mr P M Hill, OBE, Mr C P D Hoare, Mrs S V Hohler, Mr S Holden, Mr E E C Hotson, Mrs S Howes, Mr A J King, MBE, Mr J A Kite, MBE, Mr S J G Koowaree, Mr R A Latchford, OBE, Mr R L H Long, TD, Mr G Lymer, Mr B E MacDowall, Mr T A Maddison, Mr R A Marsh, Mr F McKenna, Mr B Neaves, Mr M J Northey, Mr P J Oakford, Mr J M Ozog, Mr R J Parry, Mr C R Pearman, Mr L B Ridings, MBE, Mrs E D Rowbotham, Mr J E Scholes, Mr W Scobie, Mr T L Shonk, Mr C Simkins, Mr J D Simmonds, MBE, Mr C P Smith, Mr D Smyth, Mrs P A V Stockell, Mr B J Sweetland, Mr A Terry, Mr N S Thandi, Mr R Truelove, Mr M J Vye, Mr J N Wedgbury, Mr M E Whybrow, Mr M A Wickham and Mrs Z Wiltshire

IN ATTENDANCE: David Cockburn (Corporate Director Strategic & Corporate Services), Denise Fitch (Democratic Services Manager (Council)), Andrew Ireland (Corporate Director Social Care, Health & Wellbeing), Andrew Scott-Clark (Interim Director Public Health), Geoff Wild (Director of Governance and Law) and Andy Wood (Corporate Director Finance and Procurement)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

28. Apologies for Absence

The Director of Governance and Law reported apologies from Mr Baker, Mr Bond, Mrs Dean, Mr Manion and Mrs Whittle.

29. Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or Other Significant Interests

(1) Mr Cowan declared an interest in that both he and his wife were foster carers for Kent County Council.

(2) M Long declared an interest in relation to the item on Health and Social Care Integration as he acted as a solicitor for various health service providers.

30. Minutes of the meeting held on 17 July 2014 and, if in order, to be approved as a correct record

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 July 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the spelling of the word "Nijmegen" being corrected in minute no 21 (d) (11), (12) and (13) and on page 11 also minute no 24 (2) 1 be amended by the deletion of the word "up" and the insertion of the word "upon".

31. Chairman's Announcements

(1) The Chairman announced that it was with great regret that he had to inform Members of the sad death of Mr John Muckle on Thursday 14 August and he and other Members had attended Mr Muckle's funeral in early September.

(2) Mr Muckle, had served as the Labour County Councillor for Dartford North, between 1988 and 2009. During this time he had served on the Planning Applications Committee, Highways Advisory Board, Environment & Regeneration Policy Overview Committee, Kent Transport Board and Superannuation Fund Committee. Mr Muckle had been appointed as an Honorary Alderman in December 2013.

(3) Mr Muckle was also one of the longest serving members of Dartford Borough Council and had served on its predecessor authority from 1967 ago. He had been Mayor of Dartford in 1973/74, the year that Dartford Borough Council was formed and he had also been Leader of the Borough Council from 1998 to 2003.

(4) Mr Maddison, Mr Kite, Mr Vye and Mr Harrison paid tribute to Mr Muckle.

(5) At the end of the tributes, all Members stood in silence in memory of Mr Muckle.

(6) After the one minute silence, the Chairman moved, the Vice Chairman seconded and it was

(7) Resolved unanimously that the Council record the sense of loss it feels on the sad passing of Mr Muckle and extends to his family and friends our heartfelt sympathy to them in their sad bereavement.

(8) (b) Long Service achievement

(9) The Chairman stated that it gave him great pleasure to advise Members that earlier this month, a member of staff in the Finance and Procurement division, Mr Adrian Richardson, celebrated 50 years of working full-time for Kent County Council; a truly astonishing achievement.

(10) Mr Richardson had been with KCC all of his working life from leaving school at the age of 17 and starting work in the former County Treasurer's Department in 1964. He had remained in Finance, working in the Insurance Team for the last 42 years. During his 50 years at work, Mr Richardson had not taken a single day off work sick.

(11) The Chairman asked on behalf of all Members, the County Council formally record our sincere thanks for Mr Richardson's dedication and loyal service to KCC.

(c) Chairman's East Kent Reception

(12) The Chairman stated that he was delighted to report that his programme of Area Networking Receptions was now complete with the last reception taking place at the beautiful Knowlton Court Estate near Canterbury.

(13) He advised Members that the Reception had raised over £500 for his nominated charities this year, bringing to total raised to date to over £1300.

(d) Nijmegen Marches

(14) The Chairman reminded Members that at the last County Council meeting he had announced that the Kent Wing of the Air Training Corps were taking part in this year's Nijmegen Marches in Holland, which involved some 52 Kent air cadets walking 40 kilometres or 25 miles a day for four consecutive days. He was pleased to be able to tell you that all of cadets completed all four marches. They survived the heat and were extremely buoyant when they arrived home to England. Many of the cadets plan to return next year.

(14) On behalf of the County Council, the Chairman congratulated the cadets and volunteers on this achievement.

(e) Last Post under the Folkestone Step Short Arch.

(15) The Chairman drew Members' attention to the playing of the Last Post under the Folkestone Step Short Arch every Sunday until the 9 November 2014 in commemoration of the millions who died in World War One.

(16) Horn player Bryan Walker, who served for 26 years in the Royal Marines Band Service, will play the Last Post followed by a two minute silence and then Reveille, under the memorial arch every Sunday evening at 7pm. These performances would echo the ceremony held at Menin Gate Cemetery in Ypres, Belgium.

(17) Kent County Council has organised the performances as part of the legacy work surrounding the Arch. The Arch was a project organised by WW1 charity Step Short and funded by a range of trusts, individuals, public bodies and corporate sources, including the Roger De Haan Charitable Trust, Kent County Council, Shepway District Council and Folkestone Town Council.

(18) The Chairman encouraged all KCC Members, staff and their families to attend one of these performances.

32. Questions

In accordance with Procedure Rule 1.17(4), 8 questions were asked and replies given which are attached as an appendix to the minutes.

33. Report by Leader of the Council (Oral)

- (1) The Leader updated the County Council on events since the previous meeting.
- (2) Mr Carter referred to the outcome of inspection of the Member Development programme yesterday by South East Employers (SEE). He was delighted to be able to inform the meeting that KCC had retained the Member Development Charter Plus accreditation which was the highest level that could be awarded. SEE had noted particular strengths including a clear commitment to member development across all political parties in KCC, a sensible Member Development budget, strong feedback from partner organisations and that a significant number of Members had a Personal Development Plan. Mr Carter expressed his thanks to Mr Wickenden, Democratic Services Manager (Members) who had organised the evidence for the inspection and similarly Mr Bowles, as chairman of the Member Development Steering Group.
- (3) Mr Carter referred to the mention that he had been made at the last County Council meeting of the massive work programme that was underway to deliver £100's m worth of savings. Through the summer period, including August, he reported that rapid progress had been made and that we are now on time and in a good place. He referred to the work carried out by Newton Europe Ltd which had been shared with all political parties in relation to the Portfolio Transformation agenda. £10's m of savings had already been delivered in the phases of work that they were undertaking. Procurement activities were now in full swing especially for back office services. He stated that it would soon be necessary to get fully engaged with the outcome of the private sector interest in delivering various programmes of work. He expressed the expectation that the private sector would deliver a great deal and stressed that all Members would be fully involved in the decision making.
- (4) Another major piece of work, involving Andy Wood and John Simmonds, had been the framing of the Medium Term Budget which would be launched in early October for consultation with the endorsement of the Conservative group. He referred to the massive progress that was being made with efficiencies and savings and that front line services were being delivered and improved with a lot less money. He stated that it would not be the 'slash and burn' budget which opposition Members would like to see but it would sit well with residents in relation to change and improvements for front line services. He referred to the item, later in the meeting, which would illustrate how KCC was working in partnership to improve health and social care integration.
- (5) He stated he looked forward, at the next meeting of the County Council, to receiving the interim recommendations from the Member's Working Group on Commissioning that Mr Hotson was chairing.
- (6) Mr Carter referred to the good work, involving all parties on the County Councils' Network (CCN) to launch a document at party conferences to encourage further decentralisation to empower local government in England, whilst today Scotland votes on its future. He reported that the document put forward a good case to all parties to ask for significant trust and greater capacity to be given to county governance across the country. The County Council had already demonstrated that that it was able to deliver complex infrastructure and facilitated strong partners especially with NHS commissioners and providers.

(7) Mr Carter stated that county governance represented 40% of English local authorities and some 23 million people were residents of County Council areas. This put County Councils at the centre of public sector reform. The CCN document suggested “one area one budget” and provided the opportunity to look at the operational management of the total of public spending in Kent. He stated that localism was well intended but there was micro management by government departments and civil servants were creating unnecessary bureaucracy. An example of centralism with a Government Department taking control where the County Council had a record of successfully delivering was the priority schools building programme.

(8) Mr Carter mentioned the Local Enterprise Partnership which needed to be empowered to enable local government to work in partnership with business communities in their areas making good locality based decisions and developing locally based strategies.

(9) Mr Carter referred to the inequality of allocation for social care funding: County Councils received £496 per person for over 75's in comparison to Metropolitan Boroughs (£978) and London Boroughs (£2,000). In relation to the revenue support grant, London Boroughs received £705 per head, Metropolitan Boroughs £475 per head and County Councils received £207 per head. He stated that there needed to be consideration given to re-calculating the way that public sector funding was distributed. Scotland received 20% more than the average for England per capita. He expressed the hope that the document when launched will have traction with all nation political parties and receive publicity.

(10) Mr Latchford, the Leader of the Opposition, responded by referring to the Scottish referendum. He stated that he was confident that without exception Members were saddened that a “Yes” vote could mean the possible breakup of United Kingdom. He referred to the government's agreement to the referendum and to the way in which the main political parties had supported the “No” campaign. He stated that he truly hoped that we will remain a United Kingdom.

(11) Mr Latchford then referred to the Transformation Programme and stated that he fully supported the Leader's statement regarding the success of the programme which was going to plan due to the hard work and dedication of the officers and those Members closely involved. He expressed his gratitude to the Leader for choosing to involve all Group Leaders from the outset. He felt that they have had a voice, which he acknowledged would not necessarily make a difference to the outcome, but appreciated the opportunity to have an input. He stated that all involved at all levels should be congratulated.

(12) Mr Latchford then referred to the Commissioning Working Group, set up under Mr Hotson's chairmanship, where officers and Members had been working together closely as a team. They had received excellent presentations from officers and these meeting' had been skilfully chaired by Mr Hotson. He stated that there was much to do and we must work together to identify savings necessary and accept the change.

(13) Mr Latchford mentioned Manston which was at a critical stage; he was pleased to note the positive situation that had been reached and hoped that a good decision would result.

(14) With regard to the Member Development Charter Plus, Mr Latchford expressed his thanks to Mr Wickenden and his team who been instrumental in assisting Members with this achievement. He stated that his Group had received

enormous support from Mr Wickenden and his team since they were elected in May 2013.

(15) Mr Latchford expressed his disappointment at the Leader's comment, in relation to the Medium Term Budget and opposition groups. He stated that he believed that all groups accepted that changes had to be made and his group supported those changes where they were necessary and were supportive where they considered these changes to be right.

(16) Mr Cowan, Leader of the Labour Group, referred to devolution for Scotland and expressed the view that Scotland and the Britain would be poorer if there was a "Yes" vote. He acknowledged the enormous contribution that Scotland had made to the United Kingdom and the benefit that Scotland had secured from togetherness.

(17) In relation to devolution of power from Westminster, Mr Cowan stated that whatever the outcome of the referendum, his group were are happy to join this debate. If Scotland voted "No" and the political leader's fulfilled their promises then there would need to be a root and branch discussion about the rest of the UK including the devolution of powers from the centre and how that could be funded. He stated that the referendum had shown that people were too far removed from decisions that affected their lives and that there needed to be discussion around funding for the public sector.

(18) Regarding the Members Development Charter Plus, Mr Cowan expressed his thanks to Mr Wickenden and his team.

(19) Mr Cowan referred to the Leader's comments on the Medium Term Budget and stated that all Members aimed to get the best savings for their communities. He referred to the report to Cabinet on 15 September 2014 and the reference to a possible overspend of £12.4m for 2014/15 and the plans to reduce the overspend to £5.5m through management action.

(20) Mr Cowan emphasised the importance of the first phase of the Transformation, which was due in May 2015, being a success.

(21) Mr Vye, Deputy Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group, began by stating that his Group supported the process of transformation which was proceeding at a pace. He noted that the pace was leaving, even, the Transformation Advisory Board gasping for breath. He emphasised that the Transformation was sorely needed.

(22) Mr Vye referred to the Newton Europe report on adult care and children services. This report showed that expenditure by Specialist Children's Services per deprived child or young person under 18 was seven times greater in Tonbridge and Malling than in Swale; despite the same percentage of the population being supported by Specialist Children's Services. He stated that if all Districts spent the same as Swale per deprived child and achieved the same outcomes this would result in a saving for the County of £10m. He questioned why this had not been picked up before.

(23) Mr Vye stated that when the consultants had finished their work, KCC needed to do much better if the conclusion was not to be drawn that this organisation was too big to manage effectively; this would not help the case for devolution.

(24) Mr Vye referred to the recent report to Cabinet on the first quarter's financial monitoring which showed a total predicted overspend for Children's Services of £7.5m. He stated that the Budget set in February 2014 was unrealistic as the demand for Children's Services was neither reducing nor increasing. He stated that

the newly formed Early Help Services could not be expected to work if an unrealistic budget was set as this could result in management action to bring it back within the budget. He asked the Leader what effect such management action would have on an already over stretched service.

(25) Mr Vye expressed his full support for the idea of having a Members Commissioning Advisory Board. He commended Mr Hotson for his chairing of the Member Working Group which appeared to have achieved a cross party consensus on the way forward. This would enable Members to gain an understanding on what is happening regarding commissioning and procurement.

(27) Regarding devolution, Mr Vye hoped that all groups would look at each other's manifestos. He stated that he was proud of the Liberal Democrats' manifesto and was happy to share it with the Leader.

(28) Mr Whybrow, Leader of the Independents Group, stated that he was sorry to hear the Leader say that the opposition would love to see a slash and burn budget. He believed that Members would be disappointed that the budget targets were missed. Although the opposition may not always agree with the direction of travel, the Leader should be aware of the constructive cross party work carried out in the Members Working Group on Commissioning. He did not believe that anyone on his side of the Chamber would be delighted to see a slash and burn budget.

(29) Regarding devolution, Mr Whybrow stated that he agreed with the Leader's sentiments. Mr Whybrow believed that pressure was now building in the CCN to achieve devolution to local authorities in England. He expressed the view that localism had been vapid. This could be seen in Kent in the way that Central Government had taken away planning decisions from local authorities such as Ebbsfleet, the Urban Development Corporation and the NPPF, which was intended to give central government more control.

(30) Mr Whybrow referred to the Adonis Growth Review which had promised £39b devolved to local government and said that he was not optimistic about this being delivered. He stated that the Local Government Association had put it well, devolution must not stop at the border, local authorities should raise and spend money in the way that best suited the people in their area. He looked forward to the CCN report generating a lot of publicity and debate.

(31) In response to the Opposition Group Leader's responses, Mr Carter stated that he was looking forward to a mature debate at County Council in February when the budget for 2015-16 would be agreed. He referred to the turning off of street lighting at night, providing that there were no safety or criminality implications, which had improved KCC's carbon footprint and achieved savings of £1m a year. It had contributed to keeping the Council tax low whilst preserving valuable statutory and non- statutory front line services.

(32) Mr Carter referred to the latest quarterly monitoring report submitted to the last Cabinet meeting and stated that he was confident that the budget would be brought into line by the end of the year.

(33) Mr Carter agreed that it was important to respond to the challenges identified in the Newton Europe report and to consider whether resources could be re-directed to provide the expected outcomes with less expenditure. It was important to learn from the past and to make sure every Kent £1 was used to good effect.

(34) RESOLVED that the Leaders report be noted.

34. Health & Social Care Integration in Kent

(1) The Chairman welcomed Patricia Davies (Accountable Officer for Dartford, Gravesham and Swanley Clinical Commissioning Group and Accountable Officer for Swale CCG), Susan Acott (Chief Executive of Darent Valley Hospital) and Hazel Carpenter (Accountable Office for South Kent Coast CCG) to the meeting.

(2) The Charman stated that he had agreed that a short DVD "Integrated Health and Social Care" would be shown to provide an introduction to this item.

(3) Ms Davies and Ms Acott gave a PowerPoint presentation on Health Care in North Kent and Ms Carpenter gave a presentation on the Prime Minister's Challenge Fund. The guests and answered questions from Members on their presentations.

(4) Mr Carter moved and Mr Gough seconded the following motion:

"Kent County Council commends the Health and Wellbeing Board and its partners for its significant work to drive forward health and social care integration to produce improved outcomes for Kent residents. This Council supports the move towards 24/7 community-based integrated care provision that puts the patient at the heart of the service, giving more control to patients over what and how services they need are provided.

This Council thanks the partners from the Clinical Commissioning Groups for their comprehensive update and notes the content of the report."

(5) Ms Harrison moved and Mr Caller seconded the procedural motion that "the question be put" and the votes cast were as follows:

For (59)

Mrs A Allen, Mr M Angell, Mr M Baldock, Mr M Balfour, Mr R Bird, Mr H Birkby, Mr A Bowles, Mr D Brazier, Mrs P Brivio, Mr R Brookbank, Mr C Caller, Mr I Chittenden, Mrs P Cole, Mr G Cowan, Mrs M Crabtree, Mr A Crowther, Mrs V Dagger, Mr D Daley, Dr M Eddy, Mr J Elenor, Mrs M Elenor, Mr T Gates, Mr P Harman, Ms A Harrison, Mr M Harrison, Mr M Heale, Mr C Hoare, Mrs S Hohler, Mr S Holden, Mr P Homewood, Ms S Howes, Mr A King, Mr J Kite, Mr G Koowaree, Mr R Latchford, Mr R Long, Mr G Lymer, Mr B MacDowall, Mr T Maddison, Mr F McKenna, Mr B Neaves, Mr M Northey, Mr J Ozog, Mr R Parry, Mr L Ridings, Mrs E Rowbotham, Mr W Scobie, Mr T Shonk, Mr C Simkins, Mr C Smith, Mr D Smyth, Mrs P Stockell, Mr B Sweetland, Mr A Terry, Mr R Truelove, Mr M Vye, Mr J Wedgbury, Mr M Whybrow, Mr A Wickham.

Against (5)

Mr P Carter, Mr J Simmonds, Mr R Gough, Mr P Oakford, Miss S Carey.

Abstain (0)

Procedural motion carried

(6) The Chairman put the original motion proposed by Mr Carter and seconded by Mr Gough to the vote and the votes cast were as follows:

For (75)

Mrs A Allen, Mr M Angell, Mr M Baldock, Mr M Balfour, Mr R Bird, Mr H Birkby, Mr A Bowles, Mr D Brazier, Mrs P Brivio, Mr R Brookbank, Mr L Burgess, Mr C Caller, Miss S Carey, Mr P Carter, Mr I Chittenden, Mr B Clark, Mrs P Cole, Mr G Cooke, Mr G Cowan, Mrs M Crabtree, Ms J Cribbon, Mr A Crowther, Mrs V Dagger, Mr D Daley, Mr M Dance, Dr M Eddy, Mr J Elenor, Mrs M Elenor, Mr T Gates, Mr G Gibbens, Mr R Gough, Mr P Harman, Ms A Harrison, Mr M Harrison, Mr M Heale, Mr M Hill, Mr C Hoare, Mrs S Hohler, Mr S Holden, Mr P Homewood, Mr E Hotson, Ms S Howes, Mr A King, Mr J Kite, Mr G Koowaree, Mr R Latchford, Mr R Long, Mr G Lymer, Mr B MacDowall, Mr T Maddison, Mr F McKenna, Mr B Neaves, Mr M Northey, Mr P Oakford, Mr J Ozog, Mr R Parry, Mr C Pearman, Mr L Ridings, Mrs E Rowbotham, Mr J Scholes, Mr W Scobie, Mr T Shonk, Mr C Simkins, Mr J Simmonds, Mr C Smith, Mr D Smyth, Mrs P Stockell, Mr B Sweetland, Mr A Terry, Mr N Thandi, Mr R Truelove, Mr M Vye, Mr J Wedgbury, Mr M Whybrow, Mr A Wickham.

Against (0)

Abstain (0)

(7) RESOLVED that Kent County Council commends the Health and Wellbeing Board and its partners for its significant work to drive forward health and social care integration to produce improved outcomes for Kent residents. This Council supports the move towards 24/7 community-based integrated care provision that puts the patient at the heart of the service, giving more control to patients over what and how services they need are provided. This Council thanks the partners from the Clinical Commissioning Groups for their comprehensive update and notes the content of the report.

35. Treasury Management Annual Review 2013 - 14

- (1) Mr Simmonds moved and Ms Carey seconded that the report be noted.
- (2) RESOLVED that the report be noted.

36. Motion for Time Limited Debate

- (1) Mr MacDowall moved and Mr Baldock seconded the following motion.

“This Council recognises the widescale public concern about the decision to turn streetlights off at night.

It recognises the public fears over crime and safety, and notes the anecdotal evidence coming in from the media and from various resident groups that the policy has caused some serious issues.

Therefore, we propose an immediate full review be carried out rather than wait for the current review date on order that any necessary revisions can be made before the winter months.”

(2) Mr Caller moved and Dr Eddy seconded the following amendment:

"This council recognises the widescale public concern about the decision to turn streetlights off at night.

It recognises the public fears over crime and safety, and notes the anecdotal evidence coming in from the media and from various resident groups that the policy has caused some serious issues.

Therefore, we propose that the street lights throughout Kent should be reinstated immediately to all night lighting while a full review is carried out that includes a more detailed and direct consultation with those residents affected by part night lighting; the review should also include detailed risk assessments aided by professional bodies."

(3) Mr Vye moved and Mr Chittenden seconded the procedural motion "that the question be put" and the votes cast were as follows:

For (12)

Mr A Bowles, Mrs P Brivio, Mr L Burgess, Mr D Daley, Mr R Latchford, Mr T Maddison, Mr F McKenna, Mrs E Rowbotham, Mr J Scholes, Mr W Scobie, Mr N Thandi, Mr R Truelove.

Against (36)

Mr M Angell, Mr M Balfour, Mr H Birkby, Mr D Brazier, Mr R Brookbank, Mr P Carter, Miss S Carey, Mr I Chittenden, Mr B Clark, Mrs M Crabtree, Mr M Dance, Dr M Eddy, Mr J Elenor, Mr G Gibbens, Mr P Harman, Mr M Hill, Mr C Hoare, Mr M Harrison, Mr E Hotson, Mr J Kite, Mr G Lymer, Mr B MacDowall, Mr P Oakford, Mr J Ozog, Mr M Northey, Mr R Parry, Mr C Pearman, Mr L Ridings, Mr T Shonk, Mr C Simkins, Mr J Simmonds, Mr C Smith, Mr A Terry, Mr J Wedgbury, Mr A Wickham, Mr M Whybrow.

Abstain (8)

Mr M Baldock, Mr A Crowther, Mrs M Elenor, Mr T Gates, Mr R Gough, Mr M Heale, Mr B Neaves, Mr M Vye.

Procedural motion lost

(4) After further debate the amendment as set out in paragraph (2) above was put to the vote, whereupon the voting was as follows:

For (15)

Mr M Baldock, Mrs P Brivio, Mr C Caller, Mr G Cowan, Ms J Cribbon, Dr M Eddy, Ms A Harrison, Ms S Howes, Mr T Maddison, Mrs E Rowbotham, Mr W Scobie, Mr T Shonk, Mr D Smyth, Mr N Thandi, Mr R Truelove

Against (55)

Mrs A Allen, Mr M Angell, Mr M Balfour, Mr R Bird, Mr H Birkby, Mr A Bowles, Mr D Brazier, Mr R Brookbank, Miss S Carey, Mr P Carter, Mr I Chittenden, Mr B Clark, Mrs P Cole, Mr G Cooke, Mrs M Crabtree, Mr A Crowther, Mrs V Dagger, Mr D Daley, Mr M Dance, Mr J Davies, Mr J Elenor, Mr T Gates, Mr G Gibbens, Mr R Gough, Mr P Harman, Mr M Harrison, Mr M Hill, Mr C Hoare, Mr S Holden, Mr P Homewood, Mr E Hotson, Mr A King, Mr J Kite, Mr R Latchford, Mr R Long, Mr G Lymer, Mr B MacDowall, Mr F McKenna, Mr M Northey, Mr P Oakford, Mr J Ozog, Mr R Parry, Mr C Pearman, Mr L Ridings, Mr J Scholes, Mr C Simkins, Mr J Simmonds, Mr C Smith, Mrs P Stockell, Mr B Sweetland, Mr A Terry, Mr M Vye, Mr J Wedgbury, Mr M Whybrow, Mr A Wickham

Abstain (4)

Mr L Burgess, Mrs M Elenor, Mr M Heale, Mr B Neaves

Amendment lost

(5) Mr Cowan moved and Mr Truelove seconded the procedural motion “that the question be put” and the votes cast were as follows:

For (57)

Mrs A Allen, Mr M Angell, Mr M Baldock, Mr M Balfour, Mr H Birkby, Mr A Bowles, Mr D Brazier, Mrs P Brivio, Mr R Brookbank, Mr L Burgess, Mr C Caller, Miss S Carey, Mr P Carter, Mr B Clark, Mr G Cooke, Mrs M Crabtree, Ms J Cribbon, Mr A Crowther, Mrs V Dagger, Mr M Dance, Dr M Eddy, Mr T Gates, Mr G Gibbens, Mr R Gough, Ms A Harrison, Mr M Harrison, Mr M Heale, Mr M Hill, Mr C Hoare, Mr S Holden, Mr P Homewood, Mr E Hotson, Ms S Howes, Mr A King, Mr R Long, Mr G Lymer, Mr B MacDowall, Mr F McKenna, Mr B Neaves, Mr M Northey, Mr P Oakford, Mr J Ozog, Mr R Parry, Mr C Pearman, Mr L Ridings, Mr J Scholes, Mr W Scobie, Mr T Shonk, Mr C Simkins, Mr J Simmonds, Mr C Smith, Mr D Smyth, Mrs P Stockell, Mr B Sweetland, Mr A Terry, Mr N Thandi, Mr R Truelove

Against (6)

Mr R Bird, Mr D Daley, Mr M Vye, Mr J Wedgbury, Mr A Wickham, Mr M Whybrow,

Abstain (1)

Mrs M Elenor

Procedural motion carried

(6) The Chairman put the original motion to the vote and the votes cast were as follows:

For (31)

Mr M Baldock, Mr R Bird, Mr H Birkby, Mrs P Brivio, Mr L Burgess, Mr C Caller, Mr B Clark, Mr G Cowan, Ms J Cribbon, Mr A Crowther, Dr M Eddy, Mr J Elenor, Mrs M Elenor, Mr P Harman, Ms A Harrison, Mr M Heale, Mr C Hoare, Ms S Howes, Mr R

18 SEPTEMBER 2014

Latchford, Mr T Maddison, Mr B MacDowall, Mr F McKenna, Mr B Neaves, Mrs E Rowbotham, Mr W Scobie, Mr T Shonk, Mr D Smyth, Mr A Terry, Mr N Thandi, Mr R Truelove, Mr M Vye.

Against (43)

Mrs A Allen, Mr M Angell, Mr M Balfour, Mr A Bowles, Mr D Brazier, Mr R Brookbank, Miss S Carey, Mr P Carter, Mr I Chittenden, Mrs P Cole, Mr G Cooke, Mrs M Crabtree, Mrs V Dagger, Mr D Daley, Mr M Dance, Mr J Davies, Mr T Gates, Mr G Gibbens, Mr R Gough, Mr M Harrison, Mr M Hill, Mr S Holden, Mr P Homewood, Mr E Hotson, Mr A King, Mr J Kite, Mr R Long, Mr G Lymer, Mr M Northey, Mr P Oakford, Mr J Ozog, Mr R Parry, Mr C Pearman, Mr L Ridings, Mr J Scholes, Mr C Simkins, Mr J Simmonds, Mr C Smith, Mrs P Stockell, Mr B Sweetland, Mr J Wedgbury, Mr A Wickham, Mr M Whybrow.

Abstain (0)

Motion Lost

COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday 18 September 2014

**Question by Martin Vye to
David Brazier, Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport**

Given that winter is only two months away, will the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport list the measures already put in place by agencies, including KCC, to prevent flooding in each of the locations where it occurred last winter; and will he also list the measures judged to be essential to prevent flooding in those locations, but for which the funding has not been identified, and inform the Council of the subsequent assessment of risk of flooding, in terms of red/amber/green ratings, in each of those locations.

Answer

The winter floods included a number of separate flood events. The first was the tidal storm surge on 5/6 December 2013, this was followed by the storms on 23-27 December 2013 and 4-6 January 20-14 that brought power cuts, fluvial, sewer and surface water flooding. The continued wet weather in the winter led to high groundwater levels and flooding on groundwater fed watercourses and groundwater flooding. Approximately 929 properties were recorded as flooding in the winter of 2013/14.

A table* summarising works undertaken to date and any long-term measures that have been identified in the areas significantly affected by flooding this winter has been included in the hard copy County Council Questions pack and will be made available as part of the online agenda for this meeting on the KCC website. In many of these areas multi-agency groups have been established to coordinate the delivery of protection measures and training has been provided for local flood wardens to coordinate the flood response locally.

A red/amber/green rating for flood risk is difficult as for many areas there are several aspects that affect the risk assessment that are not known in detail yet, including the flood frequency and properties at risk. The estimated number of properties at risk in each area from the long-term measures has been indicated where it is available. Further work is required in order to determine what schemes are viable in each area and what the benefits will be. KCC is part of a group of authorities that are delivering these schemes. KCC leads on highway works, coastal and fluvial works are led by the Environment Agency and Southern Water or Thames Water lead on sewer works.

**Table in appendix:*

County Council Question 1 – Appendix

Area flooded	Measures employed	Long-term measures required	Properties protected
Faversham	A multi-agency group has been established to oversee the identification of appropriate flood protection measures.	The tidal wall needs to be raised along with some improvements to the drainage outfalls. This is subject to a bid for government funds.	22
Westerham and Brasted	KCC are working in partnership with the EA and Thames Water to investigate the drainage system and identify areas for improvement.	Capital money has been allocated to undertake improvements this financial year. The scale of these improvements will be confirmed on completion of the ongoing survey work.	n/a
Dartford	Tankers were provided during the groundwater flooding of Bob Dunn Way.	A permanent pump will be installed to manage water levels later this year.	n/a
Edenbridge	Damage to the flood wall has been repaired.	Improved flood protection is required by increased conveyance through the stone bridge. There are no plans to undertake this work as consultation is required with the residents on the nature of the work.	216
Medway Valley, including Tonbridge, Hildenborough, Yalding, Collier Street and Maidstone	A multi-agency group has been established to review the works required. Works have been undertaken to repair damaged walls, improve conveyance, clear culverts and trees and undertake surveys.	Improved capacity at the Leigh Barrier a flood storage area on the Beult River. These schemes need to be designed. The outline design work is in hand however it is subject to partnership funding. Once the scheme is designed partnership funding will be required to deliver it, currently estimated to be approximately £17m. KCC has already supported the next phase of the development of this scheme with a contribution of £50k and is currently considering how it will continue to support it.	1,957
East Peckham	This is also covered by the Medway Valley multi-agency group. Blockages have been removed, a wall repaired and trees cleared.	East Peckham will benefit from the Leigh Barrier improvements proposed, there is also a scheme to protect it locally from the Medway River and other rivers that requires funding. A bid for government funding for this scheme is currently being considered.	313

Area flooded	Measures employed	Long-term measures required	Properties protected
Nailbourne and Little Stour Valley, including Barham, Bridge, Patrixbourne, Bekesbourne, Little Bourne, Ickham and Wickhambreaux	A multi-agency group has been established to review the works required. Works have begun to repair walls, clear culverts and improve conveyance. Southern Water is continuing to undertake works to improve the sewer network.	Further work is required to improve conveyance and flood protection along the Nailbourne, which requires additional investigation to determine the best means to achieve it. There are also schemes for the Little Stour that require funding. These are subject to a bid for government funds, but they are not cost beneficial so may not be successful.	401

It should be noted that there is a lot of uncertainty about the long-term solutions outlined here for a number of reasons:

- For many areas a specific scheme to protect homes has not been identified, therefore there is uncertainty about the costs and benefits of this scheme and the provision of funds to deliver it
- Where a scheme has been identified the government's commitment to funding these will not be announced until after the Autumn Statement and certainty about that portion of the funds cannot be given at this time
- Most schemes will require partnership funding in order to be delivered, even with a government contribution secured. There will be uncertainty over this contribution until a legal agreement is in place

COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday 18 September 2014

**Question by Brian Clark to
Roger Gough, Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform**

A number of schools across the county are introducing schemes to provide students with tablet PCs. While some schools have a policy not to charge for such devices, some clearly are charging parents, in fact the fees can be significantly higher than devices generally available.

Can the Cabinet Member confirm how many schools have such a tablet PC scheme and how many chose not to charge for such provision and would he agree that a school charging for devices used for educational purposes is the thin end of the wedge of paid-for education provision?

Answer

I am unable to confirm how many schools charge for tablet PCs as this is a decision taken locally by each Headteacher or Governing Body. We are aware that some schools run a parent laptop leasing scheme where students are provided with a specific model for a fixed monthly fee which includes licensing and support. Others loan tablets to year cohorts. Schools would need to be surveyed in order to gain that information.

COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday 18 September 2014

**Question by George Koowaree to
David Brazier, Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport**

Now that the Secretary of State for Transport has given the go ahead for J10a of the M20 in Ashford will the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport take a lead in influencing the Minister to increase the funding for improving Barrey Junction on the A2070 so that drivers can turn right and, for those who want to visit the commercial site coming from Junction 10, can do so safely?

Answer

The A2070 is a part of the Highways Agency, HA, road network and therefore any proposed amendments to the Barry Road junction will need to satisfy their requirements. Following previous correspondence from residents, KCC officers discussed local aspirations for the provision of a right turn from Barrey Road on to the A2070 with the HA and the intention was that KCC would have investigated this request as part of the SELEP interim scheme for J10A.

The HA are now leading on the delivery of the full junction scheme at J10A and there will be a formal opportunity to raise local concerns such as this with the HA during the proposed public consultation, required as part of the planning process. The HA has issued the following statement in response to recent correspondence from KCC officers regarding Barrey Road:

The HA project team for the M20 J10a scheme will be considering any comments on the scheme, as we progress through the preliminary design and prior to submitting a planning application (through the Development Consent Order process) in autumn 2015. We will be carrying out a public consultation in summer 2015, where we will formally capture any issues arising and address them, providing evidence for any decisions on what is and is not possible.

KCC officers will also be part of the HA Steering Group for the delivery of the full J10A and will ensure that the concerns of local residents are considered by the HA project team.

COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday 18 September 2014

**Question by Rob Bird to
Paul Carter, Leader of the Council**

Given that there is a commitment to engage Members at their local level in the shaping and commissioning of KCC services, and that many of our services require cooperation with district councils, will the Leader inform the Council of the recent active steps he has taken to engage district council leaders in constructive conversation about developing closer working between the County and District Councils?

Answer

It is indeed important that we have close and constructive dialogue and relationships between the County and the District, Borough, and City Councils, and this has growing significance as we commission more of our services. The joint working recently on the commissioned district-based Youth Services and the roll out of the Troubled Families agenda would be good examples of the Districts and County working together. There are many other examples such as:

- Health and Wellbeing Boards
- Maximising opportunities for bringing European funding into Kent
- The 'One Public Estate' programme

The Kent Leaders Group and the Joint Chief Executives Group are well established and meet regularly.

The Conservative administration is currently investigating the possibility of setting up regular briefings for all County Council Members on a double district basis to ensure Members have a comprehensive picture of KCC service provision in their division and the opportunity to discuss local issues with the responsible officer. It is the intention to invite the District Council Leaders and Chief Executives to these briefings, as well as continuing to support local boards at district level, such as Joint Transportation Boards, Children's Operational Groups, Youth Advisory Groups, and Community Safety Partnerships.

COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday 18 September 2014

**Question by Dan Daley to
Graham Gibbens, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Public Health**

Will the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Public Health inform the Council how many users have taken Direct Payments since the new contractors have been in place, and how this has affected staffing levels in the department responsible for assessment and in the processing of invoices?

Answer

There were 6100 people who were receiving home care arranged by the council when the new Domiciliary Contract came into effect. As part of this, all of those who were affected by the changes were reminded of their right to ask for Direct Payment instead of services. As of 28 August, 1694 of these people had expressed an interest in finding out more about Direct Payments. Of the 559 who have progressed to a detailed assessment, 376 have chosen to go on to take a Direct Payment.

As part of this contract re-let, it was expected that the number of Direct Payment recipients would increase and so 4 additional staff have joined the Access to Resources Team that supports Direct Payment recipients and reviews their use of this money. This is a planned part of the transformation of Adults' Services which is delivering better outcomes for people and extending the hours that services are available, while reducing overall staff numbers.

COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday 18 September 2014

**Question by Ian Chittenden to David Brazier,
Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport**

For a number of years Kent County Council has allowed sponsors to advertise on roundabouts in Kent.

Counties such as Surrey use advertising as a means to directly enhance roundabouts with additional planting and regular maintenance, Kent has no such scheme.

In Maidstone for example, where the majority of roundabouts sit on prime entry roads for visitors to our county town, shrubs and trees are typically choked by grass and weeds. Beyond some low level grass cutting, there is minimal maintenance and there have been no new planting programs for many years.

Does the cabinet member agree that a change in policy is needed, to allow local businesses to sponsor roundabouts, generating landscaping funding which will once again allow us to give a proper Kentish welcome to the thousands of visitors to towns across the county?

Answer

Roundabout sponsorship is managed by Kent Commercial Services, and the income made from this is returned to KCC Finance as part of its annual dividend payment. Spending more money on roundabout maintenance would mean another area of spend would need to be reduced. However I am willing to look again at the arrangements for roundabout maintenance, and the scope for a more direct linkage between encouraging greater sponsorship and maintaining roundabouts to a higher, more presentable standard in future.

COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday 18 September 2014

**Question by Lee Burgess to Roger Gough,
Cabinet Member for Education & Health Reform**

As we are the Authority responsible for trying to meet the requirements for the Government's promise on free school meals, could you give me assurance on the following.

The funding provided by Central Government to KCC has been described as short of the mark and that's putting it kindly and no doubt we are going to have to prioritise where the money is most needed with the very real possibility that many schools will not get what they need.

The LGA has recently estimated that Council's will have to find an average of over £400,000. to meet the shortfall and I think for an authority of our size this could be a conservative estimate. Many schools will be disadvantaged thanks to poor government policy planning. Can you assure me that in light of the shortfall in funds that other budgets, that already face extreme pressure, will not be raided in our efforts to implement this policy?

Answer

KCC has been allocated £2.7 million capital funding for Local Authority schools.

In January, KCC asked schools to complete an online survey to enable an assessment as to how best to allocate the funds. It was identified that schools where the implementation of this initiative would have the most impact, were the 140 Kent schools without onsite cooking facilities and the local schools currently providing for them. Based on the results of this survey and using local knowledge, it was immediately identified that the allocated funding was not sufficient to complete all the capital works needed to fully deliver the proposed changes. It is estimated that to fully address the UIFSM initiative, the capital required would be nearer to £7M.

This £7m would have covered the cost of converting 50 of the 64 schools transporting in over 100 meals per day into production kitchens; placing additional cooking equipment in around 60 mother kitchens; providing additional equipment in 85 kitchens; and improving ventilation in around 30 schools.

The Schools Funding Forum approved a recommendation to manage the funds centrally and using criteria based on need in order to prioritise schools within the budget available, the following projects have been agreed: 12 new kitchens; improving facilities in 1 kitchen; 5 ventilation projects and additional equipment; plus 100 smaller projects.

In addition to the £2.7M allocated, £210k has been allocated from reactive maintenance within the planned Enhancement Budget for 2014/15 to fund 5 ventilation projects.

At this time we are working on estimated meal numbers and will not know the true impact until mid-September when all KS1 pupils are full time in school. There are a few schools who are very disappointed they were not selected to receive the amount of funding they had hoped for, and a number of schools that are concerned that their school hall capacity means that the number of sittings they now have to have will impact on curriculum time. All LA schools will be providing a hot meal for UIFSM in September plus any KS2 pupils entitled to a FSM or wishing to purchase one. The Children's Food Trust are providing advice and the Client Services team are working with caterers to look at solutions such as batch cooking, adapting menus, staggering lunchtime sittings etc.

KCC will not allocate any additional funding to this initiative but there are issues that may affect individual school budgets, such as additional midday meal supervision; additional rental costs for those using village halls; additional equipment.

In October another online survey will be sent to all schools to assess the position.

COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING
Thursday 18 September 2014
Question by Roger Truelove to
Roger Gough, Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform

“A recent open meeting in Sittingbourne for a group hoping to establish a Free Primary school attracted only 6 interested parents. Apart from a few isolated outbreaks of interest, do you agree that this reflects the prevailing lack of enthusiasm for Free Schools across the County of Kent?”

Answer

There are five free schools operating in Kent at present and two more in the pipeline to commence admitting pupils in September 2015. Kent County Council policy is to welcome the creation of Free Schools in areas where school places are required. Four out of the seven schools meet this expectation.

Kent County Council objected to the Secretary of State when consulted about three out of the seven schools because they did not meet our expectation of providing additional school places in locations where they were required.

The number of Free Schools is a tiny proportion of the total number of schools in Kent. In contrast Kent County Council is building seven brand new Primary Schools for September 2015 and there are several more planned for September 2016 and 2017.

The sponsors of Free Schools have all adopted slightly different models of public consultation, information and marketing. Our experience of expanding existing schools and building new ones over the past few years has demonstrated that public interest is generated when there are concrete proposals for new provision. There is less interest generated by initial generalised proposals for potential new provision in the area.

A stronger indication of the enthusiasm among parents for Free Schools is in their popularity once opened. Four out of the five operational Free Schools in Kent are oversubscribed and therefore popular with local parents. All five Free Schools are either full or nearly full in all their year groups.

It is our intention to continue our policy of welcoming Free Schools where they are needed, and continue our practice of engaging with Free School sponsors at the earliest possible stage.

This page is intentionally left blank