

ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT CABINET COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Environment & Transport Cabinet Committee held in the Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 9 April 2015.

PRESENT: Mrs P A V Stockell (Chairman), Mr M Baldock, Mr A H T Bowles, Mr C W Caller, Mr I S Chittenden, Dr M R Eddy, Mr M J Harrison, Mrs S V Hohler, Mr B E MacDowall, Mr J M Ozog, Mr C R Pearman, Mr C Simkins, Mr M E Whybrow and Mr M A Wickham

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

71. Apologies and Substitutes

(Item A1)

The Chairman welcomed those present including those registered to speak as part of the meeting and reported that item B5 would be moved up the agenda to B1 in order to accommodate those in attendance for that item.

Apologies for lateness were reported on behalf of Mr Caller, who would join the meeting later.

There were no further apologies received or substitutes reported.

72. Declarations of Interest by Members in items on the Agenda

(Item A2)

No declarations of interest were received.

73. Election of Vice-Chairman

(Item A3)

It was proposed by Mr Harrison and seconded by Mr Simpkin that Mr Pearman be appointed to the role of Vice Chairman.

There were no further nominations and following a vote Mr Pearman was duly elected.

74. Minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2015

(Item A4)

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 14 January 2015 were agreed as a correct record, subject to an amendment proposed by Mr Baldock to include details of the vote recorded in minute 13.

Although, the webcast was not clear as to a request received at the time; for the sake of clarity the details of the vote on Mr King's suggestion that the report be noted and not further discussed for reasons set out in the debate were as follows:

For: Stockell, Balfour, Simpkin, Harrison, Pearman and King
Against: Macdowell, Baldock, Caller, Eddy, Whybrow and Chittenden

The Chairman used her casting vote and the motion was carried.

75. Verbal updates

(Item A5)

1. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Mr Balfour, thanked Mr Brazier, his predecessor as Cabinet Member for his hard work and diligence and looked forward to the work ahead in his new role as portfolio holder, he went on to make the following comments and announcements:

- a. That John Burr had stepped down for six months from his duties as Director of Highways Transportation and Waste to focus on other areas of work and that Roger Wilkin, supported by three others, would be acting up as interim director.
- b. That David Hall had recently retired following many years of loyal service and that the gratitude of Members for his hard work should be expressed.
- c. Members were invited to visit Allington Waste Management Facility in the week commencing 25th May 2015. A date would be arranged following the meeting.
- d. The Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan would come to examination in public from the 14th April. Sharon Thompson and her team were thanked for the hard work over many years that had led to this document being produced. He also thanked Mr Brazier who would continue to oversee work on this important document.
- e. Statistics had been requested in relation to the Young persons Travel Pass and the current figures for passes issued was as follows:
 - i. 13,457 full year, full cost passes
 - ii. 1,267 full year, half price passes
 - iii. 7,765 second half year, full cost passes
 - iv. 209 second half year, half price passes
 - v. 1,349 young carer / local authority child in care full year, no cost passes
 - vi. 465 carers, full year no cost passes
 - vii. 24,512 passes in circulation as at 10 march.

It was agreed that a note would be circulated following the meeting to members containing the details reported.

- f. That, as reported at County Council, there were several distinct issues ongoing regarding street lighting:
 - i. How the council came to introduce part night lighting and other changes to policy which would be considered by a special meeting of the Scrutiny Committee for that purpose.
 - ii. The need to establish criteria for requests received to turn lights on again which had been turned off as part of the part night lighting exercise and this would be considered at the July meeting of the Cabinet Committee. Mr Balfour requested that any member with ideas for relevant criteria put them forward for consideration.

- iii. Finally the issue of lighting requirements and criteria in the future should LED lighting be in place would need to be fully considered and agreed and it was likely that a report would be brought before the committee in November.
 - g. That issues related to Border controls had recently been publicised in the media and following work with the tunnel operators and the Dover Port Authority, a mini 'operation stack' arrangement had been agreed should it be required. Any further issues would result in full 'operation stack' procedures. He assured members that work continued toward Lorry Park solutions across the county
- 2. The Cabinet Member for Communities, Mr Hill provided updates on the following:
 - a. Community wardens: Following a meeting with KALC a pilot scheme for volunteer wardens was to be established. These volunteers would be known as Local Warden Support Officers and it was hoped that the pilot would be in place by mid-September 2015. Should the scheme be successful, full implementation was planned for September 2016.
 - b. That a new Chief Coroner for England and Wales had been appointed and he and Barbara Cooper had held a positive meeting with him in February. He hoped that work could now begin to slowly move Kent toward a single full time Coroner for the county.

The following comments were made by members of the Committee and Cabinet Members:

1. That should members of the public be confused as to the status of the decision regarding night lighting and any potential 'switching on' then members should be clear that a full debate and further consideration would be undertaken before any decision was made.
2. That the new arrangements for traffic management at Dover should be monitored to assess their effectiveness.
3. That LED lighting had been implemented in some areas with great success and should be welcomed by members.
4. That figures on the Young Persons Travel Pass were welcomed and additionally Bus Pass information would be useful to members.
5. That the precise duties of those officers undertaking different elements of John Burr's previous workload under the Interim Director be circulated to members in order that they may direct queries appropriately.

The following comments were made by Cabinet Members and officers in response to questions raised by members of the Committee:

1. That further consideration would be given to a suggestion that 'Joint Communities Boards' might help to facilitate greater District and County Council communication, particularly over issues such as the success or otherwise of the Local Warden Support Officer scheme. A member of the Committee urged that should this type of Committee be introduced, the officers in attendance should be senior officers. In addition staffing and resources for any new Board should be made available without impact on existing mechanisms.

On this matter Barbara Cooper, Director of Growth, Environment and Transport reminded members of the District Deal process that would facilitate closer joint working and priority setting. Currently signed up to that process were Swale, Ashford, Tunbridge Wells and Tonbridge and Malling.

76. Extension of wood Waste Recycling Contract

(Item B1)

The Committee received a report seeking endorsement of, or recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport on, the proposed decision to extend the contract for Wood Waste recycling with Kent based company Countrystyle Recycling Ltd.

Roger Wilkin, Interim Director of Highways, Transportation and Waste was in attendance to speak to the item. He introduced the report and in particular referred to the following:

- i. That the contract provided for wood discarded at Kent County Council Household Waste sites to be collected and recycled, mainly as chipboard. This was considered to be better than the service offered by many other companies which often shredded wood for incineration to create power.
- ii. That the contract to date had performed well and had provided a good service whilst maintaining value for money, in a manner that was in line with Kent County Council's strategic vision being, as it was, procured in partnership with another authority.
- iii. That in order to demonstrate the benefit of an extension to the existing contract work had been done to ascertain whether other authorities had better provision of the same or equivalent service and this had not been the case.

Following comments made and questions raised by members, officers provided the following further information:

- i. That Countrystyle were required to provide shipment notices to show that wood collected had been sent to a suitable board making company and would therefore be recycled.
- ii. That although there was a cost to the contract, as was the case for most of the materials recycled by Kent County Council, the method in general, and the contract in particular, provided better value than other types of disposal costing approximately half that of other methods.
- iii. That although the wood would be suitable for use as biomass it was preferred that it be recycled as chipboard or other material in order to promote a circular economy in Kent, where materials are used and reused multiple times. This was not the case when wood was utilised as biomass as it could not be used again after that.

Members welcomed the report and news that the contract delivered well. Some debate was had regarding the level of detail contained within the report, but the sentiment was positive about its purpose and it was suggested that the service be advertised more widely in order to encourage further deposits.

Mr Bowles, seconded by Mr Chittenden proposed that the extension of the contract by Cabinet Member decision be endorsed. The motion was put to the vote and carried.

It was RESOLVED that the proposed cabinet member decision be endorsed.

77. Highways and Transportation Schemes Funded through the South East Local Enterprise Partnership
(Item B2)

The Committee received a report seeking endorsement of, or recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport on, a proposed decision to give approval to the necessary actions for progression and completion of highway and transportation improvement schemes funded following successful bids to central government via the South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP).

The schemes in question were:

- Tonbridge Town Centre Regeneration Scheme, in drg. No. 4300127/000/11
- North Deal Transport Improvements, in drg. No. NDTI-1
- Maidstone Sustainable access to Employment areas, in drg. No. MSAEA-1
- Sittingbourne Town Centre Regeneration, in drg. No. STCR-1
- A26 London Rd/Speldhurst Rd/Yew Tree Rd, Tunbridge Wells, in drg. No. KCC/LTP/YTR/001
- West Kent Local Sustainable Transport Fund and
- Kent Thameside Local Sustainable Transport Fund.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport introduced the report for members; he welcomed the report and the opportunity for some of these projects to finally be fulfilled after being aspired to for many years.

Ann Carruthers, Head of Strategic Planning and Policy was in attendance to speak to the item. She reminded members that KCC had secured £100million for 21 transport projects through successful bids to the Local Growth Fund, applied for and administered by the LEP. The report before members, she explained, sought endorsement of the processes needed to take forward seven of the schemes to be undertaken with these funds, three of which had had business plans approved by the LEP already.

Ms Carruthers briefly expanded on each scheme for the benefit of those members not familiar with them.

Ms Carruthers also reported that although the report stated that monies would be paid to KCC **quarterly** in advance, since the report had been written agreement had been secured from government that funding would come **annually** in advance.

In response to comments made and questions raised by members, Ms Carruthers provided the following further information:

- i. That it was acknowledged that the 'North Deal' scheme was actually in 'Middle Deal' ward but it was felt that for the sake of consistency that the name not be changed from that which was originally submitted via the LEP when communicating with the LEP. KCC however could refer to the scheme by the "Middle Deal" title for its own purposes.
- ii. That KCC had new responsibilities in relation to drainage from 1 April 2015 and as a result would be a statutory consultee on all new developments, in the

case of the North Deal project, and others, it would be an issue that would be investigated carefully and recommendations made as appropriate.

- iii. That promotion of safe cycling was one of many issues that would be discussed with developers and which they would be encouraged to promote where appropriate, including on the North Deal project should this be the case in those circumstances.

Other comments from members were as follows:

- i. Surprise was expressed from one member that the Sittingbourne Town Centre project continued to be pursued in the face of public concern. In particular the drop off point at the station was referenced and the intended new space for buses as areas of concern. The scheme, he argued, had not considered properly the needs of the western end of the town by building housing on space currently utilised for parking. Finally the same member argued that the scheme did not provide answers to the issues faced by those travelling east to west across Sittingbourne; proposed new roundabouts and traffic signals would only serve to make the journey more complicated.
- ii. Those views were countered by another member, who felt that the scheme was a good one, properly supported by the democratic process which it had been subject to.
- iii. That the Maidstone schemes were welcomed by Maidstone members and regular updates on each would be requested to the JTB meetings.
- iv. Some debate was undertaken as to whether the issues were properly considered at District, County or LEP level but a general consensus was reached that all parties had separate, but overlapping, interest in the schemes.

It was proposed by Mr Bowles and seconded by Mr Chittenden that the decision as set out by the Cabinet Member for approval, be endorsed

It was RESOLVED that the proposed decision be endorsed.

78. Street Lighting Conversion to LED *(Item B3)*

The Committee received a report seeking endorsement of the proposed decision to convert Kent's stock of street lighting to LED and recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport on the same. Details of the indicative costs and contractual arrangements were set out within the report. The full details of the decision were set out at Appendix A and included:

- Approval for the procurement of the services to supply and fit LED lanterns to the County Council's stock of street lights,
- Award of a 15 year maintenance contract to the preferred bidder with potential extension.

Behdad Haratbar, Head of Programmed Works and Rob Clark, LED Project Manager, were in attendance to speak to the item and on introducing the report to members referred to the following:

- i. That Kent County Council was one of the largest street lighting authorities in the country with responsibility for approximately 118,000 street lights and

- 25,000 LED signs and bollards. The running cost to the council was currently approximately £9.5million per annum.
- ii. That the conversion to LED was expected to cost around £40million and save around £5.2million annually.
 - iii. That a two day non-binding market engagement exercise had been undertaken and from this three options had emerged. These were as follows:
 - Option 1 – KCC to procure the supply and implementation of LED lighting with responsibility for the stock reverting to KCC on completion and after the 12 – 24 month guarantee period.
 - Option 2 – KCC to procure supply and implementation of the conversion and the long term management of the converted stock.
 - Option 3 – Ask the market to fund the conversion and undertake long term maintenance which would be akin to PFI
 - iv. The three options had been considered by the CAB in March 2015 and option 2 recommended for endorsement by the Cabinet Committee and ultimately approval by the Cabinet Member

The following further information was provided by officers in response to questions from members:

- i. That all District and Parish Councils would be contacted in order that a full list of lighting controlled by other authorities could be compiled. Following that exercise the preferred bidder would, by inclusion in the contractual terms and conditions, offer District and Parish Councils access to the contract rates.
- ii. That the Scrutiny Committee was scheduled to consider the adoption and implementation of the safe and sensible street lighting policy in 2010 but that this was a separate issue from the proposed decision before the Committee.. A further decision would be required should changes be made to lighting policy, in particular, the illumination levels. The policy in this regards will be the subject of a report to a future meeting of the Committee.
- iii. The conversion programme as a whole would not require lights to be reconnected to the mains. This was due to the LED connection being connected above the sub fuse, owned by the Council.
- iv. That implementation would be phased, starting in the residential areas with main routes and town centres to follow.
- v. The £18million funding gap was being funded through the County Council's Capital Programme
- vi. LED would provide improved lighting as shown by the experience of other authorities and trials in Kent.

Mr Bowles put forward an amendment, seconded by Mr Baldock to the proposed decision for endorsement that liaison take place with KALC in order to formalise the engagement with Parish and District Councils referred to by officers. The amendment was carried by a majority and included with in the substantive motion.

It was RESOLVED that the substantive motion to endorse the proposed decision as amended be AGREED.

79. Commons Act 2006 - Introduction of fees for specified applications
(Item B4)

The Committee received a report seeking endorsement of, or recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport on, a proposed decision to introduce fees in accordance with the detail set out in Appendix A of the report in respect of applications under the Commons Act 2006 following changes to legislation introduced in December 2014.

Mr Paul Crick, Director of Environment, Planning and Enforcement, was in attendance to speak to the item and introduced the report for members; in particular he referred to the following:

- i. That changes to legislation in December 2014 now allowed Council's to cover the costs of applications made under the Commons Act 2006 such as registering village greens etc.
- ii. The proposals before the committee were to recover costs where applications were for the benefit of the landowner.

The issue was opened for debate and following questions from members officers clarified the following matters:

- i. That the missing words in the report should read 'village greens'
- ii. The creation of a 'right of common' was a technical term which was not related to the right of access it referred to very old rights such as the right to graze cattle and so were for the benefit of the applicant and not the wider community as may be first assumed.
- iii. That the £50 per hour fee for officer time to process application was the standard fee currently charged by the Public Rights of Way Team on other paid for applications, and was deemed to be appropriate in this case also. It was reviewed on an annual basis.
- iv. No charges had been made for this service in the past.
- v. That it was possible to de-register a village green in limited circumstances but should the land be of a size over 250sqm the landowner would be required to provide alternative land in exchange.

It was proposed by Mr Pearman and seconded by Mr Ozog that the cabinet member decision as set out in the report for approval be endorsed.

80. Canterbury District Transport Plan
(Item B5)

80. Canterbury District Transport Plan
(Item B5)

The Committee received a report setting out the proposed decision of the Cabinet Member to endorse the principles of the Canterbury local Transport Strategy. The Chairman explained that the report was returned to the Committee despite having been discussed previously owing to a number of administrative errors that, whilst not substantive, could have called in to question the proper consideration of the matter by the Committee.

The Chairman had agreed that three members of the public may speak to the item, Ms Barwick, Mr Hirst and Mr Baker, as well as local member for Canterbury City South West, Mr Vye.

Ms Barwick addressed the committee. She referred to the Car parking strategy to gradually reduce car by the means of parking tariffs to encourage park and ride and sustainable transport, at paragraph 462 of the strategy. As Chairman of the Canterbury Independent Traders Alliance, and representing their views at that time, she held the following:

- i. That the City Council policy of reducing car parking spaces, by 18% as identified in the strategy, would have a detrimental effect on small business and shops in Canterbury city centre.
- ii. That figures showed that businesses had already suffered as a result of the policy to date. Referring to papers handed out at the beginning of the meeting showing a reduction of car visits and a reduction in park and ride use to the city centre, each, it was claimed, costing businesses £35 per trip not taken.
- iii. That the letter from the Chief Executive and Leader of Canterbury City Council containing assurances for KCC in relation to this element of the strategy and included in the papers for the meeting, had not been adhered to to date and as such should not be relied upon by Kent County Council.

Finally Ms Barwick urged the Committee to only endorse the transport strategy with a recommendation that reference to city centre parking closures be removed.

Mr Baker addressed the Committee; he particularly referred to the issue of parking at Canterbury West Railway Station. He argued that, since the introduction of high speed rail at that location, patronage had increased dramatically placing additional and unsustainable pressure on car parking spaces. He maintained that all 120 available spaces were taken by 10am each day, with approximately 15 regular commuters already parking in the nearby city council car park intended for casual rail users and shoppers. A copy of a petition signed by 49 taxi drivers who also supported an increase in spaces in order that they had a designated waiting area had been distributed before the meeting.

Mr Baker also referred to the findings of an independent consultant who had recommended that 120 parking spaces were needed at that location. He argued that not only was that figure not met, being only 99 currently, but that the City Council intended to reduce that number, citing as evidence the Local Plan which identified both the overflow car park and the city council car park for development. He urged the committee to seek further assurance that there would be no reduction in car parking in that location without alternative arrangements in place and that he and the taxi drivers referred to previously asked the committee to also encourage Canterbury City Council to utilise the unused railway depot on Railway Road for additional parking.

Mr Hirst, a Canterbury City Councillor, addressed the Committee. He referred again to the letter that had been sought and received from the Chief Executive and Leader of Canterbury County Council containing assurances regarding the parking strategy and argued that it did not satisfy the concerns that had led to it being requested. He was concerned that it did not mention railway station parking nor did it require evidence of public support for any future disposal of car parking space. He maintained that this would allow the sale of car parking spaces even where consultation showed that it was unpopular and cited the recent agreement of the Canterbury City Council Executive to sell spaces at Ivy Lane as evidence of this.

Furthermore he urged the committee not to rely on the letter as it had not been democratically agreed by Canterbury City Council elected members and the signatories would not be in place for the life of the Local Plan. He claimed that it was not good practice that the Transport Strategy, a public document, was not in line with views expressed in a private letter which would not be considered as part of the inspection in public of the Local Plan.

For all of those reasons, he urged the Committee to disregard the letter and only endorse the proposed Cabinet Member decision to endorse the strategy if the strategy itself was in line with the views of the County Council, without the need for any additional assurance and also asked the Committee to recommend that further assurances be sought from Canterbury City Council that any spare land be bought forward for additional parking spaces.

Mr Vye, local member for Canterbury City South West addressed the Committee, he believed that the strategy was undeliverable for three reasons:

- i. The 4000 houses identified for building in South Canterbury;
and the concomitant
- ii. Off-slip at The Bridge interchange
- iii. The off-slip from the A2 at Wincheap

He continued in order to explain his concerns and in particular referred to the following:

- i. That the complicated nature of people's movements across and around the city centre had not been properly considered.
- ii. That he did not believe it would be possible to create an off-slip at Wincheap based on developer contributions from the Wincheap Industrial Estate and that without them and the intended off-slip, congestion in the area would become unmanageable, particularly along the A28
- iii. That there were no sensible mitigation proposals for the proposed development of 4000 houses in South Canterbury and congestion on both the old and new Dover Roads was likely to be increased, particularly if lanes were squeezed to create an additional bus lane.

He concluded by welcoming the most part of the strategy, particularly the emphasis on cycling and urged the Committee and Cabinet Member to consider the endorsement of the strategy with the three projects to which his concerns were addressed included, very carefully.

The Chairman requested that the members of the public now left the table and brought Ruth Goudie, Strategic Transportation and development Planner, KCC to address the Committee.

Ms Goudie brought the following information to the attention of the Committee:

- i. That a report had been considered, and the principles endorsed, by the Committee in December 2014. However, the draft strategy presented at that time had not been the most up to date and therefore had not included some of the changes made by the Executive at Canterbury City Council nor the JTB as it should have. The report was therefore returned with the current version of

the strategy appended and the amendments detailed within the report. The two major amendments were:

- The removal of a reference to a site identified for a fourth park and ride at Harbledown
- Additional clarity that city centre parking would only be reduced if evidence that there would continue to be an adequate overall supply and following a public consultation.

Finally Ms Goudie apologised for the inconvenience caused by the administrative error at the last meeting and asked the committee to endorse the principles of the updated strategy and the proposed Cabinet Member decision once more.

The Chairman opened the floor to members and the following comments were made:

- i. That the wishes of the members of the public appeared to be satisfied within the report.
- ii. That the strategy referred to the reduction in car parking as having been promoted as part of the 'Park Plan' but that for the consent of the public to a direction of travel in 2015 should not be assumed from a document adopted in 1989.
- iii. That the letter from the Leader and Chief Executive of Canterbury City Council, referred to by speakers, suggested that the plans and proposals being considered would, if adopted, have status beyond the current administration and would be binding on future administrations. If that were the case it would be contrary to the fundamental principles of democracy inherent in the British system of governance.
- iv. That neither the strategy nor the principles inherent within it should be endorsed before an open and honest investigation in to what is proposed had taken place.
- v. That the principles for which the committee and ultimately the Cabinet Members endorsement were sought were undermined by some of the detail and conversely, lack of detail within the draft strategy.
- vi. That the welcoming of assurances from Canterbury City Council, a reference to the letter, should be deleted as it could not be relied upon.
- vii. That it was difficult to identify where the principles of the strategy were contrary to the aims and objectives of Kent County Council and its plans as a highway authority and therefore endorsement should follow.
- viii. That the detail of the strategy was a matter for Canterbury City Council and should not be considered by the County Council.
- ix. That if the County Council did not support the City Council in its adoption of an appropriate and democratically determined Local Plan it would leave the area vulnerable to inappropriate and unwanted development, often on green field sites.
- x. That the JTB had requested that the Roper Road site should be considered by the City Council as overflow, or new parking, for the Railway station but that this did not appear to have happened.

The Corporate Director and Cabinet Member made the following comments in response to parts of the debate:

- i. That the heavy emphasis on developer contributions to meet infrastructure needs was appropriate for Canterbury but it was recognised that it would not be possible in some other areas of Kent and the Growth and Infrastructure Framework was intended to identify such funding gaps and potential funding solutions, such as LEP funding.
- ii. That insertion of the word 'generally' into the recommendation regarding developer contributions was not considered necessary as it already included the word 'largely' as opposed to exclusively.
- iii. That the Canterbury Local Plan had already been placed 'on deposit' and would in the near future be subject to an 'examination in public'. It was for this examination that the support of Kent County Council to the Transport element of the local plan was important to its successful passage to adoption. It was recognised that best practice would be to work alongside districts in order to place on deposit a document already supported by both the District and the County.
- iv. That the wording in recommendation 2. Be amended to include the words "Canterbury City Council and" after "Where this is the case".

It was RESOLVED by a vote of 12 in favour to 2 against that the recommendations within the report be agreed with a minor amendment to the wording of recommendation 2. as noted above.

Mr Baldock and Mr MacDowell requested that their votes against the proposed recommendations be recorded.

81. Work Programme 2015

(Item C1)

Cabinet Committee received the work programme report, presented by Mr Balfour. He reported that the entry relating to Allington Waste Management Facility would not be a key decision as listed but instead a report for consideration. The additional meeting to be held in November, in order to consider LED lighting, had not been agreed at the time of writing and would be included in the next work programme.

It was resolved that, subject to the amendments reported by the Cabinet Member, the Work Programme be AGREED.

82. Growth, Environment and Transport Directorate Business Plan (2015-2016)

(Item D1)

Cabinet Committee received a report outlining the draft Growth, Environment & Transport Directorate Business Plan (2015-16) for consideration and comment, prior to publication online in May 2015.

The Cabinet Members present both welcomed the document and commended the way in which it had been written.

The Business Plan set out how the Directorate would deliver against the Strategic Outcomes agreed at County Council.

Barbara Cooper, Director of Growth, Environment and Transport introduced the Plan for the committee and described its key elements, including significant upcoming projects and transformation work.

She also highlighted information on commissioning and procurement timetables which would enable members to manage committee agendas according to important future contracts.

Mrs Cooper welcomed comments on the draft.

The following comments were made:

1. That the document was of very high quality and would be a useful tool for members.
2. That as the future of libraries was considered it was of concern that targets missed in the 2014/15 budget had been further reduced for 2015/16. In response Mrs Cooper reported that the failure to meet the 2014/15 target was as a result of IT issues restricting public access to the service via the website and that this had now been resolved.
3. That descriptions, in the form of a glossary, of terms used and of the current providers listed within the document would be welcomed. In addition it was suggested that as contracts were awarded, information for members about the company would be welcomed including contact information for officers responsible.

It was agreed that, with the comments of the committee duly noted by the Director and Cabinet Member, the draft business plan be NOTED.

83. Risk Management - Strategic Risk Register (Item D2)

Cabinet Committee received a report presenting the strategic risks relating to the Environment & Transport Committee remit. The paper also explained the management process for review of key risks.

Mark Scrivener, Corporate Risk Manager, was in attendance to present the report to the Committee who reported that the risk register complimented the Business Plan already considered by the Committee and set out any risks to the achievement of targets within it.

He explained that the register was a 'living' document and continued to be managed and maintained as appropriate.

It was agreed that the report be NOTED.

84. Performance Dashboard (Item D3)

The Cabinet Committee received a report setting out the Environment and Transport Performance Dashboard, which showed progress made against targets set for Key Performance Indicators.

Richard Fitzgerald, Performance Manager was in attendance to introduce the report and take questions from members.

He highlighted a performance issues of interest to the members present including:

- Street lighting repairs related to the contractor and for which actions were in now place
- An increase in recycling that saw total figures at close to 50%.
- An improvement in income in performance for Kent Scientific Services that meant that income generation had now improved and was on target.

The following comments were received from members:

- That target HT03 related to connection of street lights and not to repair and that HT03d could be more usefully reported by providing details of repairs conducted. Mr Wilkin agreed that greater detail could be provided for members wherever they would like to see it and in a form that was most useful
- That actual numbers should be included alongside percentages in all cases
- That targets should be stretched as appropriate to encourage high achievement. Officers and the Cabinet Member assured Committee members that targets were continually reviewed in order that they were set at an appropriate level.

It was agreed that the report be NOTED.

85. Development of a Growth and Infrastructure Framework for Kent and Medway - Presentation
(Item E1)

Cabinet Committee was due to receive a presentation from Paul Crick, Director of Environment, Planning and Enforcement detailing progress on the development of a Growth and Infrastructure Framework for Kent and Medway but owing to technical issues it was not possible to screen the presentation and the Committee agreed to receive information on the Framework at a future meeting.

Cabinet would receive the presentation at its next meeting, scheduled for 27 April and members could attend that meeting, in addition it would continue to be discussed by the Committee and would be circulated to members.

86. Process for Reviewing the Kent Environment Strategy
(Item E2)

Cabinet Committee received a report setting out for information the process, timescale and subsequent consultation for the review of the Kent Environment Strategy, including opportunities for Members to engage and provide feedback.

It was agreed that the process be ENDORSED.