

# **SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, 9th November, 2016**

**10.00 am**

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







## **AGENDA**

### **SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, 9th November, 2016, at 10.00 am**  
**Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone**

Ask for: **Joel Cook/Anna Taylor**  
Telephone: **03000 416892/416478**

#### **Membership**

Conservative (6): Mr R J Parry (Chairman), Mr J E Scholes (Vice-Chairman),  
Mr E E C Hotson, Mr A J King, MBE, Mr L B Ridings, MBE and  
Mrs P A V Stockell

UKIP (2) Mr H Birkby and Mr R A Latchford, OBE

Labour (2) Mr G Cowan and Mr R Truelove

Liberal Democrat (1): Mrs T Dean, MBE

Church Mr D Brunning, Mr Q Roper and Mr A Tear

Representatives (3):

Parent Governor (2): Mr P Garten and Mr G Lawrie

*Tea/coffee will be available 15 minutes before the start of the meeting*

*County Councillors who are not Members of the Committee but who wish to ask questions at the meeting are asked to notify the Chairman of their questions in advance.*

#### **Webcasting Notice**

Please note: this meeting may be filmed for the live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site or by any member of the public or press present. The Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be filmed by the Council

By entering into this room you are consenting to being filmed. If you do not wish to have your image captured please let the Clerk know immediately.

### **UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

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

#### **A - Committee Business**

- A1 Introduction/Webcast Announcement
- A2 Substitutes
- A3 Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this Meeting
- A4 Minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2016 (Pages 5 - 10)
- A5 Energy Security Select Committee - 3 months on from County Council Implementation Plan (Pages 11 - 16)
- A6 Grammar Schools and Social Mobility Select Committee - 3 months on from County Council Implementation Plan (Pages 17 - 28)

#### **B - Any items called-in - None for this meeting**

#### **C - Any items placed on the agenda by any Member of the Council for discussion**

- C1 Progress Report of the Growth and Infrastructure Framework (Pages 29 - 36)
- C2 Motion to exclude the press and public

That under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

### **EXEMPT ITEMS**

*(During these items the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the press and public)*

- C3 Exempt minute from the meeting of the Committee held on 21 September 2016 (Pages 37 - 40)

John Lynch  
Head of Democratic Services  
03000 410466

**Tuesday, 1 November 2016**

## KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

---

### SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Scrutiny Committee held in the Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Wednesday, 21 September 2016.

PRESENT: Mr R J Parry (Chairman), Mr J E Scholes (Vice-Chairman), Mr G Cowan, Mr D L Brazier (Substitute for Mr A J King, MBE), Mr J A Davies (Substitute for Mr L B Ridings, MBE), Mrs T Dean, MBE, Mr E E C Hotson, Mr R A Latchford, OBE, Mrs P A V Stockell, Mr A Terry (Substitute for Mr H Birkby) and Mr R Truelove

ALSO PRESENT: Mr M A C Balfour and Mr M C Dance

IN ATTENDANCE: Mrs B Cooper (Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport), Mr D Smith (Director of Economic Development), Mr B Watts (General Counsel (Interim)), Mrs L Whitaker (Democratic Services Manager (Executive)), Mr P Sass (Head of Democratic Services) and Mrs A Taylor (Scrutiny Research Officer)

### UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

#### **107. Minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2016** (Item A4)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 106 were an accurate record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

#### **Suspension of Procedure Rules**

The Chairman read a statement as follows:

“The constitution states that Members of a Cabinet Committee may serve as ordinary or substitute members of the Scrutiny Committee, UNLESS the Scrutiny Committee is dealing with an item that has been considered by the Cabinet Committee on which they serve. In these circumstances, they should take no part in the debate or vote on the item. (*Appendix 4 Part 4: Additional Rules applying to the Scrutiny Committee and Select Committees, para 4.1(2)*)

Both Mrs Dean and Mr Latchford are members of the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee which has previously considered the consultation protocol.

Similarly Mr Brazier (who is substituting for Mr King) and Mr Truelove are members of the Growth Economic Development and Communities Cabinet Committee which has previously received reports on the Regional Growth Fund schemes

The Scrutiny Committee has the power to suspend procedure rules, as set out in *Appendix 4, Part 2, para 2.13: Suspension of Procedure Rules*

And thus the Scrutiny Committee is asked to agree to suspend the procedure rule as set out in Appendix 4, Part 4, para 4.1(2) for items C1 & C2 to enable Mr Brazier,

Mrs Dean, Mr Latchford and Mr Truelove to take part in the debate and, if necessary, vote on the items.”

This was agreed.

RESOLVED that the Committee agree to suspend the procedure rule as set out in Appendix 4, Part 4, para 4.1(2) for items C1 & C2 to enable Mr Brazier, Mrs Dean, Mr Latchford and Mr Truelove to take part in the debate and, if necessary, vote on the items.

### **Thanks to Peter Sass**

The Chairman announced that it would be the last formal meeting at Kent County Council (KCC) for Peter Sass, Head of Democratic Services. He had been an excellent and very helpful officer. The Committee wished to formally record its strong thanks to Mr Sass for all the positive things he had done for Scrutiny and during his time at KCC, the Committee wished Mr Sass every success in his new role at Wandsworth Council.

### **108. KCC's Consultation Protocol (response to consultations received), clarification of the requirement to inform Local Members, following KCC's response to planning application OL/TH/16/0550 (Stone Hill Park - Manston) (Item C1)**

1. Mr Latchford introduced this item explaining that in July 2015 KCC unanimously supported the Manston site remaining as an airfield and a motion was agreed to keep an open mind on the future of Manston. However on 30 August 2016 a letter was written from Kent County Council to Thanet District Council (TDC) 'strongly supporting' the Stone Hill Planning application. Mr Latchford asked on who's authority was the letter sent. It was Mr Latchford's understanding that elected Members decided on policy and officers supported that policy. Mr Latchford also confirmed that he had not been consulted, advised or informed before the letter was sent and this was in breach of the constitution.
2. A Member confirmed that the Consultation Protocol had previously been considered by the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee and that the Cabinet Committee had accepted generally that the local member should have been involved and that the protocol should include such a reference to local member involvement.
3. There was support for Mr Latchford that the letter sent was ill-advised and that it should have been constructed advising that KCC would strongly support any application which would bring about regeneration in Thanet and that Members all wanted the best for the site, however the letter had been badly worded.
4. Mr Balfour confirmed that there had been discussions around the use of the site and there had been a resolution at County Council to support a viable use for the land at Manston. The Cabinet Member apologised for not keeping the local members informed of progress, it was not general practice to ask the opinion of local members on the response to planning applications. KCC was a consultee on planning applications and this differed from being consulted on planning matters – where members were consulted. The Cabinet Member did not

consider it appropriate for members to tell officers how to respond to planning applications, however in the past discussions had been held between members to ensure certain points were taken into consideration in responses.

5. Mrs Cooper explained that the Council dealt with many planning applications, this was a delegation to officers within the council. On planning application responses officers had not previously consulted members, largely members had approached officers if there were issues to raise. Mrs Cooper apologised as this was not in line with the consultation protocol, however she had been consistent with how this had been dealt with. Mrs Cooper did not accept that this was a policy decision, but it was written in accordance with the motion agreed at County Council in July 2015. At a previous meeting with the Scrutiny Chairman and Spokespeople they had requested that Mrs Cooper send a follow up letter to TDC outlining that the 30 August letter did not indicate a preference for the development outlined in the planning application. This letter was sent to TDC on 21 September and a letter would be circulated to Scrutiny Committee Members.
6. Mr Latchford confirmed that not only did he not know that the 30 August letter had been sent to TDC, but many conservative members were not aware of it. Mr Latchford made the Committee aware of a letter written by Mr Balfour, on behalf of the Leader, to Sir Roger Gale which stated that the letter sent was based on the professional judgement of officers. Mr Latchford asked whether officers were empowered to support policy which had not been agreed by elected members.
7. Mr Watts, KCC's interim General Counsel with monitoring officer responsibilities, explained that he was relatively new in post and had dealt with a number of issues relating to local member engagement in recent months, it was necessary that members and officers were clear on their responsibilities and obligations, and that members had timely access to the information that they required to enable them to carry out their jobs. The consultation protocol aimed to regularise member engagement elements set out within the constitution to ensure clarity for members and officers and, with the experience of recent issues, this would be looked at again. Mr Watts would be speaking to the opposition group leaders to ensure that the protocol more accurately reflected the views of the council with the flow of information between members and officers. Mr Watts would also be undertaking some training with Corporate Management Team around the responsibilities and obligations within the constitution which would give officers an opportunity to share their concerns.
8. The Chairman asked Mr Watts to confirm as soon as possible with the Corporate Directors that if in doubt it was better to inform than not.
9. In response to Mr Latchford's query about the creation of policy in the response to the planning application Mr Watts expressed his view that the letter in response to the planning application was not a policy decision, but a response which was consistent with the broad council decision in 2015 which stated the following:

*"RESOLVED that we the elected members of KCC wish it to be known that we fully support the continued regeneration of Manston and East Kent and will keep an open mind on whether that should be a business park or an airport, depending upon the viability of such plans and their ability to deliver significant economic growth and job opportunity."*

10. In response to a query from the Vice Chairman Mr Watts confirmed that he would, through members desk, seek information from Members and gain from their experience.
11. Mr Balfour clarified the wording within his letter dated 20 September 2016 and read paragraphs from the letter confirming that the response to the planning application sent to TDC on 30 August was based on the professional judgement of officers and was largely technical in content. It did not form any position on the use of the Manston Airport site for aviation purposes as it was specifically a response to this particular application.
12. A Member clarified that the 'strongly supports' phrase had largely been mitigated by the second letter to TDC clarifying that KCC was not expressing a preference towards this application. There was concern that the response to the planning application was too enthusiastic.
13. Mrs Cooper confirmed that the mitigating letter had been sent to the officer dealing with the planning application to ensure that they would be considered side by side. KCC had had meetings, as requested, with airport promoters and had not acted in any preferential way.
14. The crucial issue was how elected members of the council were consulted in future and to ensure that local members were aware of what was happening in their area. Mr Watts confirmed that he would discuss this with members to ensure that the provisions within the constitution were understood by officers within the council.
15. A Member queried whether, if an aviation planning application had arrived, it would have been strongly supported. The Member also praised a recent briefing on the Maidstone Local Plan – this had been an excellent, non-statutory exercise, and lessons could be learnt from the way in which it was held.
16. A Member commented on the meeting held between the Cabinet Member, Corporate Director, Scrutiny Chairman and Opposition Group Leaders and following a discussion the Cabinet Member and Corporate Director accepted that an error had been made and apologised for it. Some common sense was needed in the way that Members were made aware of issues affecting their area and it was thought that had KCC had an application from an aviation company it would have responded in the same way, this was supported by other scrutiny committee members.
17. The Cabinet Member suggested that he would write to each planning authority in Kent to ensure that, in future, Members receive every planning application which had been validated in their electoral area.
18. In response to a question from a member Ms Cooper confirmed that she was responsible for the words 'strongly support' within the letter dated 30 August. She explained that the mitigating letter sent to TDC had been sent at the first opportunity following officer leave over the summer.



19. It was confirmed, by members, that County Council Members representing electoral divisions in the Thanet had not been contacted by TDC about this application.
20. Further to the Cabinet Members comment about consulting Members about every planning application validated within their electoral division a Member confirmed that he would not want this to result in a large amount of duplicated work.
21. The Chairman suggested that Members make any comments they have on the consultation protocol directly to Mr Watts. It was also important to note that Mr Watts had received positive experiences from Members.
22. Mr Watts confirmed that he now had a period of time to consult with Members and Officers. He undertook to write to all Members after Corporate Management Team on 13 October 2016. A working draft of the consultation protocol would be submitted to Scrutiny Committee Members before it was considered by the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee and Cabinet.

RESOLVED that the Scrutiny Committee

23. Thank Mr Balfour, Mrs Cooper, Mr Watts and Mrs Whitaker for attending the meeting for answering Members' questions,
24. Welcome the consultation protocol and reminds the officers of the need to inform and consult members and allow them to express their views which should be carefully considered before officers arrive at their decision.
25. Ask Mr Watts to ensure that the spirit of the intended changes be incorporated into the modus operandi of the County Council at the earliest opportunity.
26. Consider that there is no need to use the wording 'strongly support' in a consultation response of this kind.

### **Motion to Exclude the Press and Public**

RESOLVED that under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following business on grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

### **109. Regional Growth Fund Schemes - to follow** (Item C2)

1. The Chairman welcomed Mr Mark Dance, Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Mrs Barbara Cooper, Corporate Director and Mr David Smith, Director, Economic Development.
2. Mr Dance briefly outlined the Regional Growth Schemes and, along with his officers answered questions from the Scrutiny Committee Members.

RESOLVED that the Scrutiny Committee:

3. Thank Mr Dance, Mrs Cooper and Mr Smith for attending the meeting and answering Members questions on this item.
4. Request a report back at their meeting in November 2016 on one of the “Phoenix” companies, and Officers to produce a list of three ‘red’ companies for members to review one more company.

**From:** Matthew Balfour, Cabinet Member Environment and Transport  
Barbara Cooper, Corporate Director Growth, Environment and Transport

**To:** Scrutiny Committee – 9<sup>th</sup> November 2016

**Subject:** **ENERGY SECURITY SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT –  
Action Plan and 3 Month Update**

**Classification:** Unrestricted

**Past Pathway:**

**Future Pathway:** N/A

**Electoral Division:** All

**Summary:** Kent County Council (KCC) Energy Security Select Committee conducted a review of issues and opportunities relating to Energy Security in Kent and Medway, concluding with 15 recommendations that will contribute toward delivery of a sustainable affordable and secure energy supply .This paper provides a summary of the work undertaken so far and the work now underway to address those recommendations.

**Recommendations:** The Committee is asked to review and note the report and the attached annex.

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The KCC Energy Security Select Committee (the Select Committee) was established in November 2015 to identify the current local and national position with regard to energy security, the challenges we face, the actions we are already taking and to outline a number of recommendations which would contribute to promoting energy security in a sustainable, reliable and affordable manner, both at national and county-wide level. The aim was to provide an informative and objective review to further develop a joint Kent and Medway energy security strategy and inform the updating of the Kent Environment Strategy (KES), led by KCC's Sustainable Business and Communities team.
- 1.3. The report and recommendations were reported to the Cabinet on 25 April 2016 and were endorsed by the County Council on the 19 May 2016. As required by the Council's constitution, the Scrutiny Committee needs to be informed within three months of what action is being undertaken to deliver the recommendations. Due to the links between the Energy Security Select Committee update and the Growth and Infrastructure Framework update this item was postponed to the 9th November 2016 to enable both items to be heard at the same meeting.

## 2. Key Findings and Recommendations

- 2.1 The Select Committee report discusses and documents a number of key energy topics and issues that have significant impact on environment, economy, health and wellbeing of residents, business and public sector in Kent and Medway, covering:
  - State of play in terms of UK and Kent's energy consumption and

- generation, infrastructure, policy and current and future pressures;
- UK and overseas best practice for ensuring a sustainable, affordable and resilient supply of energy;
- Diversification opportunities for supply of energy from alternative, new and emerging technologies, and localized and community approaches to energy supply.

Recommendations made by the Select Committee are to be delivered by elected Members where stated, or otherwise by officers working in partnership with public, private and community sector partners.

- 2.2 Due to the strong links and strategic fit between the recommendations and the KES, the findings and recommendations of the Select Committee have been used to inform priorities within the Kent Environment Strategy (KES) and to develop specific actions within the implementation plan **Annex 1** provides an overview of the recommendations, their alignment to KES priorities and a summary of progress for the first three months since the report was finalised.

### 3. Conclusion

- 3.1 The issue and recommendations raised by the Energy Security Select Committee require members and officers to work together along with partner agencies to ensure actions are being delivered. This Committee's scrutiny is an important part of ensuring our obligations are being met.
- 3.2 Following the Scrutiny Committee's consideration, the next formal step will be to reconvene the Energy Security Select Committee to review progress after 12 months following the publication of their report.

**4. Recommendations:** Scrutiny Committee is asked review and note the report and the attached appendix.

### 5. Report Author

Carolyn McKenzie, Head of Sustainable Business and Communities, EPE  
[carolyn.mckenzie@kent.gov.uk](mailto:carolyn.mckenzie@kent.gov.uk)  
 +44 (0) 3000 413419

- 6. Annex:** Recommendations alignment with KES and Implementation Plan, and progress of delivery of recommendations to date, November 2016

### 7. Background Documents

Energy Security Select Committee Report, May 2016

**Annex 1:** A summary of the KCC Energy Security Select Committee recommendations, their alignment with the Kent Environment Strategy and its Implementation Plan, and progress to date in their delivery

Energy Security Select Committee Recommendations	Alignment of recommendations with Kent Environment Strategy and Implementation Plan	Progress
<p>Recommendations 1 to 6: The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport writes to the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change, to highlight key issues of concern for national and local energy security, such as:</p> <div><div>Page 13</div><div><div>1.</div><div>The importance of further new nuclear both nationally and for Kent (see Section 5.1, p.81)</div></div><div><div>2.</div><div>The need for the introduction of stronger national building standards, requiring both increased energy efficiency and generation measures in new developments (Section 5.1, p.84)</div></div><div><div>3.</div><div>The need for additional financial support and incentives for community energy projects following the reduction of the FiT (Section 4.2, p.76)</div></div><div><div>4.</div><div>The need for local authority control and management of any future energy efficiency schemes that replace ECO (Section 5.3, p.103)</div></div><div><div>5.</div><div>The need for energy utilities to produce and implement 25 year management plans, akin to those held by water utilities (Section 6.1, p.120)</div></div><div><div>6.</div><div>The need to ensure that the South-East CORE is adequately resourced and supported so as to facilitate the continued uptake of renewable (wind) energy within Kent (Section 4.2, p.74).</div></div></div>	<p><b>Theme 1 Priority 2.2:</b> Use our evidence bases to influence local, national and EU strategy and policy as appropriate</p> <p><b>Implementation Plan: Action BF2.2:</b> Develop targeted policy briefings based on evidence'</p> <p>This action is being amended to reflect the need for Cabinet Members/key partners e.g. the Chair of the Kent and Medway Sustainable Energy Partnership to write to the Secretary of State for Business Energy and Industrial Strategy on issues of key concern or opportunity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Recommendation is reflected in the Kent Environment Strategy and has been incorporated into the Kent Environment Strategy Implementation Plan</li><li>• The Chairman of the Kent and Medway Sustainable Energy Partnership (KMSEP) has written two letters to the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change regarding fuel poverty and the need for consistent funding schemes.</li><li>• Progress to date has been a little bit delayed due to a change in Prime Minister and changes to Government Departments.</li><li>• Contacts are now being established with the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), and a review of key energy issues is underway as a result of the Growth and Infrastructure Framework (GIF) and also to reflect the new Government's Priorities and influence of BREXIT.</li><li>• KCC also Chair the Association of the Directors of Environment, Planning and Transport (ADEPT) Energy Sub Group which is used as a means to influence Government.</li></ul>
<p>7: That KCC, working in partnership with relevant organisations, builds on the work of the Select Committee in identifying key opportunities and risks to Kent's energy infrastructure, ensuring the evidence base underpinning our energy security is up-to-date and robust (Section 2.4, p.35)</p>	<p><b>Theme 1 Priority 1.4:</b> Improve our understanding of risks and opportunities related to specific resource constraints such as water, energy and land</p> <p><b>Theme 3 Priority 8:</b> Influence Sustainable Growth Across the County</p> <p><b>Implementation Plan: Action SF8.2:</b> Identify energy needs for growth and how these can be met sustainably and ensuring that these are incorporated into the Growth and Infrastructure Framework (GIF) (e.g. district heating and community energy).</p>	<p>The detailed review of the GIF in 2017 will include reviewing the energy sections making clearer reference to the potential for renewable energy and heat networks, and the need for data in terms of understanding how much we consume and generate energy (energy balance)</p> <p>Work is already underway to consolidate what information Kent already has and where the gaps</p>

Energy Security Select Committee Recommendations	Alignment of recommendations with Kent Environment Strategy and Implementation Plan	Progress
		<p>are as part of the process for developing an evidence hub to inform future growth and establish Kent's energy balance.</p> <p>The remit of the Kent and Medway Sustainable Energy Partnership (KMSEP) is being broadened to incorporate energy security and identify key areas for collaboration.</p>
<p>8: That KCC leads by example through driving further energy saving and energy generation measures across its estate - in accordance with KCC's Carbon Management Plan - and in partnership with Kent social housing providers and districts (Section 4.1, p.67)</p>	<p><b>Theme 2 Priority 6.1:</b> Reduce negative impacts and maximise the resource efficiency of public sector services, setting out our public commitments for energy, waste and water use reduction</p> <p><b>Implementation Plan: Action MR6.1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update and widely communicate public commitments for energy, waste and water use reduction across local authorities</li> <li>• Identify and implement renewable energy opportunities across public sector estates, partnering with communities and businesses as appropriate</li> </ul>	<p>This activity is ongoing. To date £3million has been invested with more than £10million+ in energy savings.</p> <p>Additional SALIX SEALS funding has been granted to support schools with LED lighting.</p>
<p>9: That KCC creates a communications strategy strengthening its engagement with businesses and local communities to help them understand the benefit of reducing energy use and generating their own energy (Section 4.2, p.76)</p>	<p><b>Theme 1 Priority 3.3:</b> Develop an environmental communications and engagement strategy, improving awareness of priorities and supporting behaviour change</p> <p><b>Implementation Plan: Action BF3.3:</b> Develop a targeted environmental communications and engagement strategy and plan</p>	<p>Communications Strategy currently being developed , launch for 2017 .</p> <p>There are currently three energy related campaigns which are KCC and Kent wide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integration of energy issues into New Ways of Working;</li> <li>• Kent Warm Homes – residential energy efficiency and fuel poverty; and</li> <li>• Low Carbon Kent – specific work with business to improved energy efficiency.</li> </ul>
<p>10: That KCC investigates the feasibility of creating investment measures to develop local, low-carbon energy generation and diversification projects (Section 5.2, p.101)</p>	<p><b>Theme 2 Priority 6.1:</b> Reduce negative impacts and maximise the resource efficiency of public sector services, setting out our public commitments for energy, waste and water use reduction</p> <p><b>Implementation Plan: Action MR6.1:</b> Identify and implement renewable energy opportunities across public sector estates, partnering with communities and businesses as appropriate</p>	<p>In light of BREXIT we are investigating the impact on energy investments and exploring future avenues of non EU funding including crowd funding and share funds and what our future strategy should be.</p> <p>Investigating potential for utilising SALIX funding for community groups as well as for KCC and schools</p> <p>Also working with utilities and renewable energy generators to maximise the potential for accessing community benefit funds to finance local initiatives e.g. Horsebridge Centre Whitstable and Friendship House in Minister</p>
<p>11: That KCC works with partners and local authorities to influence the design and planning process for developments from the start, so as to ensure that they are as energy efficient as possible</p>	<p><b>Theme 3 Priority 8.3:</b> Develop guidance and support to enable sustainable growth protecting the county of Kent's environmental and historic assets, and supporting healthy, prosperous communities</p>	<p>Kent Design in its original form no longer exists, but has evolved into the Design South East Programme, providing targeted training events KCC are working with District Partners, developers</p>

Energy Security Select Committee Recommendations	Alignment of recommendations with Kent Environment Strategy and Implementation Plan	Progress
(Section 5.3, p.106)	<b>Implementation Plan: Action SF8.3:</b> Provide support and guidance e.g. Kent Design to achieve sustainable growth through incorporating KES priorities	and other public sector bodies to identify the most effective way of influencing planning with regards to key issues such as energy, water, air quality etc.
12: That KCC works with educational institutions within Kent to ensure that students and apprentices are given the necessary skillsets and expertise required for working across the energy sector (Section 5.4, p.111)	<p><b>Theme 1 Priority 3.1:</b> Develop knowledge networks, sharing best practice and training to build capacity for informed decision making</p> <p><b>Implementation Plan: Action BF3.1:</b> Identify training and development needs in relation to delivery of Kent Environment Strategy priorities and establish recommendations for skills and knowledge development</p>	Reviewing in partnership with Economic Development. This activity is in it's early stages, and an action plan will be agreed late 2016.
<p>13: That KCC continues to strengthen its ability to work in partnership with local authorities, relevant agencies, businesses, community groups and the education and training sector to make sure that a comprehensive approach is taken in ensuring energy security for Kent (Section 6.1, p.116)</p> <p>Page 15</p>	<p>This recommendation links to Theme 1 as a whole:</p> <p><b>Theme One: Building the Foundations for Delivery.</b> The Theme establishes priorities that provide an evidenced understanding of risks and opportunities from environmental change, and the relationship to our communities, health and wellbeing, and economy. It also includes priorities that establish how we can develop actions, as a partnership, to respond to those changes now and into the future.</p>	<p>Recommendations have informed priorities and actions within the Strategy and Implementation Plan. A Kent wide governance group has been established to deliver the strategy and actions through strategic and operational level groups, and a steering group. An internal KCC governance structure has also been developed with the Environment Board (operational), Corporate Management Team (executive) and E&amp;T Cabinet and Cabinet Committees (political). Check and challenge groups have also been established with a KCC Informal Members Group and a Kent wide champions group.</p> <p>Other significant partnerships include the Kent and Medway Sustainable Energy Partnership specifically focusing on energy initiatives</p>
14: That LASER and Sustainable Business and Communities investigate the feasibility of KCC establishing itself as an energy supplier to the local community (Section 6.1, p.118)	<p><b>Theme 2 Priority 6.1:</b> Reduce negative impacts and maximise the resource efficiency of public sector services, setting out our public commitments for energy, waste and water use reduction</p> <p><b>Implementation Plan: Action MR6.1:</b> Identify and implement renewable energy opportunities across public sector estates, partnering with communities and businesses as appropriate</p>	<p>Currently at early stages with this activity looking at other similar initiatives across the UK e.g. Nottingham. The recommendation fits under MR6.1 as this is also broadly about energy generation and security</p> <p>The activity will be amended to reflect this.</p>
15: That KCC works in partnership with UKPN and relevant energy generation companies within Kent to better understand the risks to Kent's energy systems and how these can be mitigated (Section 6.1, p.120)	<p><b>Theme 3 Priority 8.1:</b> Ensure that key environmental risks such as flooding, water scarcity and heat are informing policy decisions and development</p> <p><b>Implementation Plan: Action SF8.1:</b> Ensure outputs of the Kent Climate Change Risk Assessment are integrated into policy and planning</p> <p><b>SF8.2</b> Identify energy needs for growth and how these can be met sustainably and ensuring that these are incorporated into the Growth and Infrastructure Framework (GIF) (e.g. district heating and community energy).</p>	Work with energy utilities, OFGEM and National Grid initiated to address energy issues such as fuel poverty and energy security across Kent. Relationships now established and work programmes being developed.

This page is intentionally left blank



By: Patrick Leeson, Corporate Director for Education and Young People's Services

To: Scrutiny Committee – 9 November 2016

Subject: Select Committee on Grammar Schools and Social Mobility Action Plan and 3 Month Update

Classification: Unrestricted

---

**Summary:** In accordance with the process for monitoring Select Committee recommendations, as set out in the Constitution (Appendix 4 Part 4 – 4.36), an action plan from the Cabinet Member/Corporate Director should be submitted to the Scrutiny Committee for consideration 3 months after the County Council has received the Select Committee's final report. This report sets out the actions plan and progress following County Council approval of the Select Committee Grammar Schools and Social Mobility recommendations.

---

## Introduction

1.

- (a) The remit of the Select Committee (June 2016) was to identify what could be done to improve the representation of children from disadvantaged backgrounds in grammar schools in Kent, so that they can benefit from a selective education if it is suitable for them.
- (b) In its findings the committee acknowledged the rapidly changing educational landscape which, with an increasing number of schools becoming academies, means that recommendations from this report cannot be imposed on schools.
- (c) The County Council is the Admissions Authority for only three of the Kent grammar schools. The others are all their own admission authority.
- (d) However, the committee believes that Kent County Council, primary, and grammar schools have a shared moral responsibility to ensure that the most academically able children from disadvantaged backgrounds access grammar schools in the same way other children do. The full report and recommendations were therefore presented and discussed at the Primary Heads Forum this month. Similar discussions will take place with the Kent Association of Headteachers executive group to promote the findings of the committee. In addition, all grammar schools will receive a pack of information, guidance and case studies of practice to support them in increasing the numbers of children from disadvantaged backgrounds who apply for and gain places at grammar schools.

## **Additional Considerations**

1.

- (a) Members of the Select Committee are reminded that to deliver Recommendation 13 it is anticipated KCC will need to identify in excess of £500k to meet this discretionary requirement. It should be noted that no budget is currently identified and existing Home to School transport costs are already increasing at a significant pace driven primarily by the rising costs of fuel.
- (b) Scrutiny Committee Members are invited to consider the need to find ways to operate a new means tested system associated with the implementation of Recommendation 13. There is currently no established way to 'means test' families seeking this support and its implementation in advance of any nationally supported database could expose KCC to a significant risk of fraud. KCC currently does not have the means to police applications, or to detect and manage fraudulent activity which seeks to misrepresent income levels. The cost of establishing this resource will form part of the proposal that will be brought forward to Members at a later date.
- (c) The Scrutiny Committee is advised that the Government has identified working families who are 'just about managing' as a group it is keen to target with additional support. This same group would be regarded as those in a family income bracket of £16,190 to £21,000 which aligns with the ambition of the Select Committee to focus on supporting those in work but on a modest income. It is hoped that in order to provide support to this group the government will adapt the current means of identifying those families whose children are eligible for Free School Meals to also take account of those on incomes up to £21,000. This would help to remove the operational barrier and reduce the risk of fraud by allowing KCC to consult a nationally maintained data source in order to confirm eligibility. The role of education in supporting social mobility is a key component of the current DfE consultation 'Schools for Everyone'. If this theme is translated into national policy then it is reasonable to expect that mechanisms to identify the targeted group will support the Scrutiny Committee's recommendations.

## **Recommendations**

1. Members of the Scrutiny Committee are asked to acknowledge the completed actions and stated approach to delivering the Select Committee recommendations set out in Appendix 1.

## Appendices

- Appendix 1: Progress on Select Committee recommendations

### Lead Officers:

Gillian Cawley  
Director of Education, Quality  
and Standards

Email: [Gillian.Cawley@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Gillian.Cawley@kent.gov.uk)  
Tel: 03000 419853

Keith Abbott  
Director of Education, Planning  
and Access

Email: [Keith.Abbott@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Keith.Abbott@kent.gov.uk)  
Tel: 03000 417008

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Appendix 1: Progress on Select Committee recommendations**

### **Viewing grammar school as a potential option**

#### **Securing a grammar school place**

**Recommendation 1:** As the champion of pupils, parents and families, KCC will work with all primary school Headteachers to identify those most academically able pupils and discuss with parents the opportunity to put their child forward for the Kent Test.

**Recommendation 8:** KCC to monitor and challenge the proportion of pupils supported by the Pupil Premium (PP) who go on to grammar school.

**Recommendation 9:** KCC School Improvement Advisers to work with Primary Headteachers to consider how the most academically able pupils supported by the Pupil Premium are being identified and assisted to progress.

<b>Lead Officer:</b>	Anton Francic Head of Standards and School Improvement
<b>Deadline for completion of work:</b>	Recommendations 1 and 9 – actioned September 2016 Recommendation 8 – July 2017
<b>Deadline for assessment of impact:</b>	September 2018

#### **Actions being taken:**

These recommendations are being addressed through the visit programme of School Improvement Advisers in primary schools. Advisers are using data to identify more able vulnerable learners, in particular those in receipt of free school meals, with school leaders (including governors) and challenge attainment and rates of progress. They will additionally discuss the numbers of disadvantaged pupils who go on to grammar school. Where appropriate, advisers will recommend Pupil Premium review where performance gaps are not closing rapidly.

In addition a Senior Improvement Adviser for Closing Gaps was appointed in June 2016 to provide a strategic lead across the county in reducing the attainment gap for all vulnerable learners. A priority in this role is to identify and promote effective practice in closing attainment gaps and this includes more able pupils in receipt of Free School Meals. Dissemination of effective practice will be through headteacher briefings, conferences and the creation of a Vulnerable Learners' Strategy website. In addition, an online toolkit aimed at schools and promoting effective approaches for raising the attainment of Pupil Premium pupils is currently being developed and will be launched in Term 3.

## **Securing a grammar school place**

**Recommendation 6:** Identify a dedicated education professional in the Virtual School Kent to provide support and guidance to foster carers on appropriate secondary school destinations, as well as support through the secondary schools appeal process for children in their care, to be tracked through their Personal Education Plan.

**Recommendation 7:** Publish information on Pupil Premium spend for children in care on the Virtual School Kent website, including support for pupils from Key Stage 1 through to Key Stage 2, and detail on the type of secondary school destinations for these children.

<b>Lead Officer:</b>	Tony Doran Head of Virtual School Kent (VSK)
<b>Deadline for completion of work:</b>	Recommendation 6 – actioned July 2016 Recommendation 7 – actioned July-October 2016
<b>Deadline for assessment of impact:</b>	September 2018

### **Action being taken:**

A lead member of the VSK team was appointed in July 2016 to lead the actions in this area. The role has a responsibility to liaise with the School Improvement Team and facilitate a training programme for foster carers, liaise with fostering teams to promote this training and raise awareness of the support available from VSK particularly in relation to appeal processes. The role provides a point of contact for foster carers and social workers to provide information related to Grammar school applications and appeals and will establish a register of Children in Care attending Grammar schools to ensure they are receiving appropriate support via their Personal Education Plans.

The role also provides advice and training as necessary for Grammar school staff to ensure Children in Care have any additional support required. In addition, Children in Care currently in Key Stage 2 will be reviewed to identify pupils who have the academic ability to be considered for Grammar school provision.

The post holder will review Pupil Premium information published on the VSK website to ensure that details of all support offered to Children in Care in the primary phase is detailed on the site. They will also ensure that data is published on the site to show how many Kent Children in Care attend grammar schools and the support offered to professionals when a Grammar school destination for a Year 7 pupil is being considered. The role will also ensure that VSK staff members promote applications to grammar schools where this is judged to be the appropriate destination school.

## **Securing a grammar school place**

**Recommendation 10:** If not already in place, schools should follow best practice and nominate a lead governor for the Pupil Premium and how children in receipt of this are being supported to apply for the school most appropriate for them.

<b>Lead Officer:</b>	Anton Francic Head of Standards and School Improvement
<b>Deadline for completion of work:</b>	September 2016 and ongoing
<b>Deadline for assessment of impact:</b>	September 2018

### **Action being taken:**

Area Governance Officers check and where necessary challenge schools to ensure that Governing Bodies have a lead governor for Pupil Premium. As well as monitoring the use of Pupil Premium funding in the school, the lead governor's role is to challenge the Governing Body to ensure that all Pupil Premium pupils achieve their full potential, including the most able.

The Governance team provide training for Pupil Premium governors to enable them to understand outcomes data and hold to school leaders to account on the performance of disadvantaged learners. The Governance team is also offering Pupil Premium reviews where schools require further support in identifying where improvements can be made.

This academic year the Area Governance Officers will be monitoring school websites regularly and providing reminders to schools to ensure that all schools publish their Pupil Premium Strategy, in line with legal requirements.

## **Removing financial barriers to grammar schools**

**Recommendation 12:** KCC to extend the existing entitlement for children on Free School Meals to free school transport to their nearest appropriate school to all children in receipt of Pupil Premium.

**Recommendation 13:** KCC should raise the low income threshold to £21k to enable pupils from low income families but not entitled to Free School Meals to access free transport to their nearest appropriate secondary school

**Recommendation 14:** KCC to create a schools focused supplementary transport bursary, that would enable grammar schools and other types of schools where appropriate, to provide bespoke transport solutions especially for children from rural areas without bus services to enable better access to grammar schools

**Lead Officer:** Scott Bagshaw  
Head of Fair Access

**Deadline for completion of work:** April 2017

**Deadline for assessment of impact:** From September 2017

### **Action being taken:**

In line with these three recommendations we will review existing transport policies and bring forward proposals for Members to consider a new transport policy which encompasses the recommended changes. In order to implement recommendations 12, 13 and 14 KCC Cabinet is required to determine a new County Transport Policy which will require a formal consultation in advance of any report and recommendations being presented. It is anticipated a new policy for consideration and consultation will be developed by the end of December 2016. Once new transport policy is implemented officers will need to amend existing information for parents and liaise with schools as to the operation of a bursary fund as proposed in recommendation 14.

In respect of recommendation 13 detailed work will have to be undertaken to develop a process for the potential means testing that is required. Proposals to Members on all three recommendations will identify the additional financial and staffing resource that will be required to implement these recommendations for April 2017. To ensure delivery of these recommendations this additional funding will need to be included in the 2017-18 Education and Young People's Services budget.



## **Viewing grammar school as a potential option**

### **Securing a grammar school place**

**Recommendation 3:** KCC should target all children eligible for Pupil Premium and children from areas of low registration for the Kent Test, providing detailed information on the Kent Test process and their transport entitlements.

**Recommendation 4:** All grammar schools should provide more outreach to primary schools including after school classes in English and mathematics, mentoring and preparation for the Kent Test for primary aged pupils in Yrs 4-6 including those most academically able children in receipt of the Pupil Premium.

**Recommendation 5:** Urge all Primary Headteachers to utilise Headteacher Assessment Panels within the Kent Test process to advocate for those most academically able children supported by the Pupil Premium.

<b>Lead Officer:</b>	Scott Bagshaw Head of Fair Access
<b>Deadline for completion of work:</b>	Recommendation 3 & 4 – Spring 2017 Recommendation 5 – Completed October 2016
<b>Deadline for assessment of impact:</b>	September 2018

#### **Action being taken:**

Primary schools have already been encouraged them to use their headteacher assessment panels as per recommendation 5. This was completed prior to the 2016 Headteacher assessment stage of the selection process. The wording for the Information for Primary Schools booklets will be revised to emphasise the need for schools to target their support for the borderline pupil premium children in time for the 2017 selection process.

We will be writing to all grammar schools and primary schools to encourage them to adopt recommendations 3 and 4 with a Social Mobility Pack providing operational guidance to assist schools in implementing the recommendations. This will also include a data pack around pupil premium information and case studies prepared by School Improvement colleagues evidencing the outreach and monitoring already provided by some schools.

Primary schools in areas of low registration for the Kent Test will be sent promotional material to encourage take up of more able children from low income families.

## **Viewing grammar school as a potential option**

### **Removing financial barriers to grammar schools**

**Recommendation 2:** Grammar schools should engage fully with parents and families to address misconceptions and promote the offer grammar schools can make to all students irrespective of background

**Recommendation 11:** Urge all grammar schools to use multiple uniform providers to minimise costs and subsidise/cover the costs of schools trips and other expenses for pupils from low income families to ensure these are not prohibitive factors to children applying for or securing a grammar school place

**Lead Officer:** Scott Bagshaw  
Head of Fair Access

**Deadline for completion of work:** Spring 2017

**Deadline for assessment of impact:** September 2018

#### **Action being taken:**

The Social Mobility pack provided to all grammar schools will include guidance on targeted parental engagement in order to promote the grammar school offer to all children. The pack will also provide a list of feeder primary schools to help grammar schools target outreach activity and guidance on how to incorporate clearer information on school websites explaining the support that is available for pupils from lower income families. The pack will also include guidance on the specific support schools can offer on school uniform, school trips and other potentially prohibitive for lower income families.

## **Increasing fair access to grammar schools**

**Recommendation 15:** To invite grammar schools to fully consider the disadvantaged children eligible for Pupil Premium support face and take action within their oversubscription admissions criteria. Where this fails to happen we will expect KCC to challenge the determined admissions arrangements.

**Recommendation 16:** Urge all “super selective” grammar schools to allocate a number of places for pupils registered in that academic year for Pupil Premium support and who achieve an appropriate combined test score in the Kent Test. We would also invite these schools to review the impact of “super selection” on social mobility in their areas.

**Lead Officer:** Scott Bagshaw  
Head of Fair Access

**Deadline for completion of work:** November 2016

**Deadline for assessment of impact:** September 2018 – September 2019

### **Action being taken:**

We will be writing to all grammar schools specifically in relation to admissions arrangements to promote these two recommendations. For community and Voluntary Controlled grammar schools in Kent we will consult on amending admission over-subscription criteria to include priority for pupil premium children. In addition we will write to all other grammar schools that have their own admissions arrangements to urge consideration of these recommendations.

All super selective grammar schools will be written to separately, with data on the impact of super selection on social mobility in their areas, asking that they introduce changes to their admission arrangements in order to increase the number of places for pupils with pupil premium. The Social Mobility Pack sent to all grammar schools will provide more detailed guidance on ways in which super selective grammars could attract a greater proportion of children from low income families into their grammar school.

This page is intentionally left blank

**By:** Matthew Balfour, Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport  
Barbara Cooper, Corporate Director, Growth Environment and Transport

**To:** Scrutiny Committee

**Subject:** Progress report on Kent and Medway Growth and Infrastructure Framework

**Classification:** Unrestricted

---

**Summary:** This report responds to a request from Scrutiny Committee and reports on the progress made in respect of the Kent & Medway Growth and Infrastructure Framework, the interim refresh and the onward programme of work for the 2017 update.

---

## Introduction

1. In 2015, KCC published the Kent and Medway Growth and Infrastructure Framework (GIF), a first of its kind in assessing the predicted levels of housing and economic growth for the county and the infrastructure needed to support this. The analysis showed a significant gap between the funding required and that anticipated/secured from central government, development contribution and other investment. Of the £6.74 billion investment needed, a third (£2.01 billion or £118 million pa) was still required to support the predicted 158,500 new homes, 293,300 new people and 135,800 new jobs within the county between now and 2031.

2. The publication of the GIF was not the conclusion of this work. The GIF has provided a tool and a platform from which to engage with Government and other partners, including private sector investors, in how we meet that funding gap. An action plan was developed, which centred on working with partners and Government to find ways of making the most of the resources we have; finding innovative ways to secure funding and investment; and unlocking the value we can create from development, present and future, to invest in the infrastructure that is so critical to making growth happen.

3. This report sets out progress against this action plan, introduces the refreshed data and outlines on the onward work programme.

## Achievements of the last year

4. The 10 point action plan set out in the GIF (see appendix 1) provides the starting point to measure progress over the past year, which includes:

- 1) Using the GIF to attract investment

- (a) Use of the GIF to prioritise and provide robust evidence to support the Southeast Local Enterprise Partnership submission (July 2016) to Government for Local Growth Fund Round 3 funding of £69.8m
- (b) Use of the GIF to underpin the emerging Local Transport Plan 4 which sets out the county's strategic transport priorities.

## 2) Using the GIF to engage with London and the Southeast

- (a) Work with South East Strategic Leaders, South East Planning Officers Society and South East Officers Group to raise awareness and join up efforts on the infrastructure challenges across the South East region.
- (b) Work with Greater London Assembly (GLA) to consider London demographics and the population forecasts. In time, this will include examining how the GLA's model on inward/outward migration can be used to understand and address some of the impacts of London's growth in Kent.
- (c) Progress on the development of a shared programme of work for KCC that is delivering a Single Forecasting System, Single Monitoring System and GIF Single Communications Channel. These systems will enable KCC to forecast, monitor and communicate Kent's infrastructure needs more clearly and effectively to developers and districts, and ultimately, enable KCC to robustly and effectively monitor the attraction of and deployment of developer contributions to deliver infrastructure to support growth.

## 3) Engaging with key infrastructure providers

- (a) Establishment of the Kent Utilities Engagement Sub-Committee (covering water, gas, power and telecommunications) to engage with the relevant bodies, with aim of ensuring that utility companies understand the growth ambitions across the county and plan accordingly.
- (b) Regular liaison (officer and member attended) with Kent's three largest water utility companies continues and similar engagement Southern Gas Networks, UK Power Networks and OFGEM is in development.
- (c) Work with Health and Wellbeing Boards to identify how the GIF can assist with better joint working and ultimately with Sustainable Transformation Plans.

## 4) Using GIF as a platform for engagement

- (a) Engagement with the districts around GIF refresh, LTP4 and LGF.
- (b) Regular liaison with Kent Developers Group, with GIF a standing item on the group's agenda as a platform for identifying shared issues in the delivery of growth and infrastructure.
- (c) Development of a Growth and Infrastructure Communications Strategy, which closely aligns communication work to that also being undertaken for the LGF.

5. In addition, the GIF has recently received the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) award for Delivering Infrastructure Through Planning for the Southeast for 2016, recognising the innovative approach being taken by Kent in not only creating the evidence base but in how it is now being used to shape the infrastructure agenda.

### **GIF interim refresh: 2016**

6. The GIF is only as good as the data it is based on and following revised housing figures from a number of the districts, it was agreed that an interim refresh would be commissioned to reflect new housing and population forecasts. This refresh would also address:

- 1) Revised education needs based on latest commissioning plan;
- 2) Further district input to ensuring that the GIF accurately reflects district priorities;
- 3) A more accurate picture of utilities, broadband and waste;
- 4) A perspective on maintenance as well as capital costs;
- 5) A fuller understanding of the “impact” of London – migration and housing; and
- 6) General amendments to address some concerns raised by stakeholders.

7. A period of informal consultation with districts was undertaken to ensure that they concurred with the revised housing and population figures and to gain their buy-in and support of the work. Likewise, KCC services were given the opportunity to review and revise the infrastructure chapters.

8. The revised figures have shown a marked increase in population forecasts, owing to changes in the assumptions used to predict growth. Unsurprisingly this increase in population has an associated rise in predicted housing and infrastructure requirements and costs.

<b>Calculation</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
New homes	158,500	188,200
(25% Growth)		
New people	293,300	413,900
(24% Growth)		
New jobs	135,800	135,800
(19% Growth)		
Total infrastructure costs	£6,740,580,000	£7,113,740,000
Total secured funding	£704,140,000	£723,820,000
Total expected funding	£4,028,910,000	£4,142,280,000
<b>Total funding gap</b>	<b>£2,007,520,000</b>	<b>£2,247,650,000</b>
<b>% of infrastructure funded</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>68%</b>

9. Implications of the new findings include:

- 1) An annual population growth of c.17,300 per year
- 2) An annual target for housing delivery in Kent and Medway of 9,410 per annum – almost twice the actual average.

- 3) Across the county there are notable differences between target actual delivery of housing. In some cases, the future target completion rates are twice the actual average delivered in previous years.
- 4) Delivering the expected increased rate of housing will not just be down to planning functions. It also relies on planning permissions being implemented in good time and other levers, such as infrastructure, enabling the growth to be accelerated.
- 5) The increase in the estimate of infrastructure needed has not been accompanied by a subsequent increase in either secured or expected funding to match that increased need. The gap has gone from just over £2bn to £2.25bn, meaning that just 68% of the infrastructure required to 2031 is funded. As such, the infrastructure challenge, if anything, has grown in significance.
- 6) Data pulled together by KCC's intelligence team has identified the continued pressure from internal migration on Kent's population figures and the particular focus of this pressure from London.
- 7) Maintenance of infrastructure is a growing issue that needs consideration alongside the delivery of new infrastructure. For the first time, the GIF starts to refer to the maintenance costs and highlights that delivery of new infrastructure must be made with a fuller understanding of the ongoing maintenance obligations it will place in future years on KCC.

### **Proposed next steps**

10. With the refresh now complete, further work will be undertaken to ensure that KCC is proactively positioned to use the GIF to unlock some of the key barriers standing in the way of progress in this agenda:

- 1) Pro-active engagement with the new Government, including Department for Communities and Local Government and Department for Transport, to introduce the uninitiated to the GIF and our key messages, as well as our key infrastructure priorities. This will also include developing and then taking to government the following policy priorities:
  - (a) Forward funding for complex but critical infrastructure.
  - (b) Review of the five year land supply policy and its discharge.
  - (c) Review of the "Redbridge issue<sup>1</sup>" and the impact this has on infrastructure provision. This is a high-level issue that will need to be taken up with the Local Government Association, London councils and Government. It is proposed that KCC undertake to engage with London Councils to try to establish a MoU or concordat between Kent and London which sets out some basic principles for how we expect to be engaged when such moves are taking place.

---

<sup>1</sup> The purchase of a lease of ex-military housing at Howe Barracks in Canterbury by Redbridge Council highlighted a potential growing issue for Kent, as well as other counties surrounding London. The move, which placed Redbridge families into Canterbury, came with little notice or subsequent communication with KCC or the City Council and without any compensation for the additional burden on infrastructure that would be incurred as a result.



- (d) Renewed focus on Kent's strategic infrastructure priorities and the importance of this infrastructure to support an increasingly significant international gateway.
- (e) Issues arising from the introduction of CIL in some of our districts
- 2) Engagement with the new London Mayor's office to explore a more robust collaboration in the development of the London Plan.
- 3) Continued engagement of the utilities through the Utilities Engagement Sub-Committee and development of recommendations for improvements to the way in which utilities are delivered in line with growth.
- 4) A fuller picture of the county's commercial forecast in the GIF, developing a strategic understanding of both existing and forecast development, together with an assessment of the quality of that accommodation against growth sectors and their needs;
- 5) Collaboration with the Housing Finance Institute on utilities dependency mapping, to identify infrastructure constraints geographically in order to target further the county's efforts to overcome barriers to sustainable growth.
- 6) Prepare a prospectus on Accelerating Housing Solutions, with Kent Developers Group, Kent Housing Group and the Homes and Communities Agency, to put forward several game-changer solutions to unlock potential for accelerated housing growth; and
- 7) Strengthen emphasis on place-making: championing high quality design through the development and support of robust policies in Local Plans and exploring the levers KCC has to promote high quality design in the delivery of both housing and resilient infrastructure.

### **Full GIF update for 2017**

11. Whereas the interim refresh was externally commissioned, the full 2017 update will be undertaken in-house. By establishing systems in-house now, the Council will be able to more easily refresh the Framework when new data is released.

12. As part of this full refresh, work has commenced to develop a better online platform for the Framework, which enables the user to navigate and interrogate the data. The intention is to have a basic system in place by the end of 2016/17.

13. The full refresh will incorporate:

- 1) A re-examination of the methodological approach, which will look to refine the process to give the most accurate picture throughout. With such a refinement, there could potentially be some swings in the data as a result.
- 2) A picture of Council Tax base and how it is impacted by the growth projections identified in the GIF
- 3) A clearer understanding of the "customer grief factor" with some of our key infrastructure. For instance, in the case of highways, congestion on the network, delays and cost to the economy and our customers
- 4) Full incorporation of work being undertaken in the accommodation strategy being developed by Social Care colleagues

- 5) An understanding not only of the volume of housing being planned and delivered, but a clearer idea of the types of housing, including proportions of social and affordable housing

14. The revised set of housing and population figures will be available for services to begin updating their infrastructure requirements in light of the new data in November 2016. The GIF will then be updated with these February to April 2017, with a draft in May 2017. Work has already been undertaken with districts and internal KCC partners to refine the brief for the full GIF update.

#### **Financial implications**

15. The GIF 2016 interim refresh was delivered via a commission with Aecom for £22,000.

16. The work set out in Proposed next steps (point 10) will be delivered using existing staff resource. The full 2017 update will be undertaken in-house, although some work may need to be commissioned in respect of the design for 2017 report, the online platform for the GIF and supporting data; this will be covered by existing budgets.

#### **Legal implications**

17. This work has no legal implications for the County Council

#### **Equalities implications**

18. An equalities impact assessment EQIA is being prepared.

#### **Recommendations**

The Committee is asked to consider progress and development of the GIF to date and to consider/comment on the next steps outlined in this report.

Officer: Sarah Platts, Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Manager  
Tel No: 03000 413412  
e-mail: [sarah.platts@kent.gov.uk](mailto:sarah.platts@kent.gov.uk)

Background Information:

*Kent & Medway Growth and Infrastructure Framework 2015:*

*Kent & Medway Growth and Infrastructure Framework 2016*

[www.kent.gov.uk/gif](http://www.kent.gov.uk/gif)

## **APPENDIX A: GIF Action Plan**

### **Action 1: Innovation in financing**

Discussions with Government on the shortfall in capital funding growth and work collaboratively to find 'new innovative ways' of closing the funding gap (e.g. Tax Increment Funding (TI F), Institutional Investment, better application of CIL etc).

### **Action 2: A single Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Kent**

Explore the feasibility of producing a single Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Kent and Medway reflecting the robust partnership working with the district authorities and Medway.

### **Action 3: A stronger relationship with London and the Southeast**

Engage with South East Strategic Leaders and the County Councils in the South East on strategic issues and priorities, in particular transport, including linkages to London and radial routes to better connect the wider South East.

### **Action 4: Reform of CIL and developer contributions**

Engage Government, using existing networks such as the County Councils Network where appropriate, to explore means of refining the current CIL and developer contribution mechanisms to better take account of varying viability in different areas of the country, to maximise the potential of CIL .

### **Action 5: The potential for private sector investment**

Open discussions with the private sector including the development, pension and insurance sectors, and other investment sectors to explore the feasibility of establishing an 'Institutional Investment' pot for infrastructure and other mechanisms that may help fund infrastructure.

### **Action 6: A stronger relationship with the utilities**

We will collaborate with the utilities sector to seek improved medium to long term planning aligned to the County's growth plans. A key role for the public sector will be to hold utilities companies to account to make the necessary capital investment. Through establishing County Council scrutiny arrangements for utility provision (which have the opportunity to feed into OFWAT, OFGEN, etc) matching utility companies' capital investment plans to the growth plan.

### **Action 7: Maximise the public estate**

We will use the One Public Estate pilot commencing across Kent to seek to ensure we are maximising opportunities to lever in investment opportunities to fund and support growth.

### **Action 8: Ensuring the GIF is a "go-to" reference for infrastructure priorities**

The GIF will be regularly refreshed to reflect the ongoing development of the Kent and Medway Local Plans and to enable refinement of many of the areas of evidence within the framework including costs and future funding assumptions.

### **Action 9: An integrated approach to planning and delivering growth**

Monitor annually on a district-by-district basis:

- Progress of Local Plans;

- Delivery of housing and employment space;
- Receipts from developer contributions and CIL ;
- Public and private sector investment in the county, including into the health and social care sectors and;
- Utility company capital investment.

**Action 10: A robust design agenda for Kent and Medway**

Consider how we can build on and refine current activity in the county aimed at ensuring high quality design, including working with Kent Planning Officers Group and Design South East and updating the Kent Design Guide where required.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank