

**SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, 23rd June, 2020**

**11.00 am**

**Online**







## AGENDA

### SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 23rd June, 2020, at 11.00 am

Ask for: **Joel Cook/Anna Taylor**

Online

Telephone: **03000 416892/416478**

#### Membership

Conservative (9): Mr A Booth (Chairman), Mr J Wright (Vice-Chairman), Mr M A C Balfour, Mr P V Barrington-King, Mrs P M Beresford, Mrs R Binks, Mr G Cooke, Mr R C Love, OBE and Mr A M Ridgers

Liberal Democrat (2): Mr R H Bird and Mrs T Dean, MBE

Labour (2) Mr D Farrell and Dr L Sullivan

Church Mr D Brunning, Mr J Constanti and Mr Q Roper

Representatives (3):

Parent Governor (2): Mr K Garsed and Mr A Roy

*In response to COVID-19, the Government has legislated to permit remote attendance by Elected Members at formal meetings. This is conditional on other Elected Members and the public being able to hear those participating in the meeting. This meeting will be streamed live and can be watched via the Media link on the Webpage for this 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.*

## **UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

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

### **A - Committee Business**

- A1 Chairman's Introduction
- A2 Apologies and Substitutes
- A3 Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this Meeting
- A4 Minutes of the meeting held on 24 January 2020 (Pages 1 - 8)

### **B - Any items called-in**

- B1 Call-in of Decision 20/00017 - Recommissioning of Early Help Services (Pages 9 - 14)

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

- C1 Update on Electric Vehicle Charging Points (to follow)
- C2 KCC's approach to the Government's Funding for Active Travel Schemes (to follow)
- C3 Short Focused Inquiries - Review Programme (to follow)

## **EXEMPT ITEMS**

*(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)*

Benjamin Watts  
General Counsel  
03000 416814

**Monday, 15 June 2020**

**KENT COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

**SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

MINUTES of a meeting of the Scrutiny Committee held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Friday, 24 January 2020.

PRESENT: Mr A Booth (Chairman), Mr J Wright (Vice-Chairman), Mr M A C Balfour, Mr P V Barrington-King, Mr A H T Bowles (Substitute) (Substitute for Mrs P M Beresford), Mr R H Bird, Mr G Cooke, Mrs T Dean, MBE, Mr D Farrell, Mr R C Love, OBE, Mr K Pugh (Substitute) (Substitute for Mrs R Binks) and Dr L Sullivan

ALSO PRESENT: Mr A R Hills and Mr P J Oakford

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr T Harwood (Resilience and Emergency Planning Manager), Mr M Tant (Flood and Water Manager), Ms Z Cooke (Corporate Director of Finance), Mr D Shipton (Head of Finance - Planning, Policy & Strategy), Mr S Pleace (Revenue and Tax Strategy Manager) and Mr J Cook (Scrutiny Research Officer)

**UNRESTRICTED ITEMS****16. Election of Vice-Chairman**

*(Item A2)*

1. The Chairman noted that Mr Ridgers had stepped down from his position of Vice-Chairman and offered thanks to him for his support and professionalism in that role. The Chairman then proposed Mr Wright for the position of Vice-Chairman, seconded by Mr Pugh. The Chairman invited any other nominations and Mr Farrell nominated Mr Bird seconded by Mrs Dean. There were no other nominations.

2. Mr Wright was elected by a majority vote.

RESOLVED that Mr Wright be elected Vice-Chair.

**17. Apologies and Substitutes**

*(Item A3)*

Apologies had been received from Mrs Beresford, Mrs Binks and Mr Ridgers. Mr Bowles substituted for Mrs Beresford and Mr Pugh substituted for Mrs Binks.

Apologies had also been received from the Parent Governor and Church Representatives.

**18. Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this Meeting**

*(Item A4)*

1. Mr Bird declared an interest as he was a resident of Yalding with experience of flooding in relation to item A8.

2. Dr Sullivan declared an interest, as her husband was employed by the County Council in the Early Help and Prevention Team, in relation to item A9.
3. Mr Bowles declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was a member of the Flood Risk Management Committee, in relation to item A8.
4. Mr Cooke declared an interest as he was a Trustee of the Fusion Healthy Living Centre in Maidstone that received grant money from KCC, in relation to item A9.

**19. Minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2019**  
*(Item A5)*

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2019 were a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

In response to a query from Mr Bird the Chairman confirmed that he had not received the information requested previously in relation to the Pupil Premium Select Committee – this would be followed up outside of this meeting.

A Member referred to the comment about the non-attendance of the Church Representatives, the clerk clarified that apologies had been sent and in addition another member clarified that the Parent Governor Representatives and Church Representatives would have had an opportunity to review the education budget at the Children, Young People and Education Committee.

**20. Affordable Housing Select Committee - Timetable**  
*(Item A6)*

The clerk explained that the Affordable Housing Select Committee timetable had been agreed between the Chairman and Spokespeople of the Scrutiny Committee outside of the formal committee (in accordance with the constitution).

Mrs Dean commented that the review started in November and was due to finish in July, with the hearings being held in February. There were concerns that holding all the hearings in February put undue pressure on the Select Committee.

RESOLVED that the Scrutiny Committee note the timetable for the Topic Review.

**21. To note the 2020/2021 Scrutiny Committee meeting dates**  
*(Item A7)*

The clerk advised the Scrutiny Committee that the meeting dates had been circulated outside of the meeting and were provided for information and noting.

**22. Kent Flood Risk Management Committee - Annual Report**  
*(Item A8)*

*Mr Hills (Chairman, Flood Risk Management Committee), Tony Harwood (Resilience and Emergency Planning Manager) and Max Tant (Flood and Water Manager) were present for this item.*

1. The Chairman welcomed Tony Harwood and Max Tant to the meeting. Mr Hills introduced the report which covered work between May 2018 to November 2019.

2. Mr Hills praised the officer support provided by Tony and Max and set out some of the highlights from the report. All the information discussed, and presentations received by the Flood Risk Management Committee were available online on the KCC webpage. Mr Hills gave a short overview of the work carried out at each meeting

3. Tony Harwood clarified that Officers provided technical advice and were pleased that there was such excellent support and understanding among the committee members on Kent Flood Risk Management Committee (KFRMC).

4. Members thanked Mr Hills for his excellent report and update, they praised the KFRMC officers and the regular external attendees, however there was disappointment at the low attendance from others.

5. A Member referred to paragraph 7.2 of the report – flash (or surface water) flooding. The report set out preparations made for coastal and river flooding but flash flooding did not seem to have any obvious preparatory element. Max Tant explained that flash flooding was very difficult to predict, these events were very localised and typically due to summer storms. During winter flooding there was often more notice due to available information. There was a question about mitigation there were some places that now flooded more often from rainfall events and it might be necessary to look at how this was mitigated. However, this was very expensive and there needed to be a good benefit-cost ratio. Tony Harwood referred to the emergency planning element to flash flooding response. Highways drainage and surface water flooding will become more of a priority as climate change impacts grow, and there was a need to look at a range of adaptation measures.

6. A Member commented that the report covered coastal and highways drainage, it was correct that transparency was vital and the public should be kept aware of the key issues and risks. The Member queried the reference to ‘Map 16’ in the report and Max Tant explained that this was the name of a piece of software used by the Highways department to help collect asset data.

7. Regarding flooding on the River Medway, there was concern about planning permission given for mobile home accommodation which was not meant to be occupied all year round. The Member asked what was the position regarding the occupants of premises when they were not meant to be occupying them? Did the local authority have responsibility to protect people occupying in such a way? Tony Harwood explained that protection of life and property was paramount and that all of the protection for mobile homes at Little Venice Country Park worked and all of the evacuated residents were back in their homes in time for Christmas.

9. Paragraph 5.4 referred to winter readiness and increased resources into asset management leading to reduced incidents of highways flooding. 5 or 6 years ago, Members were asked to suggest drainage hotspots in their divisions where flooding was frequent to inform the drainage management timetable. Was this still in place?

10. Paragraph 5.8 referred to the water aquifer levels, despite all extra rain, the aquifer was still within normal ranges, what level was this on currently? Max Tant explained that aquifers were now normal in the West of Kent and above normal in the East.

11. Tony Harwood confirmed that KCC worked with the Environment Agency and linked with National Planning Policy Framework to work on the points raised by Members. Referring to groundwater, in November the levels were still diminished but the wet December had changed this situation. Tony Harwood confirmed that he would speak to Highways to get further information regarding prioritisation for highways drainage for Members.

12. A Member referred to Southern Water. District Councils were under pressure to provide new housing developments. Lack of wastewater infrastructure was a key limiting factor. Was there anything that KCC could do to speed up the process with Southern Water? In relation to surface water, new estates had SuDS (sustainable drainage systems). There were concerns that they were not being maintained. Who was responsible for checking and maintaining them? Max Tant explained that there was no public body responsible for maintaining SuDS and that this was discussed regularly at the Flood Risk Management Committee. In current planning applications, conditions were requested to include a maintenance schedule and plan, however, it was not possible to ask the planning authority to enforce maintenance. This also relied on the maintenance company remaining in place. KCC worked with Southern Water but sewage was outside the remit of KCC.

13. Referring to Highways Drainage the Member praised the team but was frustrated that it was not possible to report highways drainage issues online. This problem needed to be addressed.

14. Mr. Hills reminded Members that the next meeting of the KFRMC was 9 March and that all Members were welcome to attend.

15. A Member asked whether officers were in discussion with Natural England regarding schemes that affected coastal areas. It was considered that this was a great idea but the practicalities were difficult, each area needed to be looked at on its merits.

16. It was considered that Environment Agency thinking was evolving, referring to the regional committee KCC was the most active of all the involved counties and money given to the regional committee unlocked more money for KCC.

17. The Scrutiny Chairman thanked the KFRMC Committee Chairman and Officers for their enthusiasm and encouraged attendance at the KFRMC meetings. Mr Hills offered high praise for Andrew Tait who was the clerk to the KFRMC.

RESOLVED that the Scrutiny Committee note the contents of the report.

**23. Draft 2020/21 Budget and the Medium Term Financial Plan. Please can Members bring their copy of the MTFP 2020-21, Budget Information 2020-21 to the meeting.**  
(Item A9)



*Committee consideration based on the draft budget issued on 6 January 2020.*

*Peter Oakford (Deputy Leader), Dave Shipton (Head of Finance – Policy, Planning and Strategy), Zena Cooke (Corporate Director Finance) and Simon Pleace (Revenue and Tax Strategy Manager) were present for this item.*

1. Mr Oakford introduced this item, highlighting that it had been a challenging decade, with over £600million being taken out of the budget over that period. So the increase, of about 6%, in the Government's settlement this year was very welcomed. The £100million of pressures in this years' budget had been addressed by the increase in grant from the Government, the Council Tax increase and Adult Social Care increase and from further savings (£34million) this year. The increased settlement would result in the most generous staff pay settlement for a decade. In addition, following reductions in Member grants these had been returned to previous level. The Capital budget was still concerning, 10% of the budget was financing the current debt. It was clear that highways were a priority and were deteriorating, however while it was easy to borrow now to pay for the necessary works, this would still be challenging to pay for as debt later. Finance were looking at alternative funding options to help manage the capital budget as the current approach was not sustainable.

2. Simon Pleace gave a presentation to the Committee. This was available online via this link. The presentation focussed on the changes since the initial draft budget book was published and there were no significant changes to the assumptions made in the draft budget.

3. The following questions were asked:

- There was not as much concern about the revenue budget compared to the capital budget which was pleasing. There was concern about the underfunding of Highways. As the Member had specific enquiries it was suggested that this be followed up outside of the Committee meeting. Mr Oakford spoke about the extra money for highways, through the capital programme of £105million over the next 3 years.
- A Member asked about the link between the payroll budget increase of 3.6% with average earnings – did this uplift including the pressures arising from the living wage increase?
- What was the prudent thing for members to do with regards to managing the debt/spend issue and reserve management? Considering an additional £121million borrowing over the next few years, this was an annual cost of 8%. Why was this such a high level of interest/cost?
- KCC needed to be mindful of the sustainability around borrowing and it would be preferable for KCC to be further away from the worse debt/reserve ratio. There was also a concern about the income received from the Council's Trading Companies.
- Members thanked Simon Pleace for an excellent presentation and officers were thanks for the briefings they gave the groups.
- Caution was urged in a transitional year; it was considered that there were some very fundamental issues that central government needed to resolve. One of the biggest pressures was adult social care – KCC could not keep waiting on the Government to develop a new formula for financing this.

- There was a question about the anticipated unallocated savings, was it possible to see a schedule of these savings along with any more details of where these savings would be made.

4. The following answers were provided:

- On borrowing – Local Government borrowing was very different to the commercial market. 8% was not the interest rate – the interest rates for borrowing were much lower, around half of total borrowing costs are to pay interest on accumulated debt (at varying rates of interest depending when loans were taken out) and other half was set aside provision to repay loans over the lifetime of the assets (known as minimum revenue provision). New loans could currently be secured at much lower interest but KCC still needed to budget for the interest costs for entire loan portfolio
- On national living wage increase - Dave Shipton explained no KCC staff were affected by this increase as all KCC staff were already paid more than the current level. This was because it had been previously agreed that KCC would pay the equivalent of the living wage foundation's real living wage of £9 per hour.
- High needs funding was currently the biggest risk to KCC. KCC was monitoring this closely and all other upper tier authorities were facing the same challenge.
- Comments on the Social Care green paper had not been forgotten by KCC's Executive.
- Referring to the Trading Companies, the £3.9m increase in income, was mostly from the existing charging policy. £6.5million was budgeted to be received next year from Traded Companies, including the additional £340k anticipated increase.
- More and more spending pressures and savings were unallocated because the details had not been fully assessed in time for the February budget process but this would be covered in the County Council report.

5. A Member asked what the difference was between the S151 officer view and Executive opinion around the use of council reserves. Zena Cooke confirmed that both the original figures and the updated figures met the County Council's requirements in terms of being prudent. There was always a debate about what should be in reserves vs what must be spent but the executive was clear that prudence was a priority. It was hoped that the right outcome from the fair funding review would help. The challenge going forward was how to manage the capital budget particularly with statutory obligations for spend around health and safety etc.

6. Zena Cooke confirmed that all accounting was in line with local government regulations. She offered to provide a written explanation to the Committee in due course.

7. A Member commented that historically budget amendments at County Council often failed because of there was not sufficient explanation of how the money would be spent, therefore could a timeframe be provided setting out how the £1million set aside for the environment, and £3.5m for the Strategic Statement would be spent. Mr Oakford explained that the final decision on the £3.5million put aside for the Strategic Statement would not be made until the results of the consultation were known. However, one priority was Community Wardens.

8. The Chairman invited Ms Carey to respond to the money allocated for the environment. She stressed that it was not just £1million being spent on the environment, a commitment had been made to report on the £1million in May with longer term plans as part of the Kent Environment Strategy group (cross party group).

RESOLVED that;

- a) the draft budget and associated reports be noted;
- b) the ongoing lobbying of government for fairer funding be welcomed and noted;  
and
- c) the Executive be recommended to continue to make particular efforts in lobbying for sufficient Higher Needs funding.

**24. Exempt minute of the meeting held on 19 November 2019**

*(Item A10)*

RESOLVED that the exempt minute of the meeting held on 19 November 2019 was a correct record and that it be signed by the Chairman.

This page is intentionally left blank

**By: Joel Cook & Anna Taylor – Scrutiny Research Officers**  
**To: Scrutiny Committee – 23 June 2020**  
**Subject: Call-in of Decision 20/00017 – Recommissioning of Early Help Services**

---

### **Background**

1. Decision 20/00017 – Recommissioning of Early Help Services was taken on 29 May 2020 having first progressed through normal KCC pre-decision governance processes.
2. Following the decision being taken, the call-in request was submitted by Mr Cooke, supported by Mr Bird, thus meeting the requirements for any call-in to be supported by a minimum of two Members (including the Member submitting the call-in) from different political Groups.
3. The reasons of the call-in were duly considered by the Monitoring Officer and determined to be valid under the call-in arrangements set out in the Constitution.

KCC Constitution – section 17.70

Members can call-in a decision for one or more of the following reasons:

- (a) The decision is not in line with the Council's Policy Framework,
- (b) The decision is not in accordance with the Council's Budget,
- (c) The decision was not taken in accordance with the principles of decisionmaking set out in 8.5, and/or
- (d) The decision was not taken in accordance with the arrangements set out in Section 12.

4. The detailed reasons under the call-in criteria (listed above) are set out in the report provided by the Children, Young People and Education Directorate.

### **Process**

5. The Cabinet Member and relevant Officers will be attending the Scrutiny Committee meeting to present their response to the call-in.
6. The Scrutiny Committee should consider the reasons set out by the Members calling-in the decision and the response from the Executive, giving due attention to the report provided by CYPE and any other information made available during questioning and discussion on this item.

### **Options for the Scrutiny Committee**

7. The Scrutiny Committee may:

- a) make no comments
- b) express comments but not require reconsideration of the decision
- c) require implementation of the decision to be postponed pending reconsideration of the matter by the decision-maker in light of the Committee's comments; or
- d) require implementation of the decision to be postponed pending review or scrutiny of the matter by the full Council.

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1 - CYPE call-in response

## **Background Documents**

Decision 20/00017 – Recommissioning of Early Help Services

[Record of Decision](#)

[Executive Decision Report](#)

[Service chart \(Appendix 1\)](#)

## **Relevant Director**

Benjamin Watts

General Counsel

[Benjamin.watts@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Benjamin.watts@kent.gov.uk)

03000416814

## **Report Author(s)**

Joel Cook

Scrutiny Research Officer

[Joel.cook@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Joel.cook@kent.gov.uk)

03000416892

Anna Taylor

Scrutiny Research Officer

[Anna.taylor@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Anna.taylor@kent.gov.uk)

03000416478

From: **Sue Chandler, Cabinet Member for Integrated Children's Services**

**Matt Dunkley, Corporate Director for Children, Young People and Education**

To: **Scrutiny Committee – 23 June 2020**

Subject: **Response to Call-In Request: NEETs Contract Decision (part of EHPS Commissioning Decision 20/00017)**

Classification: **Unrestricted**

**Electoral Division: All**

**Summary:** This report contains the responses to the call in to Scrutiny

*Recommendation(s):*

Scrutiny Committee are requested to consider the response to comments supporting the call into Scrutiny

### **Reason for Call in and Responses**

1. **Reason: Para 8.5, Sub section a) Action proportionate to the desired outcomes.** Comment: There seems to be no information relating to the desired outcome in terms of efficacy of the service only that we wish to bring this in-house under the auspices of the Education People. In the absence of a proper understanding of desired outcomes relating to the quality of service it is impossible to ascertain the level to which the action is proportionate.
- 1.1 **Cabinet Member Response:** Following the SEND inspection, it was highlighted that all service provision needs to work across the across the spectrum of need, working to be inclusive of those young people with both a diagnosed and undiagnosed SEND. In addition to this, there is a need to target other vulnerable groups, such as those entering the youth justice system or those young people that form the home educated cohort.
- 1.2 With Disabled Childrens now being imbedded in the CYPE Directorate, we can move towards an inclusive offer for all young people that takes the emphasis away from escalation of need. In order to do this, material changes need to happen within the contract. This could not happen under the guise of a contract extension, meaning the current contract is not fit for purpose.
- 1.3 TEP's approach to its role as the strategic lead for NEETs within the county is to draw partners together to streamline processes and problem solve. It has often used its own staff to add capacity to the system and to overcome problems caused by the number of parties involved in county tracking and NEET support. NEET reduction is also a strand of the careers strategy

which is led by the Enterprise Coordinators who work with schools to ensure that Careers Education Information Advice and Guidance (CEIAG) is delivered well within schools with a focus on students who are 'at risk'.

- 1.4 The coming to the end of the current NEET support service contract is a unique opportunity to add capacity to the NEET County Action Plan, create a more preventative approach to NEET reduction and optimise the resource throughout the whole year. The integration of the support service into the at-risk of NEET work going on in schools and colleges is an opportunity to deal with the problem at source and create relationships with young people before problems arise, at a time in the year when the work of the NEET support service is levelling off. At the other end of the academic year when the number of NEETs are at its lowest, it can integrate into the tracking service, where it can help identify the young people it will then work with.
- 1.5 In order to extend the current contracts, there would need to be a continuation of provision and a utilisation of the exiting terms and conditions without any material change. An extension would not enable the authority to implement the changes needed to align the NEETs service to the NEET County Action Plan and the wider Skills and Employability provision within TEP, as well as strengthen links to the current work programmes surrounding SEND improvements, as this would materially change the contract.
2. **Reason: Sub section d) A presumption in favour of openness.**  
Comment: The decision fails this test in that there has clearly been insufficient (if any) real engagement with the current provider who has written to all members of CYPE explaining their dissatisfaction with the way this has been handled. Transparency and Openness requires the decision be scrutinised.
- 2.1 **Cabinet Member Response:** Initial conversations regarding the intention to cease the existing contracts first took place with the contract providers in September 2019, when the current provider of the NEET contract were issued with their contract extension to carry on provision until 30th September 2020. Further discussions with the provider took place during the regular contract management meetings and again in January 2020 when they were advised that we would be proceeding towards the end date of the contract extension.
- 2.2 Whilst it is vital to engage with all stakeholders including end users regarding the development, initiation and ceasing of a provision, it is not necessary to consult on who will be providing that service. As there is no proposal to change the design of the service, the authority would not go out for formal consultation.
3. **Sub section e) Clarity of aims and desired outcomes. Comment: see comment relative to sub section a) above**
- 3.1 In 2020, the number of places available to young people who are NEET reduced by over 800, due to a significant reduction in ESF/ESFA funding. Despite this, the coordinated approach of the Interdependencies group and



the district NEET meetings, led by TEP, meant the NEET percentage only increased by 0.1% between January 202 and April 2020, at the same time the percentage of Not Knowns reduced by 1.6%.

3.2 The strong relationships that TEP has with Kent schools, FE Colleges and training providers enabled local negotiations leading to an increase in some local provision and minimised the immediate impact. More significantly, the county wide response has enabled TEP to directly lobby the ESFA to increase the level of funding in Kent. TEP has started a new ESFA tendering process for additional NEET support training which is expected to begin over the summer which it is anticipated will reduce percentages further.

3.3 Ultimately, NEET prevention is key to reducing the size of this cohort and TEP currently has NEET prevention action plans with 50 schools in Kent including PRUs and special schools. This is only possible due to the close working of the school improvement and participation teams within TEP. NEET reduction is now a key part of the school improvement strategy led by TEP School Improvement team. These plans identify those who are at risk of becoming NEET and highlights what the school and TEP are going to do to minimise the chances of them becoming NEET.

4. **Sub section f) Explanation of the options considered and giving reasons for decision.** Comment: The decision would seem to fail this test in that no options other than that on which the decision has been predicated have been considered.

4.1 As outlined in the response to question 1, material changes are required in order to implement the changes needed to align the NEETs service to the NEET County Action Plan and wider Skills and Employability provision within TEP, and meet the outcomes outlined in the response to question 3. Therefore, it is not possible to extend the current contracts.

4.2 In preparation of the report to Cabinet Committee (and Key Decision process), considerations were given to whether a full procurement process would provide the best opportunities for the future of this service, including the necessary alignment to the county-wide strategy for NEETs.

4.3 These considerations concluded that, for the reasons outlined within the Cabinet Committee report and in the responses above, utilising Teckal to move to an SLA with TEP would provide the best opportunities to ensure there is alignment to the county-wide strategic approach to NEET support and prevention.

4.4 As stated in the response to the first question, the coming to the end of the current NEET support service contract is a unique opportunity to add capacity to the NEET County Action Plan, create a more preventative approach to NEET reduction and optimise the resource throughout the whole year.

4.5 Material changes to the contract are required to ensure that the service provision works across the spectrum of need, including SEND and other vulnerable groups, as described in the response to question 1.

**5. The impression that comes across is that a decision has been made to support a desire to bring this service in-house without any material consideration of potential alternatives. There is a good old business mantra that says "don't fix that which ain't broke". This decision does exactly that and risks outcomes that are generally currently regarded as EXCELLENT and with no cost savings. Fundamentally that is not good decision making and why as above I wish to call this in.**

5.1 We have acknowledged within the report and in previous Cabinet Committee meetings where the progress of the contract has been reported that performance against the KPIs is good. Whilst it is recognised that the current service is good, it does not follow that a more joined up service would not be better. Furthermore, despite the good performance from the current provider, the current contract is not fit for purpose as it does not include the elements to ensure the service works across the spectrum of need and vulnerable groups, as described in the response to question 1. The material changes required could not happen under the guise of a contract extension.

**6. Recommendation(s):**

6.1: Scrutiny Committee are requested to consider the response to comments supporting the call into Scrutiny.

**7. Background Documents**

None

**8. Contact details**

Report Author

- Stuart Collins, Director of Integrated Children's Services (West Kent and Early Help and Preventative Services
- 03000 417743     stuart.collins@kent.gov.uk

Relevant Director:

- Stuart Collins - Director of Integrated Children's Services (West Kent and Early Help and Preventative Services