

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of a meeting of the County Council held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 7 November 2024.

PRESENT: Mr B J Sweetland (Chairman), Mr N Baker, Mr M Baldock, Mr P Bartlett, Mrs C Bell, Mrs R Binks, Mr A Booth, Mr A Brady, Mr D L Brazier, Mr S R Campkin, Miss S J Carey, Sir Paul Carter, CBE, Mrs S Chandler, Mr N J D Chard, Mr I S Chittenden, Mrs P T Cole, Mr P Cole, Ms K Constantine, Mr G Cooke, Mr D Crow-Brown, Mr M C Dance, Ms M Dawkins, Mrs T Dean, MBE, Mr M Dendor, Mr R W Gough, Ms S Hamilton, Mr A R Hills, Mrs S V Hohler, Mr S Holden, Mr M A J Hood, Mr A J Hook, Mr D Jeffrey, Mr A Kennedy, Mr J A Kite, MBE, Rich Lehmann, Mr B H Lewis, Mr R C Love, OBE, Mr S C Manion, Mr R A Marsh, Mrs M McArthur, Mr J P McInroy, Ms J Meade, Mr J Meade, Mr D Murphy, Mr P J Oakford, Mr J M Ozog, Ms L Parfitt, Mr C Passmore, Mr H Rayner, Mr O Richardson, Mr D Robey, Mr A Sandhu, MBE, Mr T L Shonk, Mr M J Sole, Mr P Stepto, Mr R G Streatfeild, MBE, Dr L Sullivan, Mr R J Thomas, Mr D Watkins, Mr M Whiting, Mr J Wright and Ms L Wright

ALSO PRESENT:

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr J Cook (Democratic Services Manager) and Mr B Watts (General Counsel)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

259. Apologies for Absence
(Item 1)

The Democratic Services Manager reported apologies from Mr Barrington-King, Mr Beaney, Mr Bond, Mrs Bruneau, Mr Cannon, Mrs Game, Ms Hawkins, Mr Hill, Mrs Hudson, Mrs Prendergast, Mr Ridgers, Mr Simkins and Mr Webb.

260. Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or Other Significant Interests in items on the agenda
(Item 2)

Mr Jeffrey declared an interest later in the meeting, under Item 11 (Motion for Time Limited Debate 1), that he was a member of the Kent Local Government Pension Scheme and would not take part in the debate or vote.

261. Minutes of the meeting held on 12 September 2024 and, if in order, to be approved as a correct record
(Item 3)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Council meeting held on 12 September 2024 be approved as a correct record.

262. Chairman's Announcements

(Item 4)

- 1) As agreed at the County Council meeting in September, the Chairman wrote to the Kent Paralympians on behalf of the Council to congratulate them on competing in Paris. A response was received from Mr Matthew Robertson, a Paralympian on the GB Cycling team who won a bronze medal in the men's C2 3,000m individual pursuit, thanking Members and Officers for taking the time to write.
- 2) The Chairman thanked the Democratic Services Manager for his dedicated support to Full Council.
- 3) The Chairman explained that Item 10 on the agenda - *Petition Debate Seashells Commissioned Family Hub* - would be taken immediately after Item 6 - *Report by the Leader of the Council*.

263. Questions

(Item 5)

In accordance with Sections 14.15 to 14.22 of the Constitution, 8 questions were submitted by the deadline and 8 questions were put to the Executive. 8 questions were asked and replies given. A record of all questions put and answers given at the meeting is available [online](#) with the papers for this meeting.

264. Report by Leader of the Council

(Item 6)

- 1) The Leader updated Members on events since the last meeting and said he would not refer to the Entry/Exit System in his report as it was a later item on the agenda.
- 2) Regarding devolution Mr Gough said an expression of interest, in partnership with Medway Council, had been submitted to government accompanied by a letter signed by the Council, Medway Council and all 12 districts. He highlighted the importance of working together and emphasised there was unanimity across the Kent local authorities that the area should cover all of Kent and Medway. Mr Gough explained that Mr Jim McMahon MP had set out a comprehensive view of government's plans for devolution at the recent Local Government Association conference and the English Devolution White Paper was anticipated by the end of 2024.
- 3) Mr Gough turned to the recent Autumn Budget and said he would focus on areas that directly affected the Council and local government. He welcomed the overall amount of £1.3billion additional support to the sector, which included £600million for social care, along with funding for SEND and a further renewal of the Household Support Fund. He noted, however the offsetting impacts of the changes to the national living wage and employers' national insurance; their precise effects,

and those of the funding distribution formulas, remained to be seen. He referred to three areas of pressure the Council faced and questioned how government would address them, including adult social care, special educational needs and disability (SEND), and children's services.

- 4) The Leader spoke about the decision in relation to the Lower Thames Crossing which had been delayed to May 2025 and about which the Council continued to engage.
- 5) Regarding the government's decision to remove the winter fuel allowance, the Council had been working alongside district and borough colleagues to promote the take-up of pension credit and funding had been allocated from the Household Support Fund to support those who sat just above the level to claim. Mr Gough said these measures aimed to support those on very modest incomes who would be suffering severe pressures over the winter.
- 6) Mr Gough spoke about bus transport and referred to the Government's announcement regarding £650 million for local transport and the fare cap increase from £2 to £3. He said the Council remained focussed on sustaining the bus network and where possible achieving enhancements.
- 7) The Leader explained that the link between work and health was an important focus for the Council through two partnership groups - the Kent and Medway Economic Partnership and the Integrated Care Partnership. A strategic partnership for health and the economy would be developed and an All Member Briefing would take place in January 2025. The Leader also referred to the scheme previously known as Universal Support which the Council would be the accountable body for and which was a vital initiative likely to be launched in April 2025.
- 8) Mr Gough concluded by referring to the Poppy Appeal launch and the memorandum of understanding with the Chernihiv region in Ukraine. At the invitation of the regional Administration, Mr Gough and Mr Meade had recently travelled to Chernihiv to sign the agreement. He noted that this did not cost the Council any money and they travelled at their own expense. Mr Gough emphasised the importance of the agreement and said he would keep Members updated on developments.
- 9) The Leader of the Labour Group, Mr Brady, commended the Council's continued support of Ukraine and its citizens.
- 10) Turning to devolution, Mr Brady was grateful for the update and was pleased to hear that there was engagement with the districts. He noted that of utmost importance was what was best for Kent's residents and commented that a substantial financial package alongside devolution would be needed to solve the financial problems faced by the Council.
- 11) Mr Brady spoke about the recent Autumn Statement which, he said, included a funding boost for local authorities after 14 years of austerity. He compared it against the government's 2022 budget which he explained included multiple unfunded tax cuts and resulted in the pound fall against the dollar, an increase in interest rates, and a near collapse of the UK pension industry. He said the Labour government's budget would see investment in Britain's future, including: major infrastructure investments for schools, hospitals and roads; funding for buses; protection of working people's living standards; and protection for businesses.

- 12) Mr Brady referred to the increase to employers' national insurance which he said could potentially damage the Council's finances and questioned whether the Leader thought it would be beneficial to deliver services in house instead of relying on the private sector, and whether this would be funded by an increase in Council tax if that were possible, or the implementation of a wealth tax.
- 13) Mr Brady welcomed the work being undertaken to increase pension credit take-up, the continuation of the Household Support Fund, and the extra funding for public transport in Kent. His group welcomed partnership working between work and health, but questioned whether it was purely lip service if the Council's decisions did not align with the Integrated Care Strategy. Overall, more funding for the Council to deliver its services was welcomed.
- 14) Mr Lehmann, the Leader of the Green & Independents Group was pleased that from the perspective of local government, there was more positivity than in recent years regarding the recent budget but expressed concern that a large proportion of the additional £1.3 billion of funding would go straight back to government in the form of employers' national insurance contributions. He said he was not aware of any specific exemptions for local authorities with respect to either employers' national insurance contributions or the national living wage. Mr Lehmann was disappointed that the emergency 5p cut to fuel duty had been extended at an estimated cost of £3 billion and noted that just 10% of this amount would have enabled the government to cover the full cost of the £2 bus fare cap instead of increasing it to £3. He was pleased to see that the budget included additional funding for family hubs.
- 15) Regarding devolution Mr Lehmann confirmed his group's opposition to a directly elected mayor or to any changes which moved decision making powers away from communities.
- 16) In relation to the Lower Thames Crossing, his group was pleased that the proposed crossing had been delayed. Mr Lehmann compared the cost of the proposed Medway-Canvey Island crossing in 2008 with the estimated cost in 2022 for the Lower Thames Crossing and commented that the cost would likely rise further. In terms of infrastructure, he commented that £10 billion did not go far and his group felt this sum could be spent on more innovative solutions to mitigate the transport issues in North Kent.
- 17) Mr Lehmann explained that October saw the 30th anniversary of the establishment of the Committee on Standards in Public Life, which went on to publish the Seven Principles of Public Life, more commonly known as the Nolan Principles. He wondered what Lord Nolan would have made of the political landscape of recent years, particularly with regard to the issues in the United States and questioned how the US election would affect the ongoing Russia-Ukraine conflict. He offered his congratulations to Ms Kemi Badenoch MP, who had become the Conservative Party's fourth female leader and fifth leader since 2009. Mr Lehmann said he feared the coming years could see a further erosion of the Nolan principles.
- 18) Mr Hook, Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group, referred to the upcoming period of remembrance and thanked the Leader and Mr Meade, for representing the Council at their visit to Ukraine. Mr Hook said Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine had cost Kent dearly in terms of increased energy costs and building material costs, and were Russia to be victorious, the cost to everyone in the west would be financially and morally incalculable. Mr Hook also expressed his disappointment of the recent

US election results and hoped that American policy in Ukraine would continue to be supportive.

- 19) Mr Hook said his group strongly supported the current bid for devolution of power to Kent and Medway and said the power should be at the most local level. He said his group strongly opposed the idea of an elected mayor where all the power would be in the hands of one person who could not be removed until the next election. He expressed preference to a situation where a group of people were elected, took decisions together, and elected a leadership from among their own number.
- 20) Mr Hook's group welcomed the extension of the Household Support Fund and referred to the use of part of it for a winter fuel payment scheme restricted to people aged over 65. He noted that there were many people under 65 who were also struggling with bills.
- 21) Mr Hook's group was disappointed by the increase in employers' national insurance and suggested that the government care sector be exempt. He said an alternative way to raise money would be to double tax online gambling whilst also curbing an activity that caused harm to people's mental health. His group was also disappointed that the decision on the Lower Thames crossing had been delayed.
- 22) The Leader responded to some of the points made by the Group Leaders and began by thanking Mr Hook for his remarks about remembrance and Ukraine.
- 23) On devolution Mr Gough agreed with Mr Brady that the starting point was what was best for Kent residents. He did not think that devolution was a resolution to the Council's financial issues and commented that an effective combined authority could focus its powers on strategic areas whilst not being impacted by pressures in areas such as adult social care, children's social services, and SEND.
- 24) Mr Gough referred to Mr Brady's comments about the 2022 Autumn Statement and recalled the letter that he and the Leader of Hampshire had sent to senior ministers and the financial settlement from government that followed.
- 25) Regarding the recent Budget, The Leader reiterated that there was probably a net benefit to the Council in terms of extra costs and extra revenue, but it could not be claimed that it was a definitive solution to all the pressures the Council faced. The Leader was clear that the Council had and always would push hard on government, regardless of party, where it was believed financial support was inadequate.
- 26) Returning to devolution Mr Gough commented on the points made by Mr Lehmann and Mr Hook in relation to the mayoral issue and whether this moved decision making away from communities. He recognised the importance of not looking at one form of devolution and noted the opportunity within the boundaries of Kent and Medway to bring public services together to deliver better use of the Kent pound and better services to residents.
- 27) Finally, the Leader responded to comments made about the Lower Thames Crossing and agreed with Mr Lehmann that the costs of infrastructure had risen dramatically over the years along with the processes. Mr Gough hoped that the questions regarding delays and cost escalations in projects of great importance to the Council would be addressed.
- 28) RESOLVED that the Leader's report be noted.

265. Entry and Exit System (EES) Update
(Item 7)

- 1) Mr Gough proposed, and Mr Baker seconded the motion that
“The County Council to consider the following proposal to:
 1. Note the national and local preparations for the introduction of EES border checks; and
 2. Endorse Kent County Council’s priorities for urgent Government action to resolve the outstanding issues as highlighted in this report.”

- 2) Mr Love proposed the following amendment to the motion set out in paragraph 1:
“The County Council to consider the following proposal to:
 1. Note the national and local preparations for the introduction of EES border checks; and
 2. Endorse Kent County Council’s priorities for urgent Government action to resolve the outstanding issues as highlighted in this report, **subject to the seeking of a permanent solution ‘at pace’ to Operation Brock to resolve lorry parking on the M20, in line with HM Government commitments made in 2016, being added to the list of outstanding issues in section 7 of this Report.**

- 3) The Chairman put the amendment set out in paragraph 2 to the vote and it was agreed unanimously.

Amendment carried.

- 4) Mr Hook proposed and Mr Passmore seconded the following amendment to the motion set out in paragraph 2:
“The County Council to consider the following proposal to:
 1. Note the national and local preparations for the introduction of EES border checks; and
 2. Endorse Kent County Council’s priorities for urgent Government action to resolve the outstanding issues as highlighted in this report; subject to the seeking of a permanent solution ‘at pace’ to Operation Brock to resolve lorry parking on the M20, in line with HM Government commitments made in 2016, being added to the list of outstanding issues in section 7 of this Report.
 3. **Council asks the government to explore ways to prevent EES coming into effect at all on the UK/France border including by objectively studying the costs and benefits and viability of the UK joining with other non-EU states (Norway, Switzerland, Iceland and Lichtenstein) who are already in a common travel area with the EU, building on the common travel area that already exists between the UK and Ireland.**

- 5) Following the debate, the Chairman put the amendment set out in paragraph 4 to the vote and the voting was as follows:

For (10)

Mr S Campkin, Mr Chittenden, Mrs Dean, Mr Hood, Mr Hook, Mr R Lehmann, Mr Passmore, Mr Sole, Mr P Stepto, Mr Streatfeild

Against (41)

Mr Baker, Mr Bartlett, Mrs Bell, Mrs Binks, Mr Booth, Mr Brazier, Miss Carey, Mr Carter, Mrs Chandler, Mr Chard, Mr Cole, Mrs Cole, Mr Cooke, Mr Crow-Brown, Mr Dance, Mr Dendor, Mr Gough, Ms Hamilton, Mr Hills, Mrs Hohler, Mr Holden, Mr Jeffrey, Mr Kennedy, Mr Kite, Mr Love, Mr Marsh, Mrs McArthur, Mr McInroy, Mr Meade, Mr Oakford, Ms Parfitt, Mr Rayner, Mr Richardson, Mr Robey, Mr Sandhu, Mr Shonk, Mr Thomas, Mr Watkins, Mr Whiting, Mr Wright, Ms Wright

Abstain (5)

Mr A Brady, Ms K Constantine, Ms M Dawkins, Mr B Lewis, Ms J Meade

Amendment lost.

6) The Chairman put the substantive motion set out in paragraph 2 to the vote.

For (48)

Mr Baker, Mr Bartlett, Mrs Bell, Mrs Binks, Mr Booth, Mr Brady, Mr Brazier, Mr Campkin, Miss Carey, Mr Carter, Mrs Chandler, Mr Chard, Mr Cole, Mrs Cole, Ms Constantine, Mr Cooke, Mr Crow-Brown, Mr Dance, Ms Dawkins, Mr Dendor, Mr Gough, Ms Hamilton, Mr Hills, Mrs Hohler, Mr Holden, Mr Jeffrey, Mr Kennedy, Mr Kite, Mr Lewis, Mr Love, Mr Marsh, Mrs McArthur, Mr McInroy, Mr Meade, Ms Meade, Mr Oakford, Ms Parfitt, Mr Rayner, Mr Richardson, Mr Robey, Mr Sandhu, Mr Shonk, Mr Stepto, Mr Thomas, Mr Watkins, Mr Whiting, Mr Wright, Ms Wright

Against (8)

Mr Chittenden, Mrs Dean, Mr Hood, Mr Hook, Mr Lehmann, Mr Passmore, Mr Sole, Mr Streatfeild

Abstain (0)

Motion carried.

7) RESOLVED that the County Council:

1. Notes the national and local preparations for the introduction of EES border checks; and
2. Endorses Kent County Council's priorities for urgent Government action to resolve the outstanding issues as highlighted in this report, subject to the seeking of a permanent solution 'at pace' to Operation Brock to resolve lorry parking on the M20, in line with HM Government commitments made in 2016, being added to the list of outstanding issues in section 7 of this Report.

266. Spending the Council's Money
(Item 8)

- 1) The Chairman proposed, and Mr Booth seconded, that Council resolve to extend the meeting beyond 5pm with business to conclude no later than 5.30pm and it was agreed unanimously.
- 2) Mr Gough proposed, and Mrs Binks seconded the motion that
“County Council is asked to approve the substantive changes proposed to Spending the Council’s Money, detailed in Sections 2 to 8 and available in full in the appended documents and as recommended by the Governance and Audit Committee on 9 October 2024.”
- 3) Following the debate, the Chairman put the motion set out in paragraph 2 to the vote.
- 4) RESOLVED that the County Council approves the substantive changes proposed to Spending the Council’s Money, detailed in Sections 2 to 8 and available in full in the appended documents and as recommended by the Governance and Audit Committee on 9 October 2024.

267. Member Remuneration Panel Appointment
(Item 9)

- 1) Mr Gough proposed, and Mr Jeffrey seconded the motion that
“County Council is asked to agree the appointment of Malvern Chirume, Karen Price, and Roisin Reynolds to the Member Remuneration Panel for a four-year term commencing 7 November 2024.”
- 2) Following a comment made by a Member, the Democratic Services Manager explained that the management of the Member Scheme Allowance was outside the scope of this item.
- 3) Following the debate, the Chairman put the motion set out in paragraph 1 to the vote.
- 4) RESOLVED that the County Council agrees the appointment of Malvern Chirume, Karen Price, and Roisin Reynolds to the Member Remuneration Panel for a four-year term commencing 7 November 2024.

268. Petition Debate - Seashells Commissioned Family Hub
(Item 10)

This item was taken after Item 6 and before Item 7.

- 1) The Petitioners, Ms Kate Townsend-Brazier and Ms Amy Watkins, provided a verbal statement.
- 2) The Chairman invited Members to debate the petition.
- 3) The Cabinet Member for Integrated Children’s Services responded to the petition and the debate.

- 4) Mr Whiting proposed and Rich Lehmann seconded the motion that

“This Council resolves;

1. to thank the petitioners for raising this important issue.
2. to recommend to the Cabinet Member that she puts on hold her decision;
 - a. until she has explored with Seashells a possible reduction in the contract value,
 - b. until she has clarity over the government’s extension of its Family Hub Continuity Funding,
 - c. until after Cabinet has considered the total cross-departmental cost to the County Council accruing from any decision to cancel the commissioned service at Seashells.”

- 5) Following the debate, the Chairman put the motion set out in paragraph 4 to the vote and the voting was as follows:

For (18)

Mr Brady, Mr S Campkin, Mr Chittenden, Ms Constantine, Ms Dawkins, Mrs Dean, Mr Hood, Mr Hook, Mr R Lehmann, Mr Lewis, Ms Meade, Mr Passmore, Mr Sole, Mr P Stepto, Mr Streatfeild, Dr Sullivan, Mr Whiting, Mr Wright

Against (41)

Mr Baker, Mr Bartlett, Mrs Bell, Mrs Binks, Mr Booth, Mr Brazier, Miss Carey, Mrs Chandler, Mr Chard, Mr Cole, Mrs Cole, Mr Cooke, Mr Crow-Brown, Mr Dance, Mr Dendor, Mr Gough, Ms Hamilton, Mr Hills, Mrs Hohler, Mr Holden, Mr Jeffrey, Mr Kennedy, Mr Kite, Mr Love, Mr Manion, Mr Marsh, Mrs McArthur, Mr McInroy, Mr Meade, Mr Murphy, Mr Oakford, Mr Ozog, Ms Parfitt, Mr Rayner, Mr Richardson, Mr Robey, Mr Sandhu, Mr Shonk, Mr Thomas, Mr Watkins, Ms Wright

Abstain (1)

Mr Carter

Motion lost.

- 6) Mr Jeffrey proposed and Mr Booth seconded the motion that

“Council recognises that this petition represents significant local opinion regarding the proposed decision to not recommission Family Hub Services at Seashells and asks the Cabinet Member to take that into consideration in addition to the consultation report before taking the decision.”

- 7) Mr Lehmann proposed the following amendment to the motion set out at paragraph 6:

“Council recognises that this petition represents significant local opinion regarding the proposed decision to not recommission Family Hub Services at Seashells and asks the Cabinet Member to take that into consideration in addition to the consultation report, **and detailed financial analysis**, before taking the decision.”

- 8) The Chairman put the amendment set out in paragraph 7 to the vote and it was agreed.

Amendment carried.

- 9) Following the debate, the Chairman put the substantive motion set out at paragraph 7 to the vote and the voting was as follows:

For (56)

Mr Baker, Mr Bartlett, Mrs Bell, Mrs Binks, Mr Booth, Mr Brady, Mr Brazier, Mr Campkin, Miss Carey, Mr Carter, Mrs Chandler, Mr Chard, Mr Chittenden, Mr Cole, Ms Constantine, Mr Cooke, Mr Crow-Brown, Mr Dance, Ms Dawkins, Mrs Dean, Mr Dendor, Mr Gough, Ms Hamilton, Mr Hills, Mrs Hohler, Mr Holden, Mr Hood, Mr Hook, Mr Jeffrey, Mr Kennedy, Mr Kite, Mr Lehmann, Mr Lewis, Mr Love, Mr Manion, Mr Marsh, Mrs McArthur, Mr McInroy, Mr Meade, Ms Meade, Mr Murphy, Mr Oakford, Mr Ozog, Mr Passmore, Mr Richardson, Mr Robey, Mr Sandhu, Mr Shonk, Mr Sole, Mr Stepto, Mr Streatfeild, Dr Sullivan, Mr Thomas, Mr Watkins, Mr Wright, Ms Wright

Against (0)

Abstain (1)

Mr Whiting

Motion carried.

- 10) RESOLVED that Council recognises that this petition represents significant local opinion regarding the proposed decision to not recommission Family Hub Services at Seashells and asks the Cabinet Member to take that into consideration in addition to the consultation report, and detailed financial analysis, before taking the decision.

269. Motions for Time Limited Debate *(Item 11)*

Motion for Time Limited Debate 1 – Pension Fund Investment in Affordable Housing

- 1) Ms Dawkins proposed, and Mr Stepto seconded the motion that
- “The County Council resolves to:
- Support the principle of Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) investment in affordable housing; and
 - Recommend that the Pension Fund Committee investigates the viability of committing to a project to invest LGPS funds in affordable housing.”
- 2) Mr Jeffrey declared an interest that he was a member of the Kent Local Government Pension Scheme and would not take part in the debate or vote.
- 3) Mr Chard proposed and Mr Oakford seconded the following amendment to the motion set out at paragraph 1:

The County Council resolves to:

- Support the principle of **the Kent** Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) ~~investment in affordable housing~~ **having investments in a range of assets that meet their agreed strategy**; and
 - Recommend that the Pension Fund Committee **ask its advisors, Mercers, to further** investigate the viability of ~~committing to a project to invest LGPS funds in affordable housing.~~
- 4) Following the debate, the Chairman put the amendment set out in paragraph 3 to the vote and it was agreed.
- Amendment carried.*
- 5) The Chairman put the substantive motion set out in paragraph 3 to the vote and it was agreed.
- Substantive Motion carried.*
- 6) RESOLVED that the County Council:
- Supports the principle of the Kent Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) having investments in a range of assets that meet their agreed strategy; and
 - Recommends that the Pension Fund Committee ask its advisors, Mercers, to further investigate the viability of a project to invest LGPS funds in affordable housing.

Motion for Time Limited Debate 2 – Reforming Council Tax in England

- 1) Mr Lehmann proposed, and Mr Hood seconded the motion that
- “County Council resolves:
1. To agree that the current council tax system is regressive and requires significant reform; and
 2. To recommend that the Executive write to the relevant Ministers of State to request that, for the reasons stated above, the government introduces council tax reforms in England similar to those underway in Wales.”
- 2) Mr Lehmann proposed the following amendment to the motion set out at paragraph 1:
- “County Council resolves:
1. To agree that the current council tax system is regressive and requires significant reform; and
 2. To recommend that the Executive write to the relevant Ministers of State to request that, for the reasons stated above, the government **undertakes work to scrap Council Tax and replace it with a fairer tax more reflective of people’s ability to pay whilst also remaining aware of the significant funding pressures facing local authorities.**” ~~introduces council tax reforms in England similar to those underway in Wales.”~~

- 3) The Chairman put the amendment set out in paragraph 2 to the vote and the voting was as follows:

For (19)

Mr Baker, Mr Brady, Mrs Binks, Mr Chittenden, Ms Constantine, Mr Crow-Brown, Ms Dawkins, Mrs Dean, Mr Dendor, Mr Hood, Mr Hook, Mr Kennedy, Mr Lehmann, Mr Lewis, Ms Meade, Mr Passmore, Mr Sole, Mr Stepto, Mr Streatfeild

Against (28)

Mr Bartlett, Mrs Bell, Mr Booth, Mr Brazier, Miss Carey, Mrs Chandler, Mr Cole, Mrs Cole, Mr Cooke, Mr Dance, Mr Gough, Ms Hamilton, Mr Hills, Mr Holden, Mr Jeffrey, Mr Kite, Mr Love, Mr Marsh, Mr McInroy, Mr Oakford, Ms Parfitt, Mr Rayner, Mr Robey, Mr Sandhu, Mr Shonk, Mr Thomas, Mr Watkins, Ms Wright

Abstain (0)

Amendment lost.

- 4) Following the debate, the Chairman put the motion set out in paragraph 1 to the vote and the voting was as follows:

For (4)

Mr Hood, Mr Kennedy, Mr Lehmann, Mr Stepto

Against (37)

Mr Baker, Mrs Bell, Mrs Binks, Mr Booth, Mr Brazier, Miss Carey, Mrs Chandler, Mr Chard, Mr Chittenden, Mr Cole, Mr Cooke, Mr Crow-Brown, Mr Dance, Mrs Dean, Mr Dendor, Mr Gough, Ms Hamilton, Mr Hills, Mr Holden, Mr Hook, Mr Jeffrey, Mr Kite, Mr Love, Mr Marsh, Mr McInroy, Mr Oakford, Mr Passmore, Ms Parfitt, Mr Rayner, Mr Robey, Mr Sandhu, Mr Shonk, Mr Sole, Mr Streatfeild, Mr Thomas, Mr Watkins, Ms Wright

Abstain (6)

Mr Brady, Mrs Cole, Ms Constantine, Ms Dawkins, Mr Lewis, Ms Meade

Motion lost.

Motion for Time Limited Debate 3 – Cross-channel opportunities for young people

- 1) Mr Hook proposed, and Mr Streatfeild seconded the motion that

“This Council regrets:

1. The loss of the ability of young people from Kent and the rest of the UK to travel freely to the EU for study.

2. The significant impact on our university sector of the loss of youth mobility, including a sharp decline in the number of European students enrolling on courses.
3. The impact on visits to Kent from EU schools, and Kent schools to the EU, due to additional bureaucracy and associated costs.

This Council resolves to:

Request that the Leader write to the Prime Minister expressing the council's support for:

1. Negotiations to re-establish reciprocal mobility between the EU and UK for school trips, students and other young people.
 2. Expansion of opportunities for young people to study, teach and volunteer abroad by returning to the Erasmus + programme as an associated programme member.”
- 2) Following the debate, the Chairman put the motion set out in paragraph 1 to the vote and the voting was as follows.

For (12)

Mr Brady, Mr Chittenden, Ms Constantine, Mrs Dean, Mr Hood, Mr Hook, Mr Lewis, Ms Meade, Mr Passmore, Mr Sole, Mr Stepto, Mr Streatfeild

Against (30)

Mr Baker, Mrs Bell, Mrs Binks, Mr Booth, Mr Brazier, Miss Carey, Mrs Chandler, Mr Chard, Mr Cole, Mrs Cole, Mr Cooke, Mr Dance, Mr Dendor, Mr Gough, Ms Hamilton, Mr Hills, Mr Holden, Mr Jeffrey, Mr Kennedy, Mr Kite, Mr Love, Mr McInroy, Mr Oakford, Ms Parfitt, Mr Rayner, Mr Robey, Mr Sandhu, Mr Shonk, Mr Thomas, Mr Watkins

Abstain (0)

Motion lost.