

POLICY AND RESOURCES CABINET COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 14th January, 2026

10.00 am

**Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall,
Maidstone**





AGENDA

POLICY AND RESOURCES CABINET COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 14 January 2026, at 10.00 am
Council Chamber, Sessions House, County
Hall, Maidstone

Ask for: **Hayley Savage**
Telephone: **03000 414286**

Membership (13)

Reform UK (9):	Mr C Hespe (Chairman), Mr P Chamberlain (Vice-Chair), Mr D Burns, Mr W Chapman, Ms S Emberson, Mr L Evans, Mr J Finch, Mr M Mulvihill and Mr N Wibberley
Liberal Democrat (1):	Mr A J Hook
Green (1):	Mr M A J Hood
Conservative (1):	Mr H Rayner
Labour (1):	Mr A Brady

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

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

- 1 Introduction/Webcast announcement
- 2 Apologies and Substitutes
- 3 Declarations of Interest by Members in items on the Agenda
- 4 Minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2025 (Pages 1 - 6)
- 5 Draft Budget - Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department (Pages 7 - 14)

- 6 Performance Dashboard for the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department (Pages 15 - 36)
- 7 Resilience Update (Pages 37 - 48)
- 8 Strategic Overview of Kent County Council's Peppercorn Lease Estate (Pages 49 - 56)
- 9 Decisions taken between Cabinet Committee meetings
- 10 Work Programme 2026 (Pages 57 - 60)
- 11 25/00113 - Freehold disposal of Land at former Spires Academy, Bredlands Lane, Westbere, Canterbury CT2 0HD (Pages 61 - 78)

Motion to exclude the press and public for exempt business

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.

Paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

EXEMPT ITEMS

(There are no entirely exempt items on this agenda but exempt documents feature within some items. As appropriate, the Committee may resolve to exclude the press and public as set out above.)

Benjamin Watts
Deputy Chief Executive
03000 416814

Tuesday, 6 January 2026

This page is intentionally left blank

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

POLICY AND RESOURCES CABINET COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 13 November 2025

PRESENT: Mr C Hespe (Chairman), Mr P Chamberlain (Vice-Chair), Mr A Brady, Mr D Burns, Mr W Chapman, Ms S Emberson, Mr J Finch, Mr M A J Hood, Mr A J Hook, Mr M Mulvihill, Mr H Rayner and Mr N Wibberley

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr D Shipton (Head of Finance Policy, Planning and Strategy), Mrs A Beer (Chief Executive), Mrs R Spore (Director of Infrastructure), Mr J Betts (Interim Corporate Director Finance), Ms C Maynard (Chief Procurement Officer), Ms H Savage (Democratic Services Officer), Mr M Bridger (Commissioning Standards Programme Manager), Mr H D'Alton (Programme Manager (Strategic Programmes)), Ms R Rhodes (Commercial Risk and Responsible Procurement Lead), Ms J Taylor (Head of Capital) and Ms P Edwards (Commercial Policy and Governance Lead)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

24. Apologies and Substitutes

(Item 2)

Apologies were received from Mr Evans.

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

(Item 3)

There were no declarations of interest.

26. Minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2025

(Item 4)

RESOLVED that the open and exempt minutes of the meeting on 10 September were a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

27. 25/00083 - Adoption of the Kent County Council Commercial Strategy for 2026-2028

(Item 5)

1. Mr Brian Collins (Deputy Leader), Mr Paul Chamberlain (Deputy Cabinet Member for Corporate and Traded Services) and Mrs Clare Maynard (Chief Procurement Officer) introduced the item and the key decision to adopt KCC's Commercial Strategy for 2026-2028. The strategy set out a Council-wide framework for delivering best value through procurement and contract management. Mrs Maynard highlighted that a delegation to the Chief Procurement Officer to approve the supporting documents - Responsible

Procurement Charter and Contract Management Policy – would be included within the proposed key decision.

2. Further to questions and comments from Members the discussion included the following:
 - a) The lack of public consultation that had taken place or was planned was raised as a concern, and it was queried how third party spend with Kent businesses could be increased (including the setting of targets and measures to simplify processes for local providers). Officers explained that efforts were being made to support Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and Kent suppliers through contract lotting, engagement events, and simplified processes, while maintaining best value. Mr Chamberlain confirmed plans to provide Members with a toolkit to engage SMEs locally.
 - b) More detail in relation to the proposed social value policy was requested to ensure it delivered meaningful environmental, employment and skills benefits. Officers explained that social value was a statutory requirement under the new Procurement Act, and a dedicated policy with weightings and evaluation criteria would be brought to a future Cabinet Committee meeting.
 - c) Officers explained that the strategy was high-level and supported by detailed implementation plans, timetables, and success measures. The approach aimed to move procurement beyond a transactional process to one that added value through early engagement, supply chain development, and alignment with local priorities.
 - d) The three-year timeframe reflected a structured period for delivering measurable outcomes. It was agreed that setting a target for Kent-based spend would be considered, and officers confirmed that supporting local suppliers was a priority within the Council's Strategic Statement.
 - e) A Member requested that all political groups be represented on the Contract Management Review Group. The Chairman advised that concerns about proportionality and representation on the Contract Management Review Group should be raised in writing.
 - f) Mrs Maynard clarified that the term "smarter" referred both to adopting a more strategic approach to procurement and to setting SMART targets. She emphasised that the strategy was supported by performance indicators to ensure accountability.
 - g) The positive impact of recent changes to the Procurement Act was highlighted and Members welcomed the increased focus on social value, SMEs, and Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE), stressing the importance of performance indicators and transparency for residents.
 - h) Asked about training plans, rollout across directorates, and monitoring, Mrs Maynard confirmed that user voices were already included in some evaluation processes and reiterated the importance of tracking data to demonstrate investment in Kent. Regarding training, Mrs Maynard outlined existing measures such as Chartered Institute of Procurement and Supply (CIPS) qualifications for procurement staff, policy-based training on spending council funds, system training, and contract management training.
3. The Chairman thanked officers for their work and highlighted the upcoming supplier engagement event on 27 January 2026.

4. RESOLVED that the Cabinet Committee endorses the proposed decision to:
- (a) Approve the adoption and implementation of the Kent County Council Commercial Strategy 2026-2028.
 - (b) Delegate authority to the Chief Procurement Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance, to refresh and/or make non-substantial revisions to the strategy where changes do not require additional governance.
 - (c) Delegate authority to the Chief Procurement Officer to take relevant actions, including but not limited to, entering into and finalising the terms of relevant contracts or other legal agreements, as necessary, to implement the above decision.
 - (d) Delegate authority to the Chief Procurement Officer to approve the Responsible Procurement Charter and Contract Management Policy as supporting documents to the Commercial Strategy.

28. Commercial and Procurement Performance Report (Quarter 1 and Quarter 2, 2025/2026)
(Item 6)

1. Mr Collins and Mrs Maynard introduced the item which detailed the work of the Commercial and Procurement Division, including value added, savings achieved, and progress on policies and procedures. Mrs Maynard emphasised that the achievements represented a whole-Council effort and clarified that reported savings were already captured within directorate budgets to avoid double counting.
2. Further to questions and comments from Members the discussion included the following:
 - (a) Regarding the graph at paragraph 3.1 of the report, Mrs Maynard confirmed that Q1 and Q2 figures were actuals, while Q3 and Q4 were projections based on existing contracts, and that the grey line represented projected spend for the 2026–27 financial year.
 - (b) A Member asked how the new strategy would reduce subcontracting and enable direct engagement with suppliers. Mrs Maynard responded that subcontracting would remain necessary in some cases but would reduce as more contracts were lotted and structured to support smaller providers. It was noted that reducing subcontracting aligned with the strategy's focus on SMEs and VCSEs.
 - (c) On retrospective waivers, Mrs Maynard explained that the recent increase reflected greater engagement and improved visibility through the new Oracle system, allowing better compliance monitoring and training.
 - (d) Officers confirmed that the Commercial Procurement Oversight Board was an officer-only body chaired by Mrs Maynard, with representation from finance, risk, legal, and relevant directorates.
 - (e) Asked about modern slavery and fraud within supply chains Officers outlined ongoing work based on the Home Office Procurement Pilots Report, including a Serious and Organised Crime Working Group, risk assessments, and guidance for proportionate approaches, with plans to extend this to bribery, fraud, and corruption.

- (f) A Member asked whether rescinding the climate emergency declaration reduced barriers for small businesses while maintaining proportionate environmental standards. Mr Chamberlain responded that the intention was to lower entry barriers for SMEs without removing environmental considerations.

3. RESOLVED that the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee note the report.

29. Department of Local Government Efficiency (DOLGE) - Strategy, Remit, Governance & Decision-Making Update
(Item 7)

1. Mr Matthew Fraser Moat (Cabinet Member for Local Government Efficiency) introduced the report on the Department of Local Government Efficiency's (DOLGE) strategy, remit, governance, and decision-making. He explained that DOLGE aimed to embed a more commercial approach across KCC operations and referred to the adoption of the new Commercial Strategy, cultural change initiatives, revised business processes, and new internal training courses for staff involved in procurement. These measures were expected to deliver efficiencies and savings during the 2026–27 financial year. He noted that decisions affecting the 2025–26 financial year remained the responsibility of Cabinet.
2. The Chairman emphasised that the report set out the framework rather than specific savings and confirmed that DOLGE would contribute to budget setting and medium-term financial planning.
3. Further to questions and comments from Members the discussion included the following:
 - a) Some Members expressed concern that the report lacked detail, requesting more information on immediate savings, future cost avoidance, and areas identified for deep dives. Mr Collins and the Chairman responded to comments.
 - b) It was questioned whether DOLGE duplicated existing functions such as internal audit and the Commercial Procurement Oversight Board, noting that financial prudence had long been a priority for the Council. Mr Fraser Moat clarified that DOLGE differed from internal audit by taking a forward-looking approach to efficiency rather than reviewing past compliance.
 - c) A Member asked how DOLGE would ensure transparency and accountability in its recommendations and how Cabinet Members would be supported in progressing proposals. Mr Fraser Moat confirmed that all of DOLGE's proposals were being discussed with Cabinet Members.
 - d) Mr Fraser Moat confirmed that approximately a quarter of a full-time equivalent (FTE) officer post provided secretarial support.
 - e) Mr Collins and the Chairman responded to criticisms, noting the challenging financial position inherited by the previous Administration, and significant pressures such as adult social care costs.
 - f) Asked whether savings would include the closing of waste sites and/or libraries, Mr Fraser Moat confirmed that all Council expenditure was being reviewed as part of the budget process, but no decisions had yet been made.

4. Mr Hood raised a point of order, supported by Mr Rayner, regarding the Chairman's level of independence within his chairing role and the Chairman commented that he was justified in providing contextual information to aid the debate. Mr Hood suggested that cost-cutting should be led by a dedicated officer rather than relying solely on Cabinet Members. The Chairman reiterated that transparency and accountability were addressed in the governance section of the report.
5. RESOLVED that the report be noted.

30. Budget Planning 2026-27 Update
(Item 8)

1. Mr Collins introduced the report on budget planning for 2026–27, which outlined major issues affecting revenue spending, the timetable for preparing the draft budget and medium-term financial plan, and the results of the summer budget consultation. The draft budget would be published in January and would include proposed investments in priority areas alongside savings proposals.
2. Further to questions and comments from Members the discussion included the following:
 - a) It was noted that the 2025/26 £60million overspend could increase due to adult social care overspends and Mr Collins confirmed that a 1% reduction in council tax would equate to approximately £10million per year.
 - b) Asked whether the estimated increased funding, referred to in the report, included assumptions for council tax base growth and rate increases, Mr Dave Shipton (Head of Finance Policy, Planning and Strategy) confirmed that the previous Medium-Term Financial Plan assumed a 1.5% increase in the council tax base, council tax increases up to the referendum limit, and indexation on certain grants. No assumptions for fair funding were included.
 - c) Concern was expressed about the lack of early visibility of savings proposals compared to previous years, noting that earlier drafts had been helpful for scrutiny. Mr John Betts (Corporate Director Finance) explained that an earlier draft of the budget was not possible for the 2026/27 financial year due to uncertainty over fair funding and delays to the settlement.
3. RESOLVED to note the 2026-27 budget planning, timetable and strategy towards setting a balanced budget.

31. Decant of Invicta House into Sessions House Update
(Item 9)

1. Mr Collins introduced the report on the decant from Invicta House into Sessions House. Mrs Spore reported that staff were moved primarily into Blocks A, C, and D over the summer, with compliance works undertaken to ensure the environment was warm, safe, and dry.

2. Further to questions and comments from Members the discussion included the following:
 - a) Asked about fire safety compliance (including training for Members) Mrs Spore confirmed that safety measures, including the EvacTag system, were in place across the whole building. Mrs Spore said she would follow up regarding training for Members.
 - b) Asked how accessibility needs were being addressed given the age and condition of the lifts, Mrs Spore confirmed that accessibility needs were managed through clear routes, contingency plans, and lift maintenance supported by on-site spares. She acknowledged the age-related limitations of the lifts and what was viable but confirmed that management actions were also being taken alongside the physical measures outlined above where appropriate.
 - c) Regarding the car park on County road a Member suggested repainting spaces to accommodate larger vehicles. Mrs Spore advised that this car park was leased from Network Rail, and therefore relining would require agreement. Officers agreed to consider this further.
 - d) A Member queried the cost of making the courtyard safe (and the basement underneath). Mrs Spore confirmed that the basement works had a budget allocation of approximately £600,000, with the actual cost being within this figure, primarily for structural stability and fire evacuation compliance. The space was now suitable for car parking spaces.
 - e) A Member requested an overall figure for the decant and associated works and Mrs Spore confirmed that this totalled approximately £2.4 million.
 - f) Mrs Spore explained that compliance works had focused on the “warm, safe, dry” standard, including fire alarm and emergency lighting upgrades across Blocks A and B. Additional works for systems previously rated amber or red were under review, with allocations identified in earlier decisions.
 - g) Regarding the life-expired systems referenced in the report Mrs Spore advised that fire safety systems had been renewed for long-term use, while mechanical and ventilation systems remained under assessment.
3. The Chairman thanked officers and staff for their efforts and highlighted ongoing engagement with staff groups to address emerging issues.
4. RESOLVED to note the report.

32. Work Programme 2025/26 (Item 10)

RESOLVED to note the work programme.

The Chairman took the opportunity to thank Mr John Betts (Corporate Director Finance) for his work and commitment during his time at the Council.

From: Linden Kemkaran, Leader of the Council

Brian Collins, Deputy Leader of the Council

To: Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee - 14 January 2026

Subject: Draft Capital Programme 2026-36, Revenue Budget 2026-27 and Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) 2026-29 – Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary:

This report outlines the key policy considerations within the Administration's draft capital and revenue budget proposals for the Cabinet portfolios and council departments relevant to this committee. This is a tailored report for each committee and should be considered within the context of the overall whole council budget proposals published separately to support the budget scrutiny process.

Recommendations:

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to:

- a) NOTE the Administration's draft capital and revenue budget proposals
- b) SUGGEST any alternatives that should be considered related to the Cabinet Committee's portfolio before the final draft budget is considered by Cabinet on 29th January 2026 and presented to Full Council on 12th February 2026.

1. Background and Context

1.1 The setting of the budget is a decision reserved for Full Council. The Council's Budget and Policy Framework requires that a draft budget is issued for consultation with the Cabinet and Scrutiny Committees to allow for their comments to be considered before the final budget proposals are made to Full Council.

1.2 The Council is under a legal duty to set a balanced and sustainable budget for the forthcoming year (2026-27) within the resources available from local taxation and central government grants, and to maintain adequate reserves. This duty applies to the final draft budget presented for Full Council approval at the annual budget meeting and does not necessarily apply the preceding drafts or plans for subsequent years. The overall strategy for the budget is to ensure that the Council continues to plan for revenue and capital budgets which are affordable, reflect the Council's strategic priorities, allow the Council to fulfil its statutory responsibilities and continue to maintain and improve the Council's financial resilience within the overall resource constraints.

1.3 A medium term financial strategy covering the entirety of the resources available to the Council is the best way that resource prioritisation and allocation decisions can be considered and agreed in a way that provides a stable and considered approach to service delivery and takes into account relevant risks and uncertainty. A report on the purpose of medium term financial planning was presented to Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee on 8th July 2025 [P&R MTFP Update](#). This report identified that the strategy should pull together in one place all known factors affecting the financial standing and

sustainability of the Council over the medium term. The draft budget publication sets out all this necessary information for the scrutiny process. The final draft will include all the necessary information for the approval process. These are not necessarily the same and the final draft will include supporting strategies e.g. treasury management strategy, necessary for final budget approval.

1.4 The primary focus within the capital programme must be to ensure that the Council has sufficient capacity to meet legal and regulatory requirements where there is risk of death or serious harm to residents and service users. This means first call on capital is to address “safety vital” works. The secondary focus is to reduce the impact on the revenue budget, through reducing borrowing requirements, resulting in reduced revenue debt costs and using the capital receipts flexibility powers which allows local authorities to fund permitted revenue costs. The capital programme will still include individual project schemes and rolling programmes funded from external sources.

1.5 The primary focus of the revenue budget must be to strike an appropriate balance between fulfilling the Council’s statutory obligations on service provision and the Administration’s strategic priorities. However, these aims are not always compatible and involves difficult decisions about service levels and provision both for the forthcoming year and over the medium term. In reaching this balance the budget has to include provision for forecast spending growth (base budget changes to reflect full year impact of current variances, contractual price uplifts, staff pay awards, other cost drivers such as market availability, demand increases and service improvements). The revenue budget must also include planned efficiency, policy and transformation savings and plans to generate additional income necessary to balance any differences between spending growth and the available resources from central government and local taxation.

1.6 As part of budget scrutiny process it is worth clarifying that savings relate to reducing current recurring spend whereas bearing down on future growth is cost avoidance. Both amount to the same end outcome of reducing planned spending in the forthcoming year from what would otherwise have been needed without action and intervention. Both savings and cost avoidance are essential to ensure the statutory requirement for a balanced budget is met.

1.7 Fuller details of the budget plans are set out in the draft budget report which will be available in due course. A separate report on responses to public consultation on the budget strategy has also been published and is available at [Let's Talk Kent](#).

1.8 The report to this Cabinet Committee focuses on the key policy considerations within the Administration’s draft budget proposals for the directorate/Cabinet portfolio(s) relevant to this committee. To assist this, a summary of the 2026-27 proposals for the relevant directorate/Cabinet portfolio is included as an appendix to this report. An interactive dashboard is also provided to Members, enabling the details of all proposals to be examined and scrutinised in depth.

1.9 Following the scrutiny process, a revised draft of the Administration’s final budget proposals will be published in January for Cabinet consideration and approval at County Council in February 2025.

2. Key Policy Considerations

This report does not include the impact of any decisions made at the full Council meeting on Thursday 18th December 2025. Any decisions taken forward at that meeting will be reflected in the final draft prior to the Budget Meeting on Thursday 12th February 2026.

Capital Spending

2.1 The capital programme includes additional funding as part of the Modernisation of Assets which is essential to ensure that the Highways depots and Salt Barns can meet service requirements. It should be noted that there remains significant risk given the condition of the estate that there is a building failure which cannot be managed within the allocation in the capital budgets leading to service closure.

The decision to sell Invicta House and to continue to use Sessions House as Strategic Headquarters has been reflected in the capital forecast. Further detail on the revenue implications of this decision is included in the *Revenue Savings and Income* section below.

Revenue Spending Growth

2.2 The revenue spending proposals that are due to Local Choice or a mixture of Local Choice and Unavoidable Spend are detailed below:

2.2.1 Annual uplift to Member Allowances (£54.6k additional cost in 2026-27)

In line with existing policy there is an annual increase to allowances linked to staff pay and other public sector pay awards. This spending line provides for the additional costs.

2.2.2 Finance – Counter Fraud (£54.5k additional cost in 2026-27)

The Counter Fraud Team provides a corporate service to KCC, including, but not limited to: tracking and investigation financial irregularities (fraud and error) that occur within KCC; providing advice and support to management to mitigate the risk of financial irregularities occurring within their area; and providing awareness and assessing the risk of financial irregularities with management and front-line staff.

An increase in referrals being received across the organisation is putting pressure on the existing team, and a request is being made for one additional staff member to be hired, to allow the Counter Fraud team to scale up the activity they provide. Investment in the Counter Fraud team safeguards KCC against fraud and contributes to the organisation's ability to reclaim costs incurred through fraudulent means.

2.2.3 Local Democracy – Grants to District Councils (£8.5k additional cost in 2026-27)

Annual uplift in the grant made to district council covering our contribution for Retriever, a CPI-linked debt tracing contract to help increase levels of council tax raised via improving the tax base and collection rates.

Revenue Savings and Income

2.3 These are the relevant savings and income proposals, focussing on areas of policy choice and transformation:

2.3.1 Sessions House (£30k additional cost in 2026-27; cumulative saving of £168k by the end of 2028-29)

The Deputy Leader has confirmed that Sessions House will remain Kent County Council strategic headquarters until Local Government Reorganisation in 2028. Invicta House will instead be sold to reduce holding costs and liabilities.

This decision reflects the Administration's priorities to reduce capital borrowing in the short term, preserve Sessions House as a legacy building for future Administrations, and maintain flexibility in the office estate while meeting minimum legal obligations for safety and heritage conservation. The previous plan to refurbish Invicta House and dispose of Sessions House would have required significant capital investment. Retaining Sessions House and selling Invicta House avoids up to £12 million in capital expenditure, aligning with the Administration's focus on financial prudence and simplicity.

The financial impact of this decision will vary over time and the MTFP has been updated from a capital and revenue perspective. The saving on borrowing costs related to this decision is not reflected here, as it is considered a non-attributable cost and is therefore not attributable to Infrastructure in the MTFP.

2.3.2 Car Parking Review (£1,000k in 2026-27)

Kent County Council will review its approach to car parking across its office estate to ensure that it remains appropriate to the way that we are using our office accommodation. This will include a review of car parking model, hours of operation and charging models.

A review of car parking provision supports the council's wider financial strategy and ensures that resources are used responsibly. Clear communication and engagement with staff will be essential as the review progresses. The aim is to generate a benefit to the Council of £1m from 2026 onwards.

2.3.3 Changes to Drinking Water Provision (£30k saving in 2026-27)

Kent County Council will review its approach to providing chilled drinking water across the estate to deliver a saving of £30,000. The current budget for water provision is approximately £120,000 and covers both plumbed water coolers and bottled water. The proposed change will reduce reliance on bottled water and increase the use of plumbed systems where feasible, ensuring a more cost-effective and environmentally responsible solution.

The key risks associated with this saving include the potential that some sites with older plumbing may not be suitable for plumbed water installations. These risks will be managed through careful site assessments and clear communication with staff to maintain confidence in the quality and availability of drinking water.

2.3.4 Changes to Provision of Plants (£40k saving in 2026-27)

Kent County Council will review the provision of plants in its offices as part of a review of non-essential services. The current contract includes pruning, watering, pest control and replacement of plants when required. These activities cannot be transferred to staff due to previous issues with maintenance. Continuing the contract is no longer considered a priority. Removing plants entirely will deliver a saving of £40,000 while ensuring that resources are focused on core services.

This change reflects a pragmatic approach to managing costs without compromising the council's ability to provide a safe and functional working environment.

2.3.5 KCC Estate – Community and Specialist Assets (£117.7k saving in 2026-27)

Review of Community and Specialist Assets as part of the Future Assets Strategic Reset Programme. Where possible there will be some co-location of services into buildings to

release others, and options for disposal will always consider alternative use for KCC initially.

2.3.6 KCC Estate – Office Assets (£22.1k saving in 2026-27)

The review of Office Assets will deliver the MTFP target over the medium term but has had to be re-phased due to unforeseen costs.

2.3.7 Legal – In-house Solicitors (£487.6k saving in 2026-27)

KCC are proposing to recruit 4 permanent in-house solicitors to reduce the reliance on expensive external legal firms. The cost of c. £360k is offset by income from the directorates, estimated at £847.6k, as spend is redirected from external legal firms to the in-house team. This is forecast to lead to a net saving to KCC of £487.6k overall. This proposal does not impact the existing relationship with Invicta Law. This decision supports the council's wider financial strategy and ensures that resources are used responsibly.

2.3.8 Contact Centre service levels review (£290k saving in 2026-27)

Kent County Council has reviewed its contact centre provision as part of the upcoming contract renewal. The aim is to reduce costs by further employing technology to deliver an estimated saving of £290,000 from 2026 onwards.

3. Contact details

Report Authors:

Dave Shipton (Head of Finance Policy, Planning and Strategy)

03000 419418

dave.shipton@kent.gov.uk

Cath Head (Head of Finance Operations)

03000 416934

Cath.Head@kent.gov.uk

Christopher Riley (Finance Business Partner)

03000 416866

Christopher.Riley@kent.gov.uk

Relevant Corporate Directors:

Amanda Beer (Chief Executive)

03000 415835

Amanda.Beer@kent.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX E - 2026-27 Budget

	CED	DCED	CED & DCED Linden Kemkaran	CED & DCED Brian Collins
	Core £000s	Core £000s	Core £000s	Core £000s
MTFP Category				
Original base budget	26,809.1	82,624.7		
internal base adjustments	32,047.0	-26,617.2		
Revised Base	58,856.1	56,007.5		
SPENDING				
Base Budget Changes	393.5	23.6	0.0	417.1
Reduction in Grant Income	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Prices	723.2	424.8	17.5	1,130.5
Demand & Cost Drivers - Cost	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Demand & Cost Drivers - Demand	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Government & Legislative	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Service Strategies & Improvements	888.5	-7,966.4	54.6	-7,132.5
TOTAL SPENDING	2,005.2	-7,518.0	72.1	-5,584.9
SAVINGS, INCOME & GRANT				
Transformation - Future Cost Increase Avoidance	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Transformation - Service Transformation	-136.9	-6.8	-132.8	-10.9
Efficiency	-1,257.9	-565.0	-812.1	-1,010.8
Income	-1,000.0	0.0	0.0	-1,000.0
Financing	0.0	8,021.0	0.0	8,021.0
Policy	-890.0	0.0	0.0	-890.0
TOTAL SAVINGS & INCOME	-3,284.8	7,449.2	-944.9	5,109.3
Increases in Grants and Contributions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL SAVINGS, INCOME & GRANT	-3,284.8	7,449.2	-944.9	5,109.3
MEMORANDUM:				
Removal of undelivered/temporary savings & grant	0.0	8,021.0	0.0	8,021.0
New & FYE of existing Savings	-2,284.8	-571.8	-944.9	-1,911.7
New & FYE of existing Income	-1,000.0	0.0	0.0	-1,000.0
New & FYE of existing Grants	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	-3,284.8	7,449.2	-944.9	5,109.3
Prior Year savings rolling forward for delivery in 26-27 *	0.0	-108.9	-108.9	
TOTAL Savings for delivery in 2026-27	-3,284.8	-680.7	-1,053.8	-2,911.7
* the prior year savings rolled forward for delivery in 2026-27 are based on the Qtr 3 monitoring and will be updated as part of the outturn report, and those updated figures will be used for the 2026-27 savings monitoring process				
RESERVES				
Contributions to Reserves	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Removal of prior year Contributions	-90.9	0.0	0.0	-90.9
Drawdowns from Reserves	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Removal of prior year Drawdowns	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL RESERVES	-90.9	0.0	0.0	-90.9
NET CHANGE (excl internal base adjustments)	-1,370.5	-68.8	-872.8	-566.5
NET BUDGET	57,485.6	55,938.7		

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Linden Kemkaran, Leader of the Council

Brian Collins, Deputy Leader of the Council

Amanda Beer, Chief Executive Officer

To: Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee – 14 January 2026

Subject: Performance Dashboard for the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary:

The Performance Dashboard for the Chief Executive's Department (CED) and Deputy Chief Executive's Department (DCED), shows performance against targets set for Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).

23 of the 30 KPIs achieved target for the latest month reported and were RAG rated Green, one was below target but did achieve the floor standard (Amber), and six did not achieve the floor standard (Red).

Recommendation:

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE the performance position for the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department.

1. Introduction

1.1. Part of the role of Cabinet Committees is to review the performance of the functions of the Council that fall within the remit of the Cabinet Committee. To support this role performance dashboards are regularly reported to each Cabinet Committee throughout the year, and this is the second report for the 2025/26 financial year.

2. Performance Dashboard

2.1. This Performance Dashboard for CED and DCED provides results up to September or October 2025 and is attached in Appendix 1.

2.2. The Dashboard provides a progress report on performance against target for the 30 KPIs for 2025/26. The Dashboard also includes a range of activity indicators which help give context to the KPIs.

2.3. KPIs are presented with RAG alerts to show progress against targets. Details of how the alerts are generated are outlined in the Guidance Notes, included with the Dashboard in Appendix 1.

2.4. Of the 30 KPIs, the latest RAG status is as follows:

- Twenty-three are rated Green – the target was achieved or exceeded.
- One was rated Amber – performance achieved or exceeded the expected floor standard but did not meet the target for Green.
- Six are rated Red – performance did not meet the expected floor standard. These are:
 - FN06: Percentage of sundry debt due to KCC under 6 months old
 - FN08: Invoices received on time by Accounts Payable processed within 30 days
 - FN16: Publication of budget proposals for Cabinet Committees
 - GL02: Freedom of Information Act requests completed within 20 working days
 - GL03: Data Protection Act Subject Access Requests (SARs) completed within statutory timescales.
 - CS07: Complaints responded to in timescale

3. KPI review for 2026/27

3.1. As in previous years, the Analytics team has approached services within the Chief Executive's and Deputy Chief Executive's Departments to consider any revisions to the existing KPIs within the current dashboard. This year, attention has been drawn to the priority within the Strategic Statement to "improve performance management arrangements for all KCC services by reviewing current key performance indicators and targets, and develop a range of productivity measures for each KCC service, so we can target improving productivity and drive value for money".

3.2. There are ongoing discussions within the services concerning this review, with one outcome being the inclusion from 2026/27 of a new section within the dashboard with KPIs from the Commercial and Procurement Division.

3.3. The aim is to bring proposed revisions to the report to the next Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee meeting in March.

4. Recommendation

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE the performance position for the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department.

5. Contact details

Report Author:

Matthew Wagner
Chief Analyst
Chief Executive's Department
03000 416559
Matthew.Wagner@kent.gov.uk

Relevant Director:

David Whittle
Director of Strategy, Policy, Relationships & Corporate Assurance
03000 416833
David.Whittle@kent.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Performance Dashboard for the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department

Financial Year 2025/26

Results up to Sept/Oct 2025

Produced by Kent Analytics

Guidance Notes

Key Performance Indicators

All Key Performance Indicators are provided with RAG (Red/Amber/Green) ratings.

RAG ratings are based on Targets and Floor Standards brought before the Cabinet Committee in May 2023.

Where relevant, RAG ratings are given for both the latest month and year to date (YTD).

RAG Ratings

GREEN	Target has been achieved
AMBER	Floor Standard* achieved but Target has not been met
RED	Floor Standard* has not been achieved

*Floor Standards are the minimum performance expected and if not achieved must result in management action

Activity Indicators

Activity Indicators representing demand levels are also included in the report. They are not given a RAG rating, instead where appropriate, they are tracked within an expected range represented by Upper and Lower Thresholds. The Alert provided for Activity Indicators is whether results are within the expected range or not. Results can either be in expected range (**Yes**) or they could be **Above** or **Below**. Expected activity thresholds are based on previous years' trends.

When activity indicators do not have expected thresholds, they are shown in the report to provide context for the Key Performance Indicators. In such cases the activity indicators are simply shown with comparison to activity for the previous year.

Key Performance Indicator Summary

Finance	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
FN06: Percentage of sundry debt due to KCC under 6 months old	RED	N/A
FN07: Invoices received by Accounts Payable within 30 days of KCC received date	GREEN	GREEN
FN08: Invoices received on time by Accounts Payable processed within 30 days	RED	RED
FN11: Percentage of financial assessments completed within 15 days of referral	AMBER	AMBER
FN12: Percentage of working days aggregate bank balance is in credit	GREEN	AMBER
FN13: Percentage of working days average credit rating for internally managed cash portfolio is no lower than AA	GREEN	GREEN
FN14: Percentage of third-party insurance claims resolved within the designated timescales	GREEN	GREEN
FN15: Statement of accounts (draft & final) published within deadlines	N/A	GREEN
FN16: Publication of budget proposals for Cabinet Committees / Cabinet / County Council		RED

Governance, Law & Democracy	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
GL01: Council and Committee papers published at least five days before meetings	GREEN	AMBER
GL02: Freedom of Information Act requests completed within 20 working days	RED	RED
GL03: Subject Access Requests (SARs) completed within statutory timescales	RED	RED

Marketing and Resident Experience	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
CS01: Callers who rate the advisors in Contact Point as good	GREEN	GREEN
CS04a: Daytime calls to Contact Point answered	GREEN	GREEN
CS04b: Out of hours calls to Contact Point answered	GREEN	GREEN
CS06a: Daytime calls achieving 85% of quality scorecard	GREEN	GREEN
CS06b: Out of hours calls achieving 85% of quality scorecard	GREEN	GREEN
CS07: Complaints responded to in timescale	RED	RED

Human Resource and Organisational Development	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
HR09: Training evaluated by participants as having delivered stated learning outcomes	GREEN	GREEN
HR10: Training evaluated by participants as having delivered stated learning outcomes	GREEN	GREEN

Health and Safety	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
HR25: Completed corporate themed Health and Safety audits sent within timescale	GREEN	GREEN

Technology	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
ICT01: Calls to ICT Help Desk resolved at the first point of contact	GREEN	GREEN
ICT02: Positive feedback rating with the ICT help desk	GREEN	GREEN
ICT03: Working hours where Kent Public Sector Network is available to staff	GREEN	GREEN
ICT04: Working hours where ICT Services available to staff	GREEN	GREEN
ICT05: Working hours where email is available to staff	GREEN	GREEN

Infrastructure	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
PI01: Rent due to KCC outstanding over 60 days	GREEN	N/a
PI05: Percentage of scheduled Planned Preventative Maintenance completed by due date	GREEN	GREEN
PI06: Percentage of reactive help desk tasks completed by due date	GREEN	GREEN
PI07: Percentage of help desk calls answered within timescale	GREEN	GREEN

Chief Executive's Department

Service Area	Responsible Officer	Cabinet Member
Finance	John Betts (interim Director)	Brian Collins

Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	Oct-25	Month RAG	YTD	YTD RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
FN06	Percentage of sundry debt due to KCC under 6 months old	46%	47%	41%	27%	RED	n/a		70%	65%	34%
FN07	Invoices received by Accounts Payable within 30 days of KCC received date	89%	89%	89%	88%	GREEN	87%	GREEN	85%	80%	85%
FN08	Percentage of invoices received on time by Accounts Payable processed within 30 days*	98%	86%	36%	51%	RED	85%	RED	98%	95%	96%
FN11	Percentage of financial assessments completed within 15 days of referral**	88%	86%	86%	85%	AMBER	86%	AMBER	90%	85%	88%
FN12	Percentage of working days aggregate bank balance is in credit (Incl. £1m agreed overdraft)	100%	95%	100%	100%	GREEN	99%	AMBER	100%	90%	99%
FN13	Percentage of working days average credit rating for internally managed cash portfolio is no lower than AA	100%	100%	100%	100%	GREEN	100%	GREEN	100%	90%	100%
FN14	Percentage of third-party insurance claims resolved within the designated timescales	100%	99%	98%	100%	GREEN	99%	GREEN	95%	85%	99%
FN15	Statement of accounts (draft & final) published within deadlines	Draft 30/06/2025 deadline met Final due 27/02/2026						GREEN	Date met	Date not met	N/a
FN16	Publication of budget proposals for Cabinet Committee / Cabinet / County Council	Cabinet Committee 28/10/2025 not met Cabinet due 21/01/2026 County Council 04/02/2026						RED	Date met	Date not met	N/a

*Annual performance of all invoice payments can be found here: [Annual performance of payments - Kent County Council](#)

** April & May Targets are 60% and Floors are 45% due to the Annual Reassessment process, this also means the YTD, and previous year values are calculated from June.

FN06 – There are currently 51 outstanding invoices which are over 6 months overdue, totalling £24.3m – 45 of these relate to health debt. The Kent & Medway Integrated Care Board faces severe financial challenges and KCC has agreed with the ICB to go to mediation on these issues (as they relate to KCC as both creditor and debtor) and the precise mechanisms for achieving this are being worked through.

FN08 – A move to a new Oracle cloud system during August caused some delays and reporting issues resulting in the below floor standard performance. This KPI will continue to recover as new Cloud processes are embedded within Accounts Payable.

FN11 – The number of financial assessments received in the year to October is 19% higher than at the same point last year which is impacting on achievement of the target.

FN12 – There has been two occasions this year when the KCC account has been overdrawn. Firstly, due to an internal processing issue at NatWest Bank, a transfer from the Pension Fund to KCC on 30/05/2025 was not completed as expected. As a result, the KCC account appeared overdrawn over the weekend. However, no costs were incurred, as NatWest Bank has reversed all associated charges. The second occasion was also over a weekend, when a same day payment raised on 01/08/2025 was not notified to Treasury and therefore not funded.

FN16 - The significant uncertainty over the impact of funding reforms meant it did not make sense to publish a full draft budget for detailed scrutiny in the November round of cabinet committee meetings. It is also important that the new Administration needs time to consider what elements of the existing plan should be retained and what new elements should be added, both to resolve the budget gap and to reflect emerging strategic priorities. A full draft budget will be published for the January round of cabinet committee meetings before being presented to Cabinet on 29th January 2026 for endorsement ahead of full County Council budget meeting on 12th February 2026

Finance Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	Oct-25	Year to date	Previous Year
FN06b	Value of debt due to KCC (£000s)	39,266	48,693	43,649	43,661	N/a	26,310
FN07b	Number of invoices received by KCC	8,103	3,027	5,175	4,987	44,826	58,690
FN11b	Number of financial assessments received	852	693	882	1,020	5,907	4,962
FN14b	Number of insurance claims resolved	104	98	117	116	897	1,363

Service Area	Responsible Officer	Cabinet Members
Governance, Law & Democracy	Ben Watts (Deputy Chief Executive)	Linden Kemkaran / Brian Collins

Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	Month RAG	YTD	YTD RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
GL01	Council and Committee papers published at least five clear days before meetings	83%	100%	100%	100%	GREEN	98%	AMBER	100%	96%	99%
GL02	Freedom of Information (FOI) / Environmental Information Regulation (EIR) requests completed within 20 working days	90%	85%	83%	83%	RED	86%	RED	92%	90%	80%
GL03	Data Protection Act Subject Access Requests (SARs) completed within timescales	55%	60%	62%	62%	RED	59%	RED	90%	85%	56%

GL01 – The Amber RAG for the year to date, was caused by one meeting in June, namely an urgent meeting of the Personnel Committee - Member Appointment panel where there wasn't sufficient time to publish in five clear days.

GL02 – Performance had reduced over the last few months but remains higher than the previous year. The number of requests responded to is well above the expected level, with particularly high numbers in July and September. All Directorates have achieved performance of over 80% this year, with the best performing being the Chief Executive's Department with 90% completed in timescale. The highest number of requests completed (478) has been in the Growth, Environment and Transport Directorate.

GL03 – Performance has been improving gradually in recent months, and is higher than the previous year. The majority of requests come under the Children, Young People and Education Directorate, with this being 77% of all requests this year. The majority of overdue requests relate to SEN, and the total number of requests remains historically high. Resources have been moved within the Information, Resilience and Transparency team to help improve this KPI. The Information Commissioner's Office is currently monitoring KCC's performance.

Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	YTD	In expected range?	<u>Expected Activity</u> Upper Lower		Prev. Yr YTD
GL01b	Committee meetings	6	17	3	19	50		N/a		65
GL02b	Freedom of Information requests responded to	205	313	228	281	1,443	Above	1,120	920	1,236
GL03b	Data Protection Act Subject Access requests responded to	76	72	98	73	469	Above	320	260	374

Deputy Chief Executive's Department

Service Area	Responsible Officer	Cabinet Member
Marketing and Resident Experience	Christina Starte (Head of Service)	Linden Kemkaran

Key Performance Indicators - Monthly

Ref	Indicator description	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	Oct-25	Month RAG	YTD	YTD RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
CS01	Percentage of callers who rate the advisors in Contact Point as good	98%	97%	97%	97%	GREEN	97%	GREEN	97%	90%	97%
CS04a	Percentage of daytime calls to Contact Point answered*	93%	90%	91%	94%	GREEN	92%	GREEN	90%	85%	92%
CS04b	Percentage of out of hours calls to Contact Point answered*	96%	97%	95%	95%	GREEN	96%	GREEN	95%	90%	92%
CS06a	Percentage of daytime calls achieving 85% of quality scorecard	74%	75%	76%	75%	GREEN	76%	GREEN	70%	65%	75%
CS06b	Percentage of out of hours calls achieving 85% of quality scorecard	76%	76%	76%	76%	GREEN	76%	GREEN	70%	65%	77%

* CS04a/b - Please note that these figures can vary to those reported for the Agilisys contract, as that contract allows for days of exceptionally high call volumes to be discounted from the KPI calculation. The KPI reported here includes **all** days, with none discounted regardless of call volumes.

Key Performance Indicator – Quarterly

Ref	Indicator description	Dec-24	Mar-25	Jun-25	Sep-25	Qtr RAG	YTD	YTD RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
CS07	Percentage of complaints responded to in timescale	71%	70%	71%	71%	RED	70%	RED	85%	80%	70%

CS07 – The complaints team continues to work with services and managers to support their teams in responding to complaints, particularly where there are backlogs.

In Quarter 2, complaint volumes increased by 20% on the previous quarter, with an increase of 15% on the same quarter last year. The 12 months to September saw a decrease of 3% compared to the previous year. Volumes of complaints usually do rise in Quarter 2 as September sees significant activity when schools return from the summer holidays.

In terms of Directorate performance, the majority of complaints were received by the Growth, Environment and Transport Directorate who responded to 88% within the target timescale of 20 working days, the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department, together achieved 84%. ASCH responded to 47% of complaints within timescale, however it must be noted that any agreed extensions to investigate complex cases, although agreed with the customer, will be recorded as late. CYPE responded to 39% of complaints within timescale.

Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	Oct-25	YTD 25/26	In expected range?	<u>Expected Range</u> Upper Lower		Prev. Yr YTD
CS08	Number of calls answered by Contact Point	33,572	37,145	31,293	39,530	34,600	240,518	Yes	280,000	232,000	245,641
CS12	Number of visits to the KCC website, kent.gov (000s)	559	554	522	423	535	3,840	Below	4,920	4,020	4,186
CS13	Average speed of answer (ASA) by Contact Point - priority services (seconds)	30	31	39	33	24	32	Yes	120	30	50
CS14	Average speed of answer (ASA) by Contact Point - all services (seconds)	87	77	109	114	65	92	Below	300	180	114

CS12 - The recorded number of visits (sessions) to the kent.gov.uk website was impacted by an outage to Google analytics meaning no data was recorded for a period of 6 days in September. However, even after taking this into account, visits would still have likely been lower than expected over the quarter. The most visited pages continue to be those relating to Household Waste Recycling Centres which accounted for over 40% of visits to the website

CS14 – Speed of answer below the lower threshold for this indicator shows calls are being answered promptly.

Appendix 1

Service Area	Responsible Officer	Cabinet Member
Human Resources and Organisational Development	Diane Christie (Assistant Director)	Brian Collins

Key Performance Indicators – Monthly

Ref	Indicator description	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	Oct-25	Month RAG	YTD	YTD RAG	Target	Floor	Prev Year
HR09	Live learning events evaluated by participants as having delivered stated learning outcomes	99.3%	99.5%	100.0%	99.6%	GREEN	99%	GREEN	97%	95%	99%
HR10	E-learning training evaluated by participants as having delivered stated learning outcomes	100%	99.8%	99.8%	99.9%	GREEN	99%	GREEN	97%	95%	#N/A

Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	Oct-25	In expected range?	<u>Expected Range</u> Upper Lower		Prev. Yr YTD
HR12	Number of current change activities being supported	66	61	60	58	57	Below	90	80	77
HR13	Total number of e-learning training programmes completed (YTD)	21,653	29,592	37,015	46,439	54,404	Above	49,583	40,833	48,646
HR16	Number of registered users of Kent Rewards	22,833	22,972	23,022	23,132	23,181	Above	23,000	19,000	22,929
HR21	Number of current people management cases being supported	173	178	207	211	194	Above	100	90	160
HR23	Percentage of staff who have completed all 3 mandatory learning events	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	Above	90%	85%	92%
HR24	Total number of live learning events delivered	336	517	594	683	777	Yes	875	583	New in 2025/26

Appendix 1

HR12 – Whilst the volume of change activity was lower than anticipated this quarter, the scale and complexity required a similar level of resources. Change activity is driven by the wider business and fluctuates monthly, with some activities spanning multiple months. The complexity of these activities varies significantly, requiring different levels of resources and knowledge.

HR13 - During phase 1 of the Oracle Cloud Programme, all finance and procurement learners were required to watch an introductory video before they could get access to the new system - this requirement resulted in a significant rise in course completions during Quarter 2. Additionally, mandatory e-learning courses (Information Governance, GDPR, Prevent, and NHS Data Security for ASCH) accounted for a large share of completed learning programmes.

HR16 – Additional promotion of Kent Rewards has taken place during this quarter, resulting in an increase of users. Each year an audit of Kent Rewards users is undertaken and those that have been inactive for over 6 years are removed from the system - this audit will be completed in Quarter 3, with user numbers anticipated to drop within the expected range by Quarter 4.

HR21 - Case activity is driven by requests from Managers and fluctuates from month to month. The high level indicates that managers are taking a robust approach and managing cases through the appropriate channels with HR support and advice.

HR23 – Mandatory learning compliance during Quarter 2 remained above target, this was supported by frequent automated messages from our Delta learning management system and reminders sent through corporate communication channels to both individuals and their line managers. Managers have also responded positively to the new compliance dashboards, which make it easier for them to track the status of their team members.

Service Area	Responsible Officer	Cabinet Member
Health and Safety	Jonty Tindall (Head of Service)	Brian Collins

Key Performance Indicators – Quarterly

Ref	Indicator description	Dec-24	Mar-25	Jun-25	Sep-25	Qtr RAG	YTD	YTD RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
HR25	Percentage of corporate themed Health and Safety audits sent in 7 days	100%	100%	100%	100%	GREEN	100%	GREEN	95%	85%	100%

Service Area	Responsible Officer	Cabinet Member
Technology	Lisa Gannon (Director)	Brian Collins

Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	Oct-25	Month RAG	Year to Date	Year RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
ICT01	Calls to ICT Help Desk resolved at the first point of contact	86%	85%	86%	87%	GREEN	87%	GREEN	70%	65%	79%
ICT02	Positive feedback rating with the ICT help desk	96%	96%	96%	95%	GREEN	96%	GREEN	95%	90%	96%
ICT03	Working hours where Kent Public Sector Network is available to staff	100%	100%	100%	100%	GREEN	100%	GREEN	99.8%	99.0%	100%
ICT04	Working hours where ICT Services are available to staff	99.8%	100%	99.9%	100%	GREEN	99.7%	GREEN	99.0%	98.0%	99.7%
ICT05	Working hours where email is available to staff	100%	100%	100%	100%	GREEN	100%	GREEN	99.0%	98.0%	100%

Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	Oct-25	Year to Date	Previous Year YTD
ICT01b	Calls to ICT Help Desk	5,378	4,616	6,300	5,349	38,957	58,457
ICT02b	Feedback responses provided for ICT Help Desk	364	864	1,053	988	6,429	11,323

Service Area	Responsible Officer	Cabinet Member
Infrastructure	Rebecca Spore (Director)	Brian Collins

Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	Oct-25	Month RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
PI01	Percentage of rent due to KCC outstanding over 60 days (including rent deferment invoices)	0.1%	0.3%	0.5%	1.0%	0.8%	GREEN	5%	10%	3.1%

Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	Oct-25	Year to Date	Previous Year YTD
PI01b	Total rent invoiced (£000s)	150	100	47	373	193	2,051	3,213
PI03c	Capital receipts banked (£000s)	0	1,700	0	10	1,453	3,892	12,006

Service Area	Responsible Officer	Cabinet Member
Infrastructure	Rebecca Spore (Director)	Brian Collins

Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	Oct-25	Month RAG	YTD	YTD RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
PI05	Percentage of scheduled Planned Preventative Maintenance completed by due date	98%	95%	97%	95%	GREEN	97%	GREEN	90%	80%	98%
PI06	Percentage of reactive help desk tasks completed by due date	96%	94%	90%	91%	GREEN	93%	GREEN	80%	71%	93%
PI07	Percentage of help desk calls answered within timescale	100%	100%	100%	99%	GREEN	100%	GREEN	90%	85%	99%

Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	Oct-25	Year to Date	Previous Year YTD
PI05b	Number of Planned Preventative Maintenance tasks responded to	2,341	2,358	2,507	2,259	3,279	17,449	17,952
PI06b	Number of reactive tasks responded to	783	1,589	673	935	983	6,405	5,008
PI07b	Number of help desk calls responded to	311	343	226	284	351	2,043	2,058

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Brian Collins, Deputy Leader

Rebecca Spore, Director of Infrastructure

To: Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee - 14 January 2026

Subject: Resilience update

Classification: Unrestricted

Electoral Division: All - Countywide

Summary: This report updates the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee of the work undertaken by the Resilience and Emergency Planning Service in the Council in planning for, responding to, and recovering from incidents across the county over the past six months.

Recommendation(s):

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE the report.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Resilience & Emergency Planning Service is responsible for ensuring Kent County Council (KCC) meets its duties under the Civil Contingencies Act (2004). As a Category 1 responder, KCC has seven duties to fulfil, spanning planning for, responding to, and recovering from incidents and emergencies affecting KCC and other responding agencies in the Kent and Medway Resilience Forum (of which KCC is a member).
- 1.2 As outlined in the [LGA Councillors Guide to Civil Resilience](#), officers must develop the operational expertise to manage crises effectively. For councillors, this means stepping confidently into a political leadership role – before, during, and after emergencies. Officers and councillors have distinct roles, but they are most effective when they complement each other.
- 1.3 The Local Government Association (LGA) guidance also offers specific guidance for senior councillors with executive responsibilities, including cabinet members and committee chairs on their role in supporting civil resilience.

2. Recent Incidents

- 2.1 KCC operates a number of on-call incident response roles, coordinated by the Duty Emergency Planning Officer (DEPO). The DEPO is the single point of contact for other agencies to request KCC involvement in the response to an incident. The DEPO is also responsible for alerting other local authorities in

Kent and voluntary sector organisations, should either of those sectors also be required.

- 2.2 Over the course of the year, the DEPO will respond to and receive alerts about a range of incidents or threats, including flood / weather warnings, border traffic issues, pollution events, and disruption to infrastructure. Three of the most significant incidents from the past 6 months are outlined below.

2.3 **Bitumen discharge, Gravesend, 17 August 2025**

2.3.1 The DEPO was contacted by the Environment Agency to advise that a suspected 5-10 tonnes of bitumen had been discharged by FM Conway.

2.3.2 The response was led by the Port of London Authority, who tasked their contractors with the clean-up. This eventually took 4 weeks, with pollution extending between Erith and Shorne Marshes on the south bank of the Thames Estuary, and past Southend-on-Sea along the north bank. The total recovered material came to 25 tonnes, some of which was challenging to recover due to lack of shore-side access.

2.3.3 The post-incident debriefs identified a number of issues where improvements were needed, including the flow of information, and cross-border working with neighbouring Local Resilience Forums.

2.4 **Portlands Factory Club fire, Northfleet, 26 October 2025**

2.4.1 Kent Fire and Rescue Service (KFRS) were called to a fire at the derelict Portlands Factory Club on Northfleet High Street. At the peak of the incident, KFRS had eight fire appliances, two height vehicles, and a number of other specialist vehicles, teams and officers in attendance. The scene was handed over to Gravesham Borough Council (GBC) the following afternoon.

2.4.2 Tests on debris from the fire confirmed the presence of asbestos, and on 28 October a Major Incident¹ was declared by Gravesham Borough Council and Kent County Council.

2.4.3 Gravesham Borough Council requested support from KCC under mutual aid, and it was agreed that KCC would chair the Strategic and Tactical Coordination Groups, with GBC leading on media and communications. A Media and Communications Cell, and a Vulnerable People and Communities Cell were established.

2.4.4 GBC also provided building control and planning expertise, and KCC activated its specialist asbestos contractors to work on the clean-up. KCC services involved included Resilience and Emergency Planning, Public Health, Highways, Health and Safety, Infrastructure, and Marketing and Resident Experience (MRX).

¹ A Major Incident is defined as an event or situation with a range of serious consequences which requires special arrangements to be implemented by one or more emergency responder agency.
(<https://www.jesip.org.uk/webapp/major.html>)

2.4.5 The debris field covered several of the surrounding roads and properties, as well as Lawn Road Primary School and Family Hub.

2.4.6 Due to the presence of asbestos, the clean-up operation was complex and protracted. The clean-up was split into five phases, including roads and street scene, school and hub, surveys and clean-up of residential properties, roofs / gutters / chimneys, and school reopening.

2.4.7 The incident moved into the Recovery phase on 5 November, with KCC handing over as lead agency to GBC. KCC services however have remained involved in the recovery phase of the incident.

2.4.8 The KCC internal debrief took place on 26 November, and we have identified a number of areas that could be further strengthened including awareness of activation processes, County Emergency Centre equipment, and initial information sharing.

2.4.9 Importantly, a number of areas of good practice were also noted, including; collaboration between services, proactive engagement, strong leadership, and contractor relationships.

2.4.10 The multi-agency debrief takes place on 11 December, after this report was submitted for publication, and the Head of Resilience and Emergency Planning will give a verbal overview of its outcome and next steps.

2.5 Tunbridge Wells water outage, 29 November 2025

2.5.1 On Saturday 29 November, an outage at South East Water's (SE Water's) Pembury Treatment Works interrupted supplies to the Tunbridge Wells area. The outage was originally envisaged to be resolved by 22:00 the same day, but as the outage extended into a second day, a decision was taken to stand up a Tactical Coordinating Group (TCG) in response to the ongoing water outage.

2.5.2 In total, 25,000 properties were affected including the hospital, renal unit, care homes, GP surgeries, dentists, schools and early years settings, businesses, and residential properties.

2.5.3 Whilst 10,000 properties were brought back on supply by the morning of 2 December with a plan to resupply the remaining areas, at the TCG meeting that day, SE Water revealed that there was a further issue with the Pembury treatment works which would result in output being shut down.

2.5.4 A decision was taken by Tunbridge Wells Borough Council (TWBC) and KCC to declare a Major Incident the same day. A Media and Communications Cell and a Vulnerable People and Communities Cell (both chaired by KCC) were established to manage specific aspects of the response. TWBC and KCC shared the chairing of the Strategic and Tactical Coordination Group meetings.

2.5.5 On 3 December, SE Water resupplied the network accompanied by a Boil Water Notice. Whilst this allowed properties to receive running water, for

the duration of the notice resilience forum partner agencies coordinated the response to ensure that:

- Residents, businesses and critical infrastructure are kept in supply of bottled / tankered water.
- Appropriate communication is taking place on public health messages.
- The impacts on schools, care homes, medical facilities and other impacted infrastructure are managed and mitigated.
- Businesses are supported.

2.5.6 KCC services involved in the response to this incident include Resilience and Emergency Planning, Public Health, Highways, Health and Safety, Infrastructure, and Marketing and Resident Experience (MRX).

2.5.7 In total, 15 schools were affected and closed for the majority of the first week of the outage. Oakleigh School, a Special Educational Needs (SEN) school in the area, was prioritised for reopening by KCC due to the vulnerability of its pupils, and tankered water was arranged through KCC contractors, allowing the school to open sooner.

2.5.8 Montague House, one of KCC's offices, was also closed during the outage.

2.5.9 This report is being submitted for publication during the response, so the Head of Resilience and Emergency Planning will give a verbal overview of its outcome and next steps.

3. Member briefing sessions

3.1 As part of the induction programme for new members after every county council election, the Resilience and Emergency Planning Service runs a number of briefing sessions for all members on the duties placed upon KCC under the Civil Contingencies Act (2004), what that means in practice for the authority, and the role of officers and elected members in planning for, responding to, and recovering from incidents in Kent and Medway.

3.2 In addition, the public inquiry into the fire at Grenfell Tower on 14 June 2017, has shown what happens when a local authority is ill-prepared to respond to incidents, and how elected members are a key part before, during, and after an incident.

3.3 The inquiry demonstrated that, on what may be the worst day of someone's life, it is our responsibility, our duty in law, to do the best we can to help them. It has also shown how it is inexcusable for authorities to try to do anything less than its best.

3.4 To date three-member briefing sessions were delivered by the Resilience and Emergency Planning Service in October 2025 with 38% attendance.

3.4.1 Whilst the presentation, the accompanying Handbook, and key links have been provided on the Member SharePoint area, all members are encouraged to

attend a briefing session to validate their knowledge, and to give members an opportunity to raise questions or issues with officers on any aspect of the briefing.

3.4.2 Further sessions are being arranged to ensure 100% of members can attend.

4. Exercise Troy

4.1 Exercise Troy was an internal table-top simulation organised by the Resilience and Emergency Planning Service (REPS) in Autumn 2025 to assess KCC's preparedness for a cyber incident.

4.2 The scenario simulates a major cyber-attack on KCC systems, initiated by a phishing email that resulted in a ransomware outbreak. The exercise tested the organisation's capability to manage a widespread IT outage over the course of several days, to maintain effective communication, and to restore essential services.

4.3 The objectives of the exercise were to:

- Test alternative communication arrangements.
- Identify lessons learned to inform Business Continuity (BC) planning and promote cyber awareness.
- Test arrangements for maintaining service delivery and effective communication between staff, services and suppliers.
- Acknowledge and verify interdependencies between services, systems and suppliers, and action as appropriate.

4.4 The exercise was structured around four scenario injects, which were presented to all participants to encourage group discussion, highlight common issues and find solutions. In addition, individual prompts tailored to specific attendees were provided, allowing staff to address service-specific considerations throughout the exercise.

4.5 Over three sessions, 83 staff members from all directorates participated, taking part in cross-service discussions to test KCC's response and recovery capabilities.

4.6 The exercise demonstrated that KCC is capable of strong cross-directorate collaboration, with participants engaging actively and constructively throughout the sessions. The scenario enabled high levels of engagement and provided a meaningful test of business continuity plans. The structured approach enabled participants to reflect on their preparedness and share valuable insights.

4.7 As a result of these findings, 15 key recommendations were made covering the following areas:

- The value of cross-directorate collaboration
- The importance of realistic and relevant scenarios
- The need for subject matter expert involvement

- The need for data protection guidance on alternative communication methods
- The importance of considering the use of resources where it may take time before Business as Usual can be re-established.
- The importance of managing offices to prevent overcrowding during incidents
- The importance of contact centre engagement
- The need for effective corporate messaging
- The need for guidance on managing paper records.
- The value of using learning from past incidents
- The need for an increased awareness of business continuity plans

4.8 The Resilience and Emergency Planning Service will now work to embed these lessons ahead of the 2026 Resilience Training and Exercising Programme.

5. Kent and Medway Resilience Forum engagement

5.1 KCC is a proactive and engaged member of the Kent and Medway Resilience Forum (KMRF). A key part of this is the provision of KCC staff (along with Kent Police and Kent Fire and Rescue Service staff) to the multi-agency Kent Resilience Team (KRT). The KRT is the central team that coordinates the work of the KMRF, ensuring partners work together as part of their duties under the Civil Contingencies Act to collaborate, coordinate, and develop plans to respond to incidents.

5.2 The KMRF structure is made up of the core Strategic and Delivery Boards, four standing groups, and numerous working groups. Appendix B outlines how KCC engages with each of these.

5.3 KCC regularly sends delegates on courses provided by the KMRF as part of the annual Training & Exercising Programme. In 2024/25, KCC sent the most staff on KMRF training courses, and so far in 2025/26 is joint first with further courses planned in Q4.

5.4 Courses attended included Strategic / Tactical / Operational Command courses, Welfare Centre, College of Policing Multi-Agency Gold Command Incident Command (MAGIC), How to Chair a Multi-Agency Command Cell amongst others.

5.5 KCC also attends multi-agency exercises to test our planning alongside staff from other responding agencies. The two main exercises run in 2025/26 were Op Skippered and Ex Pegasus which are summarised below:

5.5.1 Specific maritime threats have been identified in the National Security Risk Assessment which describes the reasonable worst-case scenario for the risk of passenger ferry incident. A number of pre-identified roll-on/roll-off (ro-ro) ferry ports within the UK have been designated as 'ports of reception'. Operation Skippered is a local plan which aims to provide options to enable the Port of Dover to prepare and manage the consequences resulting from a marauding terrorist attack (MTA) on a large, international ro-ro ferry.

- A two-day multi-agency tabletop exercise was run in June 2025 to test the draft plan, looking at aspects of the response such as welfare / casualty / fatality management, the counter-terrorism investigation, and recovery of the vessel and port.
- KCC staff, including the Duty Director, Coroner, Resilience and Emergency Planning, and Highways staff, participated in the exercise.
- The exercise, and subsequent debrief, identified a number of areas where further planning was required. This included port evacuation, communication between welfare centres, local authority welfare centre capabilities, and conveyance of significant numbers of walking wounded casualties.
- The Home Office team who ran the exercises for all ports of reception were very complementary about the strong partnership working between all responding agencies at the exercise. KCC staff were also positive about the opportunity to participate in the exercise.

5.5.2 Exercise Pegasus was a Tier 1 national (four nations) exercise delivered by the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) on behalf of the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC). It was designed to assess progress since the Covid-19 pandemic and test the UK's preparedness and capabilities arrangements to respond to future pandemics.

- KCC and other KMRF partner agencies attended three tabletop exercises (covering emergence, containment, and mitigation) in Autumn 2025, with information on the scenario for each only released a couple of days before the event.
- Whilst KCC staff were positive about the opportunity to participate in the exercise, the limited information available meant that the event wasn't as worthwhile as it could have been.
- KCC will lead on the update on the KMRF Pandemic Plan following the exercise, although the lack of finalised national plan limits the extent of the changes that can be made at this stage.

5.6 The next significant engagement that KCC will undertake with KMRF partners will be Ex Salvus, a multi-agency multi-part exercise taking place throughout 2026. The aim of the exercise is to explore and critically challenge KMRF partners and stakeholders' resources and capabilities to manage the secondary impacts of mass evacuation at an event site.

5.6.1 This will be achieved through the validation of control room training with a live call; a no-notice stand-up of Strategic and Tactical Co-ordination Groups to validate KMRF Command Training; a simulation briefing for KMRF partners and stakeholders to engage with and identify their organisational preparedness; the capabilities, constraints, and casualty tracking by SECAMB and the NHS through a casualty management live exercise; and the role of, and how information is shared between, the Survivor Reception Centre, Casualty Bureau, Friends and Family Centre, and Casualty Tracker.

5.6.2 KCC is involved in the general planning for the exercise, as well as leading the humanitarian assistance workstream.

5.6.3 KCC is also advocating for an observer programme, to allow KCC senior officers and key elected members to understand KMRF preparations.

6. Conclusions

- 6.1 The work of the Resilience and Emergency Planning Service is varied and extends across all services. Whilst the service prepares in the hope that the risks it aims to mitigate through plans, capabilities, training, exercising, and embedding lessons do not manifest in an incident response, experiences in Kent and in other areas across the country have shown the value of effective planning.

Recommendation(s):

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE this report.

7. Background Documents

- 7.1 Local Government Association – [A Councillor's Guide to Civil Resilience](#)

<https://www.local.gov.uk/publications/councillors-guide-civil-resilience#part-a-supporting-senior-councillors>

8. Appendices

- 8.1 Appendix A – Ex Troy scenario overview
8.2 Appendix B – KCC engagement with KMRF groups

9. Contact details

Report Author: Andy Jeffery Job title: Head of Resilience & Emergency Planning Telephone number: 03000 42 18 71 Email address: andy.jeffery@kent.gov.uk	Director: Rebecca Spore Job title: Director of Infrastructure Telephone number: 03000 41 67 16 Email address: rebecca.spore@kent.gov.uk
--	---

Appendix A – Ex Troy scenario overview

- Exercise Troy simulates a major cyber incident to test KCC's resilience and preparedness. The scenario begins with a targeted phishing email sent to hundreds of staff, designed to appear as a legitimate communication about annual leave. This email contained a malicious link, which, when clicked by several employees, triggers a ransomware attack that disrupts access to critical council systems.
- As the incident unfolds, the council face escalating challenges. Key services (including social care, payroll, HR, and customer-facing portals) become inaccessible due to data encryption. The public quickly notice service disruptions, leading to an increase in contact centre activity and media interest. ICT teams respond by investigating the breach, issuing communications to staff, and implementing precautionary system shutdowns to contain the threat.
- The exercise progresses to a stage where systems remain offline for an extended period, with partial restoration only possible through offline backups. A ransom demand is made public, increasing scrutiny from both the media and affected residents.
- The exercise concludes with systems only partially restored, prompting the council to implement a phased recovery plan. Proactive measures are taken to address and correct misinformation spreading on social media.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix B – KCC engagement with KMRF groups

Group	KCC staff attending
Executive Board	Attend
Delivery Board	Chair & attend
Risk Assessment Group	Chair & attend
Command, Control, and Coordination	Attend
Emergency Plans & Capabilities Group	Attend
Training & Exercise Group	Attend
Lessons Identified Lessons Learnt Group	Attend
Long Term Risk & Horizon Scanning Group	Vice-chair & attend
Death Management Group	Attend
Mass Fatalities	Chair & attend
Inland Pollution Group	Chair & attend
Severe Weather Group	Attend
Humanitarian Assistance	Chair & attend
Utilities	Attend
Community Resilience	Attend
Media & Comms	Chair & attend
Business Continuity	Chair
Kent Voluntary Sector Emergency Group	Attend
Resilient Telecoms	Attend
Fuel	Chair & attend
National Power Outage	Attend
Local Authority Emergency Planning Group	Vice-chair & attend

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Brian Collins, Deputy Leader

Rebecca Spore, Director of Infrastructure

To: Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee – 14 January 2026

Subject: Strategic Overview of Kent County Council's Peppercorn Lease Estate.

Classification: Unrestricted

Electoral Division: All - Countywide

Summary:

This report is a strategic overview of the portfolios of property held freehold by Kent County Council (KCC) and leased to tenants on peppercorn leases.

The report explains what peppercorn leases are and why KCC holds them, clarification of what is included under the definition of “peppercorn leases”, including their statutory context and a high-level analysis of each portfolio. It also outlines the governance framework that ensures transparency and compliance with public authority legal duties and best practice management.

Recommendation(s):

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE this report.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee requested that a strategic overview of the portfolio be presented to the committee, to give increased understanding as to why KCC has a peppercorn lease portfolio and in particular, how peppercorn leases are managed in order that cost, risk and their proper use are assured.
- 1.2 A peppercorn lease is a type of lease agreement where the rent is set at a very nominal amount, traditionally one peppercorn per year, rather than a market-based rent. The term “peppercorn” is symbolic and usually means the tenant pays virtually nothing. In contract law, a lease must have some form of consideration to be valid, and a peppercorn will satisfy this requirement.
- 1.3 KCC holds over 350 freehold properties which it lets out for “peppercorns.” Often this mechanism is used to derive value from a service perspective relating to the delivery of the Council’s function. Many of the examples where KCC has peppercorn lease arrangements in place relate to statutory or service arrangements or in some cases to historical property transactions which are held over from legacy arrangements (see below).

2. Statutory Context

- 2.1 In some of these cases, tenancies might already be in place on peppercorn leases and were acquired through legacy arrangements. An example of this would be Farm Leases distributed from the London Residuary Body (LRU) on long leases (originally set up to exert control around the M25), or windmills (legacy assets acquired to protect Kent's Heritage and Character). The rationale of the peppercorn lease in such cases is that of control.
- 2.2 KCC can also form peppercorn lease arrangements where instead of disposing of the freehold titles, it lets the property instead on a peppercorn lease. There are a number of reasons for doing so, for example:
- *An open market disposal where KCC wishes to retain/exercise control.* The property is sold as a "virtual freehold" under a peppercorn lease, and a capital value. Free development of the site may be the reason for the lease for example. This may include "ground lease" type uses.
 - *KCC is subject to certain statutory processes of disposal where the law requires a property to transfer under a prescribed peppercorn lease arrangement.* Academies are often transferred under this arrangement, restricting the use and onward disposal of the site under the Academies Act 2010.
 - *KCC may also consider "value" in transferring occupation of its assets within a commissioned contract to mitigate against administrative and legal costs.* This approach is common practice, though opportunity cost and maintaining the process within the Local Government statutory framework are the key considerations here.
 - *As part of a scheme where external funding may be a component along with external service groups.* KCC may consider a peppercorn rent as part of a project or scheme and the "value" created to the tenant in the transfer may be used as match funding. KCC would have to consider that a proposal meets service or policy criteria and may exercise greater control within the lease terms.
 - *Lastly and occasionally, it may consider "meanwhile uses" for surplus property to mitigate against holding costs and risk.* These are often short term and from time to time used to mitigate holding costs whilst the asset is either held for reuse or disposal.
- 2.3 Whatever the proposal is in respect of leasehold disposals, KCC like all local authorities are bound by Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972. This duty is to obtain 'best consideration', including granting leases where the term is more than seven years. A peppercorn rent may represent less than best consideration in financial terms, but not always, for example where it has also received a capital sum (representing the value of rent foregone); the overall "package", even including the lease terms apply in the evaluation of "best consideration".
- 2.4 Exceptions here include where the Authority is providing the lease via a statutory instrument such as the Academies Act, or where the General Disposal Consent (England) 2003 is utilised to justify a policy or social return, that the Authority is keen to support.
- 2.5 Some peppercorn leases have been in place for decades, inherited from other government bodies or introduced to meet statutory requirements, such as

Heritage Assets, like Windmills, which KCC acquired in the 1950's as owner of last resort. This is a textbook illustration of KCC's role as employing it as strategic tool for service delivery and community resilience.

- 2.6 Where statutory instruments can not be relied upon (e.g. where the undervalue is above £2m), KCC might apply with an appropriate case to the Secretary of State. This process is robust with set criteria that must be adhered to.
- 2.7 Management of Peppercorn leases varies according to lease terms which arise from the route purpose the lease was applied. The lease terms define KCC (landlord's) responsibilities and the tenants. Management of these is by practical observance and enforcement. For example, where it is clear that a tenant has breached its terms, KCC will take appropriate action as landlord.
- 2.8 The portfolios are kept under review to determine whether they are still appropriate to hold.
- 2.9 Some assets where there may be a realisable benefit to KCC through disposal of its freehold, subject to the lease in place, have been considered for release.
- 2.10 KCC applies a formal governance process to ensure peppercorn leases are only granted, or sold, when fully justified and compliant with legal and policy requirements, in line with KCC's constitution.

3. Peppercorn Lease Portfolio Overview

- 3.1 KCC has just over 350 peppercorn leases granted from its freehold estate. These amount to c.23% of the leasehold portfolio. The data is represented as follows:

Category	Number	Comment
Tenancy Agreements	1,571	KCC manages 1,571 agreements in total
Peppercorn Leases	357	Total number of Peppercorn leases

- 3.2 Most of KCC's peppercorns are required for a statutory purpose (Academies Act 2010) under a prescribed form of lease, presently accounting for 54% of the peppercorn lease portfolio. KCC cannot refuse an academy lease where a school elects to become an academy, though KCC does limit the demise transfer to accord with the area of the asset used strictly for education purposes.

Peppercorn Leases Only	Number	Comment
Academy Peppercorn Leases	192	Required by statute under the Academies Act 2010
Non-Academy Peppercorn Leases	165	These support a wide range of community, social care, and regeneration initiatives (See table below)

- 3.3 The peppercorn portfolio's tenants broadly comprise of mainly the following groups:

User Group	Who They Are	Reason for the Peppercorn Lease
Policy Tenants	Charities, Parishes or District Councils, or individuals aligned with KCC Policies or service delivery aims.	The lease supports or enhances KCC's policies and/or service offer and where there might otherwise be market failure. The peppercorns may also be to support a match funding arrangement (e.g. Lottery)
Commissioned Tenants	Organisations delivering services on behalf of KCC (e.g. care providers, youth services, Waste, highways)	To enable service delivery without rental cost burden and where this is a cost benefit to the contract.
Commercial Tenants	Businesses or external organisations	Rarely used; typically, where public benefit outweighs commercial gain, or more likely, where the rent was rolled up and a capital payment made at the lease outset.
3rd Parties	Independent groups not directly commissioned by KCC	Often for community or environmental projects where KCC has a strategic involvement or legacy arrangement.
Primary/Secondary School	Academies or schools	Required by law when transferring school land to academies
Special School	SEN or alternative provision schools	To support inclusive education access and where KCC has identified its desire to locate in the accommodation.
Agricultural Tenant	Farmers or land stewards	For land conservation or community farming initiatives. Most farms are let on long leases and were a legacy from the London Residuary Body (LRB) under statute.

3.4 The remaining “non statutory” peppercorns are broken down broadly as set out below:

Type	Number	Comment
Long leaseholds for community outdoor or similar recreation (Strategic)	22	Mainly parks, woodlands etc. Mainly let to Districts, Parishes or trusts. These leases have little value.
Service focused either via a commissioning contract or joint service delivery with other providers.	11	These benefit KCC's service such as Multi Agency Service Hubs assets, Waste Sites under a commissioned contract etc. A service works closely with joint delivery or the set-up costs of market leases etc. can be ploughed back into frontline delivery.
Heritage Legacy assets	8	These are only a handful of transferred assets with leases set up prior to the 1972 Local Government Reorganisation. We could also count assets transferred from the London Residuary Body (LRB) but instead have counted them as leases granted at a premium (there are another 5 of these).
Kings Hill specific Leases	5	Let for community uses etc. under the Kings Hill Development Agreement and in mitigation of s106 as assets with a community focus (since the development agreement was focused on delivering a new community).
Community, Economic Regeneration, Funding arrangements, non-statutory educational and misc.	38	These leases are miscellaneous and have arisen following the delivery of schemes and programmes where the rationale is tied to a programme. These leases may provide returns such as match funding. Mostly historic with very few let in recent years. The leases can typically be restrictive in nature reflecting the minimal transfer of value required.

3.5 Of the 165 Non-Academy Peppercorn Leases KCC has granted a number of these subject to a Premium:

Category	Number	Comment
Non-Peppercorn Leases granted for a Premium	81	This means that while the ongoing rent is nominal (typically £1 per year), the tenant paid a lump sum at the start of the lease. Creative Quarter, some flats and farms are

		examples.
--	--	-----------

- 3.6 Premiums generally arise where KCC grants long leases for housing or ground leases. These arrangements provide the lessee with long-term security and development rights, while KCC retains the freehold interest.
- 3.7 Although these transactions operate as effective disposals for practical purposes, given the length of the lease, they are structured so that KCC retains the reversionary interest in the asset at the end of the lease term. This ensures the property ultimately returns to KCC ownership.
- 3.8 The premium represents an upfront capital payment that reflects the value of granting such long-term rights. It is typically used to offset the opportunity cost of offering concessionary rents or to fund capital improvements. This approach balances KCC's commitment to community and social value with the need to recover a proportionate financial return on high-value or long-term arrangements.
- 3.9 Note that Utility leases could also apply here (e.g. for sub-stations which are 48 in number but not counted) but have been excluded from the report. Utility companies sometimes require nearby land to increase utility capacity. These leases are focused on the delivery of such and therefore require minimal management.

4. Financial Implications

- 4.1. Peppercorn leases can be used in certain circumstances. They reduce potential revenue streams and may tie up high-value assets in long-term leases. Compliance with statutory duties under the Local Government Act 1972 and the General Disposal Consent 2003, is essential. This ensures that concessions are legally justified when they promote social, economic, or environmental well-being.
- 4.2. Although rents are nominal, leases impact KCC's financial reporting because assets must be valued and recognised under IFRS 16 accounting standards. Peppercorn leases are treated as non-business for VAT purposes, meaning no VAT is charged, although recovery of VAT on related costs remains possible.
- 4.3. KCC's governance framework ensures transparency and accountability, confirming that concessions represent best value for taxpayers while delivering statutory obligations and social value with any non-statutory lease (e.g. academy conversion) over 20 years requiring a key decision.

5. Legal implications

- 5.1. KCC cannot simply grant a peppercorn lease without following strict legal and governance requirements. The law requires councils to obtain "best consideration" (essentially, market value) when disposing of land or granting long leases. A peppercorn rent is far below market value, so special rules apply.
- 5.2. Under the Local Government Act 1972, KCC must normally seek full value. However, the General Disposal Consent (England) 2003 allows councils to grant leases at less than market value without government approval if two

conditions are met:

- a) The arrangement promotes economic, social, or environmental well-being.
- b) The undervalue does not exceed £2 million.

5.3. This means every peppercorn lease must have a clear, documented reason showing public benefit that outweighs the financial loss in accordance with KCC's governance processes.

5.4. There are also accounting requirements under IFRS 16, which require these leases to be recorded at market value on the balance sheet, even though the rent is nominal. This affects internal reporting but does not change the principle that these leases prioritise public benefit over income.

6. Equalities implications

6.1. This paper is for information only. No decision is required, and therefore an Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA) is not necessary.

7. Data Protection Implications

7.1. Not Applicable

8. Conclusion

8.1. Peppercorn leases remain an important mechanism for KCC in certain circumstances because they deliver significant benefits and support key policy objectives:

- i) **Enabling Service Delivery:** They make it possible for schools, care providers, and community organisations to operate in suitable premises without unsustainable rental costs where there is a clear benefit to KCC service delivery.
- ii) **Meeting Statutory Duties:** Certain leases, such as those for academies, a peppercorn rent refers to a legally nominal rent, often zero, for which local authorities lease school land and buildings to a new academy trust on a long-term (typically 125-year) lease. This is a requirement under the Academies Act 2010 for publicly funded schools converting to academy status and serves to make the transfer legally valid without imposing a financial burden.
- iii) **Retaining Ownership and Control:** These leases allow KCC to maintain freehold ownership while enabling public benefit, safeguarding long-term strategic interests.

Recommendation(s):

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE this report.

9. Background documents

- 9.1. [Academies Act 2010](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/32/contents)
<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/32/contents>

10. Contact details

<p>Report Authors:</p> <p>Mark Cheverton Job title: Head of Real Estate Services Telephone number: 03000 41 59 40 Email address: Mark.Cheverton@kent.gov.uk</p> <p>Rebecca Anderson Job title: Head of Business Information Strategy and Assurance Telephone number: 03000 41 77 31 Email address: address: Rebecca.Anderson2@kent.gov.uk</p> <p>Gordon Edwards Job title: Strategy Manager Telephone number: 03000 42 18 52 Email address: gordon.edwards@kent.gov.uk</p>	<p>Director:</p> <p>Rebecca Spore Job title: Director of Infrastructure Telephone number: 03000 41 67 16 Email address: rebecca.spore@kent.gov.uk</p>
---	--

POLICY AND RESOURCES CABINET COMMITTEE - WORK PROGRAMME 2026

Page 57

11 March 2026 – 10am		
Risk Management (Including RAG ratings)	David Whittle Mark Scrivener	<i>Regular item - Annual</i>
Review of proposed KPIs for 2026/2027	David Whittle Matt Wagner	
Cyber Security	Lisa Gannon	<i>Regular Item – six monthly</i>
Asset Management Strategy	Rebecca Spore	
Freehold Property Assets Disposal Policy – TBC	Rebecca Spore	
Key decision – Biodiversity Net Gain	Rebecca Spore	
Key decision – Social Value Policy	Clare Maynard Rebecca Rhodes	
Key decision – Langton Field Disposal	Rebecca Spore	
Work Programme 2026		<i>Standing item</i>
6 May 2026 – 10am		
Performance Dashboard for the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department	David Whittle	<i>Regular item</i>
Kent & Medway Domestic Abuse Strategy	Iona Hunter-Whitehouse	<i>Annual update</i>
Regular Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) update	Dave Shipton	<i>Regular item</i>
Work Programme 2026		<i>Standing item</i>
8 July 2026 – 10am		
Work Programme 2026		<i>Standing item</i>

Agenda Item 10

PATTERN OF REGULAR ITEMS

JANUARY	Annual	Draft Revenue and Capital Budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan	Dave Shipton
	Every other meeting	Performance Dashboard for the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department	David Whittle Matt Wagner
	Six-monthly	Commercial and Procurement Division Performance Report (January 2027)	Clare Maynard Michael Bridger
MARCH	Annual	Risk Management (Including RAG ratings)	David Whittle Mark Scrivener
	Six-monthly	Cyber Security	Lisa Gannon
MAY	Every other meeting	Performance Dashboard for the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department	David Whittle Matt Wagner
	Every other meeting	Regular Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) update	Dave Shipton
JULY	Six-monthly	Commercial and Procurement Division Performance Report	Clare Maynard Michael Bridger
SEPTEMBER	Every other meeting	Performance Dashboard for the Chief Executive's Department and Deputy Chief Executive's Department	David Whittle Matt Wagner
	Every other meeting	Regular Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) update	Dave Shipton
DECEMBER			

ITEMS WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN ALLOCATED TO A MEETING

LATCOs	
Oracle Update	

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Brian Collins, Deputy Leader

Rebecca Spore, Director of Infrastructure

To: Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee - 14 January 2026

Subject: Freehold Disposal of Land at Former Spires Academy, Bredlands Lane, Westbere, Canterbury, CT2 0HD

Decision no: 25/00113

Key Decision: Yes, the decision involves expenditure or savings of minimum £1m

Classification: *Unrestricted report with exempt appendix A, not for publication under the Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 refers - information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).*

Future Pathway of report: Cabinet Member Decision

Electoral Division: Herne Village and Sturry – Local Member Mark Mulvihill (Reform UK)

Is the decision eligible for call-in? Yes

Summary: This report considers the proposed disposal of Land at Former Spires Academy, Bredlands Lane, Westbere, Canterbury, CT2 0HD.

Recommendation(s):

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to consider and endorse or make recommendations to the Deputy Leader on the proposed decision as detailed in the attached Proposed Record of Decision (Appendix C).

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report addresses the Council's intention to sell land at Former Spires Academy, Canterbury.
- 1.2 The site is currently vacant and situated in Westbere, Canterbury. The site is rectangular in shape and covers approximately 1.34 hectares.
- 1.3 In terms of the surrounding area, to the north of the site is a coach depot, comprising a hard standing and a small office building accessed via Bredlands Lane. Adjacent to the south of the site is a modern housing development by Matthew Homes, primarily made up of two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings. To the southeast, on the opposite side of Bredlands Lane is the relocated Spires Academy, playing fields and associated car park. Adjoining the site to the north and west is an area of heavy mature tree coverage.

- 1.4 An aerial photograph below identifies the full extent of the site with the red line boundary setting out those areas that are proposed to be subject to the disposal:



- 1.5 Exempt Appendix A includes a full analysis of options with financials included. This information is commercially sensitive.
- 1.6 A site plan is attached in Appendix B.

2. Background

- 2.1 The site was previously used as playing fields for the former Spires Academy which was situated immediately to the south of the site. The school site was sold to Matthew Homes Limited in 2017 and redeveloped to provide 80 dwellings. A new school was built as a replacement, on the opposite side of Bredlands Lane and benefits from enhanced playing field provision. The subject site has been vacant since the school's closure and relocation in 2013.
- 2.2 KCC have instructed external consultants and obtained pre-application advice in December 2024 with a favourable response from Canterbury City Council for residential development.
- 2.3 The site has been submitted to Canterbury City Council in the "call for sites" and has been allocated in the Draft Canterbury District Local Plan under Policy N33 for 37 dwellings.

3. Options considered and associated risk

- 3.1 **Reuse the site:** KCC has no current operational requirement for the site.
- 3.2 **Continue to hold the site vacant in case of a future requirement:** Continuing to hold the site will leave the Council with significant ongoing costs for securing it against unauthorised access and potential claims for injuries arising from any trespassing. There is no identified alternative use to justify holding it.
- 3.3 **Disposal of the asset:** A freehold disposal will allow a capital receipt to be generated for reinvestment back into the Council's stated capital priorities and support the delivery of the Council's statutory obligations and reduce holding costs associated with the property.
- 3.4 **Letting the property as part of the Tenanted Estate to generate an income:** There are no structures or buildings on the site, and the property currently generates no income. The prospect of securing an agricultural tenancy or licence agreement could be pursued although this is unlikely to secure a significant income and is considered unviable. KCC would also forgo any capital receipt whilst this option was pursued.
- 3.5 A freehold disposal is proposed option to be taken forward for the site, seeking offers on an 'all enquiries' basis to ensure all potential interest is explored in line with the Council's statutory duties and to deliver a capital receipt.

4. Marketing

- 4.1 Subject to the necessary approvals being forthcoming, KCC will appoint a suitably qualified agent to openly market the site in Q1/2 2026 on an 'all enquiries' basis to allow any interested parties to submit a bid for the site.
- 4.2 A marketing campaign to advertise the site through various media channels will be undertaken to ensure a wide audience is reached; appropriate due diligence will be undertaken on any bidders.
- 4.3 Bids will be appraised in line with the Council's legislative and fiduciary duties, and in compliance with KCC Freehold Asset Disposal Policy and any other relevant Council policies.
- 4.4 Following the formal submission of bids, these will be assessed considering:
- Ability for the purchaser to complete within the proposed timescales
 - Overall price, any pricing caveats or exclusions
 - Any conditionality on the proposals and the deliverability of those
 - Compliance with the Local Plan affordable housing requirements, if appropriate
 - Deliverability of the proposals submitted, if they are reliant on the planning process.
 - Funding security
 - Any cost benefit that may be relevant in the delivery of KCC statutory services.

5. Financial implications

- 5.1 The sale of the property will result in a capital receipt which will be reinvested back into the Council's Capital Programme and will offset the previous investment by KCC in the new primary school.
- 5.2 The disposal will remove holding costs associated with the site, easing pressure on revenue budgets.
- 5.3 Further financial information is set out in the Exempt Appendix A.

6. Legal implications

- 6.1 The Council has an overarching duty under s123 of the Local Government Act 1972 to obtain not less than best consideration in the disposal of property assets. It also has a fiduciary duty to the residents of Kent.
- 6.2 External legal advisors will be appointed in consultation with KCC legal services.

7. Equalities implications

- 7.1 The Key Decision to be taken by the Cabinet Member does not relate to a service delivery or change.
- 7.2 Separately, an EqIA has been undertaken and has not resulted in any implications which might impact upon a disposal of the Council's interest. See Appendix D.

8. Data Protection implications

- 8.1 As part of this approval process and in the handling of marketing/conveyancing of the site Data Protection regulations will be observed.
- 8.2 A Data Protection Implication Assessment (DPIA) screening has confirmed that are no DPIA implications and that a further DPIA assessment is not required in respect of this decision.
- 8.3 The site has been inspected, and no sensitive material remains on site.

9. Other corporate implications

- 9.1 None - This decision will not have any impact on other areas of the Council's work.

10. Governance

- 10.1 A Key Decision is being sought in line with the Constitution and the Council's governance processes. It is expected that the level of receipt will be in excess of the delegated threshold and therefore a Key Decision is required.
- 10.2 In accordance with the property management protocol the views of the local Member, Mr Mulvilhill, have been sought and will be reported to the Cabinet Member taking the decision. To date no views or comments have been received.
- 10.3 Delegated authority is to be given to the Director of Infrastructure, in consultation with the Deputy Leader, to finalise the terms of any disposal and execution of all necessary or desirable documentation required to implement a decision to affect a disposal.
- 10.4 The Government has announced plans for Local Government Reorganisation (LGR), aiming to abolish two-tier government by 2028. At present, KCC has not received specific guidance from Central Government about how LGR will be implemented in Kent and Medway; further details are expected between May and August 2026. Until directed otherwise, KCC remains responsible for making decisions in the best interests of Kent taxpayers and disposing of assets it no longer requires.
- 10.5 When the exchange of contracts is approaching, the Director of Infrastructure will consider all relevant factors including financial considerations, any pending LGR decisions, and applicable legislation before finalising any contract agreements.
- 10.6 If at any point prior to the exchange of contracts a KCC service requirement becomes apparent, the Director of Infrastructure has the authority to withdraw the disposal from the sale and reallocate the asset to a KCC service user.

11. Next Steps and Conclusions

- 11.1 An indicative timetable for the planned disposal is set out below:

Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee	January 2026
Commence Marketing	February 2026
Exchange of Contracts	September 2026
Completion of Contracts	Q2 2028

- 11.2 The site has been declared surplus to the Council's operational requirements.
- 11.3 In accordance with the Council's strategy of recycling assets to produce capital receipts for reinvestment into capital project priorities, it is recommended that this site is progressed for disposal.

11.4 Subject to the necessary approvals being forthcoming, KCC will instruct Solicitors and Surveyors to prepare and execute a disposal strategy to affect a disposal in accordance with adopted KCC Freehold Property Asset Disposal Policy and its statutory and fiduciary obligations.

Recommendation(s):

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to consider and endorse or make recommendations to the Deputy Leader on the proposed decision as detailed in the attached Proposed Record of Decision (Appendix C).

12. Appendices

Appendix A – Exempt Appendix A

Appendix B – Site Plan

Appendix C – Proposed Record of Decision

Appendix D – Equalities Impact Assessment

13. Contact details

Lead Officer:	Relevant Director:
Mark Cheverton Head of Real Estate Services 03000 41 59 40 Mark.Cheverton@kent.gov.uk	Rebecca Spore Director of Infrastructure 03000 41 67 16 Rebecca.Spore@kent.gov.uk
Daniel Parkes Principal Surveyor – Disposals, Acquisitions & Investments 03000 41 79 55 Daniel.Parkes@kent.gov.uk	
Kelly Graham Disposal, Acquisition and Investment Surveyor 03000 41 96 38 Kelly.Graham@kent.gov.uk	

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

This page is intentionally left blank

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL – PROPOSED RECORD OF DECISION

DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY:

Brian Collins, Deputy Leader

DECISION NUMBER:

25/00113

Executive Decision – key

25/00113 – Freehold disposal of Land at Former Spires Academy, Bredlands Lane, Westbere, Canterbury, CT2 0HD

Decision:

As Deputy Leader, I agree to:

1. the disposal of Land at Former Spires Academy, Bredlands Lane, Westbere, Canterbury, CT2 0HD; and
 2. to delegate authority to The Director of Infrastructure, in consultation with the Deputy Leader, to finalise the terms of the disposal and execution of all necessary or desirable documentation required to implement the above.
-

Reasons for decision:

The property is surplus to the Council's operational requirements and due to its projected value, a key decision is required as set out in Kent County Council's Constitution.

The sale of the property will result in a capital receipt which will be reinvested back into the Council's Capital Programme.

Financial implications:

The sale of the property will result in a capital receipt which will be reinvested back into the Council's Capital Programme and/or reduce KCC's current debt position.

There are currently holding costs associated with the site of c. £5,900 per annum.

The disposal of the property will remove management liabilities associated with holding a vacant site and therefore ease pressure on revenue budgets.

Legal implications:

The Council has an overarching duty under Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 to secure not less than best consideration in respect of property disposals. It also has a fiduciary duty to the residents of Kent.

Disposing of the site will reduce risk associated with continuing to hold the site.

External legal advisors will be appointed in consultation with KCC legal services.

Equalities implications:

An Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been undertaken and identified no direct equalities implications arising from the disposal of the site.

Data Protection implications:

As part of this approval process and in the handling of marketing/conveyancing of the site Data Protection regulations will be observed. The site is vacant, and no data or records are stored on site.

A Data Protection Implication Assessment (DPIA) screener has confirmed that there are no DPIA implications and that a further DPIA assessment is not required in respect of this decision.

Cabinet Committee recommendations and other consultation:

The proposed decision will be considered by the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee on 14 January 2026.

The views of the Local Member have been sought and will be reported to the Cabinet Committee and the Cabinet Member taking the decision. To date no views or comments have been received.

Any alternatives considered and rejected:

Other options considered were to:

- Reuse the site
- Continue to hold the site vacant in case of a future requirement.
- Letting the property as part of the Tenanted Estate to generate an income:
- Disposal of the asset. This is the recommended option.

The disposal provides an opportunity to reinvest capital in agreed priorities as set out in the Council's Capital Programme; it is proposed to proceed with the disposal of the site.

Any interest declared when the decision was taken and any dispensation granted by the Proper Officer:

.....

Signed

.....

Date

EQIA Submission – ID Number

Section A

EQIA Title

Freehold disposal of Land at Former Spires Academy Bredlands Lane Westbere Canterbury

Responsible Officer

Kelly Graham - DCED INF

Approved by (Note: approval of this EqlA must be completed within the EqlA App)

Mark Cheverton - DCED INF

Type of Activity

Service Change

No

Service Redesign

No

Project/Programme

No

Commissioning/Procurement

No

Strategy/Policy

No

Details of other Service Activity

Disposal

Accountability and Responsibility

Directorate

Strategic and Corporate Services

Responsible Service

Infrastructure

Responsible Head of Service

Mark Cheverton - DCED INF

Responsible Director

Rebecca Spore - DCED I

Aims and Objectives

To obtain authority to dispose of the property asset.

To seek the delegation of authority for agreeing the specific terms of the disposal to the Director of Infrastructure in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services.

Section B – Evidence

Do you have data related to the protected groups of the people impacted by this activity?

Yes

It is possible to get the data in a timely and cost effective way?

No

Is there national evidence/data that you can use?

Yes

Have you consulted with stakeholders?

Yes

Who have you involved, consulted and engaged with?

We are required to consult with the local division member as per the Council's constitution.

As part of the key decision process other members of the authority are made aware of the decision to be

taken and are able to raise queries in respect of the proposed decision.
It is our current intention that formal member consultation will take place at the next Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee.
Has there been a previous Equality Analysis (EQIA) in the last 3 years?
No
Do you have evidence that can help you understand the potential impact of your activity?
Yes
Section C – Impact
Who may be impacted by the activity?
Service Users/clients
No
Staff
No
Residents/Communities/Citizens
Residents/communities/citizens
Are there any positive impacts for all or any of the protected groups as a result of the activity that you are doing?
Yes
Details of Positive Impacts
Redevelopment of the site for residential use is expected to add to the well-being of the area in economic terms by employment generation and improvement of the local economy due to the presence of a larger local population.
Negative impacts and Mitigating Actions
19.Negative Impacts and Mitigating actions for Age
Are there negative impacts for age?
No. Note: If Question 19a is "No", Questions 19b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
Details of negative impacts for Age
Not Completed
Mitigating Actions for Age
Not Completed
Responsible Officer for Mitigating Actions – Age
Not Completed
20. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Disability
Are there negative impacts for Disability?
No. Note: If Question 20a is "No", Questions 20b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
Details of Negative Impacts for Disability
Not Completed
Mitigating actions for Disability
Not Completed
Responsible Officer for Disability
Not Completed
21. Negative Impacts and Mitigating actions for Sex
Are there negative impacts for Sex
No. Note: If Question 21a is "No", Questions 21b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
Details of negative impacts for Sex
Not Completed

Mitigating actions for Sex
Not Completed
Responsible Officer for Sex
Not Completed
22. Negative Impacts and Mitigating actions for Gender identity/transgender
Are there negative impacts for Gender identity/transgender
No. Note: If Question 22a is "No", Questions 22b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
Negative impacts for Gender identity/transgender
Not Completed
Mitigating actions for Gender identity/transgender
Not Completed
Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Gender identity/transgender
Not Completed
23. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Race
Are there negative impacts for Race
No. Note: If Question 23a is "No", Questions 23b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
Negative impacts for Race
Not Completed
Mitigating actions for Race
Not Completed
Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Race
Not Completed
24. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Religion and belief
Are there negative impacts for Religion and belief
No. Note: If Question 24a is "No", Questions 24b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
Negative impacts for Religion and belief
Not Completed
Mitigating actions for Religion and belief
Not Completed
Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Religion and Belief
Not Completed
25. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Sexual Orientation
Are there negative impacts for Sexual Orientation
No. Note: If Question 25a is "No", Questions 25b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
Negative impacts for Sexual Orientation
Not Completed
Mitigating actions for Sexual Orientation
Not Completed
Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Sexual Orientation
Not Completed
26. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Pregnancy and Maternity
Are there negative impacts for Pregnancy and Maternity
No. Note: If Question 26a is "No", Questions 26b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
Negative impacts for Pregnancy and Maternity
Not Completed

Mitigating actions for Pregnancy and Maternity
Not Completed
Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Pregnancy and Maternity
Not Completed
27. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Marriage and Civil Partnerships
Are there negative impacts for Marriage and Civil Partnerships
No. Note: If Question 27a is "No", Questions 27b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
Negative impacts for Marriage and Civil Partnerships
Not Completed
Mitigating actions for Marriage and Civil Partnerships
Not Completed
Responsible Officer for Marriage and Civil Partnerships
Not Completed
28. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Carer's responsibilities
Are there negative impacts for Carer's responsibilities
No. Note: If Question 28a is "No", Questions 28b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
Negative impacts for Carer's responsibilities
Not Completed
Mitigating actions for Carer's responsibilities
Not Completed
Responsible Officer for Carer's responsibilities
Not Completed