KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT CABINET COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Environment & Transport Cabinet Committee held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 17 July 2025.

PRESENT: Mr J Defriend (Chair), Mr P Thomas (Vice-Chair), Mr A Brady, Mr M Brice Mr W Chapman, Mr B Fryer, Mr J Henderson, Mr M A J Hood, Mrs S Hudson, Ms I Kemp, Mr M Paul, Mrs B Porter, Mr T Prater, Mr R Waters and Mr D Burns (Substitute for Mr Palmer)

ALSO PRESENT: Mrs Rebecca Drake-Hopkins Mr P Osborne (Cabinet Member for Transport) Mr D Wimble (Cabinet Member for Environment)

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr S Jones (Corporate Director for Growth Environment and Transport) Ms H Chughtai (Director of Highways and Transportation), Mr M Smyth (Director of Environment and Waste), Mr P Lightowler (Head of Public Transport), Ms H Shulver (Head of Environment) Mr A Loosemore (Head of Highways) Mr M Wagner (Chief Analyst) Susan Reddick (Head of Resource Management and Circular Economy and Kay Groves (Service Delivery Manager)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

1. Election of Chair
(Item 2)

(The Clerk presided over this item)

1. Mr J Defriend had been nominated by the Leader to be the Chair of the Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee.

2. The Committee agreed this nomination and Mr Defriend was declared as Chair of the committee.

RESOLVED that Mr J Defriend be elected Chair of the Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee

2. Election of Vice -Chair
(Item 3)

1. Mrs B Porter proposed, and Mr M Paul seconded that Mr P Thomas be elected Vice-Chair of the Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee.

2. No further nominations were received,

therefore the Chairman declared Mr Thomas as Vice-Chair of the committee.

RESOLVED that Mr P Thomas be elected Vice-Chair of the Environment and Transport Committee.

3. Apologies and Substitutes
(Item 4)

Apologies were received from Mr R Palmer for whom Mr D Burns substituted.

4. Declarations of Interest
(Item 5)

No declarations of interest were received.

5. Minutes of the meeting held on 25/02/2025
(Item 6)

Mr M Brice queried paragraph 15 *'improved cycle path adjacent to the main road'*

The Clerk noted the query and would investigate, respond, and amend if required.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 25 February were a correct record and that they be signed by the Chair.

6. Introduction to Highways and Transport Division
(Item 7)

Mr P Osborne - Cabinet Member for Transport introduced the report. Ms H Chughtai Director of Highways and Transport and Mr S Jones – Corporate Director Growth, Environment and Transport – were in attendance.

1. Mr P Osborne prefaced the report

2. Ms H Chughtai introduced Members to the comprehensive portfolio of The Highways and Transport Service responsible for managing, operating, upgrading, modifying, and constructing local roads—KCC's most extensive and valuable asset group. In addition to this, the service played a key role in supporting the delivery of essential public transport, particularly bus services and school transport, directly serving a customer base of over 250,000 people.

3. Members asked a number of questions relating to the report

   (a) Officers responded to the questioning on the Bus Service Improvement Plan Funding (BSIP) and where current funding was directed. BSIP funding was linked to the BSIP Plan published in October 2021 and revised in July 2024. The BSIP document available on the KCC website highlighted the areas within which KCC aimed to deliver an improved bus network.

(b) The post pandemic off peak market had remained down by 30%, with operating costs having risen by 30-40%. KCC had taken the decision to protect the service after significant service withdrawals had been observed. Basic funding currently supported 62 services to a cost of £5.6 million. Many of the discussed supported bus services would be school related and would encompass private operators.

(c) In response to the recent A229 road closures officers raised that a lack of alternative routes had compounded issues. It was suggested that a wider discussion with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport take place outside the Cabinet Committee meeting to address the wider issues.

(d) Members queried if the walking and cycling members club would continue to exist. The Cabinet Member noted the request and suggested that an offline meeting occur with his Deputy Cabinet Member to discuss the matter further.

(e) Assurances were sought that the Travel Saver Scheme would continue with the new administration. Mr Osborne acknowledged the concern and would look to respond with a comprehensive answer at a later date.

RESOLVED to note the report

7. Introduction to Environment and Circular Economy
(Item 8)

Mr D Wimble - Cabinet Member for Environment introduced Mr M Smyth Director of Environment and Waste – were in attendance

1. Mr Wimble introduced the report with a brief overview that encompassed KCC's statutory requirements and included waste management and recycling, flood and coastal risk management, internal drainage, and energy security.

2. Additionally, the stewardship of farmland, green spaces, and countryside parks, was highlighted as vital for both biodiversity and community wellbeing. Heritage and conservation would also be key areas of focus and collaboration with a variety of stakeholders, including the Environment Agency, DEFRA, the National Farmers Union, and other government bodies, to ensure a coordinated and effective approach would be sought.

3. Mr Smyth expanded upon the report and discussed KCC's vital role in managing, protecting, and enhancing the environment. This would be achieved not only through the wide-ranging legislative duties and responsibilities, but also through KCC's unique ability to bring together partners, businesses, and residents to inspire a meaningful collective action.

4. Members queried aspects of the report:

(a) In response to concerns regarding a perceived deviation from the net zero action plan, Mr. Wimble reassured Members that the administration remained committed to implementing best practice policies in pursuit of its environmental objectives.

(b)Members asked if the current administration's stance on climate change, its associated detrimental impacts and the possible abandonment of net zero targets. Mr Wimble clarified that the focus would be on reviewing the terminology of 'net zero' rather than altering any best policy practices. Mr Wimble affirmed his belief in climate change as an ongoing process that had occurred for thousands of years.

(c)Officers discussed the Environment Plan that addressed the key focus in identifying ways to generate additional income to support the delivery of KCC's green agenda. Green finance had been frequently discussed, and there was growing recognition that many investment firms would be actively seeking opportunities to invest in sustainable initiatives.

(d) A pivotal part of KCC's strategy would be to determine how best to access green finance. Opportunities such as the private sector or via public sector funding and possible central government support would be explored. Kent County Council could not deliver this agenda alone. KCC was already managing numerous statutory responsibilities and facing significant budgetary pressures. Securing external funding would be essential as a critical component of KCC's ability to achieve its environmental goals.

(e)Members raised concerns about recent changes to planning laws that affected house building and questioned how Kent County Council would work with district and borough councils to ensure that green spaces were preserved. Officers explained the number of statutory consultation processes that were in place to assist.

(f) Concerns were raised about the impact of kerbside collections on Kent County Council's costs. Officers informed Members that work had been undertaken closely with district and boroughs partners and had resulted in a collective partnership named the Kent Resource Partnership (KRP) being established. The KRP would conduct a review to explore potential cost savings through the implementation of a systems-based approach to waste management.

(g)Mr Smyth acknowledged Members' questions regarding the ECE budget and residual waste. He added that, following a review of the monetary figures, he would aim to provide concise responses to any questions that fell outside the scope of the current discussion.

(h)Members discussed the withdrawal of subsidies from Kent County Council to district councils. Officers explained that from a statutory perspective a County Council that had allowed district and borough councils to retain recyclable materials for their own processing would be required to pay them a 'recycling credit.' In Kent, borough councils collected the recyclable material but had transferred it to the County Council for processing and no statutory payment was required. The County Council would bear the cost of managing the material directly

(i) Officers explained that there were differing relationships between the county and the borough councils. Under the previous administration the view had been taken that payment arrangements between the county and borough councils would be ending, particularly in light of the evolving legislative landscape.

(j) Borough councils had been mandated to collect a broad range of materials at the kerbside, including five key recyclables. However, it was highlighted that limited government incentives had hindered efforts to significantly increase actual collection volumes.

(k) Previously, collection vehicles had reported the collection of materials such as glass, paper, and plastic, although collected loads had been lighter than anticipated. This had technically met obligations however, the aim now would be a more efficient collection process with vehicles loaded in full with recyclables.

RESOLVED to note the report

8. Petition Scheme Debate-Gravesend- Tilbury Ferry Service
(Item 9)

Mrs Rebecca Drake-Hopkins- (Lead Petitioner), Mr Osborne - Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport and Mr P Lightowler - Head of Public Transport - were in attendance

1. Mrs Drake-Hopkins presented her opening statement and highlighted the 2,400 responses to the petition for reinstatement of the Gravesend – Tilbury Ferry as an indication of how much this service had meant to the community. Aspects such as better promotion of the service, integration with public transport, and the positioning of the ferry as a tourist attraction could all help boost usage and revenue were discussed. Discussions on the speed of the ferry service and its environmental impact on the local area were raised.

2. Members debated the conflicting reports regarding the withdrawal of funding and highlighted the lack of match funding from Thurrock Borough Council. It was suggested that Thurrock had been willing to support the initiative. Members stated that differing accounts were publicly available online and would require clarification. Consultation feedback had indicated support for subsidising the ferry, although some statements had suggested that the working group had been exploring a number of subsidy-free options. Members suggested the importance of clarifying whether subsidies were still an option or if only non-subsidised models had been considered.

3. The discussion considered whether capital investment would be necessary to reinstate the service. It was also proposed that a model of a reduced service

of the provision could potentially enhance the feasibility of reinstatement. One option suggested would be to explore the viability of an operated service from Monday to Friday, between 7:00am and 6:00pm.

4. Members requested clarification on the circumstances that had led to the suspension of the service. Officers responded that Thurrock Council had formally indicated its intention to withdraw funding. As the contract had neared its conclusion and Kent County Council was unable to meet the full cost independently, the service would subsequently be allowed to lapse.

5. Members discussed that political pressure from stakeholders on the opposite side of the Thames estuary had prompted Thurrock Council to reconsider its position and express a renewed interest in the service. However, Members noted that by that stage, negotiating a new contract was no longer a feasible option.

6. The positive impacts of the working group that was currently in place was highlighted. The involvement of various authorities such as: The Thames Estuary Growth Board and the Port of London Authority added to the debate that there appeared to be genuine cross-estuary support for reinstating the service.

7. The Vice-Chair discussed the involvement of the Thames Estuary Growth Board and queried if the organisation would be prepared to contribute financially. Additionally, clarification on whether the ferries themselves would still be serviceable needed investigation. This vital information had not been captured in the current documentation. It was requested that the Cabinet Member and officers look into this aspect further.

8. Members discussed the user base of the ferry service and the vital role it had played in reducing pressure on the Dartford crossing. The paper also suggested unexplored opportunities to improve revenue with a potential option to engage with the private sector.

9. Mr Brady proposed, and Mr Hood seconded, that the previous decision be revisited and that work towards reinstating the Tilbury Ferry service in 2026 be undertaken. This was agreed unanimously.

10. Officers reflected on the developments that had occurred in 2023. Colleagues from Public Transport and Commissioning at KCC, together with partners in Thurrock, had been collaborating on plans for a replacement operating tender for the Gravesend–Tilbury ferry. Jetstream had previously operated the service.

11. The intention had been to award Jetstream a one-year extension from April 2024 onwards with a view to develop a longer-term tender. In November 2023 Thurrock informed KCC that they would no longer be able to fund the operation of the ferry crossing.

12. Officers suggested that reinstating the service now would come at a higher cost and Thurrock had confirmed that they would still be unable to co fund the initiative.

13. KCC had commissioned a study on behalf of this partnership to explore all options for the ferry service. The study reviewed the business case and examined other ferry models and had considered a range of potential solutions. The findings had been shared with the partnership.

14. Officers raised that any future service would still require a subsidy, and that the cost base would be different. Working with the Thames Estuary Growth Partnership Board to build a new funding model was underway and KCC had committed to contributing no less than the past commitment, in line with the previous administration's authorisation. KCC would also actively seek additional partners to help bridge the funding gap.

15. It was highlighted that a return of the ferry service would not be immediate, but officers remained hopeful. Ongoing developments across the Thames Estuary and on the Tilbury (Thurrock) side may lead to new contributions. Further meetings with the Estuary Board would soon take place and updates would be provided.

16. Officers acknowledged the long-standing efforts of Steve Pay who had supported the ferry service since the early 2000s. KCC had worked hard to keep the service going and it was indicated that officers had been reluctant to end the service. KCC would remain committed to restoring the vital link and had been fully aware of the impact its absence has had on those who rely on it. Mr Lightowler stated that efforts would continue with a future report to be brought to the cabinet committee.

17. The Chair noted that the Cabinet Member supported by officers would be required to respond to the recommendation in writing as per the petition scheme.

RESOLVED that the Committee recommend that the Cabinet Member revisit the previous decision and that work towards reinstating the Tilbury Ferry service in 2026 be undertaken.

9. Performance Dashboard

(Item 10)

Matt Wagner, Interim Chief Analyst; and Simon Jones, Corporate Director for Growth, Environment &Transport were in attendance for this item

1. Mr Wagner presented the Performance Dashboard. The update represented the final report for the 2024/25 financial year and incorporated proposals for Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and targets for the current financial year. The cover paper was on pages 45–46 of the report pack, followed by a detailed performance dashboard.

2.In March, performance across the 17 monitored Key Performance Indicators (KPI) were as follows: 13 KPIs had been rated Green, indicating performance was at or above target. 3 KPIs were rated Amber, this indicated they would not meet target but had remained above the floor standard and 1 KPI had been rated Red, which had fallen below the floor standard.

3. Highways service demand which had been measured by new inquiries and ongoing works would close the year below expected levels. This followed after a period of elevated activity that occurred earlier in the year.

4. The volume of waste taken to Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC) continued to increase with the amount of total waste (Inc Doorstep collections by district and borough councils) having remained towards the higher end of expectations.

5.Several proposed changes to the reporting KPIs included:

(a) Update the target and floor standard for DT01, which measured the percentage of public inquiries for highways maintenance reported online.

(b) It was recommended that KPI (HT14) – *Priority inquiries completed within 20 working days or member inquiries* – be removed from the committee's performance monitoring framework. The responsibility for this KPI now lay with the Deputy Chief Executive's Department, which would not be represented at the Environment and Transport committee. As such, continued oversight of this indicator by this committee was no longer appropriate

(c) The targeted KPIs for EW2, which had encompassed greenhouse gas emissions from KCC estate services and traded companies, would now reduce emissions in line with the projected reductions across the wider KCC estate.

6. Members asked a range of questions about how future policy changes might impact KPIs. Officers responded that the KPIs and their associated targets had been developed before the new administration took office. It was acknowledged that any key decisions that could potentially shift the policy direction of the organisation be examined carefully and understood. Officers added that if such decisions were made, there would be a need to return to the committee to clarify any implications for future performance and KPIs.

7.Members highlighted that KPI (WM06) for household waste had continued to increase in tandem with the KPI (WM07) for the amount of waste that had found its way to the incinerator and being converted to energy. Members queried what actions had been taken at a county wide level to address the current increase and additional costs.

8. The need to work collaboratively and focus on the key areas of recycling were further expanded upon. It was discussed that every county, district, and borough council in the country would receive funding this year through the Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) process. The major legislative changes that were implemented required companies that produced their own packaging to cover the cost of collection and disposal of their manufactured packaging.

9. The County Council was set to receive approximately £13 million this year. The previous administration had not allocated this funding directly into the budget. Instead, it had been placed into a ring-fenced reserve that would commit £1 million to behaviour change initiatives. One example of the use of funding was the rollout of bin stickers across the county. This had seen a 10–20% increase in the amount of food waste being correctly separated. The behaviour change programme would be working closely with district and borough colleagues and looked to explore further opportunities for action.

10. In response to required clarification raised on KPI (HD1) reported potholes repaired in 28 days (96%) and the definition of a repaired pothole. Mr Loosemore clarified that the report (96%) referred to the potholes that had been repaired within the timeframe of 28 days. Mr Loosemore suggested that a much more detailed analysis on how data was collected, and the operational process be collated and presented to Members at a later date to allow greater clarification on the matter.

11. In response to Members' queries about the removal of KPIs WM02 and WM04 it was confirmed that KCC was under no contractual obligation to supply wood for energy.

12. Mr Loosemore acknowledged Members' observations on the KPI trend of planned maintenance vs reactive maintenance and highlighted that the publication of the forward works program was time sensitive. Mr Loosemore noted that the KPIs did not always encompass a true reflection of the service as a whole and he would look to show in greater detail how the highway service was performing from a broader perspective.

13. Member queried the potential viability of removing the booking system currently employed at waste recycling centres. Mr Wimble noted that he had raised similar conversations when he had become incumbent to the role of Cabinet Member for environment. The Cabinet Member explained that the booking system had proved to be an efficient way of booking a slot, had prevented any mass attendance and allowed the workflow to move more productively at sites and prevent any harassment to staff due to delays.

14. Further questions were received on KCC's direct investment in waste recycling plants, Officers responded that KCC had contracted out all of its recycling process to a materials two recycling facilities.

RESOLVED to note the performance dashboard

10. 25/00050 - Ebbsfleet Development Company (EDC) Highway Landscaping Enhancement

(Item 11)

Mr P Osborne - Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport was in attendance.

1.Mr Osborne presented the decision paper on accepting funding from the Ebbsfleet Development Corporation (EDC) to deliver and enhance the visual appeal and arrival experience for visitors to Ebbsfleet Garden City through landscape improvements at key highway verges and roundabouts.

2. It was highlighted that there was no additional financial burden on Kent County Council (KCC) for the delivery phase and future maintenance costs would be absorbed within existing KCC budgets.

RESOLVED to endorse the proposed decision, namely:

That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport agree to:

(i). Approval to enter into a funding agreement with EDC subject to the approval of the Corporate Director of Finance, Corporate & Strategic Services.

(ii). Approval to progress the detailed design and surveys for the project.

(iii). Approval to progress all statutory approvals or consents required for the schemes.

(iv). Approval to carry out any additional consultation with stakeholders required for the schemes.

(v). Approval to enter construction contracts as necessary for the delivery of the schemes.

(vi). Approval for any further decisions required to allow the scheme to progress through to delivery to be undertaken by the Corporate Director of Growth Environment and Transport under the Officer Scheme of Delegations following prior consultation with the Cabinet Member.

11. 25/00051 - Local Highways Maintenance Support Contracts
(Item 12)

Mr P Osborne - Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport was in attendance.

1. Mr Osborne presented the item that sought approval for the commissioning of a new zero-based contract framework to support pothole repairs, patching, and resurfacing works at a local level, ensuring continuity of service as current contracts expired.

2. These contracts would carry no upfront financial commitment. The council would only pay after the successful delivery of work was completed and would significantly reduce any financial risk. The discussed contracts did not guarantee any volume of work and provided the council with the maximum flexibility to adapt to budgetary pressures and funding uncertainties. The annual expenditure under these contracts was expected to range between £6 million and £14 million.

3. Members questioned the efficiency of the previous subcontracting model in terms of time and budget and proposed the adoption of a more direct approach to the

commissioning of contractors that incorporated the new procurements acts goal of embedding additional social value.

4.Officers responded by expanding upon the comprehensive process of assessing contractors. Commissioning colleagues had provided support throughout the entirety of the evaluation and moderation process before any contracts would be awarded. Financial viability and performance capabilities all had to be demonstrated throughout the process and scored accordingly through to the tender process. Only once these phases had been completed and a cost was agreed on a price per quality basis would a contract then be awarded.

5.Members queried if contracts would now place a constraint on a contractor that had subcontracting works. Officers responded that, as part of the procurement process, contractors had been required to indicate in their tender submissions would intend to subcontract any aspects of the work. These aspects would be considered throughout the tender evaluation process.

RESOLVED to endorse the proposed decision, namely:

That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport agree to:

(i) APPROVE the procurement and contract award of zero value Local Highways Maintenance Support Contracts.

(ii) DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director of Growth Environment & Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, to take relevant actions, including but not limited to, awarding, finalising the terms of and entering into the relevant contracts or other legal agreements, as necessary, to implement the decision; and

(iii) DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director of Growth Environment and Transport, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, to award extensions of the contracts in accordance with the relevant clauses within the contracts as shown at Appendix A.

12. 25/00052 - Receipt and processing of Organic Waste Contract Countywide *(Item 13)*

Mr Wimble- Cabinet Member for Environment presented the item

1. Mr Wimble presented the proposed procurement for the receipt and processing of organic waste across the entire county. The decision represented a significant step in ensuring that the council continued to meet statutory obligations as a waste disposal authority, while also supporting broader environmental objectives.

2. The new contract was scheduled to commence in April 2026 and would consolidate existing arrangements into a county-wide solution and was expected to deliver opportunities for innovation, improved efficiency, and greater value for money.

3. Members were encouraged to note the emphasis on maintaining flexibility in response to forthcoming waste reforms and the financial implications associated with the collection and processing of food and green waste.

4. Members asked if the extension of existing contracts would require further renumeration in light of the recent increase to National Insurance (NI) contributions and also queried on how far the council would be able to deviate costs and any increased risk of litigation.

5. Officers suggested that initial discussions with contractors had indicated that they were willing to adhere to the terms previously agreed. It was also discussed that updated contracts now included clauses that reflected the recent changes to national insurance contributions.

6. Members raised the need to work with districts to prevent green waste and food waste from being combined and driving costs up. In response to a question about whether the Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) funding officers confirmed that this particular funding source could only be used for packaging waste and not organic matter. Members suggested that this funding streams exact use be explained via a paper at a later cabinet committee.

7. In relation to Section 3.2 on page 93, officers were asked to clarify what measures of education were in place help prevent green waste from failing to meet standards without pretreatment. Officers acknowledged the observation and would look to engage with customers within the HWLC sites, encouraging site staff to engage with the public to help reduce contamination.

8. Members asked for clarification that Kent's waste would be going directly to Kent waste centres and that no other county would be accessing these sites to dispose of waste. Officers acknowledged the concern Mr Jones highlighted how the booking system now acted as a control mechanism for access and that cross-border policies that were in place were subject to additional monitoring.

RESOLVED to endorse the proposed decision, namely:

That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport agree to:

(i) APPROVE the procurement and contract award of an organic waste contract for an initial 5 years, (plus an extension of up to 5 years) commencing 1st April 2026.

(ii) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Environment and Circular Economy to take relevant actions to facilitate the required procurement activity.

(iii) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Environment and Circular Economy in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, to take relevant actions, including but not limited to, awarding, finalising the terms of and entering into the relevant contracts or other legal agreements, as necessary, to implement the decision; and

(iv) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Environment and Circular Economy in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment to award extensions of the contract in accordance with the relevant clauses within the contract; as shown at Appendix A.

13. 25/00053 - Continuation of Household Waste & Recycling Centres and Waste Transfer Station Operation, Management and Haulage Contracts in East, Mid and West Kent.
(Item 14)

Mr Wimble- Cabinet Member for Environment presented the item, Susan Reddick was also in attendance

.

1. Mr Wimble outlined the procurement of two contractual arrangements for the management and haulage services required at Kent's household waste and recycling centres, as well as its waste transfer stations. These contracts were currently held by FCC Environmental Limited and Commercial Services Kent Limited. The total budget allocated for these services was £14.6 million.

2. An 18-month extension had been previously agreed with both parties. However, several issues had since emerged and included the ongoing local government review, which had significantly increased the risk profile of the procurement process. As a result, KCC's ability to secure best value through a new procurement process was currently at risk.

3. It was recommended that a further 36-month extension to the existing contracts be approved. This would provide stability during the local government review period and enable the Council to continue delivering services within a known budget envelope over the next five years.

4. Members queried if all household waste recycling centres and waste transfer centres would remain open for the entirety of the contract, additionally querying if any views from the recent DOLGE Cabinet Member appointment had given any insights on the most efficient way of procuring the process and driving actions forward.

5. Mr Wimble confirmed that the number of waste transfer sites would remain unchanged and did not foresee any future closures. Mr Wimble acknowledged the question on the DOLGE Cabinet Member's involvement with contracts. Mr Chamberlain in addition explained that the current DOLGE aims would review

the processes applied to contracts to ensure they were as efficient as possible.

RESOLVED to endorse the proposed decision, namely:

That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport agree to:

(i) APPROVE the continuation of the current Household Waste Recycling Centre and Waste Transfer Station operation, management, and haulage contracts in Mid, East, and West Kent (SC18031 and SC18031/WK), by extending the existing arrangements from 18 months to a total of five years, as permitted under the contract terms. The revised contract period will now expire on 31st October 2030.

(ii) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Environment and Circular Economy in consultation with the Cabinet Member for (the Kent) Environment to award extensions of the contract in accordance with the relevant clauses within the contract as shown at Appendix A

14. Work Programme
(Item 15)

RESOLVED to note the work programme