



Summons to and
Agenda for a
Meeting on
**Thursday, 5th
November, 2026**
at **10.00 am**



DEMOCRATIC SERVICES
SESSIONS HOUSE
MAIDSTONE

Wednesday, 28 October 2026

To: All Members of the County Council

A meeting of the County Council will be held in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Maidstone, Kent, ME14 1XQ on Thursday, 5th November, 2026 at **10.00 am** to deal with the following business. **The meeting is scheduled to end by 4.30 pm.**

A G E N D A

1. The Lord's Prayer
2. Apologies for Absence
3. Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or Other Significant Interests in items on the agenda
4. Minutes of the meetings held on 17 September 2026 (Pages 1 - 22)
5. Corporate Parenting Panel - Minutes for noting (Pages 23 - 30)
6. Chairman's Announcements
7. Questions
8. Report by Leader of the Council
9. Pension Fund Committee - Governance and Terms of Reference update (Pages 31 - 38)
10. Health and Wellbeing Board - Terms of Reference Update (Pages 39 - 54)
11. Sealing of Documents - Constitution Amendments (Pages 55 - 58)
12. Motions for Time Limited Debate (Pages 59 - 72)
13. National Anthem

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'BWatts', with a large, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Benjamin Watts
Deputy Chief Executive

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of a meeting of the County Council held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 17 September 2026.

PRESENT: Mr J Baker, Mr B Black, Mr O Bradshaw, Mr A Brady, Mr M Brice, Mr M Brown, Mr D Burns, Mr C Burwash, Mr A Cecil, Mr P Chamberlain, Mr W Chapman, Mr B Collins, Mrs T Dean, MBE, Mr S Dixon, Mr M Ellis, Ms S Emberson, Mr J Eustace, Mr L Evans, Mr J Finch, Mr R Ford, Mrs B Fordham, Mrs G Foster, Mrs M Fothergill, Mr M Fraser Moat, Mr B Fryer, Mr M Harrison, Mr S Heaver, Mr J Henderson, Mr C Hespe, Mr M A J Hood, Mr A J Hook, Mrs S Hudson, Mr S Jeffery, Ms L Kemkaran, Ms I Kemp, Mr A Kennedy, Mr A Kibble, Mr P King, Mrs M Lawes, Rich Lehmann, Mr T Mallon, Mr R Mayall, Mr T Mole, Miss D Morton, Mr M Mulvihill, Mr M Munday, Ms C Nolan, Mr P Osborne, Mrs C Palmer, Mr R Palmer, Mr M Paul, Mrs B Porter, Mr T Prater, Mr H Rayner, Mr A Ricketts, Mrs S Roots, Ms C Russell, Mr G R Samme, Mr T L Shonk, Mr D Sian, Mr P Stepto, Mr R G Streatfeild, MBE, Dr G Sturley, Mr P Thomas, Mr A Thorp, Mr D Truder, Mr R Waters, Mr P Webb, Mr N Wibberley, Mrs P Williams and Mr D Wimble.

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr J Cook (Head of Democratic Services) and Ms P Der Man (Head of Law - Monitoring Officer)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

96. Lord's Prayer
(Item 1)

The meeting started with a reading of the Lord's Prayer, led by Reverend Steve Kirk-Smith.

97. Apologies for Absence
(Item 2)

The Head of Democratic Services reported apologies from Mr Bill Barrett, Mr James Defriend, Mr Marc Logen, Mr Nigel Williams, Mr Peter Evans, Mr Mike Sole, Mr Colin Sefton, Mr John Moreland, Miss Amelia Randall and Mr Rob Yates.

98. Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or Other Significant Interests in items on the agenda
(Item 3)

There were no declarations of interest.

99. Freedom of the County - Brigade of Gurkhas
(Item 4)

1. The Chairman formally welcomed Lt Col Sean Parr RE, Major Khadkabahadur Gurung, Major Babindra Gurung, and RSM Nick Chadwick, representing the Brigade of Gurkhas, to the meeting. The Chairman also thanked Sir George Jessel DL, Mr Bryan Sweetland, Mr Gary Cooke, Mr Peter Lake, Reverend Kirk-Smith and the Mayor of Medway, for their attendance.
2. Ms Kemkaran proposed, and Mr Palmer seconded the motion that:

“The County Council declares its thanks for and acknowledges the distinguished service of the Brigade of Gurkhas to the Crown and the United Kingdom and, in recognition of that service, formally grants the Brigade of Gurkhas the Freedom of the County.”
3. The Chairman invited Mr Prater, Mr Burwash, Mr Thomas, Mr Dixon, Mr Thorp, Mr Hood, Mr Hook, Mr Streatfeild, Ms Nolan, Mr Shonk and Mr Kennedy to speak.
4. The Chairman put the motion in paragraph 2 to the vote and the voting was as follows.

For (69)

Mr J Baker, Mr B Black, Mr O Bradshaw, Mr A Brady, Mr M Brice, Mr M Brown, Mr D Burns, Mr C Burwash, Mr A Cecil, Mr P Chamberlain, Mr W Chapman, Mr B Collins, Mrs T Dean, Mr S Dixon, Mr M Ellis, Ms S Emberson, Mr J Eustace, Mr L Evans, Mr J Finch, Mr R Ford, Mrs B Fordham, Mrs G Foster, Mrs M Fothergill, Mr M Fraser Moat, Mr B Fryer, Mr M Harrison, Mr S Heaven, Mr J Henderson, Mr M A J Hood, Mr A J Hook, Mrs S Hudson, Mr S Jeffery, Ms L Kemkaran, Miss I Kemp, Mr A Kennedy, Mr A Kibble, Mr P King, Mrs M Lawes, Mr R Lehmann, Mr T Mallon, Mr R Mayall, Mr T Mole, Miss D Morton, Mr M Mulvihill, Mr M Munday, Ms C Nolan, Mr P Osborne, Mrs C Palmer, Mr R Palmer, Mr M Paul, Mrs B Porter, Mr T Prater, Mr H Rayner, Mr A Ricketts, Mrs S Roots, Ms C Russell, Mr G R Samme, Mr T L Shonk, Mr D Sian, Mr P Stepto, Mr R G Streatfeild, Dr G Sturley, Mr P Thomas, Mr A Thorp, Mr D Truder, Mr R Waters, Mr P Webb, Mr N Wibberley and Mr D Wimble.

Against (0)

Abstain (2)

Mr C Hespe and Mrs P Williams.

Motion carried.

5. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman signed the document conferring the Freedom of the County to the Brigade the Gurkhas. The Chairman presented the document to Lt Col Sean Parr RE and invited him to respond.
6. Lt Col Sean Parr RE expressed his sincere thanks to the County Council for bestowing the honour. He highlighted the long-standing relationship between Kent and the Brigade, the contribution of Gurkha soldiers and their families to local communities, and the shared values of service, loyalty and respect. He stated that the granting of the Freedom of Kent would be received with great pride and gratitude as recognition of generations of service and sacrifice, and of the special bond between the Brigade of Gurkhas and the County of Kent.
7. Major Khadkabahadur Gurung, reflected on his own service as a third-generation Gurkha and highlighted the long-standing presence of the Brigade in Kent, particularly the Queen's Gurkha Engineers and Royal Gurkha Rifles and their families. He thanked the people of Kent for their continued support and friendship, including assistance provided following recent flooding in Nepal. He added that the granting of the Freedom of Kent would mark another proud milestone in the enduring relationship between Kent and the Gurkha community and expressed his hope that this friendship would continue to grow and flourish for generations to come.
8. Major Babindra Gurung thanked the County Council for the honour and highlighted the strong relationship between the regiment, its families and the communities of Kent. He expressed gratitude for the support provided by local authorities, schools and residents in helping Gurkha families settle within the county. He described the granting of the Freedom of Kent as a symbol of the friendship and respect shared between the Brigade of Gurkhas and the people of Kent, and recognised Kent as a place many Gurkha families now proudly call home.

RESOLVED that:

The County Council declares its thanks for and acknowledges the distinguished service of the Brigade of Gurkhas to the Crown and the United Kingdom and, in recognition of that service, formally grants the Brigade of Gurkhas the Freedom of the County.

This page is intentionally left blank

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of a meeting of the County Council held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 17 September 2026.

PRESENT: Mr J Baker, Mr B Black, Mr O Bradshaw, Mr A Brady, Mr M Brice, Mr M Brown, Mr D Burns, Mr C Burwash, Mr A Cecil, Mr P Chamberlain, Mr W Chapman, Mr B Collins, Mrs T Dean, MBE, Mr S Dixon, Mr M Ellis, Ms S Emberson, Mr J Eustace, Mr L Evans, Mr J Finch, Mr R Ford, Mrs B Fordham, Mrs G Foster, Mrs M Fothergill, Mr M Fraser Moat, Mr B Fryer, Mr M Harrison, Mr S Heaver, Mr J Henderson, Mr C Hespe, Mr M A J Hood, Mr A J Hook, Mrs S Hudson, Mr S Jeffery, Ms L Kemkaran, Ms I Kemp, Mr A Kennedy, Mr A Kibble, Mr P King, Mrs M Lawes, Rich Lehmann, Mr T Mallon, Mr R Mayall, Mr T Mole, Miss D Morton, Mr M Mulvihill, Mr M Munday, Ms C Nolan, Mr P Osborne, Mrs C Palmer, Mr R Palmer, Mr M Paul, Mrs B Porter, Mr T Prater, Mr H Rayner, Mr A Ricketts, Mrs S Roots, Ms C Russell, Mr G R Samme, Mr T L Shonk, Mr D Sian, Mr P Stepto, Mr R G Streatfeild, MBE, Dr G Sturley, Mr P Thomas, Mr A Thorp, Mr D Truder, Mr R Waters, Mr P Webb, Mr N Wibberley, Mrs P Williams, Mr D Wimble and Mr R Yates.

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr J Cook (Head of Democratic Services) and Ms P Der Man (Head of Law - Monitoring Officer)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

100. Apologies for Absence
(Item 1)

The Head of Democratic Services reported apologies from Mr Bill Barrett, Mr James Defriend, Mr Marc Logen, Mr Nigel Williams, Mr Peter Evans, Mr Mike Sole, Mr Colin Sefton, Mr John Moreland and Miss Amelia Randall.

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

1. In relation to Item 10, Motions for Time Limited Debate, the following declarations were made:
 - i. Mr Streatfeild declared that he had a reserve liability.
 - ii. Mr Mallon declared that he would be speaking as the Chair of the Kent and Medway Fire and Rescue Authority.

102. Minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2026
(Item 3)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Council meeting held on 16 July 2026 were a correct record and they be signed by the Chairman.

103. Chairman's Announcements
(Item 4)

1. The Chairman welcomed Members back following the summer recess and marked a number of significant anniversaries, including Merchant Navy Day, Battle of Britain Day and the 82nd anniversary of Operation Market Garden. Members observed a period of reflection in recognition of those who had served and sacrificed in defence of their country.
2. The Chairman updated Members on civic engagements undertaken by himself and the Vice-Chairman since the previous meeting, including attendance at the Chairman of Essex's annual reception, the East Sussex civic reception and Dover Merchant Navy Day, and highlighted a number of forthcoming engagements.
3. The Chairman paid tribute to Corporate Director Sarah Hammond, ahead of her retirement after 28 years of service to Kent County Council, recognising her significant contribution, particularly to Children's Services and Adult Social Care.
4. The Chairman welcomed tributes to the sad passing of four former Members: Mrs Margaret Stevens, Mr Paul Messenger, Ms Cheryl Hall and Mr Rodney Chambers.
5. Tributes to Mrs Margaret Stevens were made by Mr Brady, Ms Kemkaran, Mr Hook, Mr Thomas, Mr Hood and Mr Rayner.
6. Tributes to Mr Paul Messenger were made by Mr Rayner, Ms Kemkaran, Mr Hook, Mr Thomas, Mr Hood, Ms Nolan, Mr Shonk and Mr Wimble.
7. Tributes to Ms Cheryl Hall were made by Ms Nolan, Ms Kemkaran, Mrs Dean, Mr Thomas, Mr Hood, Mr Rayner and Mr Hespe.
8. Tributes to Mr Rodney Chambers were made by Mr Rayner, Ms Kemkaran, Mr Hook, Mr Thomas, Mr Hood and Mr Brady.
9. Mr Eustace proposed, and Mr Sian seconded, that the Council formally record the sense of loss it feels on the sad passing of Mrs Margaret

Stevens, Mr Paul Messenger, Ms Cheryl Hall and Mr Rodney Chambers and extends to their families and friends its heartfelt sympathy in their sad bereavement.

Agreed unanimously.

10. The Chairman held a one-minute silence in memory of Mrs Margaret Stevens, Mr Paul Messenger, Ms Cheryl Hall and Mr Rodney Chambers.

11. The Chairman reminded Members of the convention relating to the singing of the National Anthem at Council meetings, clarifying that only the first verse should be sung and reiterating that meetings remain in session until formally closed by the Chairman.

RESOLVED that the Council formally records the sense of loss it feels on the sad passing of Mrs Margaret Stevens, Mr Paul Messenger, Ms Cheryl Hall and Mr Rodney Chambers and extends to their families and friends its heartfelt sympathy in their sad bereavement.

104. Questions
(Item 5)

In accordance with Sections 14.17 to 14.24 of the Constitution, 15 questions were submitted by the deadline and 15 questions were put to the Executive. 10 questions were asked and replies given. A record of all questions and answers is available [online](#) with the papers for this meeting.

105. Report by Leader of the Council
(Item 6)

At the beginning of this item, the Chairman announced that the speaking times for the Leader and Opposition Group Leaders would be extended, in light of recent developments concerning Local Government Reorganisation (LGR). The Chairman also declared that no points of order would be taken during this item.

1. The Leader began her speech by criticising the Government's approach to LGR, highlighting the short period between the Government's announcement and its subsequent decision to pause implementation.
2. The Leader reported that she had been appointed as a Deputy Director on the Board of Local Government Association (LGA) and highlighted the importance of the role in representing local government interests during a period of significant change.
3. The Leader had recently held lengthy discussions with the new Chief Executive of South East Water regarding concerns raised by residents and

welcomed his engagement with the Council's forthcoming Water Resilience Partnership Forum.

4. The Leader outlined the launch of the Delivery of Local Government Efficiency (DOLGE) Strategy and explained that its transition into the delivery phase would support the Council's continued focus on achieving value for money across all services.
5. The Leader reported that she had presented her annual report to the Scrutiny Committee, covering a range of key issues including the Council's financial position, Adult Social Care, Education and the authority's long-term strategic priorities, and welcomed the opportunity to respond to Members' questions.
6. The Leader highlighted a number of engagements undertaken during July and August, including visits to Five Acre Wood School and the Kent Police Netball Community Project, and praised the contribution of both initiatives in supporting resilience, wellbeing and the development of young people.
7. Updates were provided on projects across the county, including progress at the Ebbsfleet Development site and the Road of Remembrance scheme in Folkestone, highlighting the positive impact these developments would have on local communities and residents.
8. The Leader reported that she had attended a self-defence class for women and girls and explained that participants had expressed concerns about their personal safety. She stated that many attendees linked those concerns to the presence of illegal migrants and asylum seekers in their communities and reiterated her previously stated concerns regarding the impact of illegal migration on the safety of women and girls.
9. The Leader had recently attended the launch of the newly formed London and South East University Group, created through the merger of the Universities of Kent and Greenwich.
10. The Leader provided an update on LGR and outlined the Government's announcement that implementation of the previously approved Option 4B for Kent would be paused pending a Government review.
11. The Leader reiterated her opposition to both LGR and Option 4B, arguing that it lacked sufficient evidence of long-term financial sustainability and would create significant challenges for the delivery of key services.
12. The Leader explained that she had written to the Secretary of State seeking clarification on the rationale for the decision and expressed concern that no response had been received.
13. The Leader highlighted the uncertainty created by the Government's change in position, including the implications for implementation

timescales, local elections and the future structure of local government in Kent and Medway.

14. The Leader expressed concern regarding the costs already incurred by councils in preparing for LGR and stated that Kent taxpayers should not bear the financial consequences of decisions taken by central Government.
15. The Leader emphasised that maintaining the delivery of essential services remained the Council's primary priority throughout the ongoing uncertainty surrounding LGR.
16. Finally, the Leader informed Members that the administration intended to issue a pre-action protocol letter to the Secretary of State regarding the 16 July LGR decision, in order to protect the Council's position and preserve its ability to pursue a judicial review challenge should that prove necessary.
17. Mr Hook, Leader of the Opposition, began by raising concerns about a recent protest in Dover, describing its impact on public safety and community confidence. He questioned the policing response to the event, particularly in relation to disruption caused to the port and surrounding area. He also stated that any agenda founded on racial or religious prejudice should be rejected and argued that intimidation and obstruction should not be permitted to influence public policy.
18. Mr Hook continued by expressing his appreciation for Kent's Royal National Lifeboat Institution (RNLI) volunteers, recognising their role in rescuing those in danger at sea. He condemned the harassment recently directed towards lifeboat crews, emphasised that rescue services should be provided irrespective of nationality, and stated that the RNLI deserved the Council's full support.
19. Mr Hook referred to a recent NHS consultation on fertility treatment services in Kent and Medway and welcomed the withdrawal of previously proposed cuts to fertility treatment provision. He reported that his Group had submitted a detailed response opposing further proposed changes and urged the administration to submit a consultation response opposing the proposals.
20. Mr Hook reiterated his Group's view that LGR should focus on devolving powers from central Government rather than changing Council boundaries. He expressed concern that Members were receiving updates through verbal reports rather than formal reports to Cabinet Committee and emphasised the importance of Member engagement given the long-term implications of any reorganisation proposals.
21. Finally, Mr Hook referred to the Council's Quarter 1 financial monitoring position, highlighting the forecast overspend for the current financial year and expressing concern about the implications for the Council's financial

resilience. He called on the Leader to ensure that the forecast position improved during the remainder of the year and that the Council achieved a balanced outturn.

22. Mr Thomas, Leader of the Restore Britain Kent Group, began by expressing disappointment that recent developments relating to LGR were not being debated by Full Council. He also commented on the Leader's recent appointment to the LGA Board, highlighting previous comments made towards the organisation.
23. Mr Thomas welcomed the forthcoming meeting of the Water Resilience Partnership and expressed hope that it would address important water supply infrastructure issues, replace leaking mains, upgrade equipment and help ensure a secure and reliable supply.
24. On DOLGE, Mr Thomas commented on the transition to the delivery phase and argued that efficiencies and savings would first need to be identified in order for the programme to deliver its objectives.
25. Mr Thomas welcomed the Leader's visit to Five Acre Wood School and highlighted the continued expansion of the school to meet increasing demand.
26. On illegal migration, Mr Thomas referred Members to Restore Britain's national policy on mass deportation as setting out his Group's position on the issue.
27. Mr Thomas expressed concern that the agenda contained few substantive items and questioned whether this reflected a lack of business being undertaken by the administration or a reluctance to bring matters before Full Council for debate.
28. Mr Thomas welcomed Government funding to increase vehicle capacity at the Port of Dover and expressed support for measures to alleviate pressure on Kent's road network and reduce the need for Operation Brock. He also emphasised the importance of transparency when using associated services including accurate declarations.
29. Finally, Mr Thomas reiterated his opposition to LGR and criticised the administration's approach to the process. He questioned the Leader's characterisation of recent developments as a success, raised concerns about the costs incurred in preparing for LGR, and praised a fellow Restore Britain Kent Councillor for their continued scrutiny of the issue.
30. Mr Hood, Leader of the Green Group, began by criticising the disruption caused by a recent protest in Dover, arguing that it had negatively affected local communities, the port and the county's economy. He expressed concern about participants wearing balaclavas and highlighted reports that a number of those arrested at immigration protests had previous convictions for domestic violence. He criticised what he regarded as a lack

of condemnation from the administration and argued that the protest had disrupted ferry services and other legitimate activity.

31. Mr Hood congratulated Dr Ingrid Dodd on her election as Dover District Council's first Green Councillor and highlighted the increase in her vote share. He also commented on the role that Reform UK had played in motivating support for other parties in the election.
32. Regarding LGR, Mr Hood agreed with the Leader's concerns regarding the uncertainty it had created for Council employees. He emphasised the importance of providing clarity for officers whose careers could be affected by any future changes.
33. Finally, Mr Hood advocated for an Assembly for Kent as an alternative approach to Local Government Reform. He argued that such a model could retain county-wide delivery of complex services, avoid the creation of councils that may face financial challenges, reduce costs and protect local identities. He further suggested that, given Kent's size and strategic importance, an Assembly should be granted greater devolved powers and representation alongside mayoral authorities at a national level.
34. Mr Rayner, Leader of the Conservative Group, began by criticising the Government's approach to LGR, arguing that the process had been rushed, disjointed and ultimately detrimental to local government in Kent. He stated that the uncertainty surrounding the proposals had diverted attention and resources away from other opportunities to improve services for residents.
35. Mr Rayner thanked officers across Kent County Council, Medway Council and the district councils for their work in responding to Local Government Reform proposals and expressed the hope that their efforts would not prove to have been in vain.
36. Finally, Mr Rayner expressed concern about the forecast budget overspend and highlighted rising diesel prices, increasing grain and food costs, and pressures on mortgage holders. He urged the administration to take urgent steps to reduce unnecessary expenditure and introduce emergency spending measures before the next meeting of Full Council.
37. Mr Brady, Leader of the Labour Group, began by welcoming the Youth Guarantee and emphasised the importance of supporting young people into education, training and employment. He expressed concern about the number of young people not in education, employment or training in Canterbury and called on Kent County Council (KCC) to do more to support the Youth Guarantee.
38. Mr Brady welcomed forthcoming changes to the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme, stating that the removal of time restrictions on concessionary bus passes would improve independence, reduce

transport costs and help disabled residents remain connected to their communities.

39. Referring to the recent disorder in Dover, Mr Brady highlighted the importance of tackling radicalisation in Kent. He welcomed the establishment of the Countering Violent Extremism Hub and called on KCC to play a leading role in protecting communities from extremism and promoting community cohesion.
40. Mr Brady highlighted the importance of KCC supporting the Government's Rough Sleeping programme to help people move away from homelessness and into appropriate accommodation and support. He also encouraged the Council to engage with new community energy funding opportunities and promote the recently announced hospitality grant scheme.
41. Finally, Mr Brady referred to the Government's review of LGR and stated that the current pause in the process was intended to allow further consideration of the proposals. He reported that officers had welcomed the additional time and suggested that the revised timetable could result in a delay to implementation.
42. In response, the Leader criticised Members' understanding of LGR and explained that a judicial review challenge could only be brought once a decision had been made by central Government. She stated that other authorities had progressed further through the process and incurred significant costs before being able to pursue legal action and maintained that Kent's position was not unusual.
43. The Leader strongly criticised central Government's handling of LGR, arguing that the process had been managed poorly and inconsistently and that KCC had been treated unfairly.
44. The Leader argued that stronger action by central Government on illegal migration would reduce public concern and the perceived need for protests on the issue. She criticised Opposition Groups for their response and boycott of the Council's previous declaration of an illegal migration emergency and expressed broader criticism of the Labour Government's approach to migration and national policy.
45. The Leader argued that the previous administration's record in office undermined any criticisms of the current administration's approach to financial management and service delivery.
46. The Leader criticised comments regarding the Dover protests and rejected suggestions that Kent County Council was responsible for events connected to them. She also challenged claims made by the Opposition regarding their role in securing service improvements and questioned their understanding of the Council's responsibilities and achievements.

47. The Leader highlighted the administration's achievements since taking office, including improvements to bus services, highways maintenance, Adult Social Care and library provision. She criticised the Opposition for what she characterised as permissive approaches to migration and other national policy issues.

48. Finally, the Leader expressed concern about social media responses to a Member's visit to a Sikh temple. She condemned what she described as racist and discriminatory comments and raised concerns about the handling of the matter within the political group concerned.

RESOLVED to note the Leader's Report.

106. Planning Applications Committee - Terms of Reference changes
(Item 7)

Prior to the motion being proposed and seconded, the Chairman advised Council that he was aware of an amendment that had been developed on this item but he had ruled that it had not been processed prior to the relevant deadline and would therefore not proceed.

1. Mr Wimble proposed and Mr Chapman seconded the motion that:

“County Council is asked to:

- a. Agree that the proposed amendments to the Planning Applications Committee Terms of Reference be approved.
- b. Agree that the name of the Planning Applications Committee be amended to Planning and Regulation Committee.
- c. Agree that the proposed amendments to the Appendix to the Constitution incorporating the new planning scheme of delegation be approved.
- d. Delegate to the Monitoring Officer the implementation of these changes on 31 October 2026.”

2. Following the debate, the Chairman put the motion set out in paragraph 1 to the vote and the voting was as follows.

For (43)

Mr J Baker, Mr M Brown, Mr C Burwash, Mr P Chamberlain, Mr W Chapman, Mr B Collins, Mr S Dixon, Ms S Emberson, Mr J Eustace, Mr L Evans, Mr J Finch, Mrs B Fordham, Mrs G Foster, Mr M Fraser Moat, Mr B Fryer, Mr M Harrison, Mr J Henderson, Mr C Hespe, Ms L Kemkaran, Mr A Kibble, Mr P King, Mrs M Lawes, Mr T Mallon, Mr R Mayall, Mr T Mole, Miss D Morton, Mr M Mulvihill, Mr P Osborne, Mrs C Palmer, Mr R Palmer, Mr M Paul, Mrs B Porter, Mrs S Roots, Mr T L Shonk, Mr D Sian, Dr G Sturley, Mr A Thorp, Mr D Truder, Mr R Waters, Mr P Webb, Mr N Wibberley, Mrs P Williams and Mr D Wimble.

Against (23)

Mr B Black, Mr O Bradshaw, Mr M Brice, Mr D Burns, Mr A Cecil, Mrs T Dean, Mr M Ellis, Mr R Ford, Mrs M Fothergill, Mr S Heaven, Mr M A J Hood, Mr A J Hook, Mr S Jeffery, Miss I Kemp, Mr M Munday, Mr H Rayner, Mr A Ricketts, Ms C Russell, Mr G R Samme, Mr P Stepto, Mr R G Streatfeild, Mr P Thomas and Mr R Yates.

Abstain (3)

Mr A Brady, Ms C Nolan and Mr T Prater.

Motion carried.

RESOLVED that Council:

- a. Agrees that the proposed amendments to the Planning Applications Committee Terms of Reference be approved.
- b. Agrees that the name of the Planning Applications Committee be amended to the Planning and Regulation Committee.
- c. Agrees that the proposed amendments to the Appendix to the Constitution incorporating the new planning scheme of delegation be approved.
- d. Delegates to the Monitoring Officer the implementation of these changes on 31 October 2026.

107. Treasury Management Year End Report
(Item 8)

1. Mr Collins proposed and Mr Chamberlain seconded the motion that:

“Council is asked to note the report.”

2. Following the debate, the Chairman put the motion in paragraph 1 and it was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED that Council notes the report.

108. Proportionality Update
(Item 9)

1. Ms Kemkaran proposed and Mr Collins seconded the motion that:

“The County Council is asked to:

- (a) APPROVE the amendment to the Committee sizes and the allocation of committee and sub-committee places between the political groups;

- (b) DELEGATE authority to the Head of Democratic Services to implement any time delayed changes, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer.”

2. The Chairman put the motion in paragraph 1 to the vote and the voting was as follows.

For (69)

Mr J Baker, Mr B Black, Mr O Bradshaw, Mr A Brady, Mr M Brice, Mr M Brown, Mr D Burns, Mr C Burwash, Mr A Cecil, Mr P Chamberlain, Mr W Chapman, Mr B Collins, Mrs T Dean, Mr S Dixon, Mr M Ellis, Ms S Emberson, Mr J Eustace, Mr L Evans, Mr J Finch, Mr R Ford, Mrs B Fordham, Mrs G Foster, Mrs M Fothergill, Mr M Fraser Moat, Mr B Fryer, Mr M Harrison, Mr S Heaven, Mr J Henderson, Mr C Hespe, Mr M A J Hood, Mr A J Hook, Mr S Jeffery, Ms L Kemkaran, Miss I Kemp, Mr A Kibble, Mr P King, Mrs M Lawes, Mr T Mallon, Mr R Mayall, Mr T Mole, Miss D Morton, Mr M Mulvihill, Mr M Munday, Ms C Nolan, Mr P Osborne, Mrs C Palmer, Mr R Palmer, Mr M Paul, Mrs B Porter, Mr T Prater, Mr H Rayner, Mr A Ricketts, Mrs S Roots, Ms C Russell, Mr G R Samme, Mr T L Shonk, Mr D Sian, Mr P Stepto, Mr R G Streatfeild, Dr G Sturley, Mr P Thomas, Mr A Thorp, Mr D Truder, Mr R Waters, Mr P Webb, Mr N Wibberley, Mrs P Williams, Mr D Wimble and Mr R Yates.

Against (0)

Abstain (0)

Motion carried.

RESOLVED that Council:

- (a) APPROVES the amendment to the Committee sizes and the allocation of committee and sub-committee places between the political groups;
(b) DELEGATES authority to the Head of Democratic Services to implement any time delayed changes, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer.

109. Motions for Time Limited Debate
(Item 10)

1. Mr Streatfeild proposed and Mr Hook seconded the motion that:

“This County Council resolves to:

1. Recommend that the Executive establish a Veterans Community Resilience Task and Finish Group to examine and identify the responsibilities the Council will have under the upcoming Armed Forces Bill and request the outcomes of this to be reported to the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee.

2. Request that the Executive works with the Health and Wellbeing Board to explore and develop appropriate workstreams to better tackle veteran related health inequality, in line with the Armed Forces Covenant commitments to ensure that veterans and serving personnel are not disadvantaged in accessing health and relevant support services.
3. Request that the Kent & Medway Civilian-Military Partnership Board (KMCMPPB), working with relevant partners, map the skills, experience and interests of veterans locally and identify practical ways in which veterans can contribute to domestic resilience, including emergency preparedness, community response, recovery support, mentoring, youth engagement, neighbourhood resilience, volunteering and civic leadership.
4. Encourage the Executive and relevant services to work with the Integrated Care Board, NHS partners, primary care, veterans' charities and local voluntary organisations to review and, where appropriate, strengthen pathways for veterans into physical health support, mental health and wellbeing services, suicide prevention and postvention support, rehabilitation, social prescribing, employment assistance and peer support.
5. Recommend that the Deputy Leader, works with partners across the Kent and Medway Resilience Forum to explore the development of a local Veterans Community Resilience Framework setting out how veterans can be brought together, supported and enabled to contribute safely and appropriately to local resilience activity, without replacing statutory emergency services or professional responders.
6. Recommend that the Deputy Leader explore the establishment of annual Veteran Community Resilience Days across the authority area, bringing together veterans, reservists, former regular personnel with Reserve Liability, emergency services, employers, cadet forces, community groups and local residents.
7. Ensure that the above referenced Veteran Community Resilience Days are designed to promote wellbeing and social connection; raise awareness of support services; encourage volunteering and civic participation; celebrate military service and local heritage; maintain bonds of comradeship and esprit de corps; and support pathways into Reserve service, mentoring, community leadership and resilience activity where appropriate.
8. Note the work already completed by the Kent & Medway Civilian-Military Partnership Board to identify veterans who may be isolated, under-supported, or facing service-related health needs, and request the KMCMPPB, via its Health and Wellbeing Task Group, explore any connection between veteran deaths and military service to help inform the development of improved support options.
9. Encourage the Executive and relevant services to work with Kent-based Gurkha veterans, Gurkha community organisations and the Gurkha Welfare Trust, building on the established KCC commitments to support veterans under the Armed Forces Covenant, to identify the needs, strengths and contribution of

Gurkha veterans and their families in Kent; improve culturally competent signposting into welfare, housing, health, benefits, translation, employment and social support; and ensure that Gurkha veterans are actively included in Armed Forces Covenant delivery, community resilience planning and local commemorative and civic activity.

10. Encourage the Executive and relevant services to work with Royal British Veterans Enterprise (RBVE) in Aylesford, recognising its long-standing work supporting veterans and their families through welfare provision, housing, employment, training, volunteering and community-building; and explore practical partnerships to strengthen referral pathways, employment support, skills development, supported accommodation links and opportunities for veterans to move towards independent living, purposeful activity and sustained work.
11. Request that progress on the above recommendations, in addition to any other Committee reporting on portfolio specific elements, is reported back to Full Council within twelve months as part of the Armed Forces Covenant reporting."

2. Following the debate, the Chairman put the motion set out in paragraph 1 to the vote and voting was as follows.

For (69)

Mr J Baker, Mr B Black, Mr O Bradshaw, Mr A Brady, Mr M Brice, Mr M Brown, Mr D Burns, Mr C Burwash, Mr A Cecil, Mr P Chamberlain, Mr W Chapman, Mr B Collins, Mrs T Dean, Mr S Dixon, Mr M Ellis, Ms S Emberson, Mr J Eustace, Mr L Evans, Mr J Finch, Mr R Ford, Mrs B Fordham, Mrs G Foster, Mrs M Fothergill, Mr M Fraser Moat, Mr B Fryer, Mr M Harrison, Mr S Heaven, Mr J Henderson, Mr C Hespe, Mr M A J Hood, Mr A J Hook, Mr S Jeffery, Ms L Kemkaran, Miss I Kemp, Mr A Kibble, Mr P King, Mrs M Lawes, Mr T Mallon, Mr R Mayall, Mr T Mole, Miss D Morton, Mr M Mulvihill, Mr M Munday, Ms C Nolan, Mr P Osborne, Mrs C Palmer, Mr R Palmer, Mr M Paul, Mrs B Porter, Mr T Prater, Mr H Rayner, Mr A Ricketts, Mrs S Roots, Ms C Russell, Mr G R Samme, Mr T L Shonk, Mr D Sian, Mr P Stepto, Mr R G Streatfeild, Dr G Sturley, Mr P Thomas, Mr A Thorp, Mr D Truder, Mr R Waters, Mr P Webb, Mr N Wibberley, Mrs P Williams, Mr D Wimble and Mr R Yates.

Against (0)

Abstain (0)

Motion carried.

RESOLVED that Council:

1. Recommends that the Executive establish a Veterans Community Resilience Task and Finish Group to examine and identify the responsibilities the Council will have under the upcoming Armed Forces Bill and requests the outcomes of this to be reported to the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee.
2. Requests that the Executive works with the Health and Wellbeing Board to explore and develop appropriate workstreams to better tackle veteran related health inequality, in line with the Armed Forces Covenant commitments to ensure that veterans and serving personnel are not disadvantaged in accessing health and relevant support services.
3. Requests that the Kent & Medway Civilian-Military Partnership Board (KMCMPB), working with relevant partners, map the skills, experience and interests of veterans locally and identify practical ways in which veterans can contribute to domestic resilience, including emergency preparedness, community response, recovery support, mentoring, youth engagement, neighbourhood resilience, volunteering and civic leadership.
4. Encourages the Executive and relevant services to work with the Integrated Care Board, NHS partners, primary care, veterans' charities and local voluntary organisations to review and, where appropriate, strengthen pathways for veterans into physical health support, mental health and wellbeing services, suicide prevention and postvention support, rehabilitation, social prescribing, employment assistance and peer support.
5. Recommends that the Deputy Leader, works with partners across the Kent and Medway Resilience Forum to explore the development of a local Veterans Community Resilience Framework setting out how veterans can be brought together, supported and enabled to contribute safely and appropriately to local resilience activity, without replacing statutory emergency services or professional responders.
6. Recommends that the Deputy Leader explore the establishment of annual Veteran Community Resilience Days across the authority area, bringing together veterans, reservists, former regular personnel with Reserve Liability, emergency services, employers, cadet forces, community groups and local residents.
7. Ensures that the above referenced Veteran Community Resilience Days are designed to promote wellbeing and social connection; raise awareness of support services; encourage volunteering and civic participation; celebrate military service and local heritage; maintain bonds of comradeship and esprit de corps; and support pathways into Reserve service, mentoring, community leadership and resilience activity where appropriate.
8. Notes the work already completed by the Kent & Medway Civilian-Military Partnership Board to identify veterans who may be isolated, under-supported, or facing service-related health needs, and requests the KMCMPB, via its Health and Wellbeing Task Group, explore any connection between veteran deaths and military service to help inform the development of improved support options.

9. Encourages the Executive and relevant services to work with Kent-based Gurkha veterans, Gurkha community organisations and the Gurkha Welfare Trust, building on the established KCC commitments to support veterans under the Armed Forces Covenant, to identify the needs, strengths and contribution of Gurkha veterans and their families in Kent; improve culturally competent signposting into welfare, housing, health, benefits, translation, employment and social support; and ensure that Gurkha veterans are actively included in Armed Forces Covenant delivery, community resilience planning and local commemorative and civic activity.
10. Encourages the Executive and relevant services to work with Royal British Veterans Enterprise (RBVE) in Aylesford, recognising its long-standing work supporting veterans and their families through welfare provision, housing, employment, training, volunteering and community-building; and explore practical partnerships to strengthen referral pathways, employment support, skills development, supported accommodation links and opportunities for veterans to move towards independent living, purposeful activity and sustained work.
11. Requests that progress on the above recommendations, in addition to any other Committee reporting on portfolio specific elements, is reported back to Full Council within twelve months as part of the Armed Forces Covenant reporting.

3. Mr Heaver proposed and Mr Hood seconded the motion that:

“This Council resolves to:

1. Support the continued policy of promoting lower speeds by design by working with developers through the planning and highway adoption processes to ensure that new residential developments are designed to operate with 20mph speed limits as the norm, except on appropriate arterial routes.
2. Support work to ensure that where developments have been designed to function safely and effectively with 20mph speed limits, Kent Highways makes the strongest possible recommendation for the subsequent designation of those limits through the Traffic Regulation Order process.
3. Recognise the positive contribution of the Vision Zero programme and commit to supporting the safety of Kent residents by seeking a continuation and extension of its principles and objectives, with a view to enabling successor councils to adopt and incorporate Vision Zero within their future transport and community safety strategies.
4. Call on the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport to work with the appropriate teams within the Growth, Environment and Transport Directorate to identify feasible locations for 20mph zone extensions in residential areas and town centres across Kent, and to present the findings to the Growth, Environment and Transport

Cabinet Committee, as well as providing each Member with information relating to the division they represent.

5. Call on the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport to allocate an appropriate budget to support the expansion of 20mph schemes across Kent.
6. Call on the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport to explore the technical and legal feasibility of establishing a long-term target of 20mph limits on 75% of Kent's residential roads by 2030 and report on the outcomes to the Growth, Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee.
7. Recommend that, subject to technical viability, the Cabinet Member develop a Strategy to deliver against the 2030 target."

4. Following the debate, the Chairman put the motion set out in paragraph 3 to the vote and the voting was as follows.

For (16)

Mr A Brady, Mr M Brice, Mrs T Dean, Mr M Ellis, Mr S Heaver, Mr M A J Hood, Mr A J Hook, Mr S Jeffery, Mr M Munday, Ms C Nolan, Mr T Prater, Mr A Ricketts, Mr G R Samme, Mr P Stepto, Mr R G Streatfeild and Mr R Yates.

Against (48)

Mr J Baker, Mr B Black, Mr M Brown, Mr D Burns, Mr C Burwash, Mr A Cecil, Mr P Chamberlain, Mr W Chapman, Mr B Collins, Mr S Dixon, Ms S Emberson, Mr J Eustace, Mr L Evans, Mr J Finch, Mrs B Fordham, Mrs G Foster, Mrs M Fothergill, Mr M Fraser Moat, Mr B Fryer, Mr M Harrison, Mr J Henderson, Mr C Hespe, Ms L Kemkaran, Mr A Kibble, Mr P King, Mrs M Lawes, Mr T Mallon, Mr R Mayall, Mr T Mole, Miss D Morton, Mr M Mulvihill, Mr P Osborne, Mrs C Palmer, Mr R Palmer, Mr M Paul, Mrs B Porter, Mrs S Roots, Mr T L Shonk, Mr D Sian, Dr G Sturley, Mr P Thomas, Mr A Thorp, Mr D Truder, Mr R Waters, Mr P Webb, Mr N Wibberley, Mrs P Williams and Mr D Wimble.

Abstain (5)

Mr O Bradshaw, Mr R Ford, Miss I Kemp, Mr H Rayner and Ms C Russell.

Motion lost.

5. Mr Bradshaw proposed and Mr Ford seconded the motion that:

"This Council Resolves:

1. To request that the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport commission a feasibility study into extending free concessionary bus travel for eligible pass holders before 9:30am on local bus services within Kent.
2. That the feasibility study should assess:

- a) The anticipated financial implications for Kent County Council;
 - b) The impact on bus operator capacity and service provision;
 - c) Potential health and wellbeing benefits, including improved access to healthcare and reduced social isolation;
 - d) Potential economic benefits to town centres, local businesses and the voluntary sector;
 - e) Potential environmental benefits arising from increased public transport use.
3. That the study should involve appropriate engagement with relevant stakeholders, including bus operators, NHS partners, district and borough councils, Age UK, Healthwatch Kent and other community organisations to gather necessary information.
 4. That the Cabinet Member be asked to report the findings and recommendations of the feasibility study to the appropriate Committee within six months, including outlining any options for implementation and funding should a viable proposal be identified.”

6. Following the debate, the Chairman put the motion set out in paragraph 5 to the vote and the voting was as follows.

For (17)

Mr B Black, Mr O Bradshaw, Mr A Brady, Mr M Brice, Mr D Burns, Mrs T Dean, Mr R Ford, Mrs M Fothergill, Mr S Heaver, Mr M A J Hood, Mr S Jeffery, Miss I Kemp, Mr M Munday, Ms C Nolan, Mr P Stepto, Mr P Thomas and Mr R Yates.

Against (48)

Mr J Baker, Mr M Brown, Mr C Burwash, Mr A Cecil, Mr P Chamberlain, Mr W Chapman, Mr B Collins, Mr S Dixon, Mr M Ellis, Ms S Emberson, Mr J Eustace, Mr L Evans, Mr J Finch, Mrs B Fordham, Mrs G Foster, Mr M Fraser Moat, Mr B Fryer, Mr M Harrison, Mr J Henderson, Mr C Hespe, Ms L Kemkaran, Mr A Kibble, Mr P King, Mrs M Lawes, Mr T Mallon, Mr R Mayall, Mr T Mole, Miss D Morton, Mr M Mulvihill, Mr P Osborne, Mrs C Palmer, Mr R Palmer, Mr M Paul, Mrs B Porter, Mr H Rayner, Mr A Ricketts, Mrs S Roots, Ms C Russell, Mr T L Shonk, Mr D Sian, Dr G Sturley, Mr A Thorp, Mr D Truder, Mr R Waters, Mr P Webb, Mr N Wibberley, Mrs P Williams and Mr D Wimble.

Abstain (4)

Mr A J Hook, Mr T Prater, Mr G R Samme and Mr R G Streatfeild.

Motion lost.

110. National Anthem
(Item 11)

The Chairman invited Members to join in the singing of the National Anthem. After this concluded, the Chairman closed the meeting.

CORPORATE PARENTING PANEL – 30 June 2026

**MINUTES of the meeting held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House,
County Hall, Maidstone.**

PRESENT: Pamela Williams (Chair), Adrian Kibble (Vice-Chair), Dominica Basini, Oliver Bradshaw, Dan Bride, Tom Byrne, Connor Cruickshank, Spencer Dixon, Tony Doran, Brian Horton, Juliet MacFarlane, Thomas Mallon, Robert Mayall, Terry Mole, Connie Nolan, Peter Osborne, Sharon Roots, Claudine Russell, Tracy Scott, Colin Sefton and Caroline Smith

IN ATTENDANCE: Paul Webb (Cabinet Member for Integrated Children's Services), Kevin Kasaven (Director of Children's Countywide Services), Hayley Bodiam (Service Manager), Gayle Levy (Quality Assurance Manager), Mark Vening (Fostering Service Manager), Sarah Newman (Senior Participation Support Officer) and Georgia Humphreys (Democratic Services Officer)

Apologies and substitutes

Apologies had been received from Mr Brice, Ms McInnes, Ms Sayer for whom Ms Basini was present as substitute.

Ms Bride was present virtually.

Chair's announcements

1. The Chair advised that a recent engagement event with care experienced young people included arts and crafts activities, opportunities for discussion, and a feedback board. Young people provided honest and insightful comments about their experiences and how services could better support them.
2. The Key themes raised by young people included:
 - a. The importance of considering how corporate parenting actions impact children and young people, particularly in relation to education. Young people felt that meetings should not take place during school hours.
 - b. How social workers could provide better support by taking time to understand young people's individual experiences and needs. Young people emphasised that simple actions and good communication can make a significant difference.

- c. How the Police and Youth Justice Services could better support young people by being more patient, understanding and mindful of their personal circumstances and experiences.
 - d. Messages for Corporate Parents and senior officers included the need to work more quickly, avoid unnecessary delays and ensure that children's voices are heard and acted upon.
3. The Chair reported that young people had suggested that Corporate Parents should produce a video to explain who they are, the role they play, and the departments they work within. In response, arrangements were being made with MRX to develop a video, involving children in care in its production and sharing further information with Members.

Participation Team update

1. The Participation Team provided the Panel with a comprehensive update. Key points of the update included:
 - a. That two apprentices had passed their level 2 apprenticeships in Customer Service.
 - b. The Team thanked members of the Panel for attending the event on 26th May with 20 members of the Children in Care Councils.
 - c. An Update was provided on the work of the Children in Care Councils as well as the Young Adult Council and the Young Parents Group.
 - d. The Team explained about a Speak Up referral for a young person who was finding it difficult to engage with professionals and share his interests or views. The Team explained that through Speak up Sessions the young person began to engage more openly and ultimately the work had a positive impact.
 - e. During the Easter and May Holidays there were 13 activity days facilitated for children in care, older care experienced young people, adopted children, children in kinship care and children with SEND who come under the Strengthening Independence Service.

RESOLVED that the update was noted.

Challenge Cards update

1. Ms Newman, Senior Participation Support Officer, outlined the challenge set for Corporate Parents by the Young Adult Council. This was 'Our Young Adult Council would like to challenge their Corporate Parents to improve and streamline the process of accessing case files, to help make the process smoother and more accessible.' Ms Newman explained the importance of Young Adults being able to access their records without barriers.
2. Mrs Russell proposed, and Ms Nolan seconded the amendment to the recommendation that:

'Members of the Corporate Parenting accept the challenges given by the Young Adult Council and ask officers to progress these and to update the Challenge Cards in line with this.'

3. The Chair put this to the vote and it was unanimously agreed.
4. In response to comments and questions it was said:
 - a. Mr Kasaven, Director of Children's Countywide Services, confirmed that the support for care leavers ends at 25 years of age.
 - b. When asked about Life Story work for care experienced young people, Ms Smith, Assistant Director Corporate Parenting, explained that younger children are supported through life story books, which can be added to over time by their adoptive families or carers. For older children, social workers undertake life story work directly with them, tailored to their age and understanding. Members were advised that some children have both life story books and memory boxes, which help record important events, experiences and relationships throughout their lives. Life story work is updated to reflect significant decisions and developments in a child's journey, enabling them to understand what has happened and why decisions have been made. It was further explained that all children receive a letter explaining key decisions made about their care. For older children, more detailed information is provided to help them understand their experiences, support their identity, and make sense of their time in care.

RESOLVED that Members of the Corporate Parenting Panel accept the challenges given by the Young Adult Council and ask officers to progress these and to update the Challenge Cards in line with this.

Verbal Update by Cabinet Member

1. Mr Webb, the Cabinet Member for Integrated Services advised that, since being appointed on 30 March 2026, he had commenced his induction into the

role, including meetings with officers and visits to a range of services across the county.

2. Visits had included Oak Manor Reception Centre, Acacia Court, Olea Grove, and attendance at the County Youth Justice Board Away Day. The Cabinet Member had also recently visited Windchimes, Fairlawn and Lodge Short Breaks Units, where he had met staff and observed the high standard of care being provided to children and families. He highlighted the dedication and compassion demonstrated by staff across the services.
3. On 26 June 2026, the Cabinet Member visited HMP Standford Hill to attend the Gypsy, Romany and Traveller Reverse Peer Mentoring Day. The visit had provided an opportunity to hear directly from participants and gain a greater understanding of the challenges and barriers experienced by Gypsy, Romany and Traveller communities.
4. The Cabinet Member reported that he had visited a number of Family Hubs, including those in North Ashford and Maidstone, and had attended the Temple Hill Family Hub Open Day. He had also visited the Athena Project home in Ashford, which was undergoing renovation, and a completed home in Sittingbourne, noting that the latter would provide high-quality accommodation and support for children.
5. The Cabinet Member informed the Committee that the Children's Wellbeing and Schools Act 2026 had received Royal Assent on 29 April 2026. He advised that the Act introduced significant reforms to strengthen child protection and safeguarding arrangements, including requirements for Family Group Decision Making, enhanced information-sharing duties, a strengthened role for education in safeguarding, and the establishment of multi-agency child protection teams.
6. The Panel was further advised that the Act included measures to support children in care and improve the children's social care system, including a statutory framework for the authorisation of deprivation of liberty arrangements, additional powers for Ofsted to address breaches of the Care Standards Act 2000, measures relating to unregistered children's homes, and restrictions on the use of agency social workers.
7. The Cabinet Member explained that the Act also included provisions intended to improve the children's care market, including the establishment of Regional Care Co-operatives to support the planning and commissioning of children's placements, and powers to cap the profits of certain independent providers where necessary. It was explained that the reforms were intended to improve outcomes for children and young people and strengthen support and protection for vulnerable children.

8. In response to comments and questions it was said:

- a. Mr Webb clarified that his update on Gypsy, Romany and Traveller Reverse Peer Mentoring Day was given as a wider update on his portfolio rather than specifically on Corporate Parenting.

RESOLVED that the verbal update was noted.

Independent Reviewing Officer (IRO) Service Annual Report

1. Ms Bodiam, Service Manager and Ms Levy, Quality Assurance Manager, introduced the report and provided the Panel with an overview of the work of the IROs, the findings of the Key Performance Indicators and Quality Assurance (QA) recording and reporting.
2. In response to comments and questions it was said:
 - a. It was explained that there were cases where children were unhappy with their care plans. In these cases, IRO's would support children to understand the decision-making process, recognising that it was not always safe for children to be placed where they wished to be. The IRO helped children to process and understand their feelings, advocated on their behalf, and provided appropriate challenge to the Local Authority where required.
 - b. When asked why the target dates for some of the 2024–25 recommendations had passed, Ms Bodiam explained that, in a number of cases, work had commenced and was progressing but had not yet been fully completed. As a result, the team did not consider it appropriate to mark these actions as complete prematurely.
 - c. When asked about parental involvement, Ms Levy explained that the service offered a wide range of opportunities for parents to engage. As part of the IRO review process and subsequent recommendations, discussions took place between the IRO and social workers to determine whether parental involvement was appropriate and in the child's best interests.
 - d. A Member asked what the priorities were to improve children's experiences. Ms Bodiam explained that life story work and planning for transitions into adulthood remained key areas of focus. Work was being undertaken across services to explore how agencies could work collectively to strengthen transition planning and begin this process at an earlier stage. Members recognised the importance of ensuring that appropriate pathways were in place and that there was a clear

understanding of the care-experienced journey, including the role of parents and carers throughout the process. It was further explained that reunification should remain an aspiration where appropriate. Independent Reviewing Officers (IROs) had an important role in supporting understanding of reunification, ensuring that the possibility was regularly revisited, and facilitating conversations between children, families and professionals to explore the most suitable outcomes for the child. Mr Webb added that actively listening to children and young people and getting feedback was a priority.

RESOLVED that the Panel note the IRO Annual Report and its findings.

Kent Fostering Service Annual Report

1. Ms Smith and Mr Vening, Fostering Service Manager, introduced the report and provided the Panel with an overview of the content.
2. In response to comments and questions it was said:
 - a. A Member asked what actions were being taken to prevent foster carers from de-registering. Ms Smith explained that many carers left fostering for positive reasons, including young people remaining with foster families through Staying Put arrangements, children achieving permanence through Special Guardianship Orders or adoption, and carers retiring. She advised that exit interviews were undertaken to understand carers' reasons for leaving and identify opportunities for service improvement. Feedback from these interviews had informed enhancements to Kent County Council's therapeutic support offer for foster carers and children. It was explained that recruitment and retention remained challenging due to factors such as competition from independent fostering agencies and pressures within the local market. Ms Smith emphasised that supporting existing carers was a key priority, as positive word-of-mouth remained one of the most effective recruitment tools. Mr Webb added that changes in family circumstances, including the impact of the cost-of-living crisis and young people remaining at home for longer, had reduced the availability of fostering placements. He explained that the service was therefore also developing its Kinship Service to help address these challenges.
 - b. When asked how many children were in kinship care and foster care, Ms Smith explained that there were 629 children in mainstream foster care and 99 in kinship care.

RESOLVED that the Panel noted the information contained within the Kent Fostering Annual Report and Kinship Service Annual Report and Business Plan 2026/2027.

Children in Care with Education Health and Care Plans (EHCPs)

1. Mr Doran, Headteacher, Virtual School Kent (VSK), introduced the report and gave an overview of the content.
2. In response to comments and questions it was said:
 - a. A Member asked how the service was assuring children with pupil premium were being prioritised. Mr Doran explained that the funding was robustly monitored by Virtual School Kent (VSK), with care taken to avoid duplication where children had Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) and received high-needs funding. Children in Care received three Personal Education Plan (PEP) reviews each year, with 99.3% completed as required. These reviews considered the child's needs, the support already in place, and whether additional funding was required. Where provision should have been delivered through existing funding streams, this was challenged with the education provider. Members were advised that enrichment activities were also provided during school holidays. It was explained that 57 young people were currently on the attendance tracker; however, those not attending school full-time were still receiving education through alternative provision or tuition and were encouraged to participate in enrichment activities. Work was also underway to support young people on reduced timetables into more flexible and sustainable education programmes.

RESOLVED that the Panel noted the work of the Virtual School and SEND in supporting its young people.

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Full Council - 5 November 2026

From: Sarah Emberson - Chairperson of Pension Fund Committee
Brendan Arnold – Corporate Director for Finance

Subject: Kent Pension Fund Governance Reforms

Classification: Unrestricted

Past pathway: Selection and Member Services Committee, 22 October 2026

Executive Summary:

Kent County Council is the administering authority for the Kent Pension Fund. The Fund operates across the geography of Kent and serves around 500 separate employers and nearly 200,000 members. The County Council delegates all responsibility for the oversight and management of the Fund to the Pension Fund Committee.

The Government has recently announced a range of governance reforms which place new statutory duties on LGPS Fund Administering authorities. These reforms will impact the Fund in four key areas :

1. Stronger knowledge and training requirements
2. The creation of a LGPS Senior Officer role
3. The creation of an Independent Person role
4. A new requirement for Independent Governance Reviews

This paper sets out how the County Council as Administering authority for the Fund will address these issues to ensure compliance.

Recommendation:

County Council is asked to:

- a) Note the Pension Fund governance updates being made to respond to the Government's reforms.
 - b) Approve the updated Terms of Reference for the Pension Fund Committee.
 - c) Delegate to the Monitoring Officer the authority to make any additional technical amendments to the Constitution which are required to ensure the changes set out in this report are properly embedded.
-

1 Legislative Background

- 1.1 In June 2025, MHCLG announced LGPS governance reforms via the release of statutory guidance: [Local Government Pension Scheme: fund governance - GOV.UK](#).
- 1.2 The guidance was issued by the Secretary of State in accordance with the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) (Amendment) (Governance) Regulations 2026. It relates to Section 5 of the Pension Schemes Act 2026.
- [The Local Government Pension Scheme \(Amendment\) \(Governance\) Regulations 2026](#)
 - [Pension Schemes Act 2026](#)
- 1.3 The legislation came into force on 30th June 2026. There are various deadlines within the legislation that must be adhered to.

2 Overview

- 2.1 This statutory guidance from the Secretary of State sets new governance expectations for Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) administering authorities in England and Wales. As such, the governance arrangements for Kent Pension Fund put in place by Kent County Council need to be updated so that the Fund remains compliant. The new requirements put forward by MHCLG are intended to strengthen accountability, governance, skills, oversight and fund management across LGPS funds.
- 2.2 The governance reforms focus on 4 areas :
- a) Stronger knowledge and training requirements for Committee members, and key personnel
 - b) The creation of a statutory LGPS Senior Officer role
 - c) The creation of an Independent Person role
 - d) A new requirement for Independent Governance Reviews
- 2.3 This paper summaries the requirements of each in turn and proposes a series of recommendations to ensure the Fund remains compliant.

3 Stronger Knowledge and Training Requirements

- 3.1 A key theme in the statutory guidance is that everyone involved in managing or overseeing an LGPS fund must have appropriate knowledge and understanding to carry out their responsibilities effectively. This includes:
- a) Pension Committee Members
 - b) Local Pension Board Members
 - c) The LGPS Senior Officer of each Fund
 - d) The Independent Person supporting Pension Fund Committee
 - e) Other Officers with delegated responsibilities
 - f) Independent advisers and other engaged in governance and oversight

- 3.2 The guidance states that administering authorities must maintain a Training Strategy explaining how individuals will gain and maintain the required knowledge and skills. Training must be role-specific, reviewed annually and supported by evidence of attendance and competence.
- 3.3 The Fund already has a Training Strategy, regularly delivers training, maintains a training log and undertakes knowledge assessment. However, it is proposed that the Fund's Training Strategy is comprehensively reviewed against the requirements and that any necessary updates are made.

4 The creation of a LGPS Senior Officer role

- 4.1 A major change brought in by the new legislation is the requirement for every administering authority to appoint a single LGPS Senior Officer, this individual having overall responsibility for pension fund operations. In summary, the LGPS Senior Officer, which will be a statutory role, is expected to :
- a) Lead day-to-day management of the fund
 - b) Ensure compliance with legislation and regulatory requirements
 - c) Oversee administration, funding, investment and governance
 - d) Ensure adequate resources and staffing
 - e) Implement committee decisions
 - f) Manage risks and suppliers
 - g) Support Pension Boards and Committees
 - h) Represent the fund within the host authority's senior leadership structure
- 4.2 (Full details about responsibilities are available in 53A of the Regulations and section 3 of the statutory guidance).
- 4.3 Within administering authorities, the LGPS Senior Officer role cannot be combined with the S.151 role or the Head of Paid Service role. In regard to the appointment, the statutory guidance states that the final decision lies with the Head of Paid Service (Chief Executive) (paragraph 3.16). The appointment of the LGPS Senior Officer must be made by 31 December 2026 and the Chief Executive will make the necessary decisions in this regard.
- #### **5 The creation of an Independent Person role**
- 5.1 Regulation 53A of the LGPS Regulations 2013 requires every administering authority to appoint a single Independent Person to support the LGPS Senior Officer and the Pension Committee.
- 5.2 The Independent Person's responsibilities cover all functions of the Pension Committee including decisions on investment strategy, governance, administration and the role of the administering authority as a shareholder or client of its asset pool company. The duties of the Independent Person include
- to scrutinise any advice given to the committee, whether from the pool or any other organisation or individual

- to help monitor and assess performance against targets set in LGPS strategies, including administrative performance and the pool's implementation of the investment strategy, and help monitor whether the collective pool oversight process is meeting the requirements of the administering authority
- to support consideration of the committee's governance arrangements, including any action plans arising from Independent Governance Reviews
- to contribute in any other way appropriate to the authority's LGPS functions

5.3 (Full details about responsibilities are available in 53A of the Regulations and section 4 of the statutory guidance).

5.4 An Independent Person can support more than one LGPS Fund. Each Fund must have an Independent Person in post by 31 December 2026.

5.5 A competitive interview process was held to appoint an Independent Person to support the Fund. A suitable candidate was identified and Kevin McDonald is due to start with the Fund in November 2026.

6 Independent Governance Reviews

6.1 The guidance introduces Independent Governance Reviews (IGRs) as a requirement for all LGPS administering authorities under Regulation 116A of the LGPS Regulations 2013. The purpose is to provide independent assurance that governance arrangements are effective and compliant with legislation, while giving confidence to scheme members, employers and regulators.

6.2 The focus is not simply on whether legal requirements are met, but whether governance structures, committee effectiveness, officer capacity, training, decision-making, risk management and oversight arrangements are operating to a high standard. The most significant practical requirement will be ensuring that any recommendations translate into a published and monitored improvement plan, with clear evidence of delivery before the next review.

6.3 The first review must be completed between 31 March 2025 and 31 March 2028, with subsequent reviews taking place in future valuation periods. The guidance makes clear that the reviewer must be independent:

- Must not be providing ongoing pension services to the fund.
- Must not be the fund's actuary.
- Must not be undertaking other paid pension advisory work for the fund during the period under review.
- Must have demonstrable independence, with any potential conflicts documented and publicly available

6.4 The review is intended to assess the effectiveness of governance arrangements across the fund. It requires the undertaking of a formal process and will result in the production of a formal report which is sent to the Administering Authority and Secretary of State. The Administering Authority must publish the report, develop and publish an Action Plan in response to recommendations.

- 6.5 The Fund has had independent governance reviews in the past, most notably, a broad, in-depth governance review was completed in 2021 by Barnett Waddingham which led to the governance structures which are currently in place. Officers are intending to make arrangements for the Fund's first statutory IGR in 2027, so that all requirements can be met by 31 March 2028. The Terms of Reference for Pension Fund Committee (Appendix 1) has been updated to recognise this new statutory requirement.

7 Proposed Updates to the Terms of Reference

- 7.1 Updates to the terms of reference of the Pension Fund Committee are being proposed. These are designed to recognise the new formal training requirements, along with the new LGPS senior officer and independent person roles.
- 7.2 These changes will ensure we can demonstrate compliance with the new regulations and have clarity on the independent person in relation to the committee. These changes are set out in the Appendix.
- 7.3 On 22 October 2026, the Selection and Member Services Committee agreed to recommend these changes to County Council for approval.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 For administering authorities such as the Kent County Council, the 2026 LGPS governance reforms place significant emphasis on:
- Formal governance structures.
 - Mandatory, evidenced training programmes.
 - Annual assessment of committee, board and officer competence.
 - A clearly accountable LGPS Senior Officer.
 - Stronger documentation, reporting and governance assurance processes.
 - Independent governance reviews and action planning.
- 8.2 In practical terms, the statutory guidance raises expectations around professional standards and governance maturity, making fund governance more comparable to the standards expected of large institutional pension schemes. **The recommendations in this paper are proposed to ensure the Fund is compliant.**

9 Recommendations

County Council is asked to:

- a) Note the Pension Fund governance updates being made to respond to the Government's reforms.
- b) Approve the updated Terms of Reference for the Pension Fund Committee.
- c) Delegate to the Monitoring Officer the authority to make any additional technical amendments to the Constitution which are required to ensure the changes set out in this report are properly embedded.

10 Appendices

Appendix - Proposed revised Terms of Reference for Pension Fund Committee

11 Background Documents

None.

12 Report Author and Relevant Director

Emma Green, Senior Governance and Programme Manager (Pensions)

T: 03000 410761

E: Emma.Green2@kent.gov.uk

Date: October 2026

Brendan Arnold, Corporate Director of Finance

Pension Fund Committee

17.38 Membership: 11 Members; plus, as voting members - District/Borough members (appointed by Kent Leaders Group): 3; Medway Council: 1; and as non-voting members - others: 4.

17.39 The Chair is elected by Members of the County Council only.

17.40 No individual may serve as an ordinary, co-opted, or substitute member of this Committee unless they have the degree of knowledge and understanding appropriate to the proper exercise of its functions as set out in the Training Strategy.

17.41 This Committee discharges the functions of the Council in relation to the control and investment of the Pension Fund, where they are not the responsibility of the LGPS senior officer as set out in regulations or delegated by the Council.

17.42 The Committee is also responsible for oversight of the recruitment and performance of the independent person appointed under 53A(5) of The Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013.

17.43 The Committee may appoint or remove the independent person referred to in 17.40 as a Co-Opted Member. This Co-Opted Member may participate in the business of the Committee in accordance with the rules set out in the Constitution.

~~17.39~~ 17.44 The Committee will determine whether the Co-Opted Member referred to in 17.43 will be a voting or non-voting Member.

~~17.40~~ This Committee discharges the functions of the Council in relation to the control and investment of the Pension Fund.

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Linden Kemkaran, Cabinet Member for Public Health
Dr Anjan Ghosh, Director of Public Health

To: County Council – **5th November 2026**

Subject: Development of the Kent Health and Wellbeing Board and Terms of Reference

Classification: Unrestricted

Past Pathway of Paper: Selection and Member Services Committee

Future Pathway of Paper: None

Summary

1. The purpose of this paper is to update on the future role and working of the Kent Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB) and seek approval of the proposed changes to the Terms of Reference (ToR).
 2. The Health and Wellbeing Board was established in 2013 to lead on partnership endeavours to improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities across Kent. Its working is informed by the Joint Strategic Need Assessment (JSNA) detailing the health challenges faced by the people of Kent. Delivery is through the Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy (JHWS).
 3. The Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) Neighbourhood Health Framework places the local Health and Wellbeing Board at the centre of developing a local Neighbourhood Health Plan with the key leadership role. In parallel work has been in train with the Local Government Association to rethink the Kent Health and Wellbeing Board to optimise its value.
 4. In view of the enhanced responsibilities of the Board, the increasing recognition of the importance of local partners and their approaches in tackling the wider determinants of health, and the revised NHS architecture, a number of changes to the ToR are proposed with a focus on role and membership.
 5. The ToR proposed were discussed at the Kent Health and Wellbeing Board in July and September and were recommended for approval by Full Council at the 22 October Selection and Member Services Committee meeting.
-

Recommendation(s):

County Council is asked to:

- a) Note the evolving national and local context for Health and Wellbeing Boards, including the Board's anticipated leadership role in the development and oversight of the Kent Neighbourhood Health Plan and Better Care Fund arrangements;
- b) Endorse the proposed future role, membership and ways of working for the Kent Health and Wellbeing Board as set out in this report;
- c) Approve the revised HWB Terms of Reference attached at Appendix 1.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This paper outlines the increasingly important role that the Kent Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB) will play in the next few years. This will include leadership in the development of the required Neighbourhood Health Plan for implementation from April 2027.
- 1.2 Additionally at the recent workshop, a range of initial priorities for the Kent Health and Wellbeing Board have been agreed including leadership around mental health challenges, the Marmot Coastal Region initiative, Neighbourhood Health and the Better Care Fund.
- 1.3 Work has been undertaken to review the purpose and membership of the Health and Wellbeing Board resulting in the revised Terms of Reference attached for discussion and approval. The proposed changes were discussed and endorsed at the July and September Kent Health and Wellbeing Board meetings and discussed and endorsed by the Selection and Members Services Committee in October. They require approval from the County Council.

2 Background to the Health and Wellbeing Board locally

- 2.1 To remind members, Health and Wellbeing Boards (HWBs) were established under the Health and Social Care Act 2012 to act as a forum in which key leaders from the local health and care system could work together to improve the health and wellbeing of their local population. They became fully operational on 1 April 2013 in all 152 local authorities with adult social care and public health responsibilities.
- 2.2 Under the Health and Social Care Act 2012, it was required that Joint Strategic Needs Assessments (JSNAs) and Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategies (JHWS) be developed through Health and Wellbeing Board and that these formed the basis of NHS and local authority commissioning plans, across all

local health, social care, public health and children's services that would both improve the health and wellbeing of the local community and reduce inequalities.

- 2.3 The role of the Health and Wellbeing Board defined within the NHS Neighbourhood Health Framework has become even more important. The oversight of the development and delivery of the Neighbourhood Health Plan by the HWB are a key part of the DHSC expectations around the delivery of Neighbourhood Health.
- 2.4 The time is therefore right for a review of the Kent Health and Wellbeing Board terms of reference and membership to ensure it can optimally lead health improvements in the coming years.

3 The Strategic Approach to Health and Wellbeing In Kent

- 3.1 In 2022, given the complexity of the local system in Kent and Medway and the need to develop an Integrated Care Strategy, the decision was taken in Kent that the Kent and Medway Integrated Care Strategy be adopted as the Kent Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy. This strategy came into force in 2024.
- 3.2 The Strategy is driven by a number of key principles. These include the importance of the full range of health determinants, a focus of prevention and the need to address inequalities. There was a strong recognition of the key role of local partnerships and the need to ensure a strong "bottom up" approach.
- 3.3 Additionally the wider role and impact of key local players on improving health was recognised including the role of the County Council around growth, employment and transport and the potential of large NHS trusts both as system anchors and in enabling support around the wider determinants of health.
- 3.4 It is proposed that to ensure the optimal effectiveness of the Board, that membership changes be agreed to best reflect strategic direction and approach.

4 The Neighbourhood Health Plan

- 4.1 The Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) have produced a Neighbourhood Health Framework detailing actions required to deliver neighbourhood health from now until 2029. This is the subject of a separate paper to Board. A key issue is the role of the Health and Wellbeing Board in leading the development of the Neighbourhood Health Plan (NHP). This is to be

implemented from April 2027 so will need to be developed over the coming year.

4.2 The Plan will need to:

- Provide an overview of how NHS objectives will be delivered through the three NHS Reform Agendas (improved routine services, proactive care and alternatives to hospital).
- Describe how Neighbourhood Health (NH) will support local goals around inequalities and health outcomes.
- Link local objectives to the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA).
- Confirm geographies for Neighbourhood Health.
- Confirm organisational responsibilities.
- Define governance and operational partnerships to deliver the Plan.
- Describe how other local initiatives align with Neighbourhood Health e.g. Family hubs, housing, VCSE, employment support.

4.3 The Health and Wellbeing Board will additionally have a key role in the development of the Better Care Fund (BCF) plans. These will need to strongly link with the Neighbourhood Health Plan. Pooled funding under the BCF will need to be used in line with BCF 2026/27 guidance with funding decisions consistent with the national conditions for the BCF, including required increases in the Integrated Care Board's minimum contributions to adult social care over the next three years.

4.4 There is an expectation that the Health and Wellbeing Board will agree local targets in the Neighbourhood Health Plan to begin delivery in 2027/8 with local outcome measures covering the whole life course including both health and social needs.

4.5 Neighbourhood health plans are a key part of the DHSC expectations around the delivery of Neighbourhood Health and our understanding is that they will be made a statutory requirement in due course. As NHPs will form part of the short- and medium-term work of the HWB, it makes sense to include this in the terms of reference. As and when the statutory requirements of the HWB are changed, the TOR will be reviewed to ensure it is aligned.

5 Review of the Kent Health and Wellbeing Board

5.1 A review of the Kent Health and Wellbeing Board has taken place in February – March 2026, led by the Local Government Association (LGA). This included interviews with key stakeholders as well as a workshop.

5.2 There were a range of challenges captured through interviews. These can be summarised:

- Health inequalities across Kent are stark, with significant disparities.
- Coastal communities experience disproportionate ill health and inequality.
- The Board is not functional and needs to change. It is not an effective strategic partnership, being a passive meeting.
- It is a missed opportunity, is too transactional, and needs the right people having impactful conversations to effect change.
- The purpose of the Board is unclear, with no consensus on what good looks like.
- The Integrated Care Partnership has taken the lead in areas the Health and Wellbeing Board should be leading.
- Many elected members are new with little experience of the Health and Wellbeing Board role.
- Meetings are too formal with long reports and need to be more focussed.
- There are too many meetings, the partnership landscape is complex with duplication.
- The potential impact of Local Government Reform and NHS changes in Kent.
- Unresolved, longstanding disagreements between the NHS and councils around funding often impede partnership working.

5.3 A raft of opportunities were also identified:

- The abolishment of the Integrated Care Partnership is an opportunity to reimagine and redesign the Health and Wellbeing Board.
- Recreate the Health and Wellbeing Board as the strategic partnership to lead around inequalities and wider health determinants.
- The Marmot Coastal Region initiative and the Folkestone and Hythe Neighbourhood Health Pilot are recognised as opportunities to prioritise and galvanise action.
- Tangible focus on the coast aided by Marmot, could be a powerful way to gain traction around neighbourhood planning.
- We can develop a compelling narrative and shared sense of purpose with a clear plan and priorities to bring partners along.
- The Health and Wellbeing Board can make the economic argument for addressing wider determinants and inequalities that reflects the current political reality.
- Good feedback about the health alliances in relation to place and system leadership and the opportunity to build on them.
- The DPH and Public Health are respected across the system and appear to have the authority to lead and support change.
- Make meetings less formal, with fewer papers and create the space for discussion using a workshop format with expert input.

- 5.4 The workshop then went on to consider next steps for the Health and Wellbeing Board. This included discussion around what is needed to ensure partnership working is addressing the priorities agreed for health and wellbeing. The workshop further considered the values, behaviours and ways of working that will foster collaboration to impact our shared priorities.

6 Terms of Reference changes to reflect enhanced roles and responsibilities

- 6.1 There are a number of key additional responsibilities the Board is charged with that need to be reflected in the Terms of Reference. These include the central leadership role around the Neighbourhood Health Plan, at sections 19.12 (e) and 19.12 (f) in the attached draft ToR and further duties around the Better Care Fund.

7 Terms of Reference changes to Membership to optimise working

- 7.1 The recent workshop considered the need to enhance membership informed by the Boards strategic approach around the wider determinants of health and the importance of local places in improving local health. A number of changes to the Membership are proposed to better enable this.
- 7.2 Additionally, membership has been revised to reflect changes to NHS organisation since the last review of the ToR. The proposed membership is detailed in sections 19.13 to 19.26 in the attached draft.
- 7.3 It is proposed the Kent County Council Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport be a member. This reflects the importance of these wider determinants of health in our strategic approach.
- 7.4 The importance of local place and local partners suggests a need for an enhanced local place focus within the Board. It is therefore proposed that there are three local Health Alliance representatives appointed from East, West and North Kent. It is further proposed that there is Chief Executive representation from the Kent Districts/ Boroughs/City Councils (nominated through the Kent Joint Chiefs).
- 7.5 There are currently three local elected members on the Board. Recognising the importance of democratically elected members it is proposed that this be increased to four members.
- 7.6 The importance of communities in improving health and wellbeing is recognised as a key strategic approach. To reflect this, it is proposed that a representative of the VCSE Alliance become a member of the Board.
- 7.7 The important role of NHS trusts in delivering healthcare and improving health through wider endeavours is recognised and it is proposed that three provider

trust members be appointed with one being from the NHS Kent Community Health Foundation Trust, one from the NHS Acute Trusts and one from the NHS Kent and Medway Mental Health Trust. Representation will reflect existing NHS partnership structures and ways of working.

- 7.8 There will need to be changes to reflect the change in NHS architecture. It is proposed that the current leadership be represented by two Integrated Care Board representatives and a GP representative.
- 7.9 Safeguarding is a key priority for the system and therefore it is proposed that there is a representative from the Kent and Medway Adult Safeguarding Board (KMASB).
- 7.10 It was felt that the Board would benefit from the insight and experience of front-line workers. It is therefore proposed that there are three standing non-voting frontline operational representatives drawn from adult social care, acute services, and emergency services (ambulance).

8 Governance

- 8.1 The Health and Wellbeing Board considered the evolving national and local context for Health and Wellbeing Boards, endorsed the proposed future role, membership and ways of working of the Kent Health and Wellbeing Board, and endorsed the proposed revisions to the Board's Terms of Reference.
- 8.3 As the Terms of Reference form part of Kent County Council's governance framework, the revisions endorsed by the Health and Wellbeing Board were considered by the Selection and Member Services Committee, where they were recommended to Full Council for approval. The revised Terms of Reference will only take effect following formal approval and adoption by Full County Council.

9 Conclusions and Outputs

- 9.1 The Kent Health and Wellbeing Board is charged with an enhanced role in improving local health and wellbeing with a focus on delivering the Neighbourhood Health Plan.
- 9.2 Internal workshop thinking and a strong set of strategic principles outlined in the Local Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (Integrated Care Strategy) help us to consider what further changes to Terms of Reference and Membership are required.
- 9.3 Changes to the role of the Board reflect the new enhanced role around the Neighbourhood Health Plan and the Better Care Fund.

- 9.4 Changes to Membership reflect our strategic principles including the importance of wider determinants of health, the role of community and the need to develop local responses to local issues.
- 9.5 Further membership changes are needed to reflect changes in NHS architecture.
- 9.6 Following endorsement by the Health and Wellbeing Board, the revised Terms of Reference have been endorsed by the Selection and Member Services Committee and Full County Council is asked to formally approve and adopt.
-

10 Recommendation(s):

County Council is asked to:

- a) Note the evolving national and local context for Health and Wellbeing Boards, including the Board's anticipated leadership role in the development and oversight of the Kent Neighbourhood Health Plan and Better Care Fund arrangements;
 - b) Endorse the proposed future role, membership and ways of working for the Kent Health and Wellbeing Board as set out in this report;
 - c) Approve the proposed changes to the Terms of Reference attached at Appendix 1
-

11 Appendices

Appendix 1 - revised Health and Wellbeing Board Terms of Reference

12 Contact details

Author

Dr Mike Gogarty
Interim Strategic Lead for Public Health
Mike.gogarty@kent.gov.uk

Relevant Director

Dr Anjan Ghosh
Director of Public Health
Anjan.ghosh@kent.gov.uk
03000 412633

Role

- 18.1 The Kent Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB) is a multiagency strategic partnership for Kent, covering matters relating to the health and wellbeing of the County's residents.
- 18.2 The HWB leads and advises on work to improve the health and wellbeing of the people of Kent through a coherent strategic vision underpinned by the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy, informed by the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) and a more joined up strategic commissioning approach across the NHS, social care, public health and other services (that the HWB agrees are directly related to health and wellbeing) in order to:
- (a) secure better health and wellbeing outcomes in Kent,
 - (b) reduce health inequalities, and
 - (c) ensure better quality of care for all patients and care users.
- 18.3 The HWB has a key strategic role in promoting integrated health and care services, improving population health, and reducing health inequalities.
- 18.4 The HWB also aims to increase the role of elected representatives in health and provides a key forum for public accountability for NHS, public health, social care and other commissioned services that relate to people's health and wellbeing.

Terms of Reference:

- 18.5 The HWB:
- (a) Commissions and endorses the Kent Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA), subject to final approval by relevant partners, if required.
 - (b) Commissions and endorses the Kent Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (JHWS) to meet the needs identified in the JSNA, subject to final approval by relevant partners, if required.
 - (c) Commissions and endorses the Kent Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment, subject to final approval by relevant partners, if required.
 - (d) Reviews the commissioning plans for healthcare, social care (adults and children's services) and public health to ensure that they have due regard to the JSNA and JHWS, and to take appropriate action if it considers that they do not.

- (e) Oversees, in relation to the development of the Neighbourhood health model and the Neighbourhood Health Plan, the creation of jointly owned neighbourhood health plans. These plans must:
- i. Be informed by the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA), which identifies local health inequalities and priorities.
 - ii. Align with ICB five-year commissioning plans and local outcomes frameworks.
 - iii. Include a minimum set of interventions to establish foundational neighbourhood services, while allowing flexibility for local adaptation.
 - iv. Promote multidisciplinary, cross-sector working, integrating NHS, social care, and community services to improve access and outcomes
- (f) Facilitates collaboration between ICBs, local authorities, and providers to:
- i. Define neighbourhood footprints that reflect population needs.
 - ii. Agree on pooled funding arrangements under the Better Care Fund.
 - iii. Ensure services are person-centred, preventive, and digitally enabled.
 - iv. Support the development of neighbourhood health centres, which serve as hubs for integrated care and community engagement.
- (g) Works alongside the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) to ensure that substantial variations in service provision by health care providers are appropriately scrutinised. The HWB itself will be subject to scrutiny by the HOSC.
- (h) Considers the totality of the resources in Kent for health and wellbeing and considers how and where investment in health improvement and prevention services could improve the overall health and wellbeing of Kent's residents.
- (i) Discharges its duty to encourage integrated working with relevant partners within Kent, which includes:
- i. endorsing and securing joint arrangements, including integrated or other joint commissioning where agreed and appropriate,
 - ii. use of pooled budgets for joint commissioning (s75) in the place and the co-ordination of NHS and local authority commissioning, including Better Care Fund plans,
 - iii. the development of appropriate partnership agreements for service integration, including the associated financial protocols and monitoring arrangements,
 - iv. making full use of the powers identified in all relevant NHS and local government legislation.
- (j) Works with existing partnership arrangements, e.g., children's commissioning, safeguarding and community safety, to ensure that the most appropriate mechanism is used to deliver service improvement in health, care and health inequalities.

- (k) Considers and advises Care Quality Commission (CQC) and NHS Integrated Commissioning Board; monitors providers in health and social care with regard to service reconfiguration.
- (l) Is the focal point for joint working in Kent on the wider determinants of health and wellbeing, such as housing, leisure facilities and accessibility, in order to enhance service integration.
- (m) Identifies a set of priorities annually. Progress against these priorities will be made to the Board on a regular basis.
- (n) Reports to the full County Council as and when requested on its activity.
- (o) Represents Kent in relation to health and wellbeing issues in local areas as well as nationally and internationally.
- (p) May delegate those of its functions it considers appropriate to another Committee established by one or more of the principal Councils in Kent to carry out specified functions on its behalf for a specified period of time (subject to prior agreement and meeting the HWB's agreed criteria). This includes the existing sub-committees under the Kent and Medway ICP – the Prevention and the Health Inequalities Sub-committees and the Strategic Partnership for Health and Economy. These will become workstreams under the Kent Health and Wellbeing Board, with the likely subsequent merging of the Prevention and Health Inequalities groups into a single workstream.

Membership

18.6 The Chair and Vice-Chairs are elected by the HWB

HWB:
Membership

18.7 Kent County Council:

- (a) The Leader of Kent County Council and/or their nominee*.
- (b) Three elected Members of Kent County Council nominated by the Leader of Kent County Council, recommended to be the Cabinet Members responsible for Public Health, Adult Social Care, and Children's Services.
- (c) Director of Public Health*.
- (d) Corporate Director Adult Social Care and Health*.
- (e) Corporate Director Children, Young People and Education*
- (f) Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport

18.8 Two representatives from the NHS Kent and Medway ICB*

18.9 A representative from Kent's General Practitioners, the Chair of the Primary Care Collaborative

18.10 A representative of the local Health Watch* organisation for the area of the local authority

- 18.11 Representation from NHS England for the purposes set out in section 197 of the Health and Social Care Act 2012*
- 18.12 Three representatives from the NHS Provider Trusts – one from the NHS Kent Community Health Foundation Trust, one from the NHS Acute Trusts and one from the NHS Kent and Medway Mental Health Trust. As far as is practical, these are to be aligned with current NHS Provider Collaborative arrangements across Kent. This ensures that Board membership reflects existing NHS partnership structures and ways of working
- 18.13 A representative from the VCSE Alliance. The representative will be proposed to be second vice-chair
- 18.14 One representative from each network of Health Alliances to a total of three (from East, West and North Kent)
- 18.15 Chief Executive representation from the 12 Kent Districts/ Boroughs/City Councils (nominated through the Kent Joint Chiefs).
- 18.16 Four elected Members representing the Kent District/Borough/City Councils (nominated through the Kent Council Leaders)
- 18.17 A representative from Kent and Medway Adult Safeguarding Board (KMASB).
- 18.18 Three standing non-voting frontline operational representatives drawn from adult social care, acute services, and emergency services (ambulance)
- 18.19 Any other person or representatives as the Health and Wellbeing Board considers appropriate may be co-opted with the agreement of the Board. Such co-optees will be non-voting members of the Board and their membership will be reviewed annually by the Board. This includes the provision for other frontline sectors to be called upon where required by the agenda.
- 18.20 Notes to 19.14-19.23 - *denotes statutory member.

Procedure Rules

HWB:
Procedures

- 18.21 Conduct. Members of the HWB are expected to subscribe to and comply with the Kent County Council Code of Conduct. Non-elected representatives on the HWB (e.g., GPs and Officers) will be co-opted members and, as such, covered by the Kent Code of Conduct for Members for any business they conduct as a member of the HWB.
- 18.22 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests. Section 31(4) of the Localism Act 2011 (disclosable pecuniary interests in matters considered at meetings or by a single member) applies to the HWB and any Sub Committee of it. A register of disclosable pecuniary interests is held by the Clerk to the HWB, but

HWB members do not have to leave the meeting once a disclosable pecuniary interest is declared.

18.23 Frequency of Meetings. The HWB meets at least quarterly. The date, time and venue of meetings is fixed in advance by the HWB in order to coincide with the key decision-points and the Forthcoming Decision List.

18.24 Meeting Administration.

- (a) HWB meetings are advertised and held in public and administered by the County Council.
- (b) The HWB may consider matters submitted to it by local partners.
- (c) The County Council gives at least five clear working days' notice in writing to each member of every ordinary meeting of the HWB, to include any agenda of the business to be transacted at the meeting.
- (d) Papers for each HWB meeting are sent out at least five clear working days in advance.
- (e) Late papers may be sent out or tabled only in exceptional circumstances.
- (f) The HWB holds meetings in private session when deemed appropriate in view of the nature of business to be discussed.
- (g) The Chair's decision on all procedural matters is final.

18.25 Meeting Administration of Sub-Committees. The HWB is able to establish sub-committees. The administration arrangements will be agreed at the time of establishment, and with the agreement of the partner taking on responsibility for administration. The sub-committees will be subject to the provisions stated in these Procedure Rules.

18.26 Special Meetings. The Chair may convene special meetings of the HWB at short notice to consider matters of urgency. The notice convening such meetings shall state the particular business to be transacted and no other business will be transacted at such meeting.

18.27 The Chair is required to convene a special meeting of the HWB if they are in receipt of a written requisition to do so signed by no less than three members of the HWB. Such requisition shall specify the business to be transacted, and no other business shall be transacted at such a meeting. The meeting must be held within five clear working days of the Chair's receipt of the requisition.

18.28 Minutes. Minutes of all HWB meetings are prepared recording:

- (a) the names of all members present at a meeting and of those in attendance,
- (b) apologies,
- (c) details of all proceedings, decisions, and resolutions of the meeting.

18.29 Minutes are printed and circulated to each member before the next meeting of the HWB, when they are submitted for approval by the HWB and are signed by the Chair.

- 18.30 Agenda. The agenda for each meeting normally includes:
- (a) Minutes of the previous meeting for approval and signing.
 - (b) Reports seeking a decision from the HWB.
 - (c) Any item which a member of the HWB wishes included on the agenda, provided it is relevant to the terms of reference of the HWB and notice has been given to the Clerk at least nine working days before the meeting.
- 18.31 The Chair may decide that there are special circumstances that justify an item of business, not included in the agenda, being considered as a matter of urgency. They must state these reasons at the meeting and the Clerk shall record them in the minutes.
- 18.32 Chair and Vice Chair's Term of Office. The Chair and Vice Chair's term of office terminates on 1 April each year, when they are either reappointed or replaced by another member, according to the decision of the HWB, at the first meeting of the HWB succeeding that date.
- 18.33 Absence of Members and of the Chair. If a member is unable to attend a meeting, then they may provide an appropriate alternate member to attend in their place. The Clerk of the meeting should be notified of any absence and/or substitution within five working days of the meeting. The Chair presides at HWB meetings if they are present. In their absence the Vice-Chair presides. If both are absent, the HWB appoints from amongst its members an Acting Chair for the meeting in question.
- 18.34 Voting. The HWB operates on a consensus basis. Where consensus cannot be achieved the subject (or meeting) is adjourned and the matter is reconsidered at a later time. If, at that point, a consensus still cannot be reached, the matter is put to a vote. The HWB decides all such matters by a simple majority of the members present. In the case of an equality of votes, the Chair shall have a second or casting vote. All votes shall be taken by a show of hands unless decided otherwise by the Chair.
- 18.35 In exercising its statutory and granted powers, the HWB will take into account that its decisions cannot override the statutory powers, responsibilities or governance arrangements of individual partner organisations.
- 18.36 Quorum. A third of members form a quorum for HWB meetings. No business requiring a decision shall be transacted at any meeting of the HWB which is inquorate. If it arises during the course of a meeting that a quorum is no longer present, the Chair either suspends business until a quorum is re-established or declares the meeting at an end.
- 18.37 Adjournments. By the decision of the Chair, or by the decision of a majority of those members present, meetings of the HWB may be adjourned at any time to be reconvened at any other day, hour and place, as the HWB decides.

- 18.38 Order at Meetings. At all meetings of the HWB it is the duty of the Chair to preserve order and to ensure that all members are treated fairly. They decide all questions of order that may arise.
- 18.39 Suspension/disqualification of Members. At the discretion of the Chair, anybody with a representative on the HWB will be asked to reconsider the position of their nominee if they fail to attend two or more consecutive meetings without good reason or without the prior consent of the Chair, or if they breach the Kent Code of Conduct for Members.

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Martin Paul, Chair of the Selection and Member Services Committee

To: County Council, 5 November 2026

Subject: Sealing of Documents: Constitutional Amendments

Status: Unrestricted

Past Pathway of paper: Selection and Member Services Committee, 22 October 2026

1. Introduction

- a) The common seal of Kent County Council is affixed to deeds and other documents where it is necessary to demonstrate that the council has approved the transaction through the appropriate governance processes and that the officers applying the seal are authorised to do so.
- b) Under the Council's Constitution, the Monitoring Officer has 'custody' of the common seal and maintains oversight of its use. Only officers authorised by the Monitoring Officer may attest that the seal has been properly applied.
- c) This paper is recommending a few procedural amendments to the Constitution to enable the Monitoring Officer to exercise some discretion in the use of the common seal in order to enable more efficient implementation of council decisions. Where the law requires the use of the seal, it will continue to be used.

2. Proposed Changes

- a) The flexibility that the proposed amendment will give is for such situation as individual social care packages under a call-off arrangement. These arrangements will have been established through the council's established key decision process. However, where many or all of the individual care packages could meet the formal criteria for sealing, this could lead to:
 - i. Delays in the implementation of the care package until sealing is undertaken. Sometimes these care packages need to be in place at short notice. There is a risk that care needs to commence before the contract has been formally executed, creating uncertainty about contractual status.
 - ii. Increased costs and administrative burdens. Sealing individual care packages could add hundreds of additional items of sealing each year. As well as preparing the documents for sealing, time is taken up in maintaining seal registers and for the authorised officers to check the documents and affix the seal. There may also be a cost to the service requesting the sealing.
 - iii. Combining the two points above could result in the sealing requirement becoming a bottleneck in the care process.

- b) The proposed changes are set out in the Appendix to this report. The amendments to section 13.13 of the constitution in conjunction with the new section 13.14 give the Monitoring Officer the clear ability to take a proportionate approach to the use of the common seal. The rest are more about adding clarity to the rules on sealing, rather than making substantive changes.

3. Recommendation

County Council is asked to agree the proposed amendments to the Constitution.

4. Appendices

Appendix – Proposed Amendments to the Constitution. Sealing of Documents.

5. Background Documents

None.

6. Report Author and Relevant Director

Petra Der Man, Monitoring Officer
Petra.derman@kent.gov.uk

Tristan Godfrey, Senior Governance Manager
tristan.godfrey@kent.gov.uk

Catherine Cruz, Deputy Head of Law
Catherine.Cruz@kent.gov.uk

Appendix – Proposed Amendments to the Constitution

Sealing of Documents

11.21 (k)

On behalf of the Council and in support of their delegated Executive functions the Monitoring Officer has the following responsibilities:

Custody of the Common Seal of the Council. A decision of the Council, or of any part of it, will be sufficient authority for sealing any document necessary to give effect to the decision. The Common Seal will be affixed to those documents which, in the opinion of the Monitoring Officer, should be sealed. The affixing of the Common Seal will be attested by the Monitoring Officer or some other person authorised by them in writing to do so. The Common Seal of the Council may be affixed either by physical means or by such electronic means as authorised by the Monitoring Officer ~~may from time to time authorise~~. The affixing of an electronic seal shall be of the same legal effect as affixing the Common Seal of the Council physically.

13.13

Any contract with a value in excess of £1m must be ~~made in writing and either:~~

(a) ~~Made in writing; and~~

~~(a)(b)~~ affixed with the common seal of the Council and be attested by at least one authorised Officer (see section 13.16) ~~or~~

~~(b) signed as a deed by at least one authorised Officer (as defined in 13.15) unless otherwise determined by the Monitoring Officer.~~

~~(New section). 13.14~~

~~Notwithstanding the requirements of 13.13, the Monitoring Officer may, at their discretion and where appropriate in the circumstances, waive the requirement for affixing the common seal of the council.~~

13.15~~14~~

The common seal of the Council shall be affixed to ~~any~~ all deeds (unless a specific statutory provision permits otherwise) and any document or agreement if the Monitoring Officer considers it appropriate for the purpose of transacting the Council's business or safeguarding its interests.

13.20~~19~~

Contracts may be signed and sealed via the Council's electronic signature and electronic sealing solution, following the Council's procedures for using this solution. In addition, where the law, and (where applicable) any additional requirements of a public registry (for example, HM Land Registry) allow, electronic signatures may be permitted, and will be accepted as a fair

Formatted: Expanded by 0.1 pt

representation of a willingness to enter into a contract with the Council, as long as the following apply:

- (a) the Contract will be entered into in relation to being either under seal or under hand,
- (b) the electronic signature is a true representation of the authorised person's written signature, and
- (c) is supported with a contemporaneous document of authenticity and authorisation from the Supplier.

By: Joel Cook – Head of Democratic Services

To: County Council – 5 November 2026

Subject: Motions for Time Limited Debate

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary

County Council may consider and resolve Motions for Time Limited Debate submitted by Political Groups, in accordance with section 14.34 of the KCC Constitution.

Four Motions for Time Limited Debate are included in the agenda for the 5 November 2026 meeting of the Full Council.

1. In advance of each ordinary meeting of the Full Council, each Political Group may submit one Motion for Time Limited Debate for debate and decision. Motions are placed on the agenda in the order they are received by Democratic Services.
 2. Motions for Time Limited Debate are different from most normal Committee or Decision papers as they are not prepared by KCC Officers, which would involve standard assurances and operational guidance. The Motions and any Background Information supplied for context are developed and submitted by the Political Groups, who are responsible for their content. They are therefore prepared and considered on the basis that they are political matters, allowing the Council to debate and resolve political positions on a range of issues outside of the main substantive decision-making framework for functions within the responsibility of the County Council.
 3. The official adoption of any substantive changes, if relevant, to strategies or policies referenced in a Motion approved by Full Council, where applicable to matters for which the Council has powers and responsibilities, would be subject to separate and additional relevant governance processes and decision-making.
 4. A maximum of 45 minutes will be allowed for each debate. The Motions must meet the general requirements of Motions as set out in the constitution and the debate is conducted in accordance with normal procedure rules along with any relevant directions given by the Chairman of the Council.
 5. The submitted Motions for Time Limited Debate are appended to this covering report.
-

Recommendation:

The County Council is asked to consider and determine the submitted Motions for Time Limited Debate

Appendices:

1. MTLD – Reform UK Group – Translation Services
2. MTLD – Restore Britain Kent Group – Translation Services
3. MTLD – Liberal Democrat Group – Royal National Lifeboat Institution
4. MTLD – Green Group – Kent Minerals Sites Plan

Report Author:

Joel Cook
Head of Democratic Services
03000 416892
Joel.cook@kent.gov.uk

Motion for Time Limited Debate

Cease Paying for Interpreter and Translation Services for Non-English Speaking Public

Proposer: Sarah Emberson

Seconder: Garry Sturley

Motion:

This Council resolves to:

Recommend to the Executive that it directs relevant Officers to undertake a review of arrangements for translation services, with a view to establishing how the Council could adopt the following approaches as a default position:

- (a) cease paying for interpretation and translation for non-English speaking members of the public, in the majority of circumstances and in any event only wherever it is lawfully able to do so
- (b) wherever possible, 'signpost' the public to external interpreters, translators and various technological solutions, with a view to the public paying for those as required,
- (c) use and pay for interpretation and translation only where necessary, including for the meeting of any and all statutory obligations, and always in the use of British Sign Language and Braille.

Background Information provided by the Reform UK Group

Introduction

1. In line with 'Reforming Kent', the Council's Strategic Statement, individual responsibility should be encouraged wherever possible, rather than reliance on the increasingly stretched budget of the Council in many non-essential areas of its work. This is a pragmatic and wholly reasonable position for the Council to take and makes a stand against the 'nanny state'; the assumption that KCC should 'pay for everything', and the presumption that the provision of local services has no cost to the wider taxpayer.

2. The 2021 Census stated that there were 92 languages spoken in Kent (including 12 of which are UK languages), with English being by far the predominant one, spoken to some degree by 99.8% of residents. However, with mass migration changing the cultural landscape, it is likely that the use of other non-English languages will increase. All residents are entitled to receive services from KCC, and the County Council wants people to be able to understand what is on offer and to make use of those services. However, providing interpretation and translation for people who do not speak English is not something that KCC should pay for, although 'signposting' the public to interpreters and translators to be paid for at their cost would be sensible. Also, it should be borne in mind that there are numerous translation Apps that are available for the public (and KCC) to use. Scope for KCC to continue to pay

for specific needs such as in British Sign Language and Braille (and to comply with legislative requirements) should continue, and are therefore mentioned in the exemptions within this motion.

3. The view taken by the Reform UK Group is that the default position should be that if people want translation or interpretation services, they should have to pay for them or use one of the translation Apps. Kent County Council is an English local authority and it is important that the County Council seeks to encourage English speaking within the County: ceasing to pay for the public's interpreter and translation demands sends the right message. With mass migration into the UK, the requirement for interpreters and translation is sure to increase, with the associated increased cost to KCC, should it continue to pay for this provision.

Scale of Translation and Interpretation within KCC

4. No overall record of the combined use of interpreters and translators has been collated by the County Council, as their use is diverse, varied and in some services, only occasional. However, it is clear that they are used and that it has become accepted practice within the Council to simply commission them without questioning the reasonableness and the cost.

The Use of Technological Translation Services

5. There is no legal requirement for local authorities to use in-person interpreters, and the key obligation is to ensure effective communication and meaningful participation. There are potential issues with technological translation services of GDPR compliance, accuracy and clarity. These are all matters that should be considered on a case-by-case basis and a service-wide basis; as allowed for within the parameters of this motion.

Costs to KCC

6. The total identifiable spend on interpretation and translation over the past 12 months and recorded in the Oracle system is £183,438.25, with 52.7% of that spend referring to British Sign Language and Kent Deaf Interpretation Service support. However, funds are provided from within a range of budgets to meet general interpretation and translation costs, and some are coded under 'professional fees'. Hence, the difficulty in determining total overall spend easily and accurately. But it is clear that the real cost to the Council of interpretation and translation will be higher than the Oracle figure quoted. Examples of additional spend include language translation for non-English speaking claimants in home-to-school appeals; translating some public consultations; translations within contract documentation; providing for Unaccompanied Asylum-seeking Children, and in the Community Learning Service; although the costs in those two latter services could be met partially or in whole via external grant-aid. The cost of translation services supporting Unaccompanied Asylum-seeking Children in the past 12 months was £1.2 million, borne by the UK taxpayer, including those from Kent.

Group view on Legal considerations

7. Public bodies have duties under the Equality Act 2010, the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Public Sector Equality Duty to ensure that services are accessible, delivered fairly and to eliminate discrimination. The provision of interpretation and translation services is not a specific statutory duty of Kent County Council, and nor is language itself a specifically protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010. It should be noted that Kent Social Services are legally required to ensure their services and information is accessible to people with language barriers or specific communication needs so as to ensure that it is possible to fulfil its many separate statutory service delivery obligations.

In social care, the Care Act 2014 and the Care and Support (Assessment) Regulations 2014 require assessments to be carried out in a manner appropriate and proportionate to the adult's needs and circumstances. Hence, it will be important that this Motion allows for appropriate action to ensure that there should be no procedural unfairness or indirect discrimination.

It is noted that, in the exercise of all decisions of a public function, officers must have due regard to the various statutory objectives detailed in s. 149 (1) of the Equality Act 2010. Any changes proposed, pursuant to a review carried out in pursuance of this Motion, will require an EqIA to be carried out so as to provide assurance that the 'public sector equality duty' will be discharged.

This page is intentionally left blank

Motion for Time Limited Debate: Review of Translation and Foreign Language Service Expenditure

Proposer: Paul Thomas

Seconder: Brian Black

MOTION

The council resolves to:

1. Recommend that the Executive instructs the Chief Executive to undertake a review of all current expenditure and activity related to translation, interpretation, and foreign language publication services across Kent County Council.
2. Recommend that the Executive explores adopting a policy that Kent County Council communications, publications, consultations, correspondence, advertising, and public information materials shall ordinarily be produced in English only, except where the law requires otherwise.
3. Recommend the retention and improvement of British Sign Language services as part of any review or policy change.
4. Confirm that the recommended review identify:
 - The total annual cost of such services;
 - The departments in which such costs are incurred;
 - The savings that would arise from adopting this policy.
5. Recommend that the findings of the review, together with recommendations for implementation, be reported to Policy & Resources Cabinet Committee within 6 months.
6. Recommend that the total expenditure incurred on translation and interpretation services is published on an annual basis.

Background Information provided by the Restore Britain Kent Group.

Kent County Council operates within a challenging financial environment and is required to ensure that every pound of public money is spent effectively and delivers maximum value for residents. The Council currently incurs expenditure on translation, interpretation, and the production of materials in languages other than English.

The Kent Restore Group believe that public funds should be prioritised towards frontline services and support for residents. The routine provision of translated materials and foreign language services is not an appropriate use of limited resources. As English is the principal language of the United Kingdom Council, communications should, as a matter of principle, be provided in English.

It is noted that, in the exercise of all decisions of a public function, officers must have due regard to the various statutory objectives detailed in s, 149 (1) of the Equality Act 2010. Any changes proposed, pursuant to a review carried out in pursuance of this Motion, will require an EqIA to be carried out so as to provide assurance that the 'public sector equality duty' will be discharged.

This page is intentionally left blank

Kent County Council – A Lifesaving Employer

Proposer: Mr Sole

Seconder: Mr Ricketts

Motion

The County Council resolves to:

1. Recommend that relevant Officers and Members engage formally with the Royal National Lifeboat Institution with the aim of Kent County Council becoming a recognised “Lifesaving Employer”.
2. Direct Officers to work with the RNLI, trade unions and employees to explore and develop a clear and practical framework enabling Council employees who volunteer with the RNLI to:
 - a. respond to emergency call-outs during working hours wherever reasonably practicable;
 - b. attend essential RNLI training and exercises;
 - c. have appropriate arrangements following prolonged or overnight lifesaving operations, recognising the importance of fatigue and employee welfare; and
 - d. have clear and consistent guidance for managers and employees.
3. Ensure that these arrangements appropriately balance the Council’s responsibility to maintain essential public services with its responsibility as an employer to support volunteering and community service.
4. Promote RNLI volunteering among Kent County Council employees and recognise publicly the contribution made by employees who already serve with the RNLI.
5. Call on other major employers across Kent to follow the Council’s example and look to become Lifesaving Employers, helping ensure that RNLI volunteers can answer the call whenever lives are at risk.
6. Request that the relevant Cabinet Member reports back to the appropriate committee within six months on progress towards establishing Kent County Council as a Lifesaving Employer.

Background Information provided by the Liberal Democrat Group:

The Royal National Lifeboat Institution (RNLI) has been saving lives at sea for over 200 years. Its mission is simple: to save lives. RNLI volunteer crews respond to emergencies regardless of who is in the water or why they are there, running

towards danger when others are in peril. In addition to lifeboat crews, every summer, RNLI lifeguards patrol beaches across the UK, including in Kent, helping keep people safe. Highly trained and skilled, lifeguards work hard to ensure everyone can stay safe and have fun at the coast.

This lifesaving work is particularly important in Kent, a county with a proud maritime heritage, a major visitor economy and a significant coastline. The RNLI operates nine lifeboat stations across Kent at Gravesend, Sheerness, Whitstable, Margate, Ramsgate, Dover, Walmer, Littlestone-on-Sea and Dungeness, providing vital search and rescue cover for the county's coastline, the Thames Estuary, the English Channel and surrounding waters. Crews respond to a wide range of incidents involving recreational and commercial vessels, people in the water, those cut off by tides and other maritime emergencies.

The scale and importance of this work is demonstrated by both the frequency of call-outs and the complexity of incidents attended. Between January and August 2025, Whitstable RNLI responded to 36 incidents, including three call-outs in a single weekend. In the same year, Volunteers from Dungeness, Dover, Walmer and Ramsgate were jointly recognised with the Global Search & Rescue Excellence Award for their role in carrying out complex and distressing rescues in the English Channel.

The RNLI's presence is of significant value to Kent's economy as well as public safety. Kent's visitor economy is worth approximately £4.1 billion annually and supported 66 million domestic and international visits in 2024, sustaining more than 82,000 jobs. The county's coastline, beaches, seaside towns and maritime heritage are central to that success. Kent is also home to busy commercial waterways and ports, alongside fishing, leisure boating, sailing and other marine activities, all of which rely on a safe and resilient maritime environment. RNLI crews regularly respond to incidents involving both commercial and recreational users of Kent's waters.

RNLI lifeboat crews are volunteers who balance their commitment to saving lives with employment and family responsibilities. When their pager sounds, volunteers may need to leave work at very short notice to respond to emergencies, while also undertaking regular training and exercises to maintain operational readiness. As an independent charity that receives no government funding for its lifesaving service, the RNLI depends on public generosity and community support. In 2024, the cost of operating its lifesaving service was £190.3 million, with around 90% of income

coming from donations. The organisation also relies on supportive employers who enable volunteers to respond to emergencies and attend essential training. Through its "Lifesaving Employer" scheme, the RNLI recognises employers who play a crucial role in making this lifesaving service possible.

Every life is precious, and when someone is in danger at sea the priority must always be to save life. The courage, commitment and selflessness shown by RNLI volunteers should be matched by the support of the organisations they work for. As one of the largest employers in Kent, Kent County Council should lead by example, demonstrating its commitment to the resilience, safety and wellbeing of Kent's coastal communities, visitors and maritime economy by supporting employees who volunteer with the RNLI. Supporting these volunteers is not simply an employee benefit; it is a recognition of the vital public service they provide and an investment in the safety of those who live, work and visit our coast. Kent should be a county where people who step forward to save lives are supported to do so, and Kent County Council should be proud to support employees who put themselves forward to save lives at sea, whoever needs their help.

This page is intentionally left blank

Motion for Time Limited Debate
Consideration of Kent Minerals Sites Plan Consultation Responses

Proposer: Mr Stuart Jeffery

Seconded: Mr Mark Hood

Motion:

This Council resolves to:

- 1) Reconsider, prior to submission to the Planning Inspectorate, the Kent Minerals Sites Plan, alongside a summary and analysis of the Regulation 19 Consultation responses, at a future meeting of Full Council; and
- 2) Agree that submission of the Plan shall be subject to this reconsideration.

Background Information Provided by the Green Group:

The Kent Minerals Sites Plan (KMSP) will shape the future of minerals and waste development in Kent for many years to come. As part of the statutory plan-making process, the Council has undertaken public consultation and received representations from a wide range of stakeholders.

Given the significance of the Plan and its long-term implications for communities across Kent, elected Members should be afforded the opportunity to consider the Regulation 19 consultation responses and the available options before taking a fresh decision on whether the Plan is ready for submission for independent examination by the relevant deadline. This would ensure that the views of Kent residents and stakeholders have been properly considered through a transparent, accountable and democratic process.

This page is intentionally left blank