

## KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

---

### ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT CABINET COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Environment & Transport Cabinet Committee held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Tuesday, 9th September 2025.

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

ALSO PRESENT: Mr P Osborne (Cabinet Member for Transport) and Mr D Wimble (Cabinet Member for Environment)

IN ATTENDANCE: Chief Superintendent Simon Alland (Kent Police), Mr S Jones (Corporate Director for Growth Environment and Transport) Ms H Chughtai (Director of Highways and Transportation), Mr M Smyth (Director of Environment and Waste), Mr P Lightowler (Head of Public Transport), Ms H Shulver (Head of Environment) Mr A Loosemore (Head of Highways) Mr M Wagner (Chief Analyst) Richard Emmett (Senior Highways Manager) Nikola Floodgate (Road Safety & Active Travel Group Manager) Jamie Watson (Senior Schemes Programme Manager) Mark Bunting (Vision Strategy Programme manager) Louise Smith ( Flood and Water Manager) Susan Reddick ( Head of Resource and Circular Economy) Tara O'Shea (Safer Speed & Enforcement Team Leader) Elizabeth Milne (Natural Environment & Coast Manager) Shane Bushall (Head of Service: Public Transport) Tim Read (Head of Transportation) Joseph Ratcliffe (Transport Strategy Manager) Matthew Feekings (Operations Manager) and James Willis (Democratic Services Officer)

### UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

#### 1. Apologies and Substitutes (Item 2)

Apologies were received from Mr Palmer, Mr Henderson, Mr Waters and Mr Paul. Nominated substitutes were Mr Burns, Mr Shonk, Mr Baker and Mr Ford.

#### **4. Declaration of Interest**

*(Item 3)*

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **5. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 17/07/25**

*(Item 4)*

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 17 July were a correct record and that they be signed by the Chair.

#### **6. Performance Dashboard**

*(Item 5)*

*Mr M Wagner - Chief Analyst was in attendance*

1. Mr Wagner presented the Performance Dashboard. The report represented the first report for the 2025/26 financial year. The cover paper was found on pages 17-18 of the reports pack followed by the detailed performance dashboard.
  2. It was highlighted that by the end of June, 11 out of the 14 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were rated as green and had indicated a performance at or above the target level.
  3. Two KPIs had not met the desired target but would remain above the floor standard and had been rated as amber. One KPI had not met the floor standard (HT02) and was rated as red. The noted red KPI was the *'faults reported by the public that are not completed in 28 days'* descriptor.
  4. A backlog of works were identified following the heavy rainfall and storm events that occurred in May and continued into June 2025. Monthly performance meetings would be held in an effort to improve the performance across all areas.
  5. Demand for the Highway Service, measured by new inquiries, was observed to be below expected levels during the three months leading up to June. The number of potholes scheduled for repair had slightly exceeded the anticipated range.
  6. Waste delivered to Household Waste and Recycling Centres (HWRC) continued to rise. Total waste volumes collected from doorsteps and by district and borough councils had remained within expected levels.
5. Members asked a number of questions on the presentation which included:
- a) In response to a question about July/August trends and potholes repaired within the 28-day period officers noted that the report had been drafted at a time when July's data had been not fully completed and available. KPIs tracked potholes

that were reported 28 calendar days prior to the current month, meaning their expected completion date had fallen within that month.

In June, 1,214 potholes were scheduled for completion, and 95% of them had been completed either during June or earlier. A data analysis tool to measure the pothole metric and aid in greater understanding of the scheduled works was discussed.

- b) It was highlighted that contractors would operate under a standard contract with a particular emphasis on the high-risk term maintenance agreement. All completed works would encompass a 12-month guarantee. If any defects arose within that period, the contractor would be required to rectify them at their own expense.
- c) The majority of KCC repairs had taken place during the summer months, when conditions were more favourable for first-time permanent repairs. Completed repairs were expected to last a decade or more.
- d) Members suggested a clearer and more concise signposting be added to reporting to indicate which repairs had been completed, as well as to identify any temporary repairs scheduled to become permanent to alleviate frustrations from the public and towards KCC. Officers noted the recommendation and highlighted the use of the highways publication media to convey an accurate message across.
- e) Questions directed at KPI EW2 '*Greenhouse gas emissions*' had demonstrated the success of how the KCC estate had been managed. Concerns were raised on the current administration's commitment on the decarbonisation strategy and a potential scrapping of Net Zero commitments. The Cabinet Member for Environment acknowledged the concern and responded that KCC would continue to pursue best practice.
- f) The impact of named storm events and subsequent floods in Dover and Canterbury were discussed. Members acknowledged the discussion and suggested some improvements were to be made to the data presented at future committees as to not be impacted by data 'lags' and look to show percentile impacts in a clear and concise manner.
- g) Members recognised a growing concern regarding the increased number of emergency road and footpath incidents reported across the county. It was suggested that a roundtable offline meeting occur with stakeholders take place to discuss the current impacts and bring back any findings to committee at a later date.
- h) Members returned to concerns on KPI HT02 and suggested that the current proactive drain management was insufficient. Members proposed an improved proactive schedule dedicated to drain clearing be explored. Officers acknowledged a need to change the current service standard to one that reflected the desired changes. Further conversations with the respective Cabinet

Member would need to occur to discuss the consequences of the any potential changes.

- i) Discussions emphasised concerns on the frequency of drain jetting and the removal of perennial weeds. Members asked that the frequency of these actions such as the twice-yearly removal of weeds be reviewed. Officers acknowledged the requests and suggested further discussions take place to encompass Members requests and review current policy.

**RESOLVED** to note the Performance Dashboard

## **7. Winter Service Policy**

*(Item 6)*

*Mr P Osborne - Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport presented the item. Richard Emmett-Senior Highways Manager and Andrew Loosemore -Head of Highways were also in attendance.*

- 1) Mr Loosemore highlighted that the attached paper provided a brief overview of the previous winter season (24/25). A total of 57 salting runs had been undertaken, compared with the budgeted 66. Notably, 99% of all gritting runs were completed on time.
- 2) The forthcoming budget was emphasised, with the full winter service allocation already secured. Route optimisation had been completed across the various gritting domains to ensure the most efficient coverage and deployment of resources.
- 3) Over 3,000 salt bins were now available across the county. While there were no current proposals to amend figures, location reviews had been conducted to assess their suitability.
- 4) Winter resilience data indicated that KCC currently held 23,000 tonnes of salt, exceeding the minimum requirement of 16,800 tonnes. It was stressed that the surplus had provided KCC with considerable resilience across the network.
- 5) No proposed changes were observed in the winter service policy.
- 6) Members asked a number of questions relating to the update:
  - a) Members asked for clarification on point 2.1 and asked if there had been a significant increase in the year's budget compared to the previous year. Mr Loosemore responded that the final figure between the years wasn't available in the report but would be made available to Members. It was also highlighted the costs would likely have gone up in line with price indexation and inflationary rates.

- b) In response to questions regarding the responsibility for salt bins—including ensuring they are topped up, secure, and their locations are known—officers discussed previous efforts to mark bins, and the challenges associated with maintaining accurate records on the Graphic Information system (GIS) system. Salt bins had been recorded on the KCC GIS mapping software and empty bins would be refilled when required. Restocking of salt bins were overseen by Highways Inspectors who patrol and respond to the current status of each bin.
- c) Members reported that salt bins had previously been subjected to break-ins and proposed that officers circulate a map of bin locations. This would enable Members to support efforts in monitoring and safeguarding the bins within their respective districts.
- d) Members inquired on KCC responsiveness to issues such as burst water mains, particularly during winter, and whether the Council had the authority to fine service providers responsible for such disruptions across the network. Officers explained that such incidents are typically identified by inspectors and drivers through routine monitoring. Any recharges to utility companies would be managed on a case-by-case basis, although such occurrences were noted to be relatively uncommon
- e) In response to cost-related queries, it was confirmed that salt prices had remained relatively stable over time. Contractors were responsible for purchasing salt directly, and it was not considered a significant expense within the overall budget.

**RESOLVED** to note the Winter Service Policy Update

**8. 2500062 – Active Travel Funding Grant (ATF5-Tranche 5)-  
Capital and Revenue  
(Item 7)**

*Mr P Osborne - Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport presented the item.  
Nikola Floodgate-Road Safety & Active Travel Group Manager and Jamie  
Watson-Senior Schemes Programme Manager were also in attendance.*

- 1) KCC had been awarded £1.86 Million from Active Travel England under the Active Travel Fund Tranche 5(ATF5) to develop and construct active travel schemes throughout the county.
- 2) Funding was based on £1.67 million in capital and £250,000 in revenue and was based on population and capability ratings. Schemes had been selected through consultation with districts and boroughs and had been reviewed by the Members Cycling and Walking groups (MCW) and would be overseen by the Cabinet Member for Highways and transport.

- 3) A cross-party working group, in collaboration with Highways and Transportation, would oversee the delivery of development schemes funded entirely by a designated grant. No additional Council funding would be required.
- 4) All development schemes would be completed by 31 March 2026, with construction targeted to be finalized by 31 March 2027. The Council would ensure full compliance with legal obligations, including procurement regulations, health and safety standards, and equality duties.
- 5) Members raised concerns that no borough Members had seen the schemes due to the recent Joint Transport Board being cancelled (JTB) or it not being included on the agenda. Mr Prater highlighted a lack of scrutiny around the programmes that had made the ATF list.
- 6) A significant number of applications had been submitted from across the county, and decisions would be made to fully fund, partially fund, or reject schemes. Members suggested that there had been a lack of visibility at certain points of the process.
- 7) The paper referenced a list of schemes submitted by districts and boroughs (Section 1.4), which Members had not seen. Section 1.5 stated that the list had been shared and that the officer's approach was endorsed at the 11 March meeting.
- 8) It was noted that several Members were absent from the meeting held on 11 March. Additionally, neither the list of schemes nor the proposed approach was presented at the recent MCW meeting.
- 9) Members raised queries regarding section 1.6, specifically the selection of tabled schemes and the exclusion criteria applied to others. Concerns were expressed that the prioritisation methodology had not been subject to adequate scrutiny, and that district travel teams were unaware of the schemes presented. Members indicated that there had been a lack of transparency and communication surrounding the item.
- 10) Officers responded to Members 'concerns raised at last week's MCW meeting. It was noted that an Officer had offered to arrange a follow-up session to guide Members through the background and decision-making process related to the discussed tranche of funding.
- 11) As outlined in the paper, many of the decisions and discussions occurred under the previous administration. Officers confirmed their willingness to attend any Joint Transportation Board (JTB) across the county to provide an overview of the Active Travel Programme. The offer has already been accepted by several districts and boroughs. Colleagues from Folkestone and Hythe had received a full briefing on the projects, and KCC would continue to maintain ongoing dialogue with district partners.

- 12) Officers indicated that they would be happy to have a detailed conversation with any Member regarding the schemes that were approved, those that were not, and the current status of each project within its design journey. These schemes had evolved from initial concept through various development stages, and officers welcomed Member input throughout the process.

**RESOLVED** to endorse the proposed decision, namely:

That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport agree to:

1. APPROVE the acceptance of the Active Travel Fund (ATF5) Grant award and the deployment of the grant funding in accordance with the grant conditions to take the ATF5 projects through their various stages of scheme development and delivery.
2. DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport and the S151 Officer to agree to enter into the necessary grant agreements.
3. DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport to deploy and manage the grant allocation funding to take the ATF5 projects through their various stages of scheme development and delivery.
4. DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member and S151 Officer, to accept and deploy future years funding allocations of the grant, providing it is on similar terms.
5. DELEGATE authority to Director of Infrastructure to progress and complete all relevant construction property and Compulsory Purchase Orders as necessary to deliver the schemes
6. DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport to take other necessary actions, including but not limited to entering into contracts or other legal agreements, as required to implement the decision as shown at Appendix A.

**9. 2500063 – National Driver Offender Retraining Scheme Courses (NDORS)**  
*(Item 8)*

*Mr P Osborne - Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport presented the item. Mark Bunting-Vision Strategy Programme Manager was also in attendance.*

1. The decision related to the continued delivery of the Endorsed National Driver Offender Retraining Scheme (NDORS) in strategic partnership with Kent Police. The Kent Driver Education Team was licensed by the national governing body to deliver behaviour-correcting courses for referred offenders. The team was regularly audited and had received excellent feedback for both the quality of its work and the robustness of its operational processes.
2. The NDORS programme would be delivered at zero cost to Kent County Council. Offenders would be referred via the Police and would be responsible for covering the full cost of the course, meaning no financial burden would be placed on the council.
3. The delivery of courses would play a vital role in KCC's broader Vision Zero Safe System-based road safety strategy, particularly under the "Safer Behaviours" pillar. The aim would be to address and correct unsafe driving behaviours in a constructive and educational manner.

**RESOLVED** to endorse the proposed decision, namely:

That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport agree to:

1. The Cabinet Committee is asked to consider and endorse or make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Highways & Transport to give approval to continue to operate NDORS in partnership with Kent Police to 31 March 2030 in line with the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) as shown at Appendix A.

**10. 2500064 – Consolidated Active Travel Grant (CATF-Tranche 6) -Capital and Revenue**  
(Item 9)

*Mr P Osborne - Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport presented the item. Nikola Floodgate- Road Safety & Active Travel Group Manager and Jamie Watson- Senior Schemes Programme Manager were also in attendance.*

1. KCC had been awarded £5.7 Million from the Consolidated Active Travel Fund (CATF) to aid in the construction of active travel schemes aimed at enhancing, walking and cycling infrastructures
2. The revenue grant must be committed by 31 March 2026 and delivered by September 2026. The capital grant would be committed by March 2026 and spent by March 2028. The Council would ensure all compliance with legal and statutory requirements including procurement and quality duties.
3. Members congratulated the Officers on the hard work that had been completed in bringing the CATF to fruition.



**RESOLVED** to endorse the proposed decision, namely:

That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport agree to:

1. APPROVE the acceptance of the Consolidated Active Travel Fund (CATF) Grant award and the deployment of the grant funding in accordance with the grant conditions to take the CATF activities and projects through their various stages of scheme development and delivery.
2. DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport and the S151 Officer to agree to enter into the necessary grant agreements.
3. DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport to deploy and manage the grant allocation funding to take the CATF activities and projects through their various stages of scheme development and delivery
4. DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member and S151 Officer, to accept and deploy future years funding allocations of the grant, providing it is on similar terms.
5. DELEGATE authority to Director of Infrastructure to progress and complete all relevant construction property and Compulsory Purchase Orders as necessary to deliver the schemes.
6. DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport to take other necessary actions, including but not limited to entering into contracts or other legal agreements, as required to implement the decision as shown at Appendix A.

**11. 2500066 – Internal Drainage Board**

*(Item 10)*

*Mr D Wimble - Cabinet Member for Environment presented the item. Louise Smith-Flood and Water Manager was also in attendance*

- 1) Mr Wimble explained that Kent County Council in its position as both a stakeholder and a statutory consultee had been invited to support the expansion of the River Stour Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and the trial expansion of the Upper Medway Internal Drainage Board.

- 2) It was explained that Internal Drainage Boards were independent public bodies governed by a mix of elected and appointed members and included representatives from district councils and local landowners. The core responsibilities included the management of water levels, land drainage, and flood risk. They operated in close coordination with KCC—as the Lead Local Flood Authority—and the Environment Agency.
- 3) The geographic boundaries of each IDB had aligned with flood risk extents that were determined by Environment Agency modelling. Wider catchment areas outside the current IDB boundaries could significantly influence water level management and flood risks within the districts. Members discussed the need for a broader oversight and proactive maintenance support to aid in driving the request for expansion.
- 4) Expansion would enable IDBs to be better positioned to respond to planning consultations, deliver flood risk mitigation and water management projects, and undertake enforcement activities more effectively.
- 5) The River Stour IDB proposed a full expansion to cover the entire River Stour catchment. The Upper Medway IDB would seek a pilot expansion across selected sub-catchment areas by working in partnership with KCC under a Professional Services Corporation Agreement (PSCA). The partnership had enabled shared resources and a collaborative delivery of flood risk management initiatives, including natural flood management projects, aimed at enhancing protection for local communities.
- 6) Members raised concerns regarding the recent Water Summit held on 3 September, particularly its potential to duplicate work already underway within existing committees. Mr Wimble acknowledged these concerns and clarified that the summit was an exploratory session involving key stakeholders aimed at establishing a strategic pathway for water management across Kent. At the current stage the summit would not be open to the public as its current purpose was to define the scope and parameters of the overarching group
- 7) Members asked if the discussed decision would improve the resilience of surface water drainage, groundwater resources and aid in the reduction of flooding. Officers responded that it would be beneficial on all the points raised.
- 8) IDBs would be required to submit their proposals to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), which held the authority to approve any expansion plans. Any additional charges or financial implications that arose from the expansion would be reviewed and approved by DEFRA. Should further clarity be required Officers would look to engage directly with the IDBs to seek additional information and would report back to the committee with a detailed update.

- 9) Members raised concerns on the proposals potential extra cost to taxpayers across a number of the county's districts. Officers acknowledged the concerns and discussed that many of the areas proposed for expansion were already partially covered by the IDB. District councils would only experience a minimal additional financial impact.
- 10) Members asked if reassurance on how efficiencies would benefit KCC. Officers indicated that notable cost efficiencies could be achieved through staff resourcing, with personnel potentially redeployed to externally funded projects. The expansion would present a valuable opportunity to strengthen partnership working between the IDB and highways teams.
- 11) It was noted that Mr Prater abstained from the decision

**RESOLVED** to endorse the proposed decision, namely:

That the Cabinet Member for (the Kent) Environment agree to:

1. ENDORSE the proposed expansion of the River Stour Internal Drainage Board District and
2. ENDORSE the trial expansion of the Upper Medway Internal Drainage Board and the joint working arrangement between the Upper Medway Internal Drainage Board and Kent County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority as shown at Appendix A.

**12. 2500067 – Procurement for the Receipt and Processing of Paper and Card Waste**  
*(Item 11)*

*Mr D Wimble - Cabinet Member for Environment presented the item. Matthew Smyth-Director for Environment and Circular Economy and Susan Reddick-Head of Resource Management and Circular Economy were in attendance*

- 1) Kent County Council had prepared to launch a new countywide contract for the receipt and processing of paper and card waste scheduled to begin on 1 December 2026. The contract would replace the existing arrangements which were due to expire.
- 2) The proposed contract would run for five years, with an option to extend for a further two years. It would be income-generating and tendered as a single lot. The contract would incorporate social value commitments and include a

benchmarking pricing system to ensure optimal environmental outcomes aligned with Kent's sustainability goals.

- 3) Members requested greater clarity on the social value aspects of the proposed contract. Officers highlighted opportunities for local employment, particularly in areas with existing infrastructure such as Kent's paper mills. Officers referenced apprenticeship schemes aimed at supporting skills development and long-term career pathways. Additionally, emphasis was placed on supporting local environmental initiatives and ensured that community-led sustainability efforts were recognised and actively encouraged.
- 4) In response to Members questions, Officers clarified that dry paper was more economically viable than wet paper which had been difficult and sometimes impossible to recycle.
- 5) Officers had indicated their intention to return to a future committee to facilitate a broader discussion on the collaborative work currently underway with district and borough councils. Future engagement would provide an opportunity to review progress, share insights, and ensure that Kent County Council continued to deliver best value for the Kent taxpayer.

**RESOLVED** to endorse the proposed decision, namely:

That the Cabinet Member for (the Kent) Environment agree to:

- 1) APPROVE the procurement and contract award of a paper and card recycling contract for an initial 5 years (plus an extension of up to 2 years).
- 2) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Environment and Circular Economy to take relevant actions to facilitate the required procurement activity.
- 3) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Environment and Circular Economy, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, to take relevant actions including but not limited to awarding, finalising the terms of and entering into the relevant contracts or other legal agreements, as necessary, to implement the decision; and
- 4) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Environment and Circular Economy, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, to award extensions of the contract in accordance with the relevant clauses within the contract as shown at Appendix A.

### **13. Kent and Medway Safety Camera Partnership Overview** (Item 12)

*Tara O'Shea-Safer Speed & Enforcement Team Leader presented the item – Chief Superintendent Simon Alland of Kent Police was also in attendance.*

- 1) The report highlighted the 53 mobile cameras sites across all networks. These included speed cameras, red light cameras and average speed cameras.
- 2) One of the most significant achievements of the partnership had been a sustained and measurable improvement to road safety. Over the past 20 years camera-monitored locations had seen an average reduction of 48% in the most severe injury crashes. The observed reductions had reinforced the importance of continued investment into the systems.
- 3) In 2016 the partnership had initiated a programme to upgrade outdated wet film cameras to a modern digital enforcement camera system. The transition was aimed to improve reliability, data accuracy, and long-term operational efficiency. The upgraded process was successfully completed in 2023 and would ensure that all enforcement tools were now fit for purpose and had strengthened the overall enforcement strategy.
- 4) It was recognised that revenue generated from speeding fines was not retained by local authorities as all funds were directed to the treasury's consolidated fund. It was stated that there was limited financial incentive for enforcement at the local level. When new traffic camera sites were proposed, local authorities would be then required to self-fund both the capital investment and ongoing operational costs. Overall expenses would be typically covered through the authority's existing Local Transport Plan allocation (LTP).
- 5) Enforcement required the full support of Kent Police in terms of back-office processing. Maintenance responsibilities would be shared by the relevant highway authority. Cost would be offset through the NDORS scheme. Officers highlighted the ongoing efforts to support a data-driven, community-responsive approach focused on saving lives.
- 6) Members expressed concern over the recent rise in anti-social driving behaviours and the challenges faced when reporting problematic areas. Officers clarified that responsibility for the placement of traffic camera sites would rest with the local highway authorities.
- 7) Mr Prater proposed that an annual report be presented to the cabinet committee to review the number of traffic offences recorded across the county and would enable a clearer understanding of functioning and non-functioning cameras, as well as identify key traffic issue hotspots. The Member also highlighted the challenges encountered when requesting statistics for specific camera sites.
- 8) Officers acknowledged Members frustrations in regard to the availability of offence data and confirmed that the supporting Kent County Council website would soon be updated to include the required information. Chief Superintendent Alland also addressed Members' concerns, noting that police-related data for specific districts would be made available upon request.

- 9) The discussion explored proactive versus reactive approaches to preventing road traffic accidents. Members raised concerns regarding budget constraints, the process for reviewing camera placements, the volume of funds directed to central government from enforcement activities, and the financial implications of installing additional cameras.
- 10) Officers responded by emphasising the need for a more agile and targeted approach to road safety. Financial resources would be reviewed to support the development of a camera deployment programme. A collaborative review of crash sites and areas of concern would be undertaken jointly by Kent Police and KCC. It was clarified that decisions regarding camera placements rest with the local authority, subject to review by Kent Police and the Department for Transport. (DfT)
- 11) Members suggested that lobbying central government could help enable traffic cameras to become more self-funded. In response, Officers noted that a group of transport professionals had recently submitted a document to government that proposed that revenue from fines be redistributed in a way that more comprehensively supported both local authorities and the Police.

**RESOLVED** to note the Kent and Medway Safety Camera Partnership Overview

**14. 2500068 – Folkestone & Hythe Waste Transfer Station-  
Delivery Options Report**  
(Item 13)

*Mr D Wimble - Cabinet Member for Environment presented the item. Matthew Smyth-  
Director for Environment and Circular Economy and Charlotte Smith were in  
attendance*

- 1) The paper referenced a key decision to allocate capital budget for the construction of a new waste transfer station at Junction 11 on the M20. The current waste facilities in Folkestone and Hythe would be insufficient to manage the volume of waste generated by existing housing levels.
- 2) Funding had been supported through the KCC capital budget and alongside contributions from district partners. Planning permission for the site had been granted in August 2025.
- 3) A budget gap had been identified, which had presented a challenge to moving forward with construction. The paper presented a review of the available options to close the identified budget gap and enable delivery of the essential waste infrastructure.
- 4) Following a detailed options appraisal option three had been identified as the preferred approach. Option three proposed to extend the developer

contribution collection period from 2030 to 2040 and would align with Kent County Council's published housing-led forecasts.

- 5) Officers highlighted KCC's statutory responsibility to provide a suitable waste infrastructure for the district to deliver.
- 6) Members requested clarification regarding the £6 million borrowing referenced in the paper. Officers confirmed that the figure had related to existing, already-budgeted borrowing and did not represent any additional borrowing beyond what had previously been approved.

**RESOLVED** to endorse the proposed decision, namely:

That the Cabinet Member for (the Kent) Environment agree to:

- 1) PROCEED with option 3, which is to utilise waste reserve funds to close the budget gap and extend the developer contribution collection period to 2040, thus allowing the continuation of development of the site near junction 11 of the M20.
- 2) DELEGATE authority to the Cabinet Member for (the Kent) Environment to approve the capital funding for this project and to the Director of Infrastructure to approve the purchase of the land.
- 3) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Environment and Circular Economy in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, to take relevant actions, including but not limited to, awarding, finalising the terms of and entering into the relevant contracts or other legal agreements, as necessary, to implement the decision as shown at Appendix A.

## **15. 2500075 – Kent and Medway Local Nature Recovery Strategy**

*(Item 14)*

*Mr D Wimble - Cabinet Member for Environment presented the item. Matthew Smyth- Director for Environment and Circular Economy and Elizabeth Milne Natural Environment and Coast Manager- were in attendance*

- 1) The strategy was part of a national initiative that would encompass 48 Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRSs) being developed across England. The discussed strategies would form the backbone of the National Nature Recovery Network.
- 2) The Nature Recovery Network would be a key mechanism for delivering on the Environment Act 2021 commitment to halt the decline of nature and work towards the targets that had been published in 2022. The development of the LNRS for Kent and Medway would be funded through a grant from DEFRA, which had formally appointed KCC as the responsible authority.

- 3) Development of the strategy would follow the statute guidance set by DEFRA. Strategies would align and create a wider network countrywide. Strategies would look to identify the priorities for nature recovery and the potential measures to be implemented.
- 4) Collaboration with stakeholders and delivery partners had ensured an opportunity to fully input the strategic development. The strategy had also identified a number of priority species that would need to be considered.
- 5) Over the course of the development of the work over 20 workshops had been held with over 900 individuals attending. Over 250 different organisations were also represented.
- 6) The discussed strategy was centred around ten key ambitions; each reflected the core priorities and outlined potential measures for exploration. A public consultation was held in January and had received 330 responses. It was suggested that this demonstrated a strong support for the proposed measures and confirmed alignment with stakeholder expectations.
- 7) While certain amendments had been made to the broader details of the strategy, it was noted that the core founding principles remained unchanged.
- 8) KCC was required to submit the final strategy to all planning authorities nationwide, as well as to Natural England, initiating a 28-day review period. The process provided an opportunity for issuing a public advisory notice. The review commenced on 1st September and was scheduled to conclude on 29th September. To date no major issues had been identified.
- 9) Officers responded to the members questions on returning wildlife species. It was indicated that 30 of the county wildlife recorders was to be used to identify the 141 species of taxa would be targeted. No invasive species was to be introduced.
- 10) Members raised concerns regarding the Council's capacity to implement the proposed strategies. Officers clarified that the strategy was led by DEFRA and not by Kent County Council. The responsibility for delivery laid with DEFRA, while KCC would hold a supporting role as the responsible authority. Officers recommended that progress updates be presented at future Committee meetings.

**RESOLVED** to endorse the proposed decision, namely:

That the Cabinet Member for (the Kent) Environment agree to

- 1) **APPROVE** and **ADOPT** the Kent and Medway Local Nature Recovery Strategy, developed by Kent County Council as the Responsible Authority under the Environment Act 2021, subject to the formal endorsement by relevant supporting authorities



- 2) DELEGATE authority to the Director for Environment and Circular Economy in conjunction with the Kent and Medway Local Nature Recovery Strategy Board to publish the strategy and take any necessary actions to support its implementation and associated monitoring functions.
- 3) DELEGATE authority to the Director for Environment and Circular Economy in conjunction with the Kent and Medway Local Nature Recovery Strategy Board in consultation with the Cabinet member for Environment to make non-substantive revisions or updates to the strategy as appropriate during its lifetime
- 4) DELEGATE authority to the Director for Environment and Circular Economy to take relevant actions, including but not limited to finalising the terms of, and entering into required contracts or other legal agreements, as necessary to implement the decision as shown at Appendix A.

**16. 2500078 – To extend current DPS framework SS 15096  
Supported Local Bus & Home to School Transport  
(Item 15)**

*Mr P Osborne - Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport presented the item.  
Philip Lightowler-Head of Public Transport and Shane Bushall-Head of Service:  
Public Transport were also in attendance*

- 1) Mr Lightowler opened the discussion that would encompass decisions 2500078 and 79 respectively. The Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) framework for procuring transport services had been in place since 2016. The DPS had allowed suppliers to register on a closed framework and be procured contractually.
- 2) The DPS systems allowed a 'procure compliant' ability to procure tenders in blocks. The DPS would accommodate larger tendering such as supportive bus services and also a more flexible response to individual requirements.
- 3) Procurement times using the DPS had facilitated a faster response which would be required in supporting functions such as adult's social care. Currently there were 400 active suppliers throughout Kent, with the local supportive bus mainstream homeschool transport having 40 providers currently.
- 4) As the 2026 extension point for the current procurement arrangements approached work had taken place with colleagues in Commissioning and Procurement to explore options for either extending or replacing the existing framework. The review had been shaped by the introduction of the Public Procurement Act 2023, which would bring significant changes to how the

public sector procurement would be structured. Notably, the Act would not provide a direct replacement of DPS frameworks.

- 5) The Dynamic Market option had been explored as an alternative but was deemed to lack the flexibility and scope to deliver services. The two DPS Frameworks (78 and 79) in line with received legal advice would look to be extended until February 2029.
- 6) The remarked extension would allow for the day to day running of services to remain intact and allow collaborative works to take place with Commissioning and Procurement colleagues to source an alternative commercial strategy.
- 7) Members highlighted concerns on inflated costs and asked Officers on how the council would combat the rising costs. Officers acknowledged the concern and the rising costs associated with Specialist and Complex Needs (SCN) transport. A substantial increase in demand had grown from 2,500 -3,000 clients to over 6,500.
- 8) The increased costs of contracts had been addressed and targeted works would be underway to review and address these pricing structures. It was discussed that the current frameworks in place would remain the most effective method for tendering transport services.
- 9) Over the past 12 to 18 months, KCC had undertaken a strategic project to address the growing challenges associated with Special Educational Needs (SEN) transport. A major advancement had been the introduction of a new scheduling package, which would help to streamline service planning and improve overall operational efficiency.
- 10) From 2017 onwards, the council had experienced a sharp and sustained increase in the demand for SEN transport. A positive aspect was that there had been early signs that demand may be beginning to plateau. If current measures continued to take effect there could be cautious optimism that demand could begin to stabilise or even decline over time.
- 11) Work would be focused on addressing cost pressures, particularly around high-cost contracts and unit pricing. Financial aspect would remain a priority, and the team would be actively engaged in identifying efficiencies and ensuring value for money.

**RESOLVED** to endorse the proposed decision, namely:

That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport agree to:

- 1) **EXTEND** the current DPS framework for SS15096 Supported Local Bus & Home to School Transport from its current expiry of 31st December 2026 to 23rd February 2029.

- 2) ENABLE the development of an appropriate commercial strategy, taking account of the procurement options available under Procurement Act 2023.
- 3) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Growth, Environment and Transport to approve the DPS extension report, as prepared by Commissioning and Procurement.
- 4) DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport to take other necessary actions, including but not limited to entering into contracts or other legal agreements, as required to implement the decision as shown at Appendix A

**17. 2500079 – To extend current DPS framework SS15124 Home to School Transport (taxi)**

*(Item 16)*

- 1) Items discussed in combination with Key Decision 2500078.

**RESOLVED** to endorse the proposed decision, namely:

That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport agree to:

- 1) EXTEND the current DPS framework for the Home to School Transport (taxi) SS 15124 from its current expiry of 31st October 2026 to 23rd February 2029.
- 2) ENABLE the development of an appropriate commercial strategy, taking account of the procurement options available under Procurement Act 2023.
- 3) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Growth, Environment and Transport to approve the DPS extension report, as prepared by Commissioning and Procurement.
- 4) DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport to take other necessary actions, including but not limited to entering into contracts or other legal agreements, as required to implement the decision as shown at Appendix A.

**18. 2500080 – Transport for the South East - KCC endorsement of Transport Strategy for the South East**

*(Item 17)*

*Mr P Osborne - Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport presented the item.  
Tim Read-Head of Transportation and Joseph Ratcliffe-Transport Strategy Manager were also in attendance*

- 1) Mr Ratcliffe highlighted Kent County Council's involvement with Transport for the South East (TfSE), which commenced in 2017. Over the years, several key decisions have been made in relation to the partnership's strategies and policies.
- 2) In 2024, TfSE updated its transport strategy (Section 2) and carried out a public consultation from December 2024 to March 2025. The results of the consultation were presented in Section 3
- 3) Kent County Council responded to the consultation as a constituent member of the partnership and was satisfied that its comments had been addressed. KCC had recommended endorsing the new Transport Strategy of TfSE, as outlined in the proposed decision
- 4) Members queried on how KCC had benefited from the partnership with TfSE. Officers outlined that KCC had made a financial contribution to the partnership of £58,000 a year. The contribution would allow KCC continued access to ongoing research, information and intelligence and additionally access to regional transports models. It was also noted that if KCC choose not to participate in the TfSE partnership, it would be the only county in the country not represented within a sub-national transport body.
- 5) The integrity and credibility brought by the TFSE partnership had been instrumental in strengthening bids for external funding, including those submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT) and other national bodies. KCC would not have achieved the same level of success without the added weight and authority that the collaboration provided. The partnership lends substance and legitimacy to proposals and reinforced KCC's strategic intent and operational capability.
- 6) Members asked additional questions regarding if similar partnerships were available for Kent County Council (KCC) to explore. Officers indicated that previous suggestions that involved a network of the home counties around London had been considered but ultimately not pursued.
- 7) It was observed that the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport would represent KCC at the upcoming TfSE Board meeting, scheduled for 27 October. The Board would vote on whether to endorse the proposed strategy.
- 8) The vote would be cast in accordance with the decision proposed by the leader of the Council, as outlined in the accompanying documentation. If the decision were not to endorse the strategy the position would then be reflected in KCC's vote capacity at the TfSE Board meeting.
- 9) Voting on the TfSE board was weighted by population and gave KCC the largest share of votes as the most populous county in the partnership. However, KCC does not hold a veto option and if KCC voted against the

strategy it may still be adopted if a majority of partner authorities were to vote in its favour.

**RESOLVED** to endorse the proposed decision, namely:

That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport agree to:

1. ENDORSE the new Transport Strategy for the South East prepared by Transport for the South East (TfSE) and support TfSE with its implementation; and
2. DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director Growth, Environment and Transport, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, to take the actions required to support TfSE with the implementation of the strategy, subject to the Council's decision-making procedures.
3. DELEGATE authority to the Corporate Director Growth, Environment and Transport to take other necessary actions, including but not limited to entering into contracts or other legal agreements, as required to implement the decision

## **19. Work Programme**

*(Item 18)*

**RESOLVED** to note the work programme