

**By:** Kevin Lynes, Cabinet Member for Regeneration  
David Cockburn, Executive Director for Strategy, Economic  
Development and ICT

**To:** Regeneration and Economic Development Policy Overview  
and Scrutiny Committee, 18 January 2011

**Subject:** Feedback Report from REDPOSC District visits

**Classification:** Unrestricted

---

**Summary:** The report identifies the high priority activities identified by REDPOSC Members in their November 2009 meeting, and suggests next steps for taking these forward in the context of the Kent Regeneration Framework and supporting strategies.

---

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 At their meeting on 17 November, following a thorough and detailed discussion of district wide priorities identified from the programme of visits to Kent districts between September 2009 and September 2010, REDPOSC Members agreed their overall regeneration priorities for the whole of the county.
- 1.2 The purpose of this report is to set out the proposed next steps for taking forward the high priority activities.

## **2. Proposed next steps**

- 2.1 Members agreed a revised list of 43 priorities across the county. Of these, 21 were given a High rating, 20 were given a Medium rating and just 2 priorities were given a Low rating. The revised list is presented in the official minutes for the November meeting. Members also agreed their overall priorities (10 in total), and these are also set out in the minutes.
- 2.2 As our report to the November meeting of REDPOSC indicated, most of the activities identified during the visits are already established priorities for KCC directorates. Indeed, as the appendix to this report shows, many are also consistent with the corporate regeneration themes and proposed actions identified in the Kent Regeneration Framework and its supporting strategies.
- 2.3 Some activities are identified as priorities in the emerging Local Investment Plans being prepared for the Homes and Communities Agency in partnership with the county and district councils in Kent. However, with tighter constraints on public sector budgets, implementation will become increasingly difficult.
- 2.4 The emerging public expenditure landscape means that any new regeneration

priorities identified would be unlikely to be accommodated in our future work programme. Nevertheless, these will be given consideration alongside our existing regeneration priorities, as our business plan work programme for 2011-12 and beyond is developed against the backdrop of available resources.

- 2.5 A number of the high priority activities could be for other KCC directorates and external organisations, such as the district councils, to consider taking forward. The appendix to this report suggests how and by whom the 21 high priority activities identified during the district visits, and the overall priorities agreed by REDPOSC at its November meeting, might be taken forward.
- 2.6 It is recommended that the next steps should be to propose to KCC directorates, via their respective Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committees and their representatives on the Regeneration Board, and where appropriate other external partners, that they consider taking forward the priority activities in their own work programmes from 2011-12 onwards.

### **3. Recommendation**

- 3.1 The Committee is asked to endorse the proposed next steps outlined in paragraph 2.6 above.

#### **Author Contact Details:**

Name: David Hughes  
Directorate: Chief Executive's

Email: [dave.hughes@kent.gov.uk](mailto:dave.hughes@kent.gov.uk)

Tel: 01622 221942

#### **Background Documents:**

None