

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of a meeting of the Kent County Council held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 26 January 2017.

PRESENT:

Mr T Gates (Chairman)
Mr D L Brazier (Vice-Chairman)

Mrs A D Allen, MBE, Mr M J Angell, Mr M Baldock, Mr M A C Balfour, Mr R H Bird, Mr H Birkby, Mr N J Bond, Mr A H T Bowles, Mrs P Brivio, Mr C W Caller, Miss S J Carey, Mr P B Carter, CBE, Mr N J D Chard, Mr B E Clark, Mrs P T Cole, Mr G Cooke, Mr G Cowan, Mrs M E Crabtree, Mr A D Crowther, Mrs V J Dagger, Mr D S Daley, Mr M C Dance, Mr J A Davies, Mrs T Dean, MBE, Dr M R Eddy, Mr J Elenor, Mrs M Elenor, Mr G K Gibbens, Mr R W Gough, Mr P M Harman, Ms A Harrison, Mr M J Harrison, Mr M Heale, Mr P M Hill, OBE, Mr C P D Hoare, Mrs S V Hohler, Mr S Holden, Mr P J Homewood, Mr M J Horwood, Mrs S Howes, Mr A J King, MBE, Mr J A Kite, MBE, Mr R A Latchford, OBE, Mr R L H Long, TD, Mr G Lymer, Mr B E MacDowall, Mr S C Manion, Mr R A Marsh, Ms D Marsh, Mr F McKenna, Mr B Neaves, Mr M J Northey, Mr P J Oakford, Mr J M Ozog, Mr R J Parry, Mr C R Pearman, Mr L B Ridings, MBE, Mrs E D Rowbotham, Mr J E Scholes, Mr T L Shonk, Mr C Simkins, Mr J D Simmonds, MBE, Mr C P Smith, Mr D Smyth, Mrs P A V Stockell, Mr B J Sweetland, Mr N S Thandi, Mr R Truelove, Mr M J Vye, Mrs C J Waters, Mr J N Wedgbury, Mrs J Whittle, Mr M E Whybrow and Mrs Z Wiltshire

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr D Cockburn (Corporate Director Strategic & Corporate Services), Mr B Watts (General Counsel) and Mr J Lynch (Head of Democratic Services)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

46. Apologies for Absence

The General Counsel reported apologies from Mr Burgess, Mr Chittenden, Mr Hotson, Mr Koowaree, Mr Maddison, Mr Terry and Mr Wickham.

47. Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or Other Significant Interests in items on the agenda

Mr McKenna declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in agenda item 10, Motion for Time Limited debate on South Eastern Rail Franchise, as he was an employee of Network Rail.

48. Minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2016 and, if in order, to be approved as a correct record

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2016 be approved as a correct record and they be signed by the Chairman.

49. Chairman's Announcements

(a) New Year's Honours

(1) The Chairman referred Members to the list of New Year Honours recipients from Kent. He formally congratulated all those who had received an Honour and in particular Sir Julian Brazier MP Member of Parliament for Canterbury on his knighthood for Political and Public Service and Mr and Mrs Upton, who had been KCC Foster Carers, on receipt of their MBE's for Services to Children.

(b) Queen's Fire Service Medal for Distinguished Service

(2) The Chairman congratulated Ms Ann Millington, Chief Executive of the Kent and Medway Fire and Rescue Service on being awarded the Queen's Fire Service Medal for Distinguished Service.

(c) Permanency Carer Award 2016

(3) The Chairman stated that he was delighted to announce that Mr and Mrs Moody, two Kent foster carers, had been awarded FosterTalk magazine's Permanency Carer Award 2016. The award had been made all the more special by the fact that they were nominated by one of their current foster children. On behalf of all Members he had congratulated them on this recognition of their 14 year contribution to fostering.

(d) Petitions

(4) The Chairman received petitions from Mr Thandi, requesting the installation of a crossing in London Road Northfleet, and Mr Homewood, relating to the junction of Bull Lane and Pilgrims Way.

(5) The Chairman passed these two petitions to Mr Balfour, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, and requested him to respond to them in accordance with the Petition Scheme.

(e) Election information for Members

(6) The Chairman drew Members attention to the purdah guidance and election timetable, which had been circulated to all Members.

(f) County Council Directorate and Strategic Commissioning Structure

(7) The Chairman referred to item 7 (County Council Directorate and Strategic Commissioning Structure) and advised Members that he had agreed that the relevant Corporate Directors and the Head of Paid Service would not be in attendance for this item.

50. Questions

In accordance with Procedure Rule 1.17(4), 6 questions were asked and replies given. A record of all questions put and answers given at the meeting are available [online](#) with the papers for this meeting.

51. Report by Leader of the Council (Oral)

- (1) The Leader updated the Council on events since the previous meeting.
- (2) Mr Carter referred to the differentials for schools under the proposed fair funding formula, and fair funding for local government, education and adult social care.
- (3) He reminded Members of the current national government consultation, on funding for schools which was due to close on 22 March. This included proposed changes and indicative budgets along with what this would mean for each individual school in the country. Within the consultation there was an acceptance that many parts of the country were overfunded and other parts were underfunded and an intended re-adjustment from government. However colleagues across the county council network shared concerns about whether this would be achieved by these proposals. He stated that there was a need to work with schools to make sure that, if there were to be significant adjustments, these were applied to the right schools in a fair and equitable way.
- (4) Mr Carter made reference to prior attainment being a big factor in driving additional money for schools and being superimposed upon what he considered to already be a fairly generous pupil premium allocation to secondary schools. He referred to the potential for some High Schools in Kent with challenging prior attainment to receive about £7,450 per pupil, including pupil premium, compared to a high performing High School and a Grammar School, trying to achieve excellent and high performance, receiving £3k less per pupil (e.g. about £4350 per pupil) which could mean a differential of £3m between secondary schools.
- (5) Mr Carter emphasised the importance of working with schools to make sure that well intended adjustments to the national funding formula returned to the basics of baseline funding for a one form entry primary school or a 6 form or 4 form entry secondary school. Also to make sure that factors were added in a sensible, intelligent way that gave all schools a fair chance of getting the very best out of all their pupils.
- (6) Mr Carter put forward his suggestions for sustainable adult social care funding. He referred to the growth in foreign aid over the last 5 – 6 years of £10.5 billion rising to £16.5 billion by 2020. He compared this to the 36% reduction in local government funding, with local government funding social services to help some of the most vulnerable, elderly or sick people in the community. He expressed the view that national government needed to re-calibrate as the world became a more peaceful place. He believed that some £4 billion from the foreign aid budget could be put into adult social care, whilst still increasing the foreign aid budget from £10 billion to £12 billion.
- (7) Mr Carter suggested that national government should review adult social care entitlement to services across Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales and England. He referred to free domiciliary care for everybody at the point of delivery in Scotland, at a massive cost to the Treasury, and the deference in the methods of payment to health and social care providers in Wales. He stated that he believed that there should be

some form of National Insurance scheme that would raise £1billion or £2billion to protect the hard earned wealth of families of the 30% of elderly people who would need fairly intensive domiciliary care or residential care packages before they reach the end of their lives.

(8) Mr Carter referred to the relative needs formula paying predominately inner London authorities more than double per capita for their population over the age of 70 compared to the rest of the country. It was estimated about £1billion could have been re-distributed against a fair and equitable system into funding social care.

(9) Mr Carter stated that his suggestions added up to somewhere between £6 billion - £8 billion that could be distributed, therefore could mean another £200million into social care services in a local authority of the scope and size of Kent. He explained that all of his suggestions meant that the Treasury did not have to find any additional monies to fund this solution.

(10) Mr Carter expressed the hope that colleagues could work together to put the case for significant change on the basis of fairness and equity, specifically in the distribution of school funding and the funding of social care. Also that the fair funding review established sensible baselines for what services in inner London cost to deliver compared to the services in shire counties. He stated that area cost adjustments should be based on actual need, which would re-distribute over £1 billion of RSG before the baseline was assessed.

(11) In relation to the broader issue of local government funding Mr Carter stated that the local authority treasurers were meeting to work out what baseline funding was needed based on current evidence of funding levels across the different sizes and types of local authorities in the country. He believed that this would confirm the fact that inner London authorities were over funded. He stated that the question would be whether national government would be brave enough to address the issue where inner London boroughs were paying Council tax levels of £500 to £600 a year and county shires £1,500 a year, and make the necessary changes.

(12) Mr Latchford, the Leader of the Opposition, expressed concern about the continued reduction in central government grants to local government at the same time as increasing local government responsibilities. He referred to the potential Surrey County Council referendum on a 15 % increase in Council Tax. He echoed the accepted view that the County Council could not keep passing on an increased tax burden to the residents of Kent.

(13) Mr Latchford thanked the Leader for his statement on overseas aid and the financing of care for the elderly. He hoped that the Leader would, together with other Council Leaders, use his influence in Parliament.

(14) Mr Latchford stated that whilst he welcomed the move to a new formula for schools he questioned the fairness of the proposed formula. He referred to the 2015 spending review where the Department of Education had recognised that transforming education was central to government commitments to extend opportunity and deliver social justice. However, the old system where some pupils missed out on up to 2,000 of funding depended on what part of the country they lived in was a postcode lottery and let down some pupils who were seriously in need. He stated that the under the new formula whilst an estimated 11,000 schools would gain,

9,000 schools were alleged to lose out. Any changes to the current unfair system should not come from levelling down schools finances making a desperate situation even worse and shifting funding between schools.

(15) Mr Latchford referred to Kent's pride in its grammar schools and the reported pressure that Ministers were facing from MP's concerned about costs affecting schools of all kinds in their constituencies. He also mentioned that some grammar schools were now asking parents to make a parental contribution towards the cost of education within that school

(16) In conclusion Mr Latchford stated that fairer funding for schools could be a step in the right direction but it could only be viewed in the context of schools funding as a whole.

(17) Mr Cowan, Leader of the Labour Group, referred to the fair funding formula and the changes to the finances of local government. He stated that the government had reacted to short term issues with instant policies regardless of their overall impact. He gave the example of the Northern Powerhouse, local authorities in the Manchester area had been told that if they grouped together and had an elected mayor they would get special financial support for their economic development plans. This raised the question of what happened to those local authorities, including Kent who did not want to have an elected mayor. He referred to the proposal by Surrey, East Sussex County Council's and Tunbridge Wells District Council to form a grouping and the ability of the later to join even if the County Council was opposed.

(18) Mr Cowan mentioned the recent announcement that the Northern Powerhouse would get £556.3m for its development programme whereas the South East Local Enterprise Partnership, a longer established regional local authority based organisation, had put in a bid for £229m but were currently receiving between £45m-£55m. He could therefore understand why the Leader wanted to talk about fair funding due to the issues that local government were facing at every single level.

(19) Mr Cowan referred to reforming local government finances based chiefly on Council Tax and business rate receipts but expressed the view that neither of these sources of revenue were buoyant enough to meet the demands placed upon local authorities. He mentioned the rise in demand for council services, especially adult social care and that the funding for this was a central government problem. He made reference to the increased funding received by inner London councils compared to County Councils, which he stated made a mockery of the concept of fair funding. He stated that the government should acknowledge the substantial funds needed to meet demands imposed on local government and at the same time address the whole set of injustices and distortions so the government funding really would be fair.

(20) Mr Cowan concluded by stating that central government were to blame for local government fair funding issues.

(21) Mrs Dean, Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group, referred to the comments that had been made regarding fair funding and which were the result of wanting to see a civilised way of funding those who were most vulnerable.

(22) Mrs Dean asked the Leader if he was prepared to write to Mrs May, supported by other Leaders, to express the opposition of Kent County Council to the President of America's announcement that he was prepared to consider a return to torture.

(23) Mrs Dean referred to fair funding as the holy grail of local authorities in that it had been sought for a long time and never achieved. She referred to the government's announcement that the lion's share of the local growth fund was to go to those regions with elected mayors. The reasoning given for this was that where there were devolution deals in place the Department knew that there was a degree of accountability. She questioned what having an elected mayor had to do a local authorities deprivation, past record of delivery, value for money or need.

(24) Mrs Dean questioned how taxation based on a system which was not related to the ability to pay and was not related to service demands could provide a system of local services to deal with the most needy in our society. She expressed the view that there was no other way of funding social services other than through National Insurance, as this was a national burden. She did not believe that it was possible to address local authority demands through business rates which were not related to these services and did not reflect the needs of society. She stated that this unfairness needed to be replaced by openness and transparency

(25) Mr Whybrow, Leader of the Independents Group, reflected on the strange times on both sides of the Atlantic and stated that we seem to have entered an era of "alternative facts". He referred to central government using "alternative facts" in relation to local government funding for years. He also mentioned the Surrey County Council's proposed increase of 15% in council tax and the resultant referendum that this would trigger. He hoped that this would generate a very high profile very public debate about the whole nature of local government finance.

(26) Mr Whybrow expressed the view that central government should maintain the foreign aid budget and properly finance local government. He stated that Members should remember the human costs of reduced local government funding.

(27) Mr Whybrow referred to the short sightedness of government making cuts in public health funding when a recent report had shown that Britain's younger people had higher rates of obesity than the majority of their counter parts in the rest of Europe. He acknowledged that raising Council Tax was not the proper way to fund local government.

(28) In replying to the other Leaders' comments, Mr Carter referred to the potential increase in Council Tax by Surrey County Council and stated that he had not seen any evidence of Surrey's differences to most county shires across the country. He considered that Surrey County Council's proposed increase in Council Tax demeaned the hard work of other counties who had delivered services in response to the reduction of 36% in real terms. He agreed that it was necessary to find a sustainable way of funding social care.

(29) Mr Carter clarified that if the foreign aid budget stayed at £12b or £12.5b it would still represent a significant increase in public expenditure on foreign aid.

(30) Mr Carter emphasised the importance of working with Kent school's regarding the consultation on the funding formula. He stated that the good news was that Kent

would get £30m more but he was concerned that it would not be distributed in a way that would deliver better support and outcomes for all young people in Kent schools.

(31) In relation to commercial rate retention Mr Carter expressed concern at the lack of correlation between business rate collection pool and the demand led pressures on people based services.

(32) Mr Carter stated that he was more optimistic that if Kent brokered its case, working with all other local authorities, it would be possible to provide the evidence as to why money needed to be re-allocated from inner London, in a fair and equitable way, to fund services in other parts of the country. There was much to broker to make sure that there was a system that spent the £30m additional funding coming to Kent in the most intelligent way and the establishment of a new transparent evidence based way of funding local government needs.

52. County Council Directorate and Strategic Commissioning Structure

(The Head of Paid Service and the relevant Corporate Directors withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.)

(1) Mr Carter moved and Mr Simmonds seconded the following motion

“The County Council is asked to:

- Approve the proposed operating framework which sees the deletion of two existing Corporate Director posts and the introduction of two new ones leading to two new Directorates, as recommended by the Personnel Committee.
- Approve the new senior level post of Strategic Commissioner reporting to the Head of Paid Service.
- Approve revision to the pay and grading structure for the Head of Paid Service and three Corporate Director roles.
- Authorise the Monitoring Officer to make any necessary and consequential changes to the Constitution as outlined in section 4 of this paper.
- Note the actions and timescale that will result from this decision as outlined in section 8 of this paper.

(2) Following a debate the Chairman put the motion as set out in paragraph (1) above to the vote and the voting was as follows:

For (60)

Mrs A Allen, Mr M Angell, Mr R Bird, Mr H Birkby, Mr N Bond, Mr A Bowles, Mr D Brazier, Mrs P Brivio, Miss S Carey, Mr P Carter, Mr N Chard, Mr B Clark, Mrs P Cole, Mr G Cooke, Mrs M Crabtree, Mr A Crowther, Mrs V Dagger, Mr D Daley, Mr M Dance, Mr J Davies, Mrs T Dean, Mr J Elenor, Mrs M Elenor, Mr T Gates, Mr G Gibbens, Mr R Gough, Mr M Harrison, Mr M Heale, Mr M Hill, Mr C Hoare, Mrs S Hohler, Mr S Holden, Mr P Homewood, Mr M Horwood, Mr A King, Mr J Kite, Mr R Latchford, Mr R Long, Mr G Lymer, Mr S Manion, Mr A Marsh, Mrs D Marsh, Mr M Northey, Mr P Oakford, Mr J Ozog, Mr R Parry, Mr C Pearman, Mr L Ridings, Mr J Scholes, Mr T Shonk, Mr C Simkins, Mr J Simmonds, Mr C Smith, Mrs P Stockell, Mr B Sweetland, Mr M Vye, Mrs C Waters, Mr J Wedgbury, Mrs J Whittle, Mrs Z Wiltshire

Against (14)

Mr M Baldock, Mr M Balfour, Mr C Caller, Mr G Cowan, Dr M Eddy, Mr P Harman, Ms A Harrison, Ms S Howes, Mr B MacDowall, Mrs E Rowbotham, Mr D Smyth, Mr N Thandi, Mr R Truelove, Mr M Whybrow.

Abstain (2)

Mr F McKenna, Mr B Neaves.

Motion carried

(3) RESOLVED that;

- a) the proposed operating framework which sees the deletion of two existing Corporate Director posts and the introduction of two new ones leading to two new Directorates, as recommended by the Personnel Committee be approved;
- b) the new senior level post of Strategic Commissioner reporting to the Head of Paid Service be approved;
- c) revision to the pay and grading structure for the Head of Paid Service and three Corporate Director roles, as set out in section 6 of the report, be approved;
- d) the Monitoring Officer be authorised to make any necessary and consequential changes to the Constitution as outlined in section 4 of this paper; and
- e) the actions and timescale that will result from this decision as outlined in section 8 of this paper be noted.

53. Early Years and School Performance in 2016 - National Curriculum Test and Public Examination Results

(1) Mr Gough moved and Mr Northey seconded the following motion:

“Members of the County Council are asked to note :

- The improvements in the Early Years Foundation Stage.
- The positive outcomes at Key Stages 1, 2, 4 and in A Level and technical qualifications at Post 16.”

(2) Mr Cowan moved and Mr Truelove seconded the following amendment

“Members of the County Council are asked to note :

- The improvements in the Early Years Foundation Stage.
- The positive outcomes at Key Stages 1, 2, 4 and in A Level and technical qualifications at Post 16.
- **The remaining areas of the report that require significant improvement.**

(3) Mr Gough with the approval of his seconder accepted the amendment and, following a debate the amended motion, was agreed without a formal vote.

(4) RESOLVED that the following be noted;

- a) The improvements in the Early Years Foundation Stage.
- b) The positive outcomes at Key Stages 1, 2, 4 and in A Level and technical qualifications at Post 16.
- c) The remaining areas of the report that require significant improvement.

54. Revised Proportionality Calculations and Committee Membership

- (1) The Chairman moved and the Vice-Chairman seconded the following motion:

“The Council is invited to agree that the UKIP Group should give up a seat on 2 of the County Council Committees (except for the Superannuation Fund Committee and the Electoral and Boundary Review Committee).”

- (2) The motion was agreed without a formal vote.

- (3) RESOLVED that the UKIP Group give up a seat on 2 of the County Council Committees (except for the Superannuation Fund Committee and the Electoral and Boundary Review Committee).

(Post meeting note – the UKIP Group gave up one seat on the Governance & Audit Committee and one seat on the Regulation Committee.)

55. Motion for Time Limited Debate - South Eastern Rail Franchise

(Mr McKenna declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and withdrew from the meeting for this item.)

- (1) Mr Balfour proposed and Mr Pearman seconded the following motion:

“This Council welcomes the opportunity the new South Eastern franchise will present, and specifically:

- (1) supports the offer from the Secretary of State for Transport to Kent County Council to play a full and active part in the process of determination of the service specification for the new South Eastern franchise;
- (2) supports the new policy of the Secretary of State for Transport not to approve the transfer of the South Eastern franchise Metro services from the Department for Transport to the Mayor of London;
- (3) expects the new franchise to deliver a significant enhancement to High Speed services on the routes between London St Pancras and Kent;
- (4) expects the new franchise to deliver upgraded rolling-stock and services, with reliability on the Mainline routes between London Charing Cross / Cannon Street / London Bridge / Victoria and Kent;
- (5) expects the new franchise to deliver a higher quality of service, with improved station facilities, improved access for all, cleaner trains and enhanced public information;
- (6) expects the new franchise to offer continued support for the Kent and Sussex Community Rail Partnerships and the rural lines they support.”

- (2) Mr Caller proposed and Mr Smyth seconded the following amendment:

"This Council welcomes the opportunity the South Eastern franchise coming to an end will present, and specifically:

- (1) supports the offer from the Secretary of State for Transport to Kent County Council to play a full and active part in the process of determination of the service specification;
- (2) Kent County Council calls upon the Secretary of State for Transport to bring the South Eastern railway back into public ownership and accountability by re-establishing Directly Operated Rail Limited (DOR) to run it;
- (3) expects the DOR to deliver a significant enhancement to High Speed services on the routes between London St Pancras and Kent;
- (4) expects the DOR to deliver upgraded rolling-stock and services, with reliability on the Mainline routes between London Charing Cross / Cannon Street / London Bridge / Victoria and Kent;
- (5) expects the DOR to deliver a higher quality of service, with improved station facilities, improved access for all, cleaner trains and enhanced public information at a lower cost to both the tax payer and user;
- (6) expects the DOR to offer continued support for the Kent and Sussex Community Rail Partnerships and the rural lines they support."
- (6) expects the DOR to offer continued support for the Kent and Sussex Community Rail Partnerships and the rural lines they support."

(3) Following a debate the Chairman put the amendment as set out in paragraph (2) above to the vote and the voting was as follows:

For (18)

Mr M Baldock, Mr N Bond, Mrs P Brivio, Mr C Caller, Mr B Clark, Mr G Cowan, Dr M Eddy, Mr P Harman, Ms A Harrison, Mr M Heale, Ms S Howes, Mr B MacDowall, Mrs E Rowbotham, Mr T Shonk, Mr D Smyth, Mr N Thandi, Mr R Truelove, Mr M Whybrow.

Against (53)

Mrs A Allen, Mr M Angell, Mr M Balfour, Mr H Birkby, Mr A Bowles, Mr D Brazier, Miss S Carey, Mr P Carter, Mr N Chard, Mrs P Cole, Mr G Cooke, Mrs M Crabtree, Mr A Crowther, Mrs V Dagger, Mr D Daley, Mr M Dance, Mr J Davies, Mr J Elenor, Mrs M Elenor, Mr T Gates, Mr G Gibbens, Mr R Gough, Mr M Harrison, Mr M Hill, Mr C Hoare, Mrs S Hohler, Mr S Holden, Mr P Homewood, Mr M Horwood, Mr A King, Mr J Kite, Mr R Latchford, Mr R Long, Mr G Lymer, Mr S Manion, Mr A Marsh, Mrs D Marsh, Mr M Northey, Mr P Oakford, Mr J Ozog, Mr R Parry, Mr C Pearman, Mr L Ridings, Mr J Scholes, Mr C Simkins, Mr J Simmonds, Mr C Smith, Mrs P Stockell, Mr B Sweetland, Mrs C Waters, Mr J Wedgbury, Mrs J Whittle, Mrs Z Wiltshire

Abstain (4)

Mr R Bird, Mrs T Dean, Mr B Neaves, Mr M Vye.

Amendment lost

(4) Following a debate the Chairman put the motion as set out in paragraph (1) to the vote and the voting was as follows:

For (61)

Mrs A Allen, Mr M Angell, Mr M Baldock, Mr M Balfour, Mr R Bird, Mr H Birkby, Mr N Bond, Mr A Bowles, Mr D Brazier, Miss S Carey, Mr P Carter, Mr N Chard, Mr B Clark, Mrs P Cole, Mr G Cooke, Mrs M Crabtree, Mr A Crowther, Mrs V Dagger, Mr D Daley, Mr M Dance, Mr J Davies, Mrs T Dean, Mr J Elenor, Mrs M Elenor, Mr T Gates, Mr G Gibbens, Mr R Gough, Mr M Harrison, Mr M Hill, Mr C Hoare, Mrs S Hohler, Mr S Holden, Mr P Homewood, Mr M Horwood, Mr A King, Mr J Kite, Mr R Latchford, Mr R Long, Mr G Lymer, Mr S Manion, Mr A Marsh, Mrs D Marsh, Mr B Neaves, Mr M Northey, Mr P Oakford, Mr J Ozog, Mr R Parry, Mr C Pearman, Mr L Ridings, Mr J Scholes, Mr T Shonk, Mr C Simkins, Mr J Simmonds, Mr C Smith, Mrs P Stockell, Mr B Sweetland, Mr M Vye, Mrs C Waters, Mr J Wedgbury, Mrs J Whittle, Mrs Z Wiltshire.

AGAINST (14)

Mrs P Brivio, Mr C Caller, Mr G Cowan, Dr M Eddy, Mr P Harman, Ms A Harrison, Mr M Heale, Ms S Howes, Mr B MacDowall, Mrs E Rowbotham, Mr D Smyth, Mr N Thandi, Mr R Truelove, Mr M Whybrow.

ABSTAIN (0)

Motion carried

RESOLVED that this Council welcomes the opportunity the new South Eastern franchise will present, and specifically:

- (1) supports the offer from the Secretary of State for Transport to Kent County Council to play a full and active part in the process of determination of the service specification for the new South Eastern franchise;
- (2) supports the new policy of the Secretary of State for Transport not to approve the transfer of the South Eastern franchise Metro services from the Department for Transport to the Mayor of London;
- (3) expects the new franchise to deliver a significant enhancement to High Speed services on the routes between London St Pancras and Kent;
- (4) expects the new franchise to deliver upgraded rolling-stock and services, with reliability on the Mainline routes between London Charing Cross / Cannon Street / London Bridge / Victoria and Kent;
- (5) expects the new franchise to deliver a higher quality of service, with improved station facilities, improved access for all, cleaner trains and enhanced public information;
- (6) expects the new franchise to offer continued support for the Kent and Sussex Community Rail Partnerships and the rural lines they support.

26 JANUARY 2017