

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT CABINET COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Environment & Transport Cabinet Committee held in the Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Tuesday, 22 July 2014.

PRESENT: Mrs P A V Stockell (Chairman), Mr M A C Balfour (Vice-Chairman), Mr M Baldock, Mr C W Caller, Mr I S Chittenden, Dr M R Eddy, Mr P M Harman (Substitute for Mr M E Whybrow), Mrs S V Hohler, Mr B E MacDowall, Mr S C Manion (Substitute for Mr A H T Bowles), Mr J M Ozog, Mr C R Pearman (Substitute for Mr M J Harrison), Mr C Simkins and Mr M A Wickham

ALSO PRESENT: Mr D L Brazier and Mr P M Hill, OBE

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr M Austerberry (Interim Corporate Director, Growth, Environment & Transport), Mr S Beaumont (Head of Community Safety and Emergency Planning), Mr J Burr (Director Highways, Transportation & Waste and Principal Director of Transformation), Ms A Carruthers (Transport Strategy - Delivery Manager), Mr P Crick (Director Environment, Planning & Enforcement), Mr R Fitzgerald (Performance Manager), Mr B Haratbar (Head of Programmed Work), Mr F Qadir (Principal Transport Planner - Delivery), Mr J Ratcliffe (Principal Transport Planner - Strategy), Mr A Roach (Planning Policy Manager), Mr M Scrivener (Corporate Risk Manager), Mr R Wilkin (Waste Manager) and Ms A Evans (Democratic Services Officer)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

14. Membership

(Item A1)

The Chairman informed Members that Mr Andrew Bowles had been appointed to the Cabinet Committee to fill the Conservative vacancy.

15. Apologies and Substitutes

(Item A2)

Apologies were received from Mr Bowles, Mr Harrison and Mr Whybrow who were substituted by Mr Manion, Mr Pearman and Mr Harman respectively.

16. Declarations of Interest by Members in items on the Agenda

(Item A3)

No declarations were made.

17. Minutes of the meeting held on 24 April 2014

(Item A4)

(1) Mr Wickham asked if his votes could be shown in the votes relating to Item 7 (13/00095/2 Young Person's Travel Pass and Petitions to extend the Young Person's

Travel Pass to 16-19 year olds and reduce the cost from £100 to £50 for pupils entitled to free school meals).

(2) Subject to this amendment it was RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 24 April 2014 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

18. Christmas & New Year 2013-14 Storms & Floods

(Item C1)

(1) The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport which contained a full review of lessons learned from the Christmas & New Year 2013-14 storms and flooding (and previous severe weather events) and recommendations for how the County Council, in collaboration with its partners, could be better prepared to manage such future events and flood risk. Paul Crick, Director Environment, Planning and Enforcement, and Stuart Beaumont, Head of Community Safety and Emergency Planning, were in attendance to introduce the report and in particular referred to the following:

(2) The storms and floods in the Christmas and New Year period 2013-14 had been particularly severe with the wettest December for 79 years and the highest peak flows ever recorded at the Leigh Barrier. The response from officers had been excellent with many volunteering to help. Many lessons had also been learned.

(3) Although the report focused on the events from 23 December 2013 onwards, reference was also made to the preceding severe weather events on 28 October 2013 (St Jude storm) and 5 & 6 December 2013 (east coast tidal surge).

(4) During the storms and floods 929 properties, both residential and commercial, were flooded in Kent compared to 1000 properties in 2000. Surrey had been the worst hit area of the country with 2,313 properties flooded while Thames Valley had 930, West Sussex had 130 and East Sussex had 97 properties flooded.

(5) 28,500 properties were without power during the storms and floods and 50,000 sandbags were provided to protect at risk communities. Although there is no legal obligation on any organisation to provide sandbags and other practical support (e.g. pumps, dehumidifiers), public expectation was, understandably, to the contrary. This had been exacerbated throughout the response by a general lack of awareness, miscommunications & inconsistency of approaches adopted.

(6) It had been observed that there was a general lack of flood awareness and resilience within communities. For example, in some parts of Kent, 40-50% of the homes and businesses that were at risk of flooding in Kent were not signed-up to the Environment Agency's (EA's) Floodline Warnings Direct (FWD) Service and were unlikely to receive any prior warning of flooding.

(7) In response to questions raised and comments made the Committee received the following further information from officers:

(8) The report made 17 recommendations, 12 relating to the emergency response and 5 around future flood management. Some of these recommendations were

outside KCC's control or remit. With reference to recommendation 13 Cabinet had received assurance of the EA's commitment to work with KCC going forward. The issue with funding schemes was complicated; it was now unlikely that the government through the EA would fund 100% of flood schemes and for many schemes less than 50% was anticipated. Looking into other sources of funding such as community infrastructure levy, development and FDGiA fund was a priority for KCC.

(9) The implementation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) had been delayed by government by approximately nine months and KCC intended to adopt the SuDS sooner.

(10) The Kent Resilience Forum (KRF) was a partnership made up of a number of organisations and agencies including KCC, Kent & Medway Fire & Rescue Authority (KMFRA) and Kent Police based at the KMFRA base in Tovil. The EA and Public Health had also put staff into the KRF and would form the basis for the emergency reservists mentioned in recommendation 2.

(11) It had been decided that, six months on from the event, was the right time for the Committee to receive the report but an update would be brought back to the November meeting.

(12) RESOLVED that the Cabinet Committee endorsed the recommendations outlined in the Action Plan and, once approved, receive further options papers/progress reports on delivery against the Action Plan.

19. Verbal updates

(Item A5)

Community Services

Mr Hill, Cabinet Member for Community Services, gave a verbal update as follows:

Community Safety Annual Conference – 4 June 2014

(1) The 12th annual conference had been convened by the Kent Community Safety Partnership and had been attended by over 150 delegates from all public services and local authorities as well as elected Members.

(2) The theme of the conference this year was the electronic scene and it had focused on the emerging issues around personal and business safety presented by the ever increasing use of the internet, social media and other forms of electronic and web based methods of communication. This was a timely presentation of an ongoing problem and would be revisited at a later date.

Domestic Homicide Reviews

(3) Following changes in the statutory requirements since November 2011 the Community Safety Partnership had taken over responsibility from the Home Office for initiating and undertaking Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs) in response to tragic events across Kent. There had been 10 DHRs since the enactment of the legislation and three Lessons Learnt Seminars had been hosted for the completed DHRs for

frontline practitioners and multi-agencies to share the lessons and recommendations from several reviews. These seminars had involved presentation of the cases from the Independent Chairs and key agencies responses to the recommendations. The events had been very successful, with over 350 attendees and planning was underway for the next seminars in early 2015.

Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel (PCP)

(4) The Channel 4 documentary 'Meet the Commissioner' had resulted in much media and social comment. The PCP had asked the Police and Crime Commissioner, Mrs Barnes, to come and talk to them, which she had done and she would be reporting back to the PCP at its next meeting on her revised engagement strategy and to explain some of the matters which had arisen during the documentary.

Environment & Transport

Mr Brazier, Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport, gave a verbal update as follows:

Highways & Transportation

Major Projects

Poorhole Lane, Thanet – Local Pinch Point Fund Scheme

(5) Jacksons Civil Engineering had been appointed to construct the scheme and had started on site on 23 June. The first sod had been cut on the 3 July and work was due to be completed by 31 May 2015.

North Farm, Tunbridge Wells – Local Pinch Point Fund Scheme

(6) Lafarge Tarmac had been appointed to construct the scheme and had started on site on 14 July. Work on this was also due to be completed by 31 May 2015.

M20 J10a

(7) The Highways Agency (HA) was now actively promoting the full junction scheme including the KCC interim junction scheme to provide better access to Ashford from the M20 and open a new area of the town to economic development. KCC was working with the HA and the Department for Transport (DfT) to reach agreement on the delivery programme, the funding package and the governance required for the full junction scheme.

Strategic Economic Plan

(8) On the 7 July, the Government had announced an investment of £442m in the South East LEP area. Kent and Medway's allocation was £133m and included a commitment of over £68m to start a number of schemes in 2015/16.

(9) Funding had been identified for several major projects including: the A28 Chart Road improvements in Ashford; the M20 J4 Eastern Overbridge widening; the Maidstone Gyrotory Bypass and the Sturry Link Road, Canterbury.

Pothole/Road Repairs

(10) The improved weather throughout April and May had allowed good progress with the weather damage repairs. Work ranged from heavy patching, through small localised areas of resurfacing, to major resurfacing. Rural roads were to be targeted in addition to the strategic road network while roads with areas of heavy patching would be identified for surface treatment in the next financial year.

(11) KCC had been awarded a severe weather fund allocation of £8.6m from the Department of Communities & Local Government (DCLG) in March and an additional £6.3m had been awarded from the DfT following the pothole application. These combined grants had been allocated as follows: £4.7m was to resurface areas of the highway damaged by the weather and £5.5m was to undertake further potholes repairs and heavy patching. The balance had funded pothole repairs caused by the winter storms and other associated weather emergency costs incurred at the start of this calendar year. The funding had to be spent this year and the grant conditions stated that the funding was to complement planned highway maintenance expenditure for 2014/15. Amey had secured additional Small and Medium Enterprises (SME) resources to complete the Find and Fix Campaign funded by KCC at £3m and an additional £3m has been allocated by KCC to undertake an enhanced capital drainage repair programme.

(12) Pothole enquiries had substantially reduced and although similar or lower levels of enquiry were being received than for the same period last year there remained much to do over the summer.

Environment, Planning & Enforcement

Public Rights of Way & Access

(13) £75k had been allocated to deal with winter storm damage from the £8.6m granted from Government at the end of March, however approximately £500k damage had been identified to date plus existing backlogs.

Eco2Mobility

(14) Over 90 professionals from 25 organisations from across Europe came to Sessions House on 19 June to attend Eco2Mobility “The Next Generation”, a workshop focussed on sustainable transport and young people’s attitudes to the great outdoors. Twenty children from local Maidstone schools came to the event to contribute to the discussion around how this issue was affecting childhood wellbeing in the UK. The event was organised by Explore Kent and the Transport Innovations Team.

(15) Mike Austerberry, Corporate Director Growth, Environment & Transport gave a verbal update as follows:

Rail

(16) KCC held its 6th Annual Rail Summit on 30 April 2014. This had been a great success and was attended by Network Rail, South Eastern, Eurotunnel and a wide range of stakeholders.

Trading Standards

(17) Mr Austerberry advised that it may have come to Members attention that the Trading Standards (TS) team had been very visible and active on a number of fronts recently. TS were currently running a project to identify and remove from sale counterfeit and dangerous phone chargers from shops and in working with the Borders Agency and acting in its role as the relevant border control authority for product safety, had seized nearly 1000 chainsaws being imported into the EU via Dover which were believed to be unsafe. Expert technical tests were underway.

(18) TS were also investigating a conspiracy to defraud vulnerable home owners for overpriced and shoddy property repairs, one victim alone had lost over £¼ m. However arrests had been made and KCC's Financial Investigator was currently tracing the money and identifying further victims.

(19) The TS team had been supporting a small local Kent business as a major national retailer attempted to prevent them accessing the market. The local business had been very appreciative of the support.

(20) The latest customer survey shows that 95% of businesses surveyed found the advice given by TS easy to understand, 90% took action as a result of the advice, 90% said that the impact on their business of the advice was positive, 80% rated the advice as highly effective (scored 8 or higher) and all would recommend the service to other businesses.

(21) Looking ahead, the Checkatrade.com partnership with a wide range of Kent based businesses would be officially launched by Bryan Sweetland, Cabinet Member for Commercial and Trader Services, on 10 September outside County Hall. TS was currently vetting over 850 individual businesses ranging from plumbers, builders, roofers and driveway companies in preparation for the launch of this new public/private sector partnership, which aimed to protect consumers from rogue traders, whilst helping legitimate traders to grow. Two information days had been held earlier this month with Kent businesses in Ashford and Maidstone.

Waste Management

(22) The redevelopment of the waste transfer and Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) facility in Sittingbourne continued to move forward and, subject to planning approval, construction work was anticipated to begin in spring 2015.

(23) The team was currently undertaking a review of KCC's effectiveness in relation to its statutory duties and level of partnership engagement regarding fly tipping,.

(24) After several years of falling overall household waste tonnages, there had been a national rise in the first half of 2014. This growth, which was also evident in Kent, was linked to both the improvement in the economy and the very favourable growing

conditions during the mild winter and spring. Despite this overall growth in tonnage, the proportion of overall waste being recycled or composted had remained on target.

(25) RESOLVED that the Cabinet Members' and Corporate Director's verbal updates be noted.

20. 13/00025 Facing the Aviation Challenge

(Item B1)

(1) The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport and the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport which contained the draft discussion document setting out Kent County Council's (KCC) proposed view on how the UK can meet its aviation needs for the. Paul Crick, Director Environment, Planning and Enforcement, and Joe Ratcliffe, Principal Transport Planner – Strategy, were in attendance to introduce the report and in particular referred to the following:

(2) Facing the Aviation Challenge took account of KCC's earlier discussion document 'Bold Steps for Aviation' (May 2012, with revisions in July 2012) and was consistent with KCC's submissions to the Airports Commission between March 2013 and May 2014 proposals for expansion of some existing airports, better utilisation of regional airports, improved accessibility to airports by rail and reform of Air Passenger Duty (APD); as an alternative to a new hub airport in the Thames Estuary, which is strongly opposed. Improvements to the noise environment around airports also formed part of the proposed discussion document.

(3) In 'Facing the Aviation Challenge', KCC recommended to Government:

- The need for correction of the UK's competitive disadvantage in terms of APD.
- The creation of a National Policy Statement (NPS) for airports that supports the growth of existing airports with one net additional runway added in the South East by 2030.
- The NPS should not however, support the development of new airports.
- The NPS should support a phased approach to adding runway capacity to keep pace with demand, therefore allowing existing airports to add additional runway capacity when the need arises, most likely a second net additional runway in the South East by 2050.
- better utilisation of regional airports, especially in the short and medium terms, as this would provide much needed capacity across the South East and bring significant economic benefits to regional economies.
- Investment is needed to improve access to airports; especially rail access and the development of an integrated air-rail transport system that would be beneficial to London and the South East's connectivity to global markets.
- the establishment of an independent noise authority (as recommended by the Airports Commission) and measures be taken to properly measure, minimise and mitigate the noise impacts of existing airport operations and airport expansion.
- Proposals for a new hub airport must not be progressed any further. • In the interests of the national economy, action on these issues is needed now.

(4) Members commented and raised concerns over the lack of reference in the paper to Manston Airport. At the County Council meeting on 17 July 2014 Members

had voted unanimously to explore with Thanet District Council ways in which it could support proposals to retain Manston as an airport.

(5) In response to comments made and questions raised the Committee received the following additional information from officers:

(6) Manston Airport had closed as of May 2014; if it had still been open it would be an asset. As the airport was privately owned the future and fate of the airport was not within KCC's remit.

(7) Heathrow's runways operated at 98.5% capacity at peak periods with Gatwick operating close to this. The Airports Commission's interim report had shortlisted three feasible options for long term solutions to capacity issues along with short and medium term measures to make the best use of existing airport capacity.

(8) The three shortlisted options were:

- a new third runway at Heathrow;
- an extension of one of Heathrow's two runways (to then effectively operate as two separate runways, i.e. provide three runways in total); and
- a new second runway at Gatwick

(9) All three options were currently being appraised and would be subject to national public consultation. Proposals for a new hub airport in or around the Thames Estuary had not been shortlisted in the Airports Commission's interim report. However, the Commission was conducting further feasibility work for an airport on the Isle of Grain and would make a decision as to whether to add this option to the shortlist by September 2014. If shortlisted, the Isle of Grain airport proposal would then be appraised and consulted on in a similar way to the Heathrow and Gatwick options, before the Commission published its final report and recommendation to Government in summer 2015. Facing the Aviation Challenge was strongly opposed to a Thames Estuary/Isle of Grain airport.

(10) High rates of Air Passenger Duty (APD) meant that UK airports were at a competitive disadvantage with other European airports. The Netherlands had abolished APD and Germany had a far lower APD than the UK. In addition to changes in APD at a national level, reductions in APD at regional airports would provide them with a competitive advantage and could lead to the relocation of some short haul leisure flights from congested airports. This would create capacity at Heathrow and Gatwick for more long haul flights, improving the UK's global connectivity, while at the same time improving the viability of regional airports and providing connectivity and economic growth in the regions. Although the Airports Commission had ruled out this type of action in its interim report (December 2013) KCC urged Government to look into this issue again.

(11) KCC advocated the expansion of existing London airports, which would provide an affordable and mainly privately financed solution which could be delivered within the required timescale, i.e. by 2030 when the Airports Commission recommended that one net additional runway in the South East is needed. Heathrow and Gatwick airports had both put forward credible options for expansion which had been shortlisted for appraisal by the Airports Commission.

(12) Better utilisation of regional airport capacity in the South East, such as Lydd Airport, for point to point flights, would complement the main London airports that provide 'hub' operations.

(13) Dr Eddy proposed, Mr Caller seconded that a paragraph in Section 3.4 Better utilisation of existing airports should be amended as follows:

Following its closure as a commercial airport in May 2014, a financially viable and sustainable future must be found for Manston Airport. This should focus on the use of the site for aviation and related services as well as other businesses that can bring jobs and economic growth to East Kent.*

* words underlined have been inserted/changed.

(14) The Cabinet Member accepted this amendment which was agreed by the Committee without a vote.

(15) RESOLVED that, subject to the amendment in paragraph 13 above, the Cabinet Committee endorsed the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to adopt Kent County Council's discussion document on aviation in 'Facing the Aviation Challenge' (July 2014).

21. 14/00076 Position Statement on Development of Large Scale Solar Arrays *(Item B2)*

(1) The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport and the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport which contained a position statement which had been prepared to provide guidance for the consideration of impacts for large scale solar arrays ('solar panel farms'). Paul Crick, Director Environment, Planning and Enforcement, and Andrew Roach, Planning Policy Manager, were in attendance to introduce the report and in particular referred to the following:

(2) Although Districts Councils were the determining authorities for planning applications KCC was a formal consultee and provided advice on matters including the landscape/visual, ecological, historical and agricultural impacts of applications.

(3) The position statement had been prepared to ensure consistency across the county, a number of guiding principles had been set out in a statement to form the basis of KCC views on these applications. It was the intention that the position statement would be considered at the Kent Planning Officers Group (KPOG) in order to achieve ownership from Districts to these key principles and consistent evaluation of impacts across Kent.

(4) In response to comments made and questions raised the Committee received the following additional information from officers:

(5) Climate change was defined by set by a series of government and EU policies including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Climate Change Act 2008 and the EU Renewable Energy Directive.

(6) Regarding the removal of solar PV arrays at the end of their permitted period discussions were underway with borough and districts as to what mechanisms could be put in place to police this. Bonds, financial lock ins or collateral were all options that were being investigated.

(7) Dr Eddy said that paragraph 6.2 of Section 6 Historical Environment could be improved by making a clear distinction between three levels of historical environment as follows:

1. World Heritage Sites
2. Protected monuments of one sort or another, i.e. listed buildings, conservation areas and scheduled monuments; and
3. Archaeological sites and heritage assets

(8) Members were in agreement that the position statement was a step in the right direction and went a long way to supporting borough and districts.

(9) RESOLVED that, subject to the rewriting of paragraph 6.2, the Cabinet Committee endorsed the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to support the policy statement as setting out KCC's position on the assessment of solar arrays and the provision of comments to districts.

22. 14/00056 Thanet Parkway Station – Project Progress

(Item B3)

(1) The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport and the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport which contained for the consideration of the Committee details of the preliminary work carried out to date identifying an engineering feasible site to deliver a Thanet Parkway Station and outlined the key milestones in taking this project forward. Ann Carruthers, Transport Strategy Delivery Manager, and Fayyaz Qadir, Principal Transport Planner - Delivery, were in attendance to introduce the report and in particular referred to the following:

(2) Kent County Council had for a number of years had an aspiration to deliver a parkway station and associated car park in Thanet to operate as a park and ride facility. A parkway station, in conjunction with the rail journey time improvements being implemented between Ashford and Ramsgate, would boost inward investment in Thanet and Dover (including Discovery Park Enterprise Zone) by making it a more attractive location to do business. The connection to London in around an hour as well as the expanded employment catchment area for Thanet and Dover residents would provide a significant economic boost to East Kent.

(3) The optimum location for a parkway station between Minster and Ramsgate stations on the Ashford to Ramsgate line had been identified as immediately to the east of the Cottington Road underbridge .

(4) The preliminary project cost estimate was £14 million and, several weeks previously, £10 million was awarded from the Single Local Growth Fund. Kent County Council has provisionally allocated £2.65 million in the Council's Medium

Term Financial Plan and was working with key partners to fill in any funding gap to deliver this new station.

(5) Thanet District Members had asked whether enhancement to the current station at Ramsgate, in terms of additional car parking spaces, could provide the benefits of a new Parkway station. Four options had been identified but all had challenges and none had any clear future-proof benefits.

(6) An application had been made by the promoter of the Manston Green development but did not include any infrastructure for a parkway station.

(7) RESOLVED that the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport take forward the delivery of Thanet Parkway Station in the location to the west of Cliffsend by:

- a) Commencing land acquisition work;
- b) Undertaking public consultations to support the project development process; and
- c) Undertaking project development work to enable the submission of a planning application and design work for the scheme.

23. 14/00035 Management and Operation of Household Waste Recycling Centres and Transfer Stations contracts

(Item B4)

(1) The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport and the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport which contained information concerning a procurement undertaken by KCC Waste Management to identify providers for the management and operation of Household Waste Recycling Centres and Transfer Stations in Kent Roger Wilkin, Head of Waste Management, was in attendance to introduce the report and in particular referred to the following:

(2) The proposed contracts were required to avoid extensions to existing contracts which would be in breach of Procurement Regulations.

(3) KCC has a statutory responsibility as the Waste Disposal Authority for the disposal of household waste and as such the contracts are a fundamental requirement to ensure waste can be managed cost-effectively and via environmentally sound methods.

(4) Equality Impact Assessments (EqIAs) had been undertaken to inform the contract specification and assess the impacts of the procurement process. Resulting action plans had been implemented to ensure equitable access for Kent householders with regard to protected characteristics. The EqIAs informed the inclusion of equality related mandatory requirements within the tender documents including:

- Designating staff as 'equality champions' for customer care at each facility;
- Ensuring facility signage is clear and appropriate for customers where language and literacy may present as barrier to using the service; and

- All HWRCs are managed in line with KCC's policies including the Disability Access Scheme.
- (5) HWRC and TS facilities would be leased/licensed to the selected providers through KCC Property.
- (6) The proposed contract spend by KCC would be approximately £7.8m per year for an initial period of up to six years, with a possible extension of up to six years based on performance and there was potential to secure financial savings through these new contracts.
- (7) The contracts were for two lots over twelve sites and would be awarded to a maximum of two suppliers.
- (8) RESOLVED that the Committee endorse the award of contracts to the preferred tenderers following completion of the procurement process for the provision of the Management and Operation of Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC) and Transfer Stations (TS) to ensure service continuity.
- a) Lot 2: Mid Kent facilities – 5 HWRCs; 2 TS
 - b) Lot 3: East Kent facilities – 7 HWRCs; 1 TS

24. 14/00085 Highway Resurfacing Contract
(Item B5)

- (1) The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport and the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport which contained details of the countywide Highway Resurfacing Contract which is set out in the 2014/15 Strategic Priority Statements for the Highways, Transportation & Waste Division and follows the established process of market testing this element of highway works on a periodic basis. John Burr, Director of Highways, Transportation and Waste was in attendance to introduce the report and in particular referred to the following:
- (2) A significant part of the annual capital highway works budget is set aside for the delivery of carriageway resurfacing schemes. The principle of procuring the delivery of the Countywide Highway Resurfacing Programme through competitive tendering process was established in 2008 to ensure the maximum benefits from a competitive market's prices. Since then this service has been procured through the market on a regular basis.
- (3) Annually around 35-40km (approx 25miles) of the highway network is resurfaced. This generally consists of removing the top layer of the carriageway surface and replacing it with a new one. This protects the lower construction layers of the carriageway from the elements, reinstates carriageway strength and prolongs its life.
- (4) Following procurement advice it was decided to tender for a single contract to replace the existing two contracts (North and South Kent) as this would result in greater economies of scale. The duration of the new contract is two years with an option for extension by a further two years, on a one year at a time basis (2 + 1 + 1).

(5) Given the value of the contract an OJEU compliant procurement process was followed, twelve potential tenderers expressed an interest and four submitted priced tenders. The tender evaluation process consisted of three elements; initial assessment (Mandatory Questions), quality and price.

(6) In response to questions raised and comments made the Committee received the following further information from officers:

(7) The Eurovia Infrastructure Ltd tender submission represented best value, comparing like for like the costs of delivering the schemes referred to in the new contract and would result in significant savings. Eurovia are an established company, they have provided KCC services in the past and, while considerably cheaper than the previous contract, they were also sustainable.

(8) On average in previous years Highways had resurfaced 4% of the highways network savings made through the award to Eurovia would be utilised to resurface additional road schemes throughout the county.

(9) RESOLVED that the Committee endorse and recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport the approval and award of the Highway Resurfacing Contract 2014-16 to Eurovia Infrastructure Ltd.

25. Environment and Transport Work Programme 2014-15

(Item C2)

(1) The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Head of Democratic Services which contained the Environment and Transport Work Programme for 2014-15

(2) Members requested an update on Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to a future meeting. It was agreed that this would be included in the Storm and Flood update at the meeting on 5 December 2014.

(3) RESOLVED that the Environment and Transport Work Programme 2014-15 be agreed.

26. Performance Dashboard

(Item D1)

(1) The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Cabinet Members for Community Services and Environment and Transport and the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport which contained the Performance Dashboard. Richard Fitzgerald, Performance Manager, was in attendance to introduce the report and in particular referred to the following:

(2) The data within the report was to the end of May 2014. It reflected the Strategic Priority Statements that the Committee had seen at its last meeting and included the new areas of responsibility from the creation of the Growth, Environment & Transport directorate following the top tier realignment.

(3) Highways and Transport Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were mostly green and performance was generally good. Contact from the public had remained high but progress was being made on this as a result of the success of Find and Fix.

(4) Waste Management KPIs were green, an improvement on last year when there had been several amber KPIs. While many of the Environment, Planning and Enforcement KPIs were also green CO₂ emissions from business mileage per FTE, Trading Standards and Kent Scientific Services were all red. In relation to business mileage the report commentary explained that finance staff were selling more services and generating income and ICT staff installing Unified Comms, requiring travel to various sites and the response to storms and floods emergency had required more mileage. The indicators for Trading Standards and Kent Scientific Services fluctuated and could be considered amber rather than red at this stage only two months into the year.

(5) In response to questions raised and comments made the Committee received the following further information from the officer:

(6) HT02: Faults reported by the public completed in 28 calendar days was amber in the month and had gone down. It was also commented that the online fault reporting portal had been down for several days. This indicator was currently at amber largely due to clearing the backlog of faults.

(7) Expected activity levels were based on previous years' trends and were set for the number of contacts and enquiries received from the public. These figures were for works in total and expected activity levels had not been broken down into routine faults reported, potholes and street lighting, although it would be possible to do this in the future. The 100 Call Back Survey for customer satisfaction was a useful tool to understand customer expectations from the service.

(8) KCC aspired not to have any day burner street lighting but, in places such as tunnels, sometimes this was unavoidable. Converting all of the lighting stock to LED was being considered. The feasibility of separating data relating to day burners and other reasons could be investigated if required

(9) RESOLVED that the Environment and Transport Performance Dashboard report be noted.

27. Risk Management – Strategic Risk Register

(Item D2)

(1) The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport and the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport which contained the risks which had been registered in relation to Environment and Transport. Mark Scrivener, Corporate Risk Manager, was in attendance to introduce the report and in particular referred to the following:

(2) The report before the Committee was the annual presentation of directorate level risk register. It featured the five directorate level risks currently featured on the Growth, Environment and Transport Risk Register and which were all relevant to the Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee. Four risks were rated "medium" with a fifth rated "low".

(3) In response to questions raised and comments made the Committee received the following further information from officers:

(4) The list was not meant to be exhaustive; some items potentially affected several functions across the Growth, Environment and Transport directorate, and often had wider potential interdependencies with other services across the Council and external parties.

(5) Each division within the directorates had its own operational risk register.

(6) When levels of risk were deemed unacceptable, 'target' risk levels were set and mitigating actions taken with the aim of reducing the risk to a tolerable and realistic level. A standard reporting format was used to facilitate the gathering of consistent risk information and a 5x5 matrix was used to rank the scale of risk in terms of likelihood of occurrence and impact.

(7) Risk Registers should be regarded as a 'living' document to reflect the dynamic nature of risk management. Directorate Management Teams formally review their risks, including progress against mitigating actions, on a quarterly basis as a minimum, although individual risks can be identified and added to the register at any time. Key questions to be asked when reviewing risks were:

- Are the key risks still relevant?
- Have some risks become issues?
- Has anything occurred which could impact upon them?
- Have the risk appetite or tolerance levels changed?
- Are any related performance/early warning indicators appropriate?
- Are the controls in place effective?
- Has the current risk level changed and if so is it decreasing or increasing?
- Has the "target" level of risk been achieved?
- If risk profiles are increasing what further actions might be needed?
- If risk profiles are decreasing can controls be relaxed?
- Are there risks that need to be discussed with or communicated to other functions across the Council or with other stakeholders?

(8) With reference to Risk ID GET02 Health and Safety considerations and in particular the identification and rectification of crash remedial sites on highways, as with the Road Safety Policy document that had come to the last meeting, the Council was continually looking at new measures to identify and improve this. Work was being undertaken to identify areas which were potentially high risk prior to accidents happening and in this field Kent often led the way. The FIA Foundation International Road Safety Scholarship was hosted in Kent and Prince Michael of Kent had recently presented awards at the House of Lords in recognition of Kent's achievements.

(9) RESOLVED that the report be noted.