

**EDUCATION AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES
CABINET COMMITTEE**

Tuesday, 17th January, 2017

2.00 pm

**Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall,
Maidstone**



AGENDA

EDUCATION AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES CABINET COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 17 January 2017 at 2.00 pm
Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall,
Maidstone

Ask for: **Jemma West**
Telephone: **03000 419619**

Tea/Coffee will be available 15 minutes before the start of the meeting

Membership (16)

Conservative (8): Mr L B Ridings, MBE (Chairman), Mrs P T Cole (Vice-Chairman),
Mr M J Horwood, Mr S C Manion, Mr M J Northey, Mr J M Ozog,
Mr C R Pearman and Mrs P A V Stockell

UKIP (2) Mr L Burgess and Mr T L Shonk

Labour (2) Mr G Cowan and Mr R Truelove

Liberal Democrat (1): Mr M J Vye

Church
Representatives (3) Mr D Brunning, Mr Q Roper and Mr A Tear

Webcasting Notice

Please note: this meeting may be filmed for the live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site or by any member of the public or press present. The Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be filmed by the Council.

By entering into this room you are consenting to being filmed. If you do not wish to have your image captured please let the Clerk know immediately

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)

A - Committee Business

A1 Introduction/Webcast announcement

A2 Apologies and Substitutes

To receive apologies for absence and notification of any substitutes present

A3 Declarations of Interest by Members in items on the Agenda

To receive any declarations of interest made by Members in relation to any matter on the agenda. Members are reminded to specify the agenda item number to which it refers and the nature of the interest being declared

B - Key or Significant Cabinet/Cabinet Member Decision(s) for Recommendation or Endorsement

- B1 16/00114 Proposal to expand Palmarsh Primary School, St Georges Place, Hythe CT21 6NE (Pages 7 - 20)

To receive a report from the Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform and the Corporate Director for Education and Young People's Services, and to consider and endorse or make proposals to the Cabinet Member on the proposed decision to allocate £2.2m from the Education and Young People's Services Capital budget, and to authorise the relevant officers to issue a public notice, enter into any necessary contracts/agreements on behalf of the County Council and to enter into variations as envisaged under the contracts.

- B2 16/00151 - Young Carers Service Commissioning Update (Pages 21 - 26)

To receive a report from the Cabinet Member for Specialist Children's Services and the Corporate Director of Education and Young People's Services, and to consider and endorse or make recommendations to the Cabinet Member on the proposed decision to retrospectively award the contract for the delivery of the Young Carers Service.

C - Other items for comment/recommendation to the Leader/Cabinet Member/Cabinet or officers

- C1 Budget 2017/18 and Medium Term financial plan 2017/20 (Pages 27 - 48)

To receive a report from the Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform, Cabinet Member for Specialist Children's Services, Cabinet Member for Community Services, and Cabinet Member for Finance & Procurement and Deputy Leader which asks the Committee to note the draft budget and Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP), including responses to consultation and Government announcements and invites suggestions on any issues which should be reflected in the documentation.

MOTION TO EXCLUDE PRESS AND PUBLIC FOR EXEMPT BUSINESS

That, under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

- D1 Young Carers Service Commissioning Update (exempt appendices to item B2) (Pages 49 - 232)

Copies of the procurement documents relating to the award of contract for the Young Carers Service.

EXEMPT ITEMS

The Appendices to item C1 were exempt at the time of publishing the agenda but will become public on 12 January when the County Council's draft budget is published.

The papers at D1 will remain exempt

John Lynch,
Head of Democratic Services
03000 410466

Monday, 9 January 2017

Please note that any background documents referred to in the accompanying papers may be inspected by arrangement with the officer responsible for preparing the relevant report.

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Roger Gough, Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform
Patrick Leeson, Corporate Director for Education and Young People's Services

To: Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee – 17 January 2017

Subject: Proposal to expand Palmarsh Primary School, initially to 1 FE, by September 2018

Classification: Unrestricted

Past Pathway of Paper: None

Future Pathway of Paper: Cabinet Member decision

Electoral Division: Hythe (Martyn Whybrow)

Summary: This report sets out the results of the public consultation on the proposal to expand Palmarsh Primary School for September 2018.

Recommendation(s):

The Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee is asked to consider and endorse or make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform on the decision to:

- a) Authorise the Corporate Director - Education and Young People's Services to issue Public Notice to expand Palmarsh Primary School to 1FE, with a published admissions number of 30 from September 2018 (subject to planning permission being granted);
- b) Allocate £2.2m from the Education and Young People's Service Capital budget;
- c) Authorise the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support in consultation with the Director of Governance and Law to enter into any necessary contracts/ agreements on behalf of the County Council; and
- d) Authorise the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support to be the nominated Authority Representative within the relevant agreements and to enter into variations as envisaged under the contracts. Variations to contract value to be no more than 10% above the capital funding agreed by the Cabinet Member without requiring a new Record Of Decision.

Should objections, not already considered by the Cabinet Member when taking this decision, be received during the public notice period a separate decision will be required in order to continue the proposal in order to allow for proper consideration of the points raised.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Martello Lakes development built on the Nickolls Quarry site in Hythe has planning permission for 1050 houses and apartments. As part of the planning agreement for 1050 new homes, the developer is providing a £1.3m financial contribution to the cost of expanding Palmarsh Primary School on its present site. Martello Lakes is located on Dymchurch Road, the entrance being 700m from the proposed new School entrance.

2. Proposal

- 2.1 The proposal under consultation is to expand Palmarsh Primary School, initially to 1FE (210 pupils), with the intention that the School will eventually become 2FE (420 pupils). During the consultation the Local Authority explained that the current proposal will be the first phase of a gradual expansion. This Phase will see the construction of three new classrooms, providing provision for an additional 105 pupils, and the infrastructure needed to allow the School to grow in the future. This will include: a small hall, toilets, a new staffroom, offices, reception and the relocation of the entrance to Jubilee Close in order to create a drop off and pick up area within the School site. Phase 1 will provide provision for 210 pupils in total by September 2018. Phase two will be the construction of a further four classrooms, expanding the School to 1.5FE. Forecasts would suggest that this will be no earlier than 2020. The final phase will be the construction of the 3 classrooms needed to allow the School to expand to 2FE. This final phase of construction will be dependent on the rate of house building. Consultations on expanding the School further will be initiated as appropriate.
- 2.3 This report sets out the results of the public consultation, which took place between 12 September 2016 and 10 October 2016. A public meeting was held on 19 September 2016.

3. Financial Implications

- 3.1
- a. Capital –A feasibility study has been completed and the design has been developed. The estimated cost of the first phase of the expansion is in the region of £2.2m. The developer is contributing £1.3m towards the expansion with KCC providing the residual funding from the Education and Young People’s Services Capital budget.
 - b. Revenue - The School will receive increased funding through the Delegated Budget. The rising roles will be protected in line with KCC Growth Funding Policy. Revenue funding will also be allocated to enable the School to resource each new classroom as they come on line. At present that is at a value of £6,000 per classroom.
 - c. Human – The School will appoint additional staff as required, as the School size increases and the need arises.

4. Vision and Priorities for Improvement

- 4.1 These proposals will help to secure our ambition that “Every child and young person should go to a good or outstanding early years setting and school” as set out in Vision and Priorities for Improvement 2016-2019.
- 4.2 The Commissioning Plan for Education Provision in Kent 2016-20 identified the need to commission the extra provision in the Hythe area. The Plan mentioned a specific need to expand Palmarsh School by up to 1 FE.

5. Consultation Outcomes

- 5.1 A total of 17 written responses were received. A summary of the comments received is provided at Appendix 1.
- 5.2 A summary of the views and comments given at the public consultation meeting is attached at Appendix 2.
- 5.3 An Equality Impact Assessment has been completed as part of the consultation. To date no comments have been received and no changes are required to the Equality Impact Assessment.

6. Views

- 6.1 The view of the Local Members:
Cllr Martin Whybrow- Member for Hythe and a Palmarsh School Governor

The plan to extend Palmarsh Primary School is sensible, given the clear expected additional demand for school places, largely from the development at Nickolls Quarry/Martello Lakes. There is adequate space to do so within the current School boundaries, while still retaining sufficient open space for the pupils.

The delay to the housing development is a concern, in relation to planning the School expansion, so will need to be monitored.

The change of main entrance also looks sensible, providing adequate adaption of the junction and other road infrastructure is made to accommodate this. Given the problems turning onto and crossing the Dymchurch Road, strong consideration should be given for traffic lights at the junction with Jubilee Close.

Clearly, we also want to encourage as many children as possible to walk, cycle and use public transport to get to and from School. As such, I believe it is now essential to implement a pedestrian crossing at the bus stop on the Dymchurch Road to allow safe crossing of this ever more busy road (with, of course, the new homes further adding to traffic volumes) and this should be an integrated part of the School expansion plans.

In addition, I would like the new development to be as energy efficient and environmentally friendly as possible, ideally to passivhaus standards. There are excellent case studies now from around the Country of passivhaus school developments that are no more expensive than traditional developments but with much lower running costs after construction. The planned extension is sufficiently detached from the existing buildings to make passivhaus viable and Palmarsh Primary School could become a flagship for sustainable development. Refitting of the existing buildings, including LED lighting, as part of the project – as I believe is planned – would also be welcome.

- 6.2 The view of the Headteacher and Governing Body:

Mrs Sara Wakefield- Headteacher:

As Headteacher of Palmarsh Primary School I welcome the expansion of this good, well respected, community school. We currently have 134 pupils on role and facilities to house these children is inadequate. We use a mobile and have just bought an extra wooden building to run interventions. Children, parents and staff deserve a wonderful new building and look forward to its opening in September 2018.

Mrs Kenza Bowman- Chair of Governors

On behalf of the Governing Body of Palmarsh School I am pleased to say we support the expansion of the School as proposed by Kent County Council.

- 6.3. The view of the Area Education Officer:
Palmarsh Primary School is an increasingly popular school, currently catering for 134 pupils rather than the 105 it would ordinarily have on roll. This proposal will provide much needed additional primary places as the development at Martello Lakes rolls out. Concerns have been raised around increased traffic due to the expansion and the proposed drop off-pick up facility being served from Jubilee Close. Prior to the consultation KCC Highways colleagues were consulted and agreed that the new entrance through Jubilee Close, with appropriate highways modifications to the Jubilee Close carriageway and junction with the A259, was the best option. Highways colleagues will be consulted when planning consent is sought and we will work with them should any amendments to the proposal be required.

7. Delegation to Officers

- 7.1 The Officer Scheme of Delegation; under Appendix 2 part 4 of the Council's Constitution, provides a clear and appropriate link between this decision and the actions needed to implement it. For information it is envisaged, if the proposal goes ahead, that the Director of Property & Infrastructure Support will sign contracts on behalf of the County Council.

8. Conclusions

- 8.1 This expansion will provide additional primary places in Shepway.

9. Recommendation(s)

Recommendation(s): The Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee is asked to consider and endorse or make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform on the decision to:

- a) Authorise the Corporate Director - Education and Young People's Services to issue Public Notice to expand Palmarsh Primary School to 1FE, with a published admissions number of 30 from September 2018 (subject to planning permission being granted);
- b) Allocate £2.2m from the Education and Young People's Service Capital budget;
- c) Authorise the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support in consultation with the Director of Governance and Law to enter into any necessary contracts/ agreements on behalf of the County Council; and
- d) Authorise the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support to be the nominated Authority Representative within the relevant agreements and to enter into variations as envisaged under the contracts. Variations to contract value to be no more than 10% above the capital funding agreed by the Cabinet Member without requiring a new Record Of Decision.

10. Background Documents

10.1 Vision and Priorities for Improvement

<http://www.kent.gov.uk/about-the-council/strategies-and-policies/education-skills-and-employment-policies/vision-and-priorities-for-improvement>

10.2 Commissioning Plan for Education Provision in Kent 2015-19

<http://www.kent.gov.uk/about-the-council/strategies-and-policies/education-skills-and-employment-policies/education-provision-plan>

10.3 Consultation Document and Equalities Impact Assessment.

<http://www.kent.gov.uk/education-and-children/schools/school-consultations>

11. Contact details

Report Author:

- David Adams
- Area Education Officer – South Kent
- 03000 414989
- david.adams@kent.gov.uk

Relevant Director:

- Keith Abbott
- Director of Education Planning and Access
- 03000 417008
- keith.abbott@kent.gov.uk

Proposal to expand Whitfield Aspen School

Summary of Written Responses

Printed Consultation Documents distributed: 240
 Consultation responses received:

A summary of the responses received showed:

	In Favour	Opposed	Undecided	Totals
Governors	2			2
Staff	2			2
Parents	8		2	10
Pupils				
Resident			1	1
Other	1		1	2
Totals	13		4	17

Comments in favour of the proposal:

- It will benefit the local school which is currently established. It will develop it into a better, newer environment for the present pupils.
- I have worked in the school for 4 years and the growth that I have seen has been vast from 76 pupils to 130. An increase in size is urgently needed as so many families wish to come to our School. When the quarry houses are built there will not be any room for the pupils. The expansion needs to come sooner than later.
- Really positive for the area and new families moving into Hythe.
- I attended Palmarsh School as have my children and my nieces and nephews. I am a huge supporter of Palmarsh and recommend the School to the parents attending the nursery I run.
- I feel that with the growing demand for places in the School due to its excellent reputation and the increase of residents in the area, the expansion will be the best solution.
- Having more classrooms and better parking will ensure the future of our local School. It is a practical and realistic plan for the growing population.

Concerns raised:

- I would like to be assured that the works will not affect the day to day running of the School.
- My children are looking forward to the expansion though they do not want to lose much of their playing field and the trees within the grounds.
- My only concern is whether the same level of pupil care could be kept up with a larger student base. We chose Palmarsh because of the air of friendliness from pupils and teachers alike.
- Is the School ready for expansion? The School has not long been graded Ofsted good, which in education is seen as perfectly acceptable. However, the report did highlight inconsistencies in teaching and clearly states that some leaders and new teachers have not had enough time to fully develop themselves and as a result of that pose a risk to the ability to improving the outcomes of children.
- We chose Palmarsh for our son due to the small class sizes and location. Whilst it is a shame the School is set to become significantly larger by the time his younger sister attends we recognise there is an increased need. My Biggest concern is access. The current situation is hazardous and has a huge impact on

residents. The alternative being suggested is no better. Perhaps the School could use green space to build a single road routing cars through Jubilee Close, behind the School and out of the current route.

- There are a few concerns I feel need to be answered prior to the expansion of Palmarsh Primary School being given the go-ahead. My seminal concern is for the safety of the children travelling to and from school. St George's Place is a small residential road which leads to Palmarsh Primary. I do not feel this road is capable of coping with the extra traffic that would pass through if the expansion took place. As a former resident of St George's Place I often found leaving the house at school times impractical due to cars mounting pavements right the way to the top of the road often blocking access to the driveway of the house. With the extra students where would the additional vehicles park? The School already lacks the facilities to cope with pick up times traffic. Additionally, with the parked cars on the pavements it makes it difficult for parents with prams and children to stay on the pavement; they often have to walk in the road. On numerous occasions during my time at the address I witness cars driving inappropriately to and from the School; which obviously poses a danger to the children. Would there be traffic calming measures put into place to alleviate this issue? For example speed bumps? As a former resident I would not have opposed to them.
- The main road near the School is highly dangerous, a disaster waiting to happen. There is an urgent need for a crossing which will be even greater if the planned expansion goes ahead.
- It is acknowledged no traffic study has taken place before the provisional plans have been completed. This prevents any real discussion on the depth of the danger to residents and school children. When discussing the traffic study with the private company (Mouchel) represented at the pre-consultation meeting it was unfortunate that no criteria or methodology had been established. This suggests that a traffic study supporting the changes will be a simple extrapolation based on existing traffic and multiplying by the increase percentage of pupils. Previous experience of traffic studies would suggest that the traffic is likely to be between 3 and 4 times the amount for doubling the number of pupils. If the ultimate aim is to reach 3.5 the number of pupils then the traffic could reach more than 10 times the present number of vehicles presently used.
- Jubilee Close is situated on an outside bend when traffic approaches from the east and a meandering A259 when approached from the West. Therefore the entrance is blind to traffic from the East unless they are within 50m. Jubilee Close is partially blind from the West but generally safer though the speeding traffic from the East necessitates the utmost care and consideration when crossing traffic turning into the close from the West. The expected increase in the numbers of vehicles using Jubilee Close as the main entrance and exit would render it unsafe without several extensive measures. Parking restrictions are totally invalid unless enforced and the worst offenders are busy Mothers and Fathers who are "only taking a few seconds" to drop off their children. Pickup parking would appear to extend for an average of over 5 minutes will further impede the view of Jubilee Close and making it even more dangerous.
- The drop off zone within the School grounds is less than one third of the size required to alleviate the expected numbers of vehicles ensuring three point turns into the drives of residents or five point turns in the road way adding the traffic congestion and rising levels of car rage leading to risk taking on leaving drivers.
- The proposed ending of double yellow lines in Jubilee Close before reaching the school gates will cause congestion though continuing the lines will require strict enforcement. As this is KCC land it is unlikely to be anything other than a "nuisance" civilian offence. It is therefore essential that the road be designated as a public highway and all responsibility accepted by the appropriate bodies including the Police.

- I would recommended that consideration be given to creating an In/Out concept based on Jubilee Close being designated as the "in" and St Georges Place as the "out". This directs the traffic to the safer egress from St Georges as well as the bus stop adjacent to St Georges.

**Consultation on a Proposal to expand Palmarsh Primary School
from 0.5FE to 1FE (210 pupils)**

Monday 19 September 2016

5.00pm at Palmarsh Primary School, St George's Place, Hythe, Kent CT21 6NE

In Attendance:	Mrs Sara Wakefield	SW	Headteacher
	Mrs Kenza Bowman	KB	Chair of Governors
	David Adams	DA	Area Education Officer (SK) - KCC

Purpose of the Meeting

To explain the proposal to expand Palmarsh Primary School from 0.5FE to 1FE. SW welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Kenza Bowman – Chair of Governors and David Adams, Area Education Officer. DA explained the proposal in detail.

Name	Comment	Response
Mike Wallis – Resident Jubilee Close	MW - noted that the plans were comprehensive and understood the difficulties of expansion and the cost of relocation. I agree that it makes sense to expand the School. I am concerned regarding the access. It is not possible to complete a traffic study as Martello Lakes is not complete – you cannot base this on the current flow. The first year will not be so significant, but you have to think about the future – you can't put a plan together without a traffic study and that can't be done currently. It would make sense to have one entrance in and one entrance out – no traffic turning around. The most obvious solution would be Jubilee Close as the way in and St George's Place as the way out and for pedestrian traffic. This could be a compromise, safer for the children and the motorist. It is important to consider the volume of traffic now, future volume and have methodology and plans. You can't make plans/decisions without the traffic study	DA – Thank you for your comments. This is a proposal and we are consulting to gather views. A route through the School was considered during the feasibility stage but it was decided it may not necessarily be the right solution, partially due to cost and difficulties getting through the site i.e. trees, drains and nurseries. We may revisit that option but it was not our preferred option and not the one we are consulting on. We will work to the requirements of the Highways Authority. We hold information on traffic flow on the main road, traffic around the School, the School's Travel Plan, proportion of youngsters that currently walk to school. There is an intention to have footpath access from Martello Lakes into Hythe and hopefully this will encourage people to walk. This issue will go through the planning process.

	support these.	
	Can you assure me that you won't just do a simple extrapolation on how to manage the traffic?	DA – The design team will have transport consultants who will deal with that.
	Can we as residents have copies of the planning details?	DA – Anything that gets submitted through the planning process is a public document. I am happy to ask the consultants to have a conversation with residents if required.
Peter Ridley – Resident St George's Place	As residents of St George's Place we have had to put up with all the traffic and now there will be more houses. I am happy for the School to expand; it's great for the children. As for the infrastructure it's mind boggling around St George's Place. I rent a garage and there are certain times of the day when I can't get the car in or out. There is no regard for residents. The road is crumbling and the kerbs have all dipped down. You're going to do some road repairs in Jubilee Close it would be nice if you looked at St George's Place. Something has to happen.	DA – KCC recognise there is new housing and the School needs to expand to provide sufficient pupil places. Through the Developer Contribution Agreements we are bound to spend that money here or we give it back. The issue is around the access and we need to try and improve the situation as best we can, we can't avoid more cars – this is a daily problem for most people. We need to get the traffic off the road, deliver pupils to school safely and then get the traffic back on the road. This is the Highways priority. I can't pretend there will not be issues. It is unlikely we will fund road repairs to St George's Place.
Ernie Winter	What about Dymchurch Road? Are there going to be any lights or crossings? It's a dangerous road. There's a bus stop on the other side – it's a major road	
Keith Miles - Councillor	<i>Following on from previous question:</i> As a local councillor we are discussing this at the moment. We have put a bid in for a pedestrian crossing down by the Prince of Wales pub as there are a lot of elderly people who get off the bus there and try to cross. It's the famous saying 'No one has died yet' – that's the reality. I have a submission for a crossing point at Prince of Wales, but we've also said that we need one up by the School for the expansion. This has been flagged	DA – From an education perspective we are discussing whether the School should grow but unfortunately we are not sat here with a pot of money that can sort out issues in the locality generally. If there is an existing issue and we can collectively come together, we would try to do that but I can't promise to solve all existing issues or find funding for these. DA – yes. We can keep the School

	<p>a necessity.</p> <p>What route will construction traffic use – will it use Jubilee Close?</p>	<p>contained and functioning around it.</p>
Ernie Winter	<p>How many cars will the new car park cater for?</p> <p>The extra cars will be blocking the main road trying to get in.</p>	<p>DA – I'm not sure but if you leave a name and number we can get back to you.</p> <p>DA – there will be a number of spaces in the middle for visitors etc. The flow of traffic is easier in the morning as parents drop off children, the afternoon presents more of an issue as parents and children all try to get to the same place at the same time. It is however an easier point in the day for Highways to manage as there are not the traffic flows to work. There will be localised pressures and we accept this. There is no easy solution. We try to encourage people to walk, use walking buses, work with the School.</p>
<p>The meeting closed at approximately 17.40pm. Two further people arrived as the meeting wound up. David Adams, Lee Round, Sara Wakefield and Kenza Bowman stayed to discuss the proposal with Nigel Tarry and Jo Giles. DA outlined the proposal. Notes from that meeting are below.</p>		
Joe Giles - Parent	<p>What would trigger the next growth of the School? Would the LA wait for the School to become overloaded?</p>	<p>DA: The market will dictate the rate of house building in Martello Lakes. The LA will work with the School to monitor applications and admission rates into Palmarsh Primary School and when numbers show that a further expansion is needed, we will go out to consultation.</p>
Nigel Tarry – Resident Jubilee Close	<p>I live on the corner of Jubilee Close. There is a lack of visibility along the Dymchurch Road. If the entrance via Jubilee Close goes ahead people will park on the Dymchurch Road and this will stop the flow of traffic.</p>	<p>DA: The consultation will consider if any parking restrictions will help to improve traffic flow. Options to change the Junction at Jubilee Close are being explored.</p>
Nigel Tarry	<p>I have to back out of my property onto the Dymchurch Road so any changes will affect me. The Dymchurch Road will be busier when the new development is on line making the traffic situation worse. Why did the proposal to have the School on the</p>	<p>DA: When the developer contributions were agreed the number of pupils at Palmarsh School was around 49. Therefore there was capacity available in the district. This led to the decision to request developer contributions to be put forward to Palmarsh School.</p> <p>KB: Traffic in the morning will not be as bad due to the staggered times that</p>

	Martello Lakes site get rejected?	pupils arrive at the School.
Nigel Tarry	Money needs to be used to improve the Dymchurch Road.	DA: The LA recognises that all schools have parking issues and the LA needs to manage the expansion in the best possible way. We are guided by Highways and the Design Team will have an ongoing debate with Highways about sightlines and speeds in the area. If Highways have concerns then we may need to look at the options again.
Nigel Tarry	Jubilee Close will get blocked. It will only take 20 or 30 cars using the drop off and pick up to do this and the cars will then be queuing onto the Dymchurch Road.	DA: We recognise that the proposal will impact on the residents of Jubilee Close. The LA Project Manager will speak with you to discuss the way the proposal impacts on you directly.
Nigel Tarry	There is a local school with a drop off and pick up that gets crowded.	DA: The school is St Augustine's PS. It is a Catholic school and traditionally families will travel further to attend a faith school such as this. Therefore there may be more families travelling by car. At Palmarsh, generally the pupils will live closer and be more likely to walk.
Nigel Tarry	If the proposal goes ahead parents will park on the coast side of the Dymchurch Road and cross that busy road to get to the School. This could lead to an accident. The turn into Jubilee Close will be a dangerous junction.	DA: We would appreciate suggestions from residents about how they would see parking restrictions working.

8 people attended the meeting.

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL – PROPOSED RECORD OF DECISION

DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY:

Roger Gough,

Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform

DECISION NO:

16/00114

For publication

Subject: Proposal to expand Palmarsh Primary School, initially to 1 FE, by September 2018

Decision:

As Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform I agree to:

- a) Authorise the Corporate Director - Education and Young People's Services to issue Public Notice to expand Palmarsh Primary School to 1FE, with a published admissions number of 30 from September 2018 (subject to planning permission being granted);
- b) Allocate £2.2m from the Education and Young People's Service Capital budget;
- c) Authorise the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support in consultation with the Director of Governance and Law to enter into any necessary contracts/ agreements on behalf of the County Council; and
- d) Authorise the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support to be the nominated Authority Representative within the relevant agreements and to enter into variations as envisaged under the contracts. Variations to contract value to be no more than 10% above the capital funding agreed by the Cabinet Member without requiring a new Record Of Decision.

Should objections, not already considered by me when taking this decision, be received during the public notice period a separate decision will be required in order to continue the proposal and allow for a proper consideration of the points raised.

Reason(s) for decision:

The Commissioning Plan for Education Provision in Kent (2016-20) sets out the intention to commission additional school places in the Hythe area of Shepway. The Plan also mentioned a specific need to expand Palmarsh School by up to 1 FE.

In reaching this decision I have taken into account:

- The need for extra school places required in Hythe as the 1050 houses are built in the Martello Lakes development.
- The views expressed by those attending the public consultation meeting on 19 September 2016, and those put in writing in response to the consultation;
- The views of the local County Councillor, Area Education Officer; Headteacher and Governing Body of Palmarsh Primary School;
- The Equalities Impact Assessment and comments received regarding this; and
- the views of the Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee which are set out below

Financial Implications

- a) Capital – The enlargement of the School requires the provision of additional classrooms, as well as ancillary facilities in preparation for further development. The total estimated cost of the expansion is likely to be in the region of £2.2m.
- b) Revenue - The School will receive increased funding through the Delegated Budget. The rising roles will be protected in line with KCC Growth Funding Policy. Revenue funding will also be allocated to enable the School to resource each new classroom as they come on line. At present that is at a value of £6,000 per classroom.
- c) Human – The School will appoint additional staff as required, as the School size increases and the need arises.

Cabinet Committee recommendations and other consultation:

To be added after Committee meeting

Any alternatives considered:

Any interest declared when the decision was taken and any dispensation granted by the Proper Officer:

.....

.....

Signed

Date

From: Peter Oakford, Cabinet Member for Specialist Children's Services
Patrick Leeson, Corporate Director of Education and Young People's Services

To: Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee – 17 January 2017

Subject: Young Carers Service Commissioning Update

Key decision: The contract award for the Young Carers Service is regarded as a key decision as it affects more than 2 Electoral Divisions and involves expenditure of > £1million over the life of the contract

Past pathway of paper: Commissioning intentions for the Young Carers Service were considered within the Early Help Commissioning Intentions Report at Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee, 18th September 2015 and Cabinet, 12th October 2015

Future pathway of paper: Cabinet Member Decision

Classification: Unrestricted

Electoral Division: All

Summary:

A recent review of governance in the procurement of Early Help and Preventative Services contracts has identified the need to complete some actions to ensure full compliance with Kent County Council's governance process.

Early Help and Preventative Services procured a Young Carers Service in March 2016. The purpose of the service was to provide direct support to young carers and their families and raise awareness and train the wider workforce that come into contact with young carers.

Recommendation(s):

The Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee is asked to: Consider the report and endorse or make a recommendation to the Cabinet Member on the proposed decision to:

- a) retrospectively make the award of the contract for the Young Carers Service to IMAGO COMMUNITY with the total lifetime value (i.e. 36 + 12 months) of £1,316,550.73, as set out in the Approval to Award Report (attached as Appendix 1 of item D1 on this agenda); and

b) delegate the extension of the contract after three years to the Corporate Director Patrick Leeson (as Corporate Director for Education and Young People's Services), in consultation with the Cabinet Member.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report seeks to ensure full compliance with Kent County Council governance for the award of the Young Carers Service contract. This service is currently providing support to children and young people and Kent County Council is paying for this service; the report is to satisfy the governance arrangements for this contract.
- 1.2 The Council has a statutory obligation to provide for support for young carers; under the Children and Families Act 2014 and the Care Act 2014, Local Authorities must 'take reasonable steps to identify the extent to which there are young carers within their area who have needs for support' and are responsible for 'assessing whether a young carer within their area has needs for support and, if so, what those needs are'.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Early Help Commissioning Intentions for 2016/17 recognise that a new Young Carers Service could play a critical role in strengthening open access services and support for young people, thereby reducing demand for more intensive, specialist and costly services.
- 2.2 The Early Help and Preventative Services Commissioning Intentions for 2016/17 were approved via the following governance route:
- Portfolio Board – 25 June 2015;
 - CAB – 22 July 2015 & September 2015;
 - DIVMT – Various;
 - Education Cabinet Committee - 18 September 2015;
 - Corporate Board – 28 September 2015; and
 - Full Cabinet Committee – 12 October 2015.
- 2.3 At the time of contract award Florence Kroll, former Director of Early Help and Preventative Services, was the budget holder. Stuart Collins, interim Direct of Early Help and Preventative Services is now the budget holder.
- 2.4 The Procurement Plan for the Young Carers Service was agreed at Procurement Board on 25 November 2015 (attached as Appendix 2 of item D1 on this agenda). The procurement route was an open tender exercise. As the required service can be categorised under Schedule 3 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and as the value of the required service does exceed the higher threshold of €750,000 (£589,148 sterling equivalent), the Council had to advertise the opportunity on the Official Journal of the European Union ('OJEU').

- 2.5 Following an open tender procurement exercise, the authority to award the Young Carers Service contract was delegated to Peter Oakford as Cabinet Member for Specialist Children’s Services. However this decision was outside of the Education and Young Peoples Services Cabinet Committee and therefore a formal record of the decision to delegate authority to Peter Oakford is not available.
- 2.6 Imago, the Contractor for the Young Carers Service fully mobilised upon contract award and has been delivering the Contract in full since and as per the service specification since the 01 May 2016. Imago has been paid for the delivery of the Young Carers Service monthly in arrears since contract commencement in line with the payment schedule in the contract.

3. Financial Implications

3.1 The total lifetime (i.e. 36 + 12 months) value of the contract is **£1,316,550.73**.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	+ Year 4
Mobilisation	£1,430.00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Direct Support for Young Carers	£268,480.88	£295,271.76	£295,271.76	£295,271.76
Workforce Development	£56,459.52	£43,938.81	£30,213.12	£30,213.12
Total:	£326,370.40	£339,210.57	£325,484.88	£325,484.88

3.2 There are no specific financial implications attached to this contract. Budget savings were not attached to this contract in recognition of the need for a service with additional capacity to provide workforce development as well as direct support to young carers to ensure Kent County Council remains in compliance with the legislative requirement within the Care Act 2014 and the Children’s and Families Act 2014 to “take reasonable steps to identify the extent to which there are young carers within their area who have needs for support” and “assessing whether a young carer has needs for support, and if so what those needs are”.

4. Legal implications

- 4.1 Kent County Council has a statutory responsibility as defined within the Care Act 2014 and the Children and Families Act 2014 to “take reasonable steps to identify the extent to which there are young carers within their area who have needs for support” and “assessing whether a young carer has needs for support, and if so what those needs are”.
- 4.2 Imago, the contractor, is continuing to deliver the Young Carers Service as per the contract and is being paid by Kent County Council accordingly. However the Young Carers Service contract remains unsealed and in order to protect both the contractor and the Council, action is required to enable the legal sealing of the contract.

5. Equalities implications

- 5.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken and it has determined that awarding the Young Carers Service contract would have a low impact on service users with protected characteristics.

6. Other corporate implications

- 6.1 There are no further corporate implications, other than those outlined above, relating to the need to ensure the Young Carers Service contract is sealed.

7. Conclusions

- 7.1 Following a competitive procurement process, the Kent Young Carers Service contract was awarded in March 2016, with a contract commencement date of 01 May 2016. Peter Oakford, Cabinet Member for Specialist Children's Services, was awarded authority to award. The signed copy of the Approval to Award Report is attached as Appendix 3 of item D1 on this agenda. However, due to an administrative error the full governance route was not followed. A retrospective formal decision is now required before Kent County Council legal services can seal the contract.

8. Recommendation(s)

The Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee is asked to:

Consider the report and endorse or make a recommendation to the Cabinet Member on the proposed decision to:

a) retrospectively make the award of the contract for the Young Carers Service to IMAGO COMMUNITY with the total lifetime value (i.e. 36 + 12 months) of £1,316,550.73, as set out in the Approval to Award Report (attached as Appendix 1 of item D1 on this agenda); and

b) delegate the extension of the contract after three years to the Corporate Director Patrick Leeson (as Corporate Director for Education and Young People's Services), in consultation with the Cabinet Member.

9. Background Documents

10. Contact details

Report Author:
Julie Street, Commissioning Officer
03000 416737
Julie.street@kent.gov.uk

Relevant Director:
Stuart Collins, Interim Director of Early
Help and Preventative Services
03000 410519
Stuart.collins@kent.gov.uk

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL – PROPOSED RECORD OF DECISION

DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY:

Peter Oakford

Cabinet Member for Specialist Children's Services

DECISION NO:

16/00151

For publication**Key decision: YES**

The award of the contract for the Young Carers Service is regarded as a key decision as it affects more than 2 Electoral Divisions and involves expenditure of > £1million over the life of the contract.

Award of Contract for the Young Carers Service**Decision:**

As Cabinet Member for Specialist Children's Services, I propose to agree to:

Retrospectively make the award of the contract for the Young Carers Service to IMAGO COMMUNITY with the total lifetime value (i.e. 36 + 12 months) of **£1,316,550.73**, as set out in the Approval to Award Report (attached as Appendix 1 of item D1 on this agenda)

I further delegate the extension of the contract after three years to the Corporate Director, Patrick Leeson (as Corporate Director for Education and Young People's Services), in consultation with the Cabinet Member

Governance:

The Executive Scheme of Delegation for Officers set out in Appendix 2 Part 4 of the Constitution (and the directorate schemes of sub-delegation made thereunder) provides the governance pathway for the implementation of this decision by officers as it assumes at 1.9 of the scheme that once a Member-level decision has been taken, the implementation of that decision will normally be delegated to officers, so that multiple Member decisions are not required in respect of the same matter. In this instance, the Commissioning Officer will be the lead officer seeking to ensure that all such steps as are necessary to implement the decision are undertaken.

Reason(s) for decision:

The Early Help Commissioning Intentions for 2016/17 recognise that a new Young Carers Service could play a critical role in strengthening open access services and support for young people, thereby reducing demand for more intensive, specialist and costly services. The Commissioning Intentions outlined the Council's intention to commission a new Young Carers Service to identify, assess and support young carers. The Young Carers Service should increase awareness and the identification of young carers and address the complex personal and social needs for young carers and improve their quality of life.

Furthermore Council has a statutory obligation to provide for support for young carers. Under the Children and Families Act 2014 and the Care Act 2014, Local Authorities must 'take reasonable steps to identify the extent to which there are young carers within their area who have needs for support' and are responsible for 'assessing whether a young carer within their area has needs for

support and, if so, what those needs are'.

Following an open tender procurement exercise, the authority to award the Young Carers Service contract was delegated to Peter Oakford as Cabinet Member for Specialist Children's Services. However this decision was outside of the Education and Young Peoples Services Cabinet Committee and therefore a formal record of the decision to delegate authority to Peter Oakford is not available.

Since the 01 May 2016 the contract has been in place and has been delivered in full. Imago has been providing direct support to young carers and has also undertaken training and workforce development in line with the service specification. The contractor has been paid monthly in arrears as specified for the delivery of the contract

Cabinet Committee recommendations and other consultation:

The proposed decision will be discussed by the Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee on 17 January 2017 and the outcome of that meeting included in the decision paperwork which the Cabinet Member will be asked to sign when taking the decision.

Any alternatives considered and rejected:

None. An open tender exercise was undertaken to procure the Young Carers Service in line with the Procurement Plan agreed at the Procurement Board of the 25 November 2015

Any interest declared when the decision was taken and any dispensation granted by the Proper Officer:

.....
signed

.....
date

From: Roger Gough, Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform

Peter Oakford, Cabinet Member for Specialist Children's Services

Mike Hill, Cabinet Member for Community Services

John Simmonds, Cabinet Member for Finance & Procurement and Deputy Leader

To: Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee – 17 January 2017

Subject: **Draft 2017-18 Budget and 2017-20 Medium Term Financial Plan**

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: County Council debated the authority's Autumn Budget Statement on 20th October. The Autumn Budget Statement report set out an update to the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) for 2017-18 and 2018-19 including progress on proposals to close the unidentified budget gap in the original plan. County Council reaffirmed the role of Cabinet Committees in scrutinising the budget. This report is designed to accompany the final draft 2017-18 Budget and 2017-20 MTFP published on 12th January. The report is exempt until these drafts are published. The report provides further detail on the key assumptions which underpin the budget proposals and savings relevant to the remit of the Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee. The report also includes information from KCC's budget consultation, the Chancellor's Autumn Budget Statement and provisional local government finance settlement.

Recommendation(s)

The Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee is asked to note the draft budget and MTFP (including responses to consultation and Government announcements).

The Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee is invited to make suggestions to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Procurement and Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform on any other issues which should be reflected in the draft budget and MTFP prior to Cabinet on 23rd January and County Council on 9th February 2017

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The MTFP sets out the overall national and local fiscal context, KCC's revenue and capital budget strategies, and KCC's treasury management and risk strategies. It also includes a number of appendices which set out the high level 3 year revenue budget plan, a more detailed one year plan by directorate, prudential and fiscal indicators, and an assessment of

KCC's reserves. The financial plans in the MTFP take into account all of the significant changes from the current year including additional spending demands, changes to funding, and the consequential savings needed to balance the budget to the available funding. This incremental approach to budgeting and financial planning is adopted by the vast majority of local authorities.

- 1.2 Since 2014-15 the one-year detailed financial analysis in the MTFP has been produced in directorate format (previously this was produced in Cabinet portfolio format). This enables the MTFP to mirror the council's financial monitoring, reporting and management arrangements. The directorate format (and indeed the previous portfolio format) is not ideal to reflect Cabinet Committee remits as the two are not always aligned. It is not possible to re-present the budget to reflect Cabinet Committees remits in the time available. Consequently each committee will receive the relevant directorate MTFP plan and will need to ignore those aspects which are not relevant. The draft 2017-18 MTFP for the Education and Young People's Services directorate is attached as appendix 1 to this report.
- 1.3 The draft directorate revenue budget is presented in the A to Z service format for Cabinet Committee scrutiny. We have used this format since 2011-12 which is designed to reflect the services we provide to Kent residents, businesses and local communities. We believe this is the most helpful format to present the budget proposals for scrutiny. The draft 2017-18 revenue budget for the Education and Young People's Services directorate is attached as appendix 2 to this report. The A to Z format is not designed to reflect how directorates are organised. Section 8 of the draft budget book presents the manager analysis setting out the overall amounts delegated to individual directors and heads of service within directorates. We do not believe it necessary or appropriate for Cabinet Committees to scrutinise these delegations.
- 1.4 The final draft budget presented to County Council on 9th February includes Section 6 which sets out all of the changes to each line of the A to Z budget. These detailed variation statements show how the MTFP translates into the spending proposals for individual service lines. This section takes a significant amount of resource to produce and there is not enough time available to produce these detailed statements for Cabinet Committees. We are continuing to develop systems which aim to enable these detailed variation statements to be produced at the same time the draft budget is launched (and thus be available for Cabinet Committee scrutiny) but at the moment these systems do not exist.
- 1.5 The draft capital programme is also presented in directorate format. The draft 2017-20 capital programme for the Education and Young People's Services directorate is attached as appendix 3 to this report.
- 1.6 All three financial appendices are exempt from publication until the council's final draft Budget and MTFP is published. These final draft plans will be considered at County Council on 9th February and will be published well in advance of the required timetable for County Council papers to

enable members to have sufficient time to consider the proposals and any alternatives. We intend publish these papers before the Cabinet Committees meetings so that the appendices are unrestricted by the time of the meeting.

2. Financial Context

- 2.1 The overall financial context remains largely unchanged from that reported to County Council on 20th October following the Chancellor's Autumn Statement on 23rd November. The funding settlement from central government, including Revenue Support Grant (RSG), is anticipated to include the reductions outlined in the indicative settlement published last year.
- 2.2 Since the October report we have had provisional tax base calculations and collection fund balances which are higher than we had anticipated and help to resolve the unidentified savings. However, some of the spending demands are also greater arising from higher than the budgeted spend in 2016-17 (and need to be reflected in 2017-18 budget) and higher forecast future inflation/demand. Details of the assumptions underpinning spending demands are explored later in this report. Some savings options have also been revised since the October report.
- 2.3 The provisional Local Government Finance Settlement was announced on Thursday 15th December. The settlement sets out the provisional allocation of key government funding streams for 2017-18 and indicative allocations for 2018-19 and 2019-20. The settlement also includes the government's estimate of the change in local authority overall spending power taking into account both government funding and council tax.
- 2.4 Overall the context for local government spending over the medium term remains "flat-cash" between 2015-16 to 2019-20. This flat-cash includes council tax, additional social care funding and reductions in central government grants. Flat-cash means there is no overall additional funding for rising costs or demand pressures, therefore these have to be compensated by savings and spending reductions. Consequently, KCC's position remains that flat-cash for the local government sector is not good enough as this represents a significant reduction in real spending power.
- 2.5 The settlement offered additional funding for social care within the same overall flat-cash envelope with two key changes:
 - Greater flexibility in social care council tax precept – whilst this remains at 6% over the three years of the settlement (2017-18 to 2019-20), authorities have choice to raise up to 3% in any year (as long as overall the 6% limit over 3 years is not breached). This would enable council tax increases to be brought forward early although council tax charges in 2019-20 cannot be any greater than they would have been under the previous Spending Review (SR2015) announcement
 - A new one-off Social Care Reform Grant in 2017-18, funded out of New Homes Bonus (NHB) by bringing forward the proposed changes

from 2018-19. In Kent this is at the expense of districts (which collectively receive £6.2m less NHB than announced in SR2015) and KCC receives a net £4.6m more (allowing for both the new social care grant and our loss of NHB).

The final draft budget includes how KCC intends to respond to these two significant changes.

- 2.6 The table below sets out a high level summary of changes to the 2017-18 budget equation since the Autumn Budget Statement was published for County Council on 20th October.

	Autumn Budget Statement £m	Final Draft budget £m	Movement £m
Spending demands	57.2	66.3	9.1
Grant reductions	51.1	46.4	-4.6
Council Tax:			
- Increase in line with 2% referendum limit	-11.8	-11.9	-0.1
- Social Care Levy	-12.1	-12.2	-0.1
- Growth in taxbase & change in collection fund surplus	-0.9	-7.2	-6.2
Business Rates	-3.1	-3.2	-0.1
Savings	-80.4	-78.3	2.1

Note - this table, shows each element to nearest decimal place including totals; consequently the totals may not appear to add-up but are accurate

- 2.7 This equation of rising spending demands/costs compounded by reducing government funding, offset by council tax increases and the need for significant base budget savings continues the challenging theme of recent years. The 2017-18 Budget is likely to be the most difficult we have faced during the period of austerity since 2010.
- 2.8 The most significant movements between the Autumn Budget Statement and the Final Draft budget are explained in the table below:

Movement	Explanation
Spending Demands (increased by +£9.1m)	<u>Budget realignments:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • +£3.2m Children's Social Care budget realignment to reflect 2016-17 activity • +£2.0m SEN transport budget realignment to reflect higher journey costs than budgeted in 2016-17 • +£0.8m Learning Disability & Mental Health budget

	<p>realignment to reflect 2016-17 activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • +£0.6m Waste tonnage budget realignment <p><u>Pay:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -£2.0m removal of estimated pressure to increase employer pension contribution rate, which is no longer needed following the actuarial revaluation of pension fund <p><u>Prices:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • +£6.8m New provision to increase prices for adult social care contracts to facilitate market sustainability as required under Care Act 2014 • +£1.3m updates to general price provisions reflect Q2 monitoring and latest CPI assumptions • -£1.5m reduction to estimated NLW pressure following Chancellor's Autumn Budget Statement on 23rd November <p><u>Demography</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -£1.5m reduction to estimated Older People & Physical Disability demography pressure
Grant reductions (improvement of £4.6m)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • +£6.2m Social Care Support Grant announced in provisional local government finance settlement on 15th December • -£1.5m reduction to provisional New Homes Bonus Grant announced in the local government finance settlement
Growth in taxbase & change in collection fund surplus (improvement of £6.2m)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £3.1m growth in council tax base resulting from: increase in number of households; change in discounts; and reviews of local Council Tax Reduction Schemes • £3.1m increase in assumed 2016-17 council tax collection fund surplus
Savings and Income (reduction of £2.1m)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of changes as presented in revised MTFP to take into account of latest proposals and phasing and the impact of changes to spending demands and funding outlined above

2.9 This equation of rising spending demands/costs compounded by reducing government funding, offset by council tax increases and the need for significant base budget savings continues the challenging theme of recent years. The 2017-18 Budget is likely to be the most difficult we have faced during the period of austerity since 2010.

3. Budget Consultation

3.1 The budget communication and consultation campaign was launched on 13th October to coincide with the publication of the County Council Autumn Budget Statement papers. The campaign was aimed at reaching a wide audience of Kent residents, businesses and other interested parties to better inform them of the budget challenge arising from a combination of

additional spending demands (which are unfunded) and reductions in central government funding. As a result of the campaign we hoped that sufficient numbers would be inspired to engage with the consultation.

- 3.2 The campaign was primarily delivered through the council's website <http://www.kent.gov.uk/about-the-council/have-your-say/budget-201718>.

This dedicated page provided a high level summary of the financial challenge with links to consultation questionnaire, budget modelling tool and more detailed supporting information. In total the site had 1,416 unique page views between 13th October and 27th November, 489 accessed from internal users and 927 external visits. The peak traffic for internal users was immediately following the launch i.e. 13th/14th/17th October, which accounted for 302 of the 489 visits. The peak traffic for external users was Monday 14th November (125 of the 927 visits).

- 3.3 In total 512 responses were received either through the dedicated webpage or the general consultations page. A handful of written responses were also received. A summary of the responses is presented below. The questionnaire explored 4 key issues:

- Council tax increases in relation to the referendum requirement
- Council tax increases for social care precept
- KCC's overall budget strategy
- The level of awareness of the financial challenge

The questionnaire also allowed for any other comments.

- 3.4 Details of the consultation responses will be presented as part of Cabinet and County Council budget papers. For the sake of brevity we have published the report on all consultation activity as a background document to Cabinet Committee reports rather than including all the information in each committee report. This consultation can be accessed via the link at the end of this report.

4. Specific Issues for the Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee

- 4.1 Appendices 1, 2 and 3 set out the main budget proposals relevant to Education and Young People's Services directorate that will be included in the final draft MTFP, revenue budget and capital programme. These appendices are exempt until the final draft MTFP and budget book are published. These proposals must be considered in light of the general financial outlook for the County Council for 2017-18 which is for further reductions in overall funding even after planned council tax increases, and flat-cash over the medium term. This means we have no funding for additional spending demands and consequently will continue to need to make budget savings each and every year.

Dedicated Schools Grant

- 4.2 The announcements on the 20 December included details of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2017-18. The guaranteed funding rates per pupil for the schools and early year's blocks remain largely unchanged from the current year, which means that 2017-18 will be the seventh consecutive year of flat cash meaning no increases for inflationary

pressures. Whilst this position is favourable compared to some parts of the public sector, schools and early years providers are finding it increasingly difficult to find year on year efficiency savings to offset inflationary pay and price increases.

- 4.3 One of the biggest challenges for the Local Authority in relation to DSG is managing the rising pupil population, particularly High Needs pupils at a time of minimal growth funding from the DfE. Although we are set to receive an additional £3.4m growth funding to the High Needs block in 2017-18, our unavoidable High Needs pressures are estimated at £8.8m. We have discussed this position with the Schools' Funding Forum and agreed to transfer up to £5m from School budgets along with some minor changes to the operation of our notional SEN top up arrangements to meet this pressure.
- 4.4 The government have also published a consultation on the proposed changes to school funding from 2018-19 as it takes steps to introduce a fairer national funding formula. The intention is to bring a separate paper to this Cabinet Committee on 1 February with more information on these proposals which will include details of the impact for this Council and its Schools.
- 4.5 Finally, the government have also recently published their response to an earlier consultation on changes affecting early years funding which come into effect on 1 April 2017. Again our intention is to bring a separate paper to this Cabinet Committee on 1 February with more information on this issue which will include details of the impact for this Council and its Early Years providers.

Additional Spending Pressures within EYPS Directorate for 2017-18

- 4.5 The most significant additional spending pressures in 2017-18 for EYPS are within the home to school transport budgets where there are three significant budget pressures.
- £1.4m relates to the estimated price increase for home to school transport based on the latest industry advice.
 - £0.9m relates to demography for continued growth in SEND pupils requiring support with their home to school transport arrangements during 2017-18. This is in line with the rising pupil population and aligns with the Commissioning Plan.
 - £2.0m relates to the latest in-year pressure on SEN transport which reflects higher journey costs than budgeted in 2016-17.

Savings and income proposals within EYPS Directorate for 2017-18

- 4.6 The most significant savings and income proposals for 2017-18 are as follows:
- £1.883m from increased trading income with schools, academies (both within Kent and outside Kent) and with other local authorities.
 - £1.494m Route optimisation and procurement practices from capitalising on new technologies and different approaches to

procurement to drive additional savings from travel to our special schools.

- £1.636m from service re-design, integration of services and more efficient ways of working resulting in a reduction of staff costs. The delivery of these savings will be with appropriate stakeholder engagement and detailed consultations.

5. Conclusions

- 5.1 The financial outlook for the next 3 years continues to look exceptionally challenging. Although the medium term outlook is flat cash i.e. we should have a similar spending in 2019-20 to 2015-16, there is a dip in 2017-18 which makes the forthcoming year the most difficult. Furthermore, the flat cash equation includes additional funding raised through Council Tax, the 2% precept for social care and the Better Care Fund. This additional income is required to fund rising spending demands (and may not be enough to fund all demands). This means the Council will still need to find substantial savings in order cover any shortfall against spending demands and to compensate for the reductions in RSG (and any other changes in specific grants including those referred to in this report).
- 5.2 At this stage the forecasts for 2018-19 and 2019-20 are our best estimates. If these estimates prove to be accurate then the savings needed to balance the budgets in these years would be less than we have faced for a number of years. At this stage we have made no presumptions on the possible consequences of 100% business rate retention. We know that the extra business rates we will be able to retain will come with additional responsibilities although we have no indication what these might be and whether there will be enough money to cover the cost. We also know the government is reconsidering the calculation of the existing baseline which determines the top-up we receive (and the tariffs other authorities pay). Once again at this stage we have made no presumption about the outcome of this review until we know more.
- 5.3 Appendices 1 and 2 include the latest estimates for unavoidable and other spending demands for 2017-18 and future years. These estimates are based on the latest budget monitoring and activity levels as reported to Cabinet in November (quarter 2). Committees no longer receive individual in-year monitoring reports and therefore members may wish to review the relevant appendices of the Cabinet report before the meeting.

6. Recommendation(s)

- 6.1 The Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee is asked to note the draft budget and MTFP (including responses to consultation and Government announcements).
- 6.2 The Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee is invited to make suggestions to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Procurement and Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform on any other issues which should be reflected in the draft budget and MTFP prior to Cabinet on 23rd January and County Council on 9th February 2017 .

7. Background Documents

7.1 Consultation materials published on KCC website and the outcome report.

Budget Consultation Materials - <http://www.kent.gov.uk/about-the-council/finance-and-budget/budget-201718>

Budget Consultation Outcome - <http://consultations.kent.gov.uk/consult.ti/BudgetConsultation2017/consultationHome> - (exempt until 12 January 2017).

7.2 The Chancellor of the Exchequer's Spending Review and Autumn Statement on 23rd November 2016 and OBR report on the financial and economic climate.

Autumn Budget Statement - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/autumn-statement-2016-documents>

OBR Forecasts <http://budgetresponsibility.org.uk/efo/economic-and-fiscal-outlook-november-2016/>

7.3 The provisional Local Government Finance Settlement 2017-18 announced on 15 December 2016.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/provisional-local-government-finance-settlement-england-2017-to-2018>

7.4 The 2017-18 Dedicated Schools Grant settlement

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dedicated-schools-grant-dsg-2017-to-2018>

8. Contact details

Report Authors

- Dave Shipton, Head of Financial Strategy
- 03000 419418
- dave.shipton@kent.gov.uk

- Simon Pleace, Finance Business Partner for EYPS
- 03000 416947
- simon.pleace@kent.gov.uk

Relevant Directors:

- Andy Wood, Corporate Director Finance & Procurement
- 03000 416854
- andy.wood@kent.gov.uk

- Patrick Leeson, Corporate Director for EYPS
- 03000 416384
- patrick.leeson@kent.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Heading	Description	Preventative Services	Education Planning & Access	Quality & Standards	School Resources	Corporate Director E&YP	Total Education & Young Persons Services
		£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
2016-17 Base	Approved budget by County Council on 11th February 2016	22,262.6	34,396.2	4,230.3	-1,788.1	5,683.8	64,784.8
Base Adjustments (internal)	Changes to budgets which have nil overall affect on net budget requirement	378.4	-317.7	64.8		10.1	135.6
Revised 2016-17 Base		22,641.0	34,078.5	4,295.1	-1,788.1	5,693.9	64,920.4
Additional Spending Pressures							
Net Budget Realignment	<i>Necessary adjustments to reflect current and forecast activity levels from in-year monitoring reports</i>						
SEN Transport	Latest in-year pressure on SEN transport which reflects higher journey costs than budgeted in 2016-17		2,000.0				2,000.0
Pay and Prices							
Inflation							
Home to school transport	Provision for inflation on contracted services and season tickets for mainstream & SEN home to school transport and the 16+ travel card		1,417.6				1,417.6
Demography							
SEN Transport	Additional spending associated with increasing population and demographic make-up of the population						
SEN Transport	Estimated impact of rising pupil population on SEN home to school and college transport		922.5				922.5
Service Strategies & Improvements							
School Transport	Impact of Grammar School Select Committee transport recommendations		60.0				60.0
ICT Single System	Commissioning of EYPS Single System ICT through a hosted solution	420.0					420.0
	Total Additional Spending Demands	420.0	4,400.1				4,820.1

Heading	Description	Preventative Services	Education Planning & Access	Quality & Standards	School Resources	Corporate Director E&YP	Total Education & Young Persons Services
		£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Savings and Income							
Transformation Savings							
SEN Transport independent travel initiatives	Continued savings from initiatives aimed at increasing independent travel to school by SEND pupils including developing independent travel training and direct payments to parents		-695.0				-695.0
Income							
Trading	Increased income from traded services with schools, academies, other local authorities and public bodies	-397.0	-884.0	-602.0			-1,883.0
Efficiency Savings							
Staffing							
Staffing Restructures	Service re-design, integration of services and more efficient ways of working resulting in a reduction of staff costs. The delivery of these savings will be with appropriate stakeholder engagement and detailed consultations	-936.0		-700.0			-1,636.0
Infrastructure							
Contracts & Procurement							
SEN Transport Route Optimisation	Savings through improved route optimisation and procurement practices		-1,494.0				-1,494.0
Early Help	Full year effect of Early Help commissioning savings started in 2016-17	-250.0					-250.0
Home to school transport	Reduction in SEN home to school transport costs due to growth in local SEN provision attached to mainstream schools and academies		-75.0				-75.0
Other							
Youth Participation Workers	Partnership working with Headstart	-120.0					-120.0
Discretionary Spend	Pro-rata cut to discretionary spend					-248.0	-248.0
Public Health Grant	Internal commissioning of services to deliver public health outcomes	-500.0					-500.0
Policy Savings							
Home to school transport	Final instalment of 2012 decision to remove discretion on Home to School Transport Policy		-100.0				-100.0
Total savings and Income		-2,203.0	-3,248.0	-1,302.0		-248.0	-7,001.0
Public Health & other grants							
ESG	The retained element of the former Education Services Grant which has transferred into Dedicated Schools Grant, and this will reduce net spend as it will now be treated as grant income		-3,069.6	-290.4			-3,360.0
Proposed Budget		20,858.0	32,161.0	2,702.7	-1,788.1	5,445.9	59,379.5

Appendix 2 - Directorate Specific A to Z Service Analysis

Education & Young People's Services

Row Ref	2016-17 Revised Base	Service	2017-18 Proposed Budget							Affordable Activity
	Net Cost		Staffing	Non staffing	Gross Expenditure	Internal Income	External Income	Grants	Net Cost	
	£000s		£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	
		Children's Services								
		<i>Early Help</i>								
1	6,290.3	Children's Centres	6,175.1	2,203.4	8,378.5	-2,564.3	-23.9	0.0	5,790.3	Children's centres offer help and support to an average of 12,230 children per month. Approximately 68,000 children aged 0-5 are registered with a Children's Centre.
2	11,886.1	Early Intervention and Prevention	12,821.5	6,999.4	19,820.9	-226.1	-431.7	-8,313.0	10,850.1	This service intervenes as soon as possible to tackle emerging problems, ensuring that every child and young person, from pre-birth to age 19 and their family, who needs early help services, will receive it so that they are safeguarded, their educational, health, social and emotional needs are met and outcomes are good. This is done by working together with multi-disciplinary and multi-agency services to target individuals, groups at high risk or those showing early signs of a particular problem to try to stop it occurring or escalating, and to redress the situation. This includes working with families under the Tackling Troubled Families scheme.
		<i>Education and Personal</i>								
3	979.6	14 to 24 year olds	1,273.0	682.6	1,955.6	-130.0	-70.0	-906.0	849.6	A range of services for young people including preparation for employment, vocational training, apprenticeships, helping young people to set up in business via support from Kent Foundation, Skills Force and raising the age of statutory education to 18.
4	144.7	Attendance & Behaviour	2,219.4	319.4	2,538.8	-10.0	-297.0	-2,099.1	132.7	The service provides advice and direct early help intervention to reduce exclusion from school, to improve pupil attendance and to facilitate good quality Pupil Referral Units/alternative provisions for those who would otherwise not be able to attend schools due to exclusion or health needs.

Appendix 2 - Directorate Specific A to Z Service Analysis

Education & Young People's Services

Row Ref	2016-17 Revised Base	Service	2017-18 Proposed Budget							Affordable Activity
	Net Cost		Staffing	Non staffing	Gross Expenditure	Internal Income	External Income	Grants	Net Cost	
	£000s		£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	
5	1,297.3	Early Years and Childcare	4,451.2	1,833.8	6,285.0	-548.7	-857.8	-3,655.2	1,223.3	Provision of advice, support, challenge and training to secure sufficient high quality early education and childcare, incorporating almost 800 group providers in the private, voluntary and independent sectors and approximately 1,300 childminders.
6	0.0	Early Years Education	0.0	68,341.7	68,341.7	0.0	0.0	-68,341.7	0.0	Payments made to over 900 PVI providers and childminders for up to 15 hours a week of free early years education for 3 & 4 year olds for the summer term (equates to over 11 million hours of provision) and an estimated additional take up of over 30% for the new 30 hour free entitlement from September (equates to around 3.8 million additional hours). Also up to 2.2 million hours of free early years education for disadvantaged 2 year olds. This also includes an estimate of the Early Years pupil premium allocation.
7	2,188.0	Education Psychology Service	3,054.4	108.1	3,162.5	-718.7	-261.3	-2,182.5	0.0	Statutory assessment of children with special educational needs and the delivery of core and traded psychological services.
8	493.4	Individual Learner Support (incl. Inclusion Support Services Kent (ISSK) and Information & Advice Service for SEN Kent (IASK))	1,782.4	5,614.2	7,396.6	-245.1	-315.4	-6,367.7	468.4	A range of specialist services to support children and young people who may be at risk of not aspiring and achieving to their full potential.
9	0.0	Support for Pupils with SEN	112.3	5,925.0	6,037.3	0.0	-387.2	-5,650.1	0.0	Support for pupils with SEN, including those with Education and Health Care Plans (EHCPs), which has not been delegated to individual schools or SEN units.
10	1,237.7	Youth Service	1,103.2	1,835.7	2,938.9	-776.4	-999.8	-245.0	917.7	Direct delivery and commissioning of open access youth work provision in youth centres, in schools, and street-based. In addition, opportunities for outdoor educational and adventurous activities, delivery of the Duke of Edinburgh's Award and ensuring the voice of young people is heard through the work of Kent Youth County Council. As a key element of early help, youth workers also provide targeted work with more vulnerable young people.

Appendix 2 - Directorate Specific A to Z Service Analysis

Education & Young People's Services

Row Ref	2016-17 Revised Base	Service	2017-18 Proposed Budget							Affordable Activity
	Net Cost		Staffing	Non staffing	Gross Expenditure	Internal Income	External Income	Grants	Net Cost	
	£000s		£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	
11	400.6	Youth Offending Service	1,511.2	581.3	2,092.5	-323.6	-311.1	-1,137.2	320.6	Targeted partnership work in relation to children and young people who are subject to criminal youth court orders, with the primary aim of reducing re-offending, safeguarding the individual and managing the risk within the community. In a year, the service works with 650 children and young people who are subject of youth court orders.
		Other Children's Services								
12	368.4	Safeguarding	577.6	96.8	674.4	-161.4	-223.2	-289.8	0.0	Performance management of services for vulnerable children in Kent. Statutory education safeguarding functions with services commissioned by schools and other settings providing additional support and challenge.
		Community Services								
13	-1,366.4	Community Learning & Skills (CLS)	8,791.2	3,905.9	12,697.1	0.0	-3,381.9	-10,681.6	-1,366.4	Approximately 22,000 adults attending Adult Education courses in the community for personal development, skills, pleasure and wellbeing of which over 500 achieve qualifications. In the region of 4,600 families participating in family and responsive learning which helps parents and children from disadvantaged communities. CLS supports 650+ young people and adults through apprenticeships with Kent employers and approximately 1,200 learning aims delivered to 300 16-18 year olds not in education or employment. Skills Plus centres deliver over 2,300 English and Maths learning aims to 1,400 people to improve their employability skills and support Kent businesses and help 1,000 adults for whom English is not their first language to gain qualifications.
14	461.3	Supporting Employment	746.2	50.1	796.3	-305.0	-30.0	0.0	461.3	Provides support and advice to vulnerable adults, with disabilities, learning difficulties or mental health issues, in order to secure paid employment, further education/training/apprenticeships or voluntary work. KSE works with approximately 300 adults and supports another 100 young people and young adults through the Troubled Families Programme.

Appendix 2 - Directorate Specific A to Z Service Analysis

Education & Young People's Services

Row Ref	2016-17 Revised Base	Service	2017-18 Proposed Budget							Affordable Activity
	Net Cost		Staffing	Non staffing	Gross Expenditure	Internal Income	External Income	Grants	Net Cost	
	£000s		£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	
Schools & High Needs Education Budgets										
15	0.0	Exclusion Services	0.0	2,510.1	2,510.1	0.0	0.0	-2,510.1	0.0	Payments to schools for the provision of education services to excluded pupils where there are no Pupil Referral Units.
16	0.0	High Needs Pupils in Further Education Colleges - Post 16 year olds	0.0	5,110.4	5,110.4	0.0	0.0	-5,110.4	0.0	Top up payments for high needs pupils in further education college placements.
17	0.0	High Needs Pupils in Independent Sector Providers - Post 16 year olds	0.0	3,600.9	3,600.9	0.0	0.0	-3,600.9	0.0	Top up payments for post 16 high needs pupils in independent sector provision.
18	0.0	High Needs Pupils in Independent Special School placements	0.0	24,068.1	24,068.1	-274.6	-422.8	-23,370.7	0.0	Placements for approximately 530 children with severe special educational needs whose needs cannot be met within maintained schools.
19	0.0	High Needs Pupils - Recoupment	0.0	2,396.6	2,396.6	0.0	-3,054.0	657.4	0.0	Top up payments to other local authorities for Kent pupils with high needs, educated in other local authority schools, together with income from other local authorities for their pupils educated in Kent schools.
20	0.0	PFI Schools Scheme	0.0	27,006.4	27,006.4	-10,605.4	-1,603.0	-14,798.0	0.0	Service charges for 11 PFI schools.
21	0.0	Schools and Pupil Referral Units Delegated budgets	493,235.4	173,298.9	666,534.3	0.0	-49,814.8	-616,719.5	0.0	Budgets managed directly by approximately 380 local authority maintained schools and Pupil Referral Units.
Schools' Services										
22	5,032.3	Education Staff Pension costs	0.0	7,468.3	7,468.3	0.0	-684.0	-2,000.0	4,784.3	Cost of education staff early retirements including historic commitments.
23	94.1	Other Schools' Services	105.7	5,673.1	5,778.8	-2,527.4	-206.3	-3,120.0	-74.9	Crossing Patrols, licences, provision of temporary mobile classrooms, planned maintenance agreements, legionella work, asbestos and condition surveys. Reimbursement of schools' costs for maternity leave, public duties, trade union representatives, suspended staff and tribunals. Some of these services now operate on a fully traded basis.
24	0.0	Redundancy costs	0.0	1,188.7	1,188.7	0.0	0.0	-1,188.7	0.0	Redundancy costs for schools related staff.

Appendix 2 - Directorate Specific A to Z Service Analysis

Education & Young People's Services

Row Ref	2016-17 Revised Base	Service	2017-18 Proposed Budget							Affordable Activity
	Net Cost		Staffing	Non staffing	Gross Expenditure	Internal Income	External Income	Grants	Net Cost	
	£000s		£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	
25	2,375.5	School Improvement	4,453.2	2,405.8	6,859.0	-4,441.3	-764.1	-98.1	1,555.5	Providing advice, guidance, training and challenge to primary, secondary and special schools and Pupil Referral Units to raise standards of pupil achievement, and to implement national and local strategies. Support and training for over 4,800 school governors.
		Transport Services								
26	22,976.5	Home to School/College Transport (Special Educational Needs)	192.1	25,579.3	25,771.4	0.0	-801.5	0.0	24,969.9	Specialist transport arrangements for 3,800 children with special educational needs aged 0-19.
27	7,161.6	Home to School Transport (Mainstream)	0.0	7,200.6	7,200.6	0.0	-30.0	0.0	7,170.6	Transport to and from school for approximately 6,000 eligible children.
28	409.6	Kent 16+ Travel Card	0.0	3,324.2	3,324.2	-678.0	-2,202.9	0.0	443.3	Over 7,000 16+ travel cards issued to young people aged over 16 for unlimited bus travel in Kent and funding of eligible learners unable to access the 16+ travel card.
29	62,430.6	Total Direct Services to the Public	542,605.1	389,328.8	931,933.9	-24,536.0	-67,173.7	-781,727.9	58,496.3	
		Assessment Services								
30	1,152.6	Assessment and Support of Children with Special Education Needs	4,868.7	4,995.8	9,864.5	0.0	-281.0	-9,410.0	173.5	Statutory assessment and review of children with Special Educational Needs.
31	1,152.6	Total Assessment Services	4,868.7	4,995.8	9,864.5	0.0	-281.0	-9,410.0	173.5	
		Management, Support Services and Overheads								
		Directorate Management and Support for:								These budgets include the directorate centrally held costs, which include the budgets for, amongst other things, the strategic directors and heads of service.
32	1,837.8	Education & Young People (E&YP)	6,153.7	3,927.1	10,080.8	-503.5	-2,526.0	-5,629.0	1,422.3	
		Support to Frontline Services:								
33	-500.6	Finance and Procurement (excluding services commissioned from Business Services Centre)	1,681.4	100.7	1,782.1	-1,031.7	-200.3	-1,262.7	-712.6	Responsible for planning, managing and reporting upon the Council's financial resources, in liaison with both Members and senior management, in accordance with the Council's Financial Regulations.

Appendix 2 - Directorate Specific A to Z Service Analysis

Education & Young People's Services

Row Ref	2016-17 Revised Base	Service	2017-18 Proposed Budget							Affordable Activity
	Net Cost		Staffing	Non staffing	Gross Expenditure	Internal Income	External Income	Grants	Net Cost	
	£000s		£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	
34	1,337.2	Total Management, Support Services and Overheads	7,835.1	4,027.8	11,862.9	-1,535.2	-2,726.3	-6,891.7	709.7	
35	64,920.4	TOTAL	555,308.9	398,352.4	953,661.3	-26,071.2	-70,181.0	-798,029.6	59,379.5	

Row Ref	EDUCATION & YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES						
	SECTION 3 - CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLANS 2017-18 TO 2019-20 BY YEAR						
			Three Year Budget £'000		Cash Limits		
					2017-18 £'000	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000
	Rolling Programmes	Description of Project					
1	<i>Annual Planned Enhancement Programme*</i>	Planned and reactive capital projects to keep schools open and operational	25,261		9,261	8,000	8,000
2	Devolved Formula Capital Grants for Schools	Enhancement of schools	8,400		2,800	2,800	2,800
3	Schools Revenue Contribution to Capital	Schools spend on capital projects	24,000		8,000	8,000	8,000
4	<i>Pupil Referral Units</i>	Improving the provision of Pupil Referral Units	600		600		
5	Youth - Modernisation of Assets	To purchase vehicles and equipment for youth services	50			50	
6	<i>Modernisation Programme</i>	Improving and upgrading school buildings including removal of temporary classrooms	8,062		4,062	2,000	2,000
7	Total Rolling Programmes		66,373		24,723	20,850	20,800
	Individual Projects	Description of Project					
	Basic Need Schemes - to provide additional pupil places:						
1	<i>Basic Need Programme**</i>	Increasing the capacity of Kent's schools	341,437	194,470	80,165	38,652	28,150
	Other Projects:						
2	<i>Special Schools Review Phase 2</i>	Major programme of building works to ensure facilities are fit for purpose	80,922	71,466	9,456		
3	<i>Sevenoaks Grammar Annex</i>	A Grammar annex provided in Sevenoaks	22,000	13,100	8,900		
4	John Wallis Academy	To provide a new primary school building to replace the current unsuitable accommodation	5,075	75	2,500	2,500	
5	<i>EYPS Single System</i>	Improve efficiency by reducing the number of recording and monitoring systems	1,800	1,415	385		
6	<i>Priority School Build Programme (PSBP) 1 & 2</i>	Additional works under the PSBP programme not funded by the EFA	9,643	4,475	2,850	2,318	
7	Total Individual Projects		460,877	285,001	104,256	43,470	28,150
8	Directorate Total		527,250	285,001	128,979	64,320	48,950
<p><i>Italic font:</i> these are projects that are relying on significant elements of unsecured funding and will only go ahead if the funding is achieved.</p> <p>* Estimated allocations have been included for 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20.</p> <p>** Estimated allocations have been included for 2018-19 and 2019-20.</p>							

Row Ref	EDUCATION & YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES					
	SECTION 3 - CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLANS 2017-18 TO 2019-20 BY YEAR					
	Total Cost of Scheme	Prior Years	Cash Limits			
			2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	Later Years
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Funded by:						
Borrowing	35,169	36,862	32,742	2,090		-36,525
Grants	327,079	187,828	60,718	37,583	40,950	
Developer Contributions	85,818	25,377	13,712	15,279		31,450
Other External Funding	450	450				
Revenue and Renewals	24,000		8,000	8,000	8,000	
Capital Receipts	54,734	34,484	13,807	1,368		5,075
Total:	527,250	285,001	128,979	64,320	48,950	0

Row Ref	EDUCATION & YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES											
SECTION 3 - CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLANS 2017-18 TO 2019-20 BY FUNDING												
		2017-20 Funded By:										
		Three Year Budget		Borrowing	Grants	Dev Contrs	Other External Funding	Revenue & Renewals	Capital Receipts	Recycling of Loan Repayments	Total 2017-20	
		£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	
ROLLING PROGRAMMES												
1	<i>Annual Planned Enhancement Programme*</i>	25,261		623	24,638							25,261
2	Devolved Formula Capital Grants for Schools	8,400			8,400							8,400
3	Schools Revenue Contribution to Capital	24,000						24,000				24,000
4	<i>Pupil Referral Units</i>	600		201					399			600
5	Youth - Modernisation of Assets	50							50			50
6	<i>Modernisation Programme</i>	8,062			8,062							8,062
7	Total Rolling Programmes	66,373		824	41,100	0	0	24,000	449	0		66,373
		2017-20 Funded By:										
		Total Cost of Scheme	Prior Years	Borrowing	Grants	Dev Contrs	Other External Funding	Revenue & Renewals	Capital Receipts	Recycling of Loan Repayments	Total 2017-20	Later Years
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS												
Basic Need Schemes - to provide additional pupil places:												
1	<i>Basic Need Programme**</i>	341,437	194,470	27,115	90,861	28,991						146,967
Other Projects:												
2	<i>Special Schools Review Phase 2</i>	80,922	71,466		4,390				5,066			9,456
3	<i>Sevenoaks Grammar School</i>	22,000	13,100		2,900				6,000			8,900
4	<i>John Wallis Academy</i>	5,075	75	5,000					0			5,000
5	<i>EYPS Single System</i>	1,800	1,415						385			385
6	<i>Priority School Build Programme (PSBP) 1 & 2</i>	9,643	4,475	1,893					3,275			5,168
												0
7	Total Individual Projects	460,877	285,001	34,008	98,151	28,991	0	0	14,726	0		175,876
8	TOTAL CASH LIMIT	527,250	285,001	34,832	139,251	28,991	0	24,000	15,175	0		242,249
<p><i>Italic font:</i> these are projects that are relying on significant elements of unsecured funding and will only go ahead if the funding is achieved.</p> <p>* Estimated allocations have been included for 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20.</p> <p>** Estimated allocations have been included for 2018-19 and 2019-20.</p>												

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank