

**ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT CABINET COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, 21st May, 2024**

**10.00 am**

**Council Chamber**







## AGENDA

### ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT CABINET COMMITTEE

**Tuesday, 21 May 2024 at 10.00 am**  
**Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall,**  
**Maidstone.**

Ask for: **Emily Kennedy**  
Telephone: **03000 419625**

#### **Membership (16)**

Conservative (12):	Mr S Holden (Chairman), Mr N J Collor (Vice-Chairman), Mr T Bond, Mr C Broadley, Mr D Crow-Brown, Mr M Dendor, Mr A R Hills, Mr H Rayner, Mr D Robey and Mr A Sandhu, MBE
Labour (2):	Ms M Dawkins and Mr B H Lewis
Liberal Democrat (1):	Mr I S Chittenden
Green and Independent (1):	Mr M Baldock

#### **UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

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

- 1 Introduction/Webcast announcement
- 2 Apologies
- 3 Declarations of Interest
- 4 Minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2024 (Pages 1 - 8)
- 5 Verbal Updates by Cabinet Members and Corporate Director
- 6 Performance Dashboard (Pages 9 - 24)
- 7 24/00038 - Kent Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) - 2024 Refresh (Pages 25 - 36)
- 8 24/00043 - Road Asset Renewal Contract (Pages 37 - 50)
- 9 Kent Travel Saver - Pass Cost Increase - 2024 (Pages 51 - 54)
- 10 Highways Term Maintenance Contract update  
Verbal Update

- 11 24/00035 - Contract for Receipt and Treatment of Street Sweepings and Highway Mechanical Arisings (Pages 55 - 66)
- 12 Household Waste and Recycling Centres Contracts  
Report to follow
- 13 Work Programme (Pages 67 - 68)

**Motion to Exclude the Press and Public**

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.

**EXEMPT ITEMS**

*(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)*

Benjamin Watts  
General Counsel  
03000 416814

**Monday, 13 May 2024**

*rt.*

**KENT COUNTY COUNCIL****ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT CABINET COMMITTEE**

MINUTES of a meeting of the Environment & Transport Cabinet Committee held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 7 March 2024.

PRESENT: Mr S Holden (Chairman), Mr N J Collor (Vice-Chairman), Mr T Bond, Mr D Crow-Brown, Mr M Dendor, Mr A R Hills, Mr M A J Hood, Mr B H Lewis, Mr H Rayner, Mr D Robey, Mr A Sandhu, MBE and Mr M Whiting

ALSO PRESENT: Mr M Baldock (virtually)

**UNRESTRICTED ITEMS****1. Apologies and Substitutes**

*(Item 2)*

Apologies were received from Mr Cannon, Ms Dawkins and Mr Chittenden for whom Mr Passmore was present.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

*(Item 3)*

There were no declarations of interest.

**3. Minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2024**

*(Item 4)*

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2024 were an accurate record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

**4. Verbal Updates from Cabinet Members and Corporate Director**

*(Item 5)*

1) Mr Baker said, despite the continuing unsettled weather creating high demand on the service, continued progress was being made by officers to keep the highways safe. This included KCC's highways team being on course to complete its £37.5 million planned road and pavement maintenance programme for 2023/24. By the end of March, 1,250,000m<sup>2</sup> of Kent's roads will have been resurfaced and 90,000m<sup>2</sup> of its pavements during 2023/24. This programme was preventing potholes and other surface defects appearing in the first place, keeping the highways safe.

The Pothole Blitz programme had commenced and was to run through the year into the autumn, making best use of the fine weather. £8 million of additional Department for Transport (DfT) grant funding was to be put to good use to repair Kent's roads. Work was to start on a major project to reconstruct a section of the A299 Thanet Way at Whitstable to permanently resolve undulations that regularly occur. These works were funded by £4 million of the DfT's Challenge Fund which KCC successfully bid

for, together with an allocation of about £420,000 from KCC's own road maintenance budget. It was expected that works would be completed by 20 July. Once this essential maintenance was completed, Mr Baker was confident there would be a noticeable difference in the quality of the surface, which would be welcomed by all road users.

The safety of road users was an important priority and in the Members' newsletter were details of recent schemes including Wrotham Road, A225, Shoreham Road, Oakfield Lane, Beaver Lane, Margate Road in Herne Bay, A2990 Old Thanet Way and at Lower Halstow.

Officers and members of the Active Travel working group (cross party) met in Hythe on 27 February to look at some of the local issues and opportunities for Active Travel. There was an excellent presentation by Sustrans. It was hoped that these sessions could be repeated in other areas of Kent.

The Bikeability team had secured additional funding to support and enhance KCC's offer in this area. Cycle training was offered to almost 9,000 children each year. There was good news when the Secretary of State for Transport announced, in a parliamentary debate, that he had approved funding for recommended schemes put forward by Kent County Council to Active Travel England. Whilst no specific schemes were named, KCC's bid for £1.2m for funding of the Aylesford Towpath was looking favourable. Any announcement in this regard was subject to a media embargo.

The Public Transport and Fastrack Team had awarded a new bus electrification infrastructure contract to VEV. The contract covers the electric fleets for both Kent Thameside and Dover. The mobilisation of the project was underway and the three sites for the chargers were to be at Dartford Acacia Hall, Gravesend Bus Hub, and Dover Priory Station respectively and were to all be live by March 2025.

The Member Task and Finish Group steering the development of the new Local Transport Plan had met twice in 2024. Following the public consultation on the emerging plan last year, a full plan was being drafted. Engagement with district and borough councils at officer level was also underway and a full draft new Local Transport Plan was to be going back out to public consultation in summer 2024. All KCC Members were to be briefed in advance of this with the opportunity to influence the plan before the County Council vote on its adoption later in the year.

The newsletter detailed the engagement to date on the new Highways Term Maintenance Contract. Invitations had been issued for a second Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee Member meeting on 26 April.

2) Mr Thomas said he would continue to send the newsletter out in advance of meetings of Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee.

Contamination of waste had continued to be a problem and recycling weights in Kent needed to go up. The cost from contamination was high and so work was ongoing to make improvements across the county.

The data from the Windmills Consultation was to be presented at the next meeting of Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee.

Mr Thomas had been spending time with officers and he was looking forward to working with colleagues and in the community in his new role as Cabinet Member.

3) Mr Jones said there were four road inspectors appointed and they were receiving training. In addition to statutory inspections carried out they also carried out additional activity to consider;

· If the road is closed whether other forms of traffic management could have been utilised;

- Is the road closed but there is no work started;
- Is the work completed but the road is still closed;
- Is the road signage correct;
- Is the site safe; and
- Whether the diversion for the closure was suitable?

59 audits had been completed. It was found that three of the 59 closures could have had alternative traffic management options, three were closed but the work had not been started, three had been completed but were still closed, four had incorrect signage, five were unsafe of which three were KCC's own sites and all of the diversions were suitable for the road closure. Around 30% or 18 of these audits raised concerns and information about further work on these would be brought to a future meeting.

Women and young people were being encouraged to become engineers and 2024 saw the 9th year of the Challenge Cup sponsored by AMEY which sought to encourage girls into engineering. The latest event was to design and cost a replacement bridge and was held on 25 January and involved 14 schools.

Officers also attended a recruitment fair at East Kent College on 30 January where they spoke to many young people about careers in engineering and in KCC.

Work on Galley Hill continued and while legal issues were still being resolved, a contractor was in place for the stabilisation and investigation works.

The Road of Remembrance in Folkestone & Hythe remained closed and further land slips had occurred in recent weeks. Clearance work continued and the road was only be re-opened when it was safe enough.

On Lower Thames Crossing, KCC had sealed a legal agreement with National Highways to secure financial compensation for the potential loss of revenue at Shorne Woods Country Park as a result of the Lower Thames Crossing's six-year construction period. Further updates on the Lower Thames Crossing Development Consent Order application were not expected until June 2024 at the earliest after the Secretary of State had considered the Planning Inspectors' recommendation.

The examination of the Development Consent Order Application by Gatwick Airport for routine use of its standby northern runway commenced on 27 February and was to last for six months until the end of August. KCC was opposed to the expansion of Gatwick as set out in our policy on Gatwick Airport which had been in place for nearly 10 years following its adoption by Cabinet in December 2014.

This opposition was based on the noise impacts in west Kent being made worse by an increase in flights.

In addition, the DfT had launched a consultation on the next night flight regime for Heathrow, Gatwick, and Stansted (effective from October 2025 until October 2028). The consultation was to run until 22 May 2024 and sought views on proposals for movement and quota count limits for Gatwick Airport to maintain the same level of night flights as they were permitted in 2024. KCC's Transport Strategy team were to prepare a response to the consultation and Members would be contacted for their input.

In February 2024, Mr Jones joined 36 GET and Medway Valley Thursday Action Group volunteers at Boxley Farm cluster where they planted over 1,400 hedges in one day, helping to create a new 250m biodiverse native hedgerow.

A special thanks was given to Andrea Griffith for organising the day and Kent Downs National Landscapes who provided the funding.

4) Further to comments from Members, it was noted that:

- The assessment and risk profile on all the highway assets was an ongoing issue for KCC. The road and off-road network had been affected by weather conditions.
- There was discussion around Members receiving notifications on all road closures. Concerns were raised that there were cases where works had been completed but the road was still closed.
- Members were able to use a platform called One Network and sign up for alerts on road closures. It was proposed that Members be trained on how to use the platform.

## **5. Performance Dashboard**

*(Item 6)*

*Matt Wagner, Interim Chief Analyst; Matthew Smyth, Director for Environment and Circular Economy and Simon Jones, Corporate Director, GET were in attendance for this item*

1) Mr Wagner introduced the report and said that the data showed performance up to December 2023. There were 19 key performance indicators (KPIs); 13 were rated green, and the remaining 6 were rated amber.

There were two indicators where the 'year to date' performance were red but they were now amber, based on the latest performance.

There were some areas of challenge relating to Highways and Transportation, where demand for pothole repair and routine faults remained extremely high.

2) Mr Baker said that the performance data lag meant that where indicators were showing as green on the report, it did not mean that there are not problems on the roads at the time of the meeting.



3) Mr Jones reported that enquiries about potholes were very high at the time of the meeting, around 2 ½ times higher than the same time in 2023. Despite the high demand, the service was quickly working to get into a sustainable position.

There had been a significant improvement in the performance of the team dealing with correspondence and Members' enquiries. Other KPIs were also close to the target levels.

4) Further to Members' questions, it was noted:

- A query was raised about what customer satisfaction means and what is being measured: Is it the experience of reporting and engagement, or is it the outcome from the report made? It was clarified that it was about the engagement with customer. However, the question was to be explored in more depth.
- A Member had asked the Cabinet Member about the metric being used for the performance indicator for HT13 - Streetwork permits issued. The Cabinet Member agreed that a more useful indicator would be to show how many days had been 'lost' of road use.
- Members agreed that there should be a review of KPIs reported to the committee.

3) RESOLVED to note the Performance Dashboard.

## **6. Corporate Risk Register**

*(Item 7)*

*Mark Scrivener, Head of Risk and Delivery Assurance and Matthew Smyth, Director for Environment and Circular Economy, were in attendance for this item*

1) Mr Scrivener introduced the annual Corporate Risk Register report.

2) Members asked questions and the following was noted:

- Costs to KCC associated with Exit Entry System on other parts of the network (non-national routes) should be reflected in risks. National funding policy does not reflect the impact on KCC's Highways budget. The government funding mechanisms were not operating on volume of traffic but on network length.
- Concerns were raised that there was not enough emphasis on climate change impact and it was suggested that more should be done to look at adaptations strategy for climate change.
- A cross-directorate approach was being taken to achieving the government's Net Zero policy. A KCC adaptation strategy was being developed which was due to be completed in April 2024. There had been a series of meetings to look at adaptations to KCC's buildings and services, within the affordability envelope that the authority was operating within. Savings would come from what might happen in the future, so it was avoided future cost rather than budgeted cost. It was recognised that the organisation putting in the measure in place was not always the organisation that would benefit from it financially. Therefore, it was important to look at the overall picture of costs and savings.
- Mr Thomas had agreed to join a Kent and Medway partnership working on climate change issues.

3) RESOLVED to agree the recommendations as outlined in the report.

## **7. Entry/Exit system**

*(Item 8)*

*Toby Howe, Strategic Resilience Manager; Haroona Chughtai, Director of Highways & Transportation, and Simon Jones Corporate Director, GET, were in attendance for this item*

1) Mr Howe and Ms Chughtai introduced the report.

2) Members commented and asked questions and the following was noted:

- The Entry/Exit System (E/ES) was being initiated by the EU as UK citizens were now considered third country nationals and was to involve further customs checks, including biometric testing. Technical solutions had not been developed and passports would need to be seen and observed. There would be increased processing times because of the checks and the impact would be wider than on the network around Dover.
- KCC were in contact with central government around preparation and mitigation of the impacts of E/ES as a national issue. There were concerns about the longer term impact on passengers as well as issues around freight. In the longer term, it was hoped the process would be simplified but in the meantime, the legislation meant that the process could not be done 'from home'.
- It was suggested that the Leader should write to government and that representations be made to politicians, the DfT, DHLUC, and the Home Office.
- Rail alternatives could be explored to counter the issues around lorries.
- Concerns were raised around the impact on the wider infrastructure in Kent and potential for impact on AONBs.
- It was suggested that the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport and GET officers join the Cabinet Member for Economic Development to address the Straits Committee.

3) Mr Rayner proposed, Mr Baldock seconded and Members agreed a motion to make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Highways regarding the management of E/ES:

- a. To take positive action on controlling the movement of heavy goods vehicles and non-domestic freight in Kent from early October 2024, through strong representation to central government, the Home Office, DfT, and DHLUC;
- b. Encourage development of an application to enable Kent bound HGVs to be held (ideally in 'Golden Triangle' in the midlands and north of England).

4) Mr Rayner proposed, Mr Hills seconded and Members agreed an additional motion to make recommendations to the Cabinet Member as follows:

To seek to negotiate with the unaccompanied freight ferry operators to establish what scope might be available to increase capacity at Purfleet and Tilbury, including bringing into use Dartford and Sheerness to keep freight out Operation Brock queues.

To work to set up passenger welfare facilities in advance of October 2024 to enable welfare of passengers delayed by Operation Brock.

5) Members resolved to note the report.

## **8. 24/00018 - Mobility as a Service (MaaS): Pilot**

*(Item 9)*

*Phil Lightowler, Head of Public Transport and Jacqui Elliott, Public Transport Project Manager/Lead for MaaS*

1) Mr Lightowler introduced the report.

2) Mr Rayner proposed, Mr Hills seconded and Members agreed to endorse the recommendation as outlined in the report subject to the following being added to the recommendations:

During the current Medium Term Financial Plan, no KCC funds should be used in connections with the proposals related to the MaaS pilot.

## **9. 24/00015 - Moving Traffic Enforcement Policy**

*(Item 10)*

*Tim Read, Head of Transportation; Neil Edwards, Traffic Manager; and, Simon Jones, Corporate Director for Growth, Environment & Transport were in attendance*

1) Mr Baker introduced the report.

2) Mr Edwards outlined the report.

2) Further to questions and comments, it was noted that:

- Concerns were raised that the act of ringfencing funds received from fines might detract from the reasons for the scheme, as it was not a 'cash cow'. The ambition for the policy was network management improvement.
- Members were advised that Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 applied and was bound to traffic and environmental schemes.
- It was intended that the enforcement would begin in mid to late April 2024.
- The fine amounts were set by government aligning with on-street parking fines which had not increased for many years. Central government was being lobbied on increasing fine amounts.

3) Mr Rayner proposed, Mr Dendor seconded and Members agreed to endorse the recommendations outlined in the report subject to the addition of the following recommendation:

The funds received through this policy and fines imposed are ringfenced within GET directorate.

**10. 24/00017 - Professional Services Framework Contract Award**  
(Item 11)

RESOLVED to agree the recommendations as outlined in the report.

**11. Update on the Future of the Gravesend to Tilbury Ferry Service**  
(Item 12)

*Phil Lightowler, Head of Public Transport/Project Sponsor was in attendance for this item*

1) Mr Baker introduced the report and he thanked Jetstream.

2) Mr Lightowler outlined the report.

3) Mr Rayner proposed and Mr Bond seconded:

That negotiations be ceased and the funds not be held over and that these be put towards bus services.

Following debate, the motion was withdrawn.

4) Further to comments and questions from Members, it was also noted that:

- There were arguments made that the benefits of the ferry were mostly to the benefit of residents of Thurrock and those around the Gravesham area. However, the impact on residents of Kent was recognised and that the termination of the service would result in children not being able to get to their school and others not being able to access their place of employment.
- Members were disappointed that the second-tier authority in Essex had not committed to securing the future of the ferry service.
- Officers were thanked for their efforts in trying to secure the future of the ferry service and supported future efforts by the Cabinet Member and officers to re-instate the service.

5) RESOLVED to note the report.

**12. Work Programme**  
(Item 13)

The work programme was noted.

From: Neil Baker, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation  
 Rob Thomas, Cabinet Member for Environment  
 Simon Jones, Corporate Director for Growth, Environment and Transport

To: Environment & Transport Cabinet Committee – 21 May 2024

Subject: Performance Dashboard

Classification: Unrestricted

**Summary:**

The Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee Performance Dashboard shows performance against targets set for Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). The latest Dashboard includes data up to March 2024.

Twelve of the nineteen KPIs achieved target for latest performance and are RAG rated Green. Five KPIs are below target but did achieve the floor standard and are RAG rated Amber. Two KPIs are below floor standard for latest performance.

**Recommendation(s):**

The Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE the Performance Dashboard and COMMENT on the KPIs and targets proposed for 2024/25.

**1. Introduction**

1.1. Part of the role of Cabinet Committees is to review the performance of the functions of the Council that fall within the remit of the Committee. To support this role, Performance Dashboards are regularly reported to each Cabinet Committee throughout the year, and this is the sixth and final report for the 2023/24 financial year.

**2. Performance Dashboard**

2.1. The Dashboard provides a progress report on performance against target for the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for 2023/24. The current Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee Performance Dashboard is attached as Appendix 1.

2.2. The current Dashboard provides results up to the end of March 2024.

2.3. KPIs are presented with RAG (Red/Amber/Green) ratings to show progress against targets. Details of how the ratings are generated are outlined in the Guidance Notes, included with the Dashboard in Appendix 1.

- 2.4. Two of the six KPIs in Highways & Transportation achieved target for latest month performance and are RAG rated Green. A further two are below target but above floor standard and are RAG rated Amber. The final two are below floor standard and are RAG rated red, these are Customer satisfaction with service delivery, and Priority enquiries completed within 20 working days.
  - 2.5. All three digital take-up indicators in Highways and Transportation were RAG rated Green.
  - 2.6. Seven of the ten indicators for Environment and Waste were above target and are RAG rated Green. The remaining three indicators, which all relate to municipal and HWRC waste recycled and composted, remain below target and are rated Amber.
3. KPIs proposed for reporting performance in 2024/25 are detailed in Appendix 2.

### **3. Recommendation(s):**

The Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE the Performance Dashboard and COMMENT on the KPIs and targets proposed for 2024/25.

### **4. Contact details**

Report Author: Matthew Wagner  
Chief Analyst  
Chief Executive's Department  
03000 416559  
[Matthew.Wagner@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Matthew.Wagner@kent.gov.uk)

Corporate Director: Simon Jones  
Corporate Director, Growth, Environment and Transport  
03000 411683  
[Simon.Jones@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Simon.Jones@kent.gov.uk)

# **Environment and Transport Performance Dashboard**

## **Financial Year 2023/24**

### **Results up to March 2024**

Page 11

Produced by Kent Analytics



## Guidance Notes

Data is provided with monthly frequency except for Waste Management and Greenhouse Gases where indicators are reported with quarterly frequency and as rolling 12-month figures to remove seasonality.

### RAG RATINGS

GREEN	Target has been achieved
AMBER	Floor Standard* achieved but Target has not been met
RED	Floor Standard* has not been achieved

\*Floor Standards are the minimum performance expected and if not achieved must result in management action

### Activity Indicators

Activity Indicators representing demand levels are also included in the report. They are not given a RAG rating. Instead, they are tracked within an expected range represented by Upper and Lower Expectations. The Alert provided for Activity Indicators is whether they are within their expected range or not. Results can either be within their expected range (**Yes**), or **Above** or **Below** their expected range.



## Key Performance Indicators Summary

Highways & Transportation	Monthly RAG	YTD RAG
HT01 : Reported potholes repaired in 28 calendar days (routine works not programmed)	GREEN	AMBER
HT02 : Faults reported by the public completed in 28 calendar days	AMBER	AMBER
HT04 : Customer satisfaction with service delivery (100 Call Back)	RED	AMBER
HT08 : Emergency incidents attended to within 2 hours	AMBER	RED
HT12 : Streetlights, illuminated signs and bollards repaired in 28 calendar days	GREEN	GREEN
HT14 : Priority enquiries completed within 20 working days	RED	RED

Digital Take up	RAG
DT01 : Percentage of public enquiries for Highways Maintenance completed online	GREEN
DT03 : Percentage of concessionary bus pass applications completed online	GREEN
DT04 : Percentage of speed awareness courses booking completed online	GREEN

Environment & Waste	RAG
WM01 : Municipal waste recycled and composted	AMBER
WM02 : Municipal waste converted to energy	GREEN
WM01 + WM02 : Municipal waste diverted from landfill	GREEN
WM03 : Waste recycled and composted at HWRCs	AMBER
WM04 : Percentage of HWRC waste recycled and wood converted to energy at biomass facility	AMBER
WM08 : Overall score for mystery shopper assessment of HWRCs	GREEN
WM10 : Customer satisfaction with HWRCs	GREEN
EW2 : Greenhouse Gas emissions from KCC estate (excluding schools)	GREEN
EW1 : Percentage of statutory planning consultee responses submitted within 21 days	GREEN
DT05 : Percentage of HWRC voucher applications completed online	GREEN

<b>Division</b>	<b>Corporate Director</b>	<b>Cabinet Member</b>
<b>Highways &amp; Transportation</b>	<b>Simon Jones</b>	<b>Neil Baker</b>

### Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Dec-23	Jan-24	Feb-24	Mar-24	Month RAG	Year to Date	YTD RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Yr
HT01	Reported potholes repaired in 28 calendar days	96%	96%	97%	95%	GREEN	89%	AMBER	90%	80%	76%
HT02	Faults reported by the public completed in 28 calendar days	92%	91%	87%	89%	AMBER	86%	AMBER	90%	80%	84%
HT04	Customer satisfaction with service delivery (100 Call Back)	N/a	84%	N/a	79%	RED	87%	AMBER	95%	85%	94%
HT08	Emergency incidents attended to within 2 hours	96%	96%	92%	97%	AMBER	94%	RED	98%	95%	94%
HT12	Streetlights, illuminated signs and bollards repaired in 28 calendar days	91%	99%	96%	90%	GREEN	93%	GREEN	90%	80%	95%
HT14	Priority Enquiries completed within 20 working days	77%	74%	93%	73%	RED	61%	RED	85%	75%	74%

HT01 – This area remains on target with a Green RAG rating. To improve customer service and highway safety, we have empowered KCC Highway’s staff (in addition to our contractors) to complete minor and urgent repairs themselves where it is safe to do so. Staff have suitable material and tools in their vans to make repairs and this enables a faster response as staff repair potholes as they come across them during regular inspections or when Stewards visit sites following a fault reported by a customer. This data is included in the KPI and gives a more accurate reflection of the repairs we have completed on time.

HT02 – For the final Quarter from January 2024 to March 2024, the service received 23,653 enquiries with 20,996 enquires attended to on time which equates to 89% completed on time, narrowly missing the target by 1 percentage point.

HT04 – It has been agreed to stop the 100 call back surveys as Agilisys our contractor are no longer able to carry them out due to resource issues. The last survey was carried out in March and had a 79% satisfaction score. This was mainly due to repairs not being carried out in agreed timescales or to satisfactory levels. All feedback goes to our Service Managers for them to investigate and

feedback to customers. Our customers continue to keep us informed about the service they receive and customer feedback will be a key feature in any fault reporting tool we adopt.

HT08 – The service dealt with a total of 327 emergency responses this March giving an Amber RAG rating at 97%, missing the target by 1 percentage point. For the Quarter to March, 949 emergency incident calls were attended to, of which 902 (95%) were responded to within 2 hours, but with all incidents made safe. We are working with Amey (our term maintenance contractor) to help improve the efficiency of our emergency response crews, for instance, in 2024/25 every depot will have a dedicated emergency crew. By having these dedicated crews at each depot, we hope to see response times improve since crews can immediately attend to emergencies.

HT14 – This area of work is under a centralised team within the Deputy Chief Executive’s Department who work closely with the Highways & Transportation Division. Performance has shown signs of improvement, though is often failing to achieve floor standard. Performance has improved since earlier in the year, though still occasionally does not meet the floor standard. A high number of responses were received in January/February concerning an Active Travel Scheme in Herne Bay.

## Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Nov-23	Dec-23	Jan-24	Feb-24	Mar-24	Year to Date	In expected range?	Expected Range Upper   Lower	
HT01b	Potholes due to be repaired (arising from routine faults reported)	2,086	2,171	2,447	2,791	2,773	<b>21,884</b>	<b>Above</b>	14,100	9,300
HT02b	Routine faults reported by the public due for completion	4,006	5,882	6,372	8,312	8,969	<b>77,475</b>	<b>Above</b>	61,100	49,100
HT06	Number of new enquiries requiring further action (total new faults)	9,921	7,491	11,717	10,404	11,775	<b>105,286</b>	Yes	105,500	86,300
HT07	Work in Progress (active enquiries/jobs) - end of month snapshot	8,392	9,374	9,259	10,027	<b>12,432</b>	N/a	<b>Above</b>	8,300	7,300
HT13	Streetwork permits issued	13,921	9,337	13,473	12,423	12,693	<b>148,858</b>	Yes	168,200	137,700

HT01b & HT02b – The number of potholes requiring repair and faults due for completion continues to be above the expected range owing to the continued unsettled weather particularly heavy downpours, but teams continue to work hard especially under the Pothole Blitz contractors to decrease the backlog.

HT07 – Work in progress is above the expected range mainly due to the increased enquiries following unsettled weather.

<b>Division</b>	<b>Corporate Director</b>	<b>Cabinet Member</b>
<b>Highways and Transportation</b>	<b>Simon Jones</b>	<b>Neil Baker</b>

### Digital Take-up indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Dec-23	Jan-24	Feb-24	Mar-24	Year to Date	YTD RAG	Target	Floor	Prev. Year
DT01	Percentage of public enquiries for Highways Maintenance completed online	70%	71%	74%	77%	69%	GREEN	60%	50%	65%
DT03	Percentage of concessionary bus pass applications completed online	81%	79%	77%	78%	77%	GREEN	75%	65%	75%
DT04	Percentage of speed awareness courses bookings completed online	91%	90%	91%	93%	89%	GREEN	85%	75%	86%

Division	Corporate Director	Cabinet Member
Environment & Circular Economy	Simon Jones	Rob Thomas

**Key Performance Indicators - Rolling 12 months except WM08 (Quarterly) and WM10 (Half-yearly)**

Ref	Indicator description	Mar-23	Jun-23	Sep-23	Dec-23	Mar-24	RAG	Target	Floor
WM01	Municipal waste* recycled and composted	42%	42%	42%	42%	42%	AMBER	50%	42%
WM02	Municipal waste* converted to energy	58%	58%	58%	58%	58%	GREEN	49%	44%
01+02	Municipal waste diverted from landfill	99.8%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	GREEN	99%	95%
WM03	Waste recycled and composted at Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs)	42%	42%	43%	43%	43%	AMBER	50%	42%
WM04	Percentage HWRC waste recycled/composted & wood converted to energy at biomass facility	65%	66%	66%	66%	65%	AMBER	70%	65%
WM08	Overall score for mystery shopper assessment of Household Waste Recycling Centres	96%	96%	97%	98%	98%	GREEN	97%	90%
WM10	Customer satisfaction with HWRCs	N/a	96%	No Survey	96%	No survey	GREEN	95%	90%

\* Municipal waste is collected by Districts, and by KCC via HWRCs.

WM01 – This KPI is steady at 42%. The 50% target for this KPI is within the Kent Joint Municipal Waste Strategy agreed by the Kent Resource Partnership. Those Collection Authorities with Inter Authority Agreements with KCC do achieve better rates of recycling.

WM03 – This KPI is stable around 42% to 43%, with small fluctuations dependent on how much organic waste is produced which itself is weather dependent. Volumes of waste taken to HWRCs have been steadily increasing with a 10% rise in the 12 months to March 2024 compared to the 12 months to March 2023.

WM04 – This KPI appears stable at 65% to 66% and includes wood which cannot be recycled.

Division	Corporate Director	Cabinet Member
Environment & Circular Economy	Simon Jones	Rob Thomas

**Activity Indicators** (Rolling 12 months)

Ref	Indicator description	Mar-23	Jun-23	Sep-23	Dec-23	Mar-24	In expected range?	<u>Expected Range</u> Upper   Lower	
WM05	Waste tonnage collected by District Councils	555,365	559,642	560,037	558,633	<b>560,948</b>	Yes	570,000	550,000
WM06	Waste tonnage collected at HWRCs	94,238	96,894	100,505	101,955	<b>103,444</b>	Yes	120,000	100,000
05+06	Total waste tonnage collected	649,603	656,536	660,542	660,588	<b>664,392</b>	Yes	690,000	650,000
WM07	Waste tonnage converted to energy at Allington Waste to Energy Plant	323,934	323,801	324,700	325,518	<b>328,261</b>	Yes	340,000	320,000
WM09	Wood Tonnage converted to energy at Biomass Facility	21,648	22,384	22,604	23,106	<b>23,415</b>	Above	23,000	20,000

Division	Corporate Director	Cabinet Member
Environment & Circular Economy	Simon Jones	Rob Thomas

**Key Performance Indicator** (rolling 12-month total, reported one Quarter in arrears)

Ref	Indicator description	Sep-22	Dec-22	Mar-23	Jun-23	Sep-23	Dec-23	RAG	Target	Floor
EW2	Greenhouse Gas emissions from KCC estate (excluding schools) in tonnes	15,224	14,726	13,550	12,637	11,773	11,477	GREEN	12,680	13,950

EW2 – Core KCC emissions have halved since 2019. This is predominantly due to 1) the streetlight dimming project, 2) LED lighting rollout in streetlighting, traffic signals and displays and Highways, 3) Installation of LED in KCC estates and 4) solar PV installation on KCC own buildings, 5) swapping a small number of boilers to air source heat pumps and 6) the significant renewable electricity produced by Bowerhouse solar farm. Bowerhouse provides half of the emission reduction seen since 2019 and in effect provides renewable electricity for street lighting, traffic signals and displays, and a portion of the electricity use in estates. Reductions in emissions from the KCC owned/leased vehicles is due to a reduction in miles travelled since Covid, although this is now increasing since a return to business as usual.

Page 20

**Key Performance Indicators** (monthly)

Ref	Indicator description	Nov-23	Dec-23	Jan-24	Feb-24	Mar-24	Year to Date	YTD RAG	Target	Floor
EW1	Percentage of statutory planning consultee responses submitted within 21 days	96%	96%	98%	92%	94%	94%	GREEN	90%	80%
DT05	Percentage of HWRC voucher applications completed online	100%	99%	99%	99%	100%	99%	GREEN	98%	90%



## Proposed KPIs and Activity indicators for 2024/2025

### Highways and Transportation

#### Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

Ref	Indicator description	2023/24 Year-end	2024/25 Target	2024/25 Floor
HT01	Potholes repaired in 28 calendar days	89%	90%	80%
HT02	Routine faults/enquiries reported by the public completed in 28 calendar days	86%	90%	80%
HT08	Emergency incidents attended to within 2 hours	94%	98%	95%
HT12	Streetlights/illuminated signs/bollards repaired in 28 calendar days	93%	90%	80%
DT01	Percentage of public enquiries for Highways' maintenance reported online	69%	60%	55%
DT03	Percentage of concessionary bus pass applications completed online	77%	75%	65%
DT04	Percentage of speed awareness courses bookings completed online	89%	85%	75%

#### Activity indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Threshold	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
HT01b	Potholes repaired (as routine works and not programmed)	Upper	4,450	2,500	2,850	4,150
		Lower	3,150	1,750	2,050	2,900
HT02b	Routine faults reported by the public completed	Upper	14,400	14,600	15,200	19,200
		Lower	11,100	11,300	11,700	14,700
HT06	Number of new enquiries requiring further action (faults)	Upper	24,200	24,200	25,700	33,300
		Lower	20,200	20,200	21,300	27,700
HT07	Work in Progress (outstanding enquiries waiting action)	Upper	7,100	6,700	7,800	8,600
		Lower	5,800	5,500	6,400	7,000
HT08b	Emergency incidents attended (NEW)	Upper	580	690	810	1,400
		Lower	420	510	590	1,000
HT13	Streetwork permits issued	Upper	42,100	40,300	40,300	44,800
		Lower	34,500	33,100	32,900	36,600

KPIs removed

Ref	Indicator description	Reason
HT04	Customer satisfaction with routine Highways' service delivery (100 Call back survey)	This survey is conducted by Agilysys, and is being discontinued due to resourcing issues.
HT14	Priority Enquiries completed within 20 working days	Responsibility for responses resides in the Deputy Chief Executive's Department who are not represented at this Committee

**Resource Management and Circular Economy**Key Performance Indicators – rolling 12 months

Ref	Indicator Description	2023/24 Year-end	2024/25 Target	2024/25 Floor
WM01	Municipal waste recycled and composted	42%	50%	42%
WM02	Municipal waste converted to energy (including conversion to refuse derived fuel)	58%	49%	44%
01+02	Municipal waste diverted from landfill	99.9%	99%	95%
WM03	Percentage of waste recycled and composted at HWRCs	43%	50%	42%
WM04	Percentage HWRC waste recycled & wood converted to energy at biomass facility	65%	70%	65%
WM08	Mystery Shopping at Household Waste Recycling Centre Services	98%	97%	90%
WM10	Customer satisfaction with HWRCs	96%	95%	90%

Other Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	2023/24 Year-end	2024/25 Target	2024/25 Floor
EW2	GHG emissions (KCC estate/services and Traded Companies) in tonnes, to measure progress towards Net Zero by 2030	11,477 (Q3)	10,570 (Q3)	11,627 (Q3)
EW1	Percentage of statutory planning consultee responses submitted to the local planning authority within 21 days (Flood & Water management)	94%	90%	80%

Activity indicators (rolling 12 months)

Ref	Indicator description	Threshold	Annual
WM05	Waste tonnage collected by district councils	Upper	570,000
		Lower	550,000
WM06	Tonnage managed through HWRC	Upper	110,000
		Lower	90,000
WM05+ 06	Total Waste Tonnage	Upper	680,000
		Lower	640,000
WM07	Waste tonnage converted to energy at Allington Waste to Energy Plant	Upper	340,000
		Lower	320,000
WM09	Wood Tonnage converted to energy at Biomass Facility	Upper	25,000
		Lower	21,000

KPI removed

Ref	Indicator description	Reason
DT05	Percentage of HWRC voucher applications completed online	This KPI is consistently at 99% or higher. The transition to online transactions has been achieved.

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Neil Baker, Cabinet Member for Highways & Transport  
Simon Jones, Corporate Director, Growth, Environment and Transport

To: Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee – 21 May 2024

Subject: **Kent Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) – 2024 Refresh**

Key Decision: **Yes**

Classification: **Unrestricted**

Past Pathway of Paper: **N/A**

Future Pathway of Paper: **For Cabinet Member Decision**

Electoral Divisions Affected: **All**

**Summary:**

In October 2021, KCC submitted its Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) to the DfT in response to the Government's National Bus Strategy (NBS). Kent's BSIP was well received and subsequently allocated funding totalling £35.1m, £18.9m of which has been received to date for the delivery of an agreed BSIP initiative programme for 2023/24.

In January 2024, Government set out new BSIP guidance for all Local Transport Authorities (LTAs). The guidance requires LTAs to submit an updated 2024 BSIP to the DfT by 12<sup>th</sup> June 2024. The updated BSIP must update on change and progress since the 2021 BSIP and set out a high-level future initiative programme for 2025-29, deliverable should further external funding be made available by Government through the NBS process.

**Recommendation:** The Cabinet Committee is asked to consider and endorse or make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport on the proposed decision to:

APPROVE a BSIP initiative table for the period 2025-2029 for inclusion within Kent's 2024 BSIP submission. The table details proposed initiatives across a range of focus areas (e.g. network, fares and ticketing, infrastructure) which could be delivered should additional external funding be awarded to KCC through the Government's National Bus Strategy process as shown at Appendix A.

**1. Introduction**

1.1 As reported previously to this committee, In March 2021 the Government published its National Bus Strategy (NBS) for England, setting out a vision for how bus services and infrastructure could be developed across the country to align with what was termed as the London standard. £3bn of funding was made available to support the strategy,

although this figure was subsequently reduced to £1.2bn, due to alternative use of funds for support linked to the Covid-19 pandemic.

- 1.2 In response to the NBS, all Local Transport Authorities (LTAs) were required to submit a Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP), setting out how the vision of the NBS could be delivered locally, but in the context of the existing challenges facing the bus industry.
- 1.3 In October 2021, KCC worked in conjunction with the county's bus operators to submit its BSIP to Government.
- 1.4 In April 2022 KCC learnt that its BSIP had been well received by Government and that it had been allocated £35.1m of funding to deliver some of the interventions identified within the plan. The first tranche of this funding totalling £18.9m was received in March 2023 and has been utilised to roll out an initiative programme across the 23/24 financial year - See [Decision - 23/00027 - BSIP Tranche One](#). The second tranche of funding, totalling £16.2m for the delivery of initiatives in 24/25 is expected to be received in June 2024 following a Key Decision to accept - [Decision - 23/00104 - BSIP Tranche Two](#).
- 1.5 In January 2024 Government set out new BSIP guidance for all Local Transport Authorities (LTAs) requiring the submission of a revised 2024 BSIP by 12th June 2024.
- 1.6 A 2024 BSIP must be submitted in order to secure the release of Tranche 2 BSIP funding and to ensure that wider funding for buses is not jeopardised.

## **2. 2024 BSIP Requirement & Kent's Position**

- 2.1 A short timescale has been set for the submission of a revised BSIP, requiring the submission of a full document by 12<sup>th</sup> June 2024.
- 2.2 Government guidance has noted that the 2024 BSIP must consist of three main elements:
  - a) Updating the baseline to 2023/24: updating the 2021 BSIP's taking account of the current situation to reflect all developments since 2021, including evolution of the local bus market post-pandemic and its issues and opportunities and highlighting achievements made since 2021 through BSIP funding received to date.
  - b) Setting out the delivery programme for financial year 2024/25: should BSIP Tranche 2 funding for 24/25 be formally received.
  - c) A plan for 2025 and beyond, refreshing the plan's ambition and setting out a pipeline of proposals for the four years 2025/26 – 2028/29, ready for delivery should external funding be made available from Government through the National Bus Strategy process.
- 2.2 Elements "a" and "b" involve factual updates only, i.e. covering factual information and initiatives already agreed and approved through previous BSIP related Council decisions. As per part "ii" of the proposed Cabinet Member Decision, It is proposed

that Kent's Enhanced Partnership Board (EPB) will review and agree this content ahead of submission. Kent's EPB is chaired by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport and is attended by the Director of Highways and Transport, the Head of Public Transport and KCC's Traffic Manager. Five operator representatives are also present and all of these attendees have voting rights.

- 2.3 To meet element "c", it is proposed to submit the 2025-29 initiative table included as Appendix C as part of Kent's 2024 BSIP submission, as per part "i" of the proposed Cabinet Member Decision.
- 2.4 While timescales set by Government have not allowed for full consultation, KCC has used its existing Enhanced Partnership meeting structure to engage with District Councils and operators on the proposed 2025-29 initiative table. Feedback has been incorporated where possible.
- 2.5 It is very important to note that at this time Government has allocated no further funding for BSIPs for the 2025-29 period. As such, the initiative table provides a high-level summary of initiatives which could be delivered in the event that future funding is made available by Government through the National Bus Strategy process. No initiatives will be deliverable without this additional funding.
- 2.6 Kent's initiative table has been kept deliberately at a high and strategic level. Should funding be forthcoming to deliver any initiatives within the programme, then the initiatives would be developed to meet local circumstances and to provide more accurate costings.

### **3. Financial Implications**

- 3.1 All initiatives proposed within Kent's BSIP initiative programme for 2025-29 are subject to external funding being made available by Government through the NBS process. The submission of the initiative table does not commit KCC to direct financial commitment in the absence of this funding. Should a funding offer be forthcoming in response to this submission, then its acceptance (including related grant terms and conditions) and the initiative programme proposed for progression would be subject to a further Key Decision process. This has been the case for BSIP Tranche 1 and Tranche 2.
- 3.2 Government have advised that the agreement and submission of a 2024 BSIP will secure the release of BSIP tranche 2 funding for 24/25
- 3.3 As noted in previous papers, the acceptance of 24/25 BSIP and BSIP+ will demand that KCC does not reduce its budgets for bus for the 24/25 financial year.

### **4. Legal Implications**

- 4.1 There are no immediate legal implications linked to the 2024 BSIP. However, it is anticipated that should there be a formal funding offer resulting from this submission

that a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and Grant Determination Letter would be provided by Government for acceptance.

## 5. Equality implications

- 5.1 An initial EQIA for Kent's BSIP has been produced and updated as the project has progressed.
- 5.2 Should any initiative submitted as part of Kent's 2024 BSIP subsequently receive Government funding, it would be subject to EQIA.

## 6. Other corporate implications

- 6.1 Communication and consultation may be required; however this would only be in the event of the award of funding and subsequent delivery of initiatives.

## 7. Governance

- 7.1 Following the decision being taken by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport Kent's Enhanced Partnership Board will be asked to sign off for the wider content of Kent's 2024 BSIP, which updates the baseline position up to 23/24 and details the delivery programme.

## 8. Recommendation

**Recommendation:** The Cabinet Committee is asked to consider and endorse or make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport on the proposed decision to:

APPROVE a BSIP initiative table for the period 2025-2029 for inclusion within Kent's 2024 BSIP submission. The table details proposed initiatives across a range of focus areas (e.g. network, fares and ticketing, infrastructure) which could be delivered should additional external funding be awarded to KCC through the Government's National Bus Strategy process as shown at Appendix A.

## 9. Appendices

Appendix A – Proposed Record of Decision  
Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment  
Appendix C – BSIP Initiatives

## 10. Contact Details

Phil Lightowler – Head of Public Transport  
[Philip.lightowler@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Philip.lightowler@kent.gov.uk)



Dan Bruce – Enhanced Partnership and Infrastructure Manager  
[Dan.bruce@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Dan.bruce@kent.gov.uk)

Stephen Pay – Planning and Operations Manager  
[Stephen.pay@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Stephen.pay@kent.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

# KENT COUNTY COUNCIL –PROPOSED RECORD OF DECISION

**DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY:**

Neil Baker Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

**DECISION NO:**

For publication

Key decision: YES / NO

**Subject Matter / Title of Decision: Kent Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) – 2024 Refresh**

**Decision:**

As Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, I agree to APPROVE a BSIP initiative table for the period 2025-2029 for inclusion within Kent's 2024 BSIP submission. The table details proposed initiatives across a range of focus areas (e.g. network, fares and ticketing, infrastructure) which could be delivered should additional external funding be awarded to KCC through the Government's National Bus Strategy process.

**Reason(s) for decision:**

In October 2021, KCC submitted its Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) to the DfT in response to the Government's National Bus Strategy (NBS). Kent's BSIP was well received and subsequently allocated funding totaling £35.1m, £18.9m of which has been received to date for the delivery of an agreed BSIP initiative programme for 2023/24.

In January 2024, Government set out new BSIP guidance for all Local Transport Authorities (LTAs). The guidance requires LTAs to submit an updated 2024 BSIP to the DfT by 12th June 2024. The updated BSIP must update on change and progress since the 2021 BSIP and set out a high-level future initiative programme for 2025-29, deliverable should further external funding be made available by Government through the NBS process

**Cabinet Committee recommendations and other consultation:**

The proposed decision is being considered by members of the Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee at their meeting on 21 May.

**Any alternatives considered and rejected:**

To not produce a 2024 BSIP – This has been rejected as failure to submit a BSIP in line with Government requirements will result in the loss of tranche 2 BSIP funding for 24/25 and the release of BSIP+ funding which is vital for bus service support

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

.....  
signed

.....  
date

This page is intentionally left blank

## EQIA Submission – ID Number

### Section A

**EQIA Title**

National Bus Strategy - BSIP 2024 Initiatives

**Responsible Officer**

Luke Naylor - GT TRA

**Approved by (Note: approval of this EqIA must be completed within the EqIA App)**

Philip Lightowler - GT TRA

### Type of Activity

**Service Change**

No

**Service Redesign**

No

**Project/Programme**

Project/Programme

**Commissioning/Procurement**

No

**Strategy/Policy**

No

**Details of other Service Activity**

No

### Accountability and Responsibility

**Directorate**

Growth Environment and Transport

**Responsible Service**

Highways & Transportation

**Responsible Head of Service**

Philip Lightowler - GT TRA

**Responsible Director**

Haroona Chughtai - GT TRA

### Aims and Objectives

Following on from the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) submitted by Kent County Council in 2021, the Department for Transport (DfT) have requested an updated version to be submitted by 12th June 2024. The new BSIP is to reflect how the bus industry has changed since 2021 in a Post-Pandemic environment, whilst also identifying areas that require continued improvement from Local Transport Authorities, to support further bus travel. As part of this new BSIP, a list of new initiatives have been identified to be delivered between 2025-2029 should further Government funding become available.

Aims for the list of initiatives include:

- Having a clear plan of measures to facilitate the recovery from the challenges from the bus industry and for further enhancements to bus provision and infrastructure between 2025-29 within Kent should funding be made available by the DfT.
- Be in accordance of the requirements set by the DfT with regards to the National Bus Strategy and how BSIPs are written.
- To target opportunities of potential future growth within the bus industry within Kent.
- To target further improvements for the industry to meet requirements to be net carbon zero.

Should funding be made available, this would continue the progression made by Public Transport from the BSIP document that was released in 2021.

## Section B – Evidence

**Do you have data related to the protected groups of the people impacted by this activity?**

Yes

**It is possible to get the data in a timely and cost effective way?**

Yes

**Is there national evidence/data that you can use?**

No

**Have you consulted with stakeholders?**

Yes

**Who have you involved, consulted and engaged with?**

Bus Operators.  
District Councils.  
Elected Council Members.  
Internal colleagues within Traffic Management, Procurement, Communications and Finance.

**Has there been a previous Equality Analysis (EQIA) in the last 3 years?**

Yes

**Do you have evidence that can help you understand the potential impact of your activity?**

Yes

## Section C – Impact

**Who may be impacted by the activity?**

**Service Users/clients**

Service users/clients

**Staff**

Staff/Volunteers

**Residents/Communities/Citizens**

Residents/communities/citizens

**Are there any positive impacts for all or any of the protected groups as a result of the activity that you are doing?**

Yes

**Details of Positive Impacts**

There aren't any immediate positive impacts from the initiatives table as BSIP 2024 is not a bidding document so proposals made may not been progressed. However, should the Department for Transport make funding available as a result of the BSIP 2024 and the proposed initiatives being accepted to do so, then there will be many positive results for all bus users across the county. There will be potential to encourage greater use of buses from people who may have seen barriers to bus use e.g reliability of services or cost. With positive initiative rollout across the county, and potential bus usage increasing, more residents will have access to education, social activities, job opportunities or health centres.

## Negative impacts and Mitigating Actions

19.Negative Impacts and Mitigating actions for Age

**Are there negative impacts for age?**

No. Note: If Question 19a is "No", Questions 19b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval

**Details of negative impacts for Age**

Not Completed

**Mitigating Actions for Age**

Not Completed

**Responsible Officer for Mitigating Actions – Age**

Not Completed

<b>20. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Disability</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Disability?</b>
No. Note: If Question 20a is "No", Questions 20b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Details of Negative Impacts for Disability</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Disability</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for Disability</b>
Not Completed
<b>21. Negative Impacts and Mitigating actions for Sex</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Sex</b>
No. Note: If Question 21a is "No", Questions 21b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Details of negative impacts for Sex</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Sex</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for Sex</b>
Not Completed
<b>22. Negative Impacts and Mitigating actions for Gender identity/transgender</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Gender identity/transgender</b>
No. Note: If Question 22a is "No", Questions 22b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Gender identity/transgender</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Gender identity/transgender</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Gender identity/transgender</b>
Not Completed
<b>23. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Race</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Race</b>
No. Note: If Question 23a is "No", Questions 23b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Race</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Race</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Race</b>
Not Completed
<b>24. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Religion and belief</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Religion and belief</b>
No. Note: If Question 24a is "No", Questions 24b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Religion and belief</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Religion and belief</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Religion and Belief</b>
Not Completed

<b>25. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Sexual Orientation</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Sexual Orientation</b>
No. Note: If Question 25a is "No", Questions 25b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Sexual Orientation</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Sexual Orientation</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Sexual Orientation</b>
Not Completed
<b>26. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Pregnancy and Maternity</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Pregnancy and Maternity</b>
No. Note: If Question 26a is "No", Questions 26b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Pregnancy and Maternity</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Pregnancy and Maternity</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Pregnancy and Maternity</b>
Not Completed
<b>27. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>
No. Note: If Question 27a is "No", Questions 27b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>
Not Completed
<b>28. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Carer's responsibilities</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Carer's responsibilities</b>
No. Note: If Question 28a is "No", Questions 28b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Carer's responsibilities</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Carer's responsibilities</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for Carer's responsibilities</b>
Not Completed



**From:** Neil Baker, Cabinet Member – Highways and Transport  
Simon Jones, Corporate Director – Growth, Environment and Transport

**To:** Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee – 21 May 2024

**Subject:** Road Asset Renewal Contract 2025 Award

**Decision No:** 24/00043

**Classification:** **Unrestricted**

**Past Pathway of report:** None

**Future Pathway of report:** for Cabinet Member Key Decision

**Electoral Division:** Affects all divisions

**Summary:** This report provides the Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee with a summary of the work undertaken to date to commission the new Road Asset Renewal Contract (RARC).

**Recommendation(s):**

The Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee is asked to consider and endorse or make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport on the proposed decision to:

- (i) APPROVE the procurement and contract award of a zero value Road Asset Renewal contract;
- (ii) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Highways and Transportation, to take relevant actions to facilitate the required procurement activity;
- (iii) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Highways and Transportation, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, to take relevant actions, including but not limited to, awarding, finalising the terms of and entering into the relevant contracts or other legal agreements, as necessary, to implement the decision; and
- (iv) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Highways and Transportation, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, to award extensions of the contract in accordance with the extension clauses within the contract (5 years + up to 5 years extension).

as shown at Appendix A.

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 There are around 5,445 miles of local roads in Kent (616 miles of A roads, 279 of B roads, 1172 of C roads and 3378 of unclassified roads), one of the largest local authority networks in the country. It includes a high-speed road network of around 119 miles which has a bespoke annual maintenance programme.
- 1.2 Uniquely, our extensive road network comprises a high proportion of classified or urban roads, many undesigned 'evolved' roads, difficult and variable geology, a large fast-growing population, and high volumes of heavy goods vehicles and other traffic as a result of our proximity to London and our position as the gateway to Europe.
- 1.3 Our local highway network is the most valuable asset we own in Kent, with a replacement value of around £24 billion. Our road assets make up around £10.2 billion of that and play a vital part in delivering council objectives set out in *Framing Kent's Future* by enabling safe and reliable journeys around and through the county.
- 1.4 Our roads support social wellbeing and economic prosperity. They are essential for emergency services to execute their work: policing, healthcare, fire, and emergency response provision all require an effective highway network. These services are a key part of a functioning society which cannot exist without well-maintained and well-managed roads.
- 1.5 Our current approach to road maintenance is set out in our [Highways Asset Management Plan for 2021/22 to 2025/26](#) (HAMP) which was formally adopted and published in July 2021. The HAMP has ensured that we have been able to maximise the available Department for Transport (DfT) capital funding in recent years; make an evidenced-based case for additional KCC investment, and consistently enables KCC to demonstrate it is not negligent as a Highway Authority so that it can put forward a defence in any claim as required under the Highways Act. This approach has particularly benefited road maintenance given that it is the largest and most valuable asset group.
- 1.6 The majority of road spend is on planned data-driven maintenance to prevent potholes and surface defects occurring in the first place, a key principle of asset management. In 2024/25, our multi-pronged approach includes:
  - Planned road surface renewal and reconstruction - £25m
  - Planned road surface preservation - £11m
  - Pothole Blitz - £8.6m
  - Routine maintenance/safety inspections/customer enquiries – circa £7.2m
- 1.7 Of the above, planned road surface renewal and reconstruction works are currently delivered by GW Highways under our Road Asset Renewal contract. This contract was awarded in late 2020 and, with extensions, runs to the end of 2024. It cannot be extended beyond that point.
- 1.8 The delivery of the existing Road Asset Renewal contract has been very successful. GW Highways has a proven track record of providing an excellent service with an average service performance measures client score of 9.95/10.

Under the contract GW Highways has delivered an enhanced level of services that have included both planned and reactive resurfacing works, concrete bay replacements and full depth reconstruction schemes.

- 1.9 In 2023, GW Highways also became Carbon Neutral under PAS 2060:2014 by removing the equivalent amount of CO<sub>2</sub> to what is emitted through activities across its supply chain, by investing in emission reduction projects that absorb CO<sub>2</sub>.

## **2. Discussion**

- 2.1 Prior to 2022, the highway maintenance sector has, like the wider economy, generally experienced very low levels of price inflation, typically around 2% per annum. In 2022, an average inflation rate of around 6% was applied to our highway maintenance contracts. The position in 2023 was much more severe with prices being affected by hyper-inflation of 20-30%.
- 2.2 Given its heavy use of bituminous products, quarried aggregates and reliance on fuel use, road maintenance work has been particularly affected by high rates of inflation in 2023, affected by worldwide pressures. The price of planned road resurfacing in 2023 has increased by 30% compared to 2022. Neither DfT capital grants nor KCC capital funding are increased each year to reflect annual inflation, and so the work carried out year on year, compared to the previous year decreases (though when market inflation is low this is somewhat mitigated by innovation, efficiency and market competitiveness). However, given the significant and unprecedented inflation pressure in 2023, the volume of road resurfacing delivered in 2023 significantly reduced compared to that delivered in 2022. This coincided with very poor weather conditions in the winter of 2022/23.
- 2.3 The inflation uplift applied to 2024 rates under the current Road Asset Renewal contract was much lower at 1.21%. There nevertheless remains considerable uncertainty around pricing in the construction and highway maintenance sectors.
- 2.4 Given the above, and wider financial pressures the council is facing, our work on putting together a commissioning strategy to reprocure road asset renewal services from 2025 onwards has focussed heavily on maximising best value, whilst ensuring quality standards are maintained. It has also looked at how we can embed carbon reduction into any future commissioned service, mainly as a result of technical specification changes.
- 2.5 A Prior Information Notice was published in January 2024 inviting expressions of interest from relevant suppliers to participate in a market engagement exercise. KCC received a total of thirteen responses. Market engagement discussions were held with five organisations. These took place during 20-26 February 2024. This discussion focussed on how to drive prices down without compromising quality. Our key finds are set out below.

### **Market Overview and Interest**

- There are a number of national and local contractors with access to nearby batching plants for the processing of asphalt, the key material required for the service.
- Contractors are expected to be very interested due to the high value of this contract. Although there is no specific guarantee of yearly expenditure, it is anticipated to range between £20-25 million annually, resulting in an expected total spend of £200-250 million throughout the contract's duration, including all possible extensions.
- Contractors might not be interested due to the large geographical spread of works; smaller contractors may prefer to work on only half of the county, but this contributes to inefficiencies and reduced best value due to the comparative inaccessibility of the east of the county.

### **Operational**

- Elements such as traffic management, lining and ironworks are commonly subcontracted, though some contractors carry the necessary resources for these services in house.
- Ordering works from a schedule of rates is well-established within the market, as are the form of contract (NEC4) and the Highway Maintenance Efficiency Programme (HMEP) standard on which the schedule of rates is based.
- Cost drivers include labour rates (especially for nights and weekends), and the price of asphalt.

### **Procurement and Bidding**

- Previous procurements of this service received an average of six bids.
- The market is small but mature, with primarily tier 1 contractors expected to tender.
- Potential opportunity for tier 2 contractors if they successfully pass the Selection Questionnaire stage.
- Dialogue is encouraged throughout the procurement process.

### **Contracting Models and Risk Management**

- Fixing rates prompts the market to incorporate this risk into their price submissions; however, annual inflationary uplifts serve as a countermeasure.
- Extended contract terms of 5+ years enable investment, innovation, and environmental improvements in the service, offering a sufficient duration for the depreciation of capital assets. A term of this length will incentivise and focus the contractor.
- Longer contract terms (5 years and beyond) provide the contractor with increased buying power within their supply chain, enabling them to pass on the resulting benefits to the Council. This, in turn, enhances best value and facilitates the achievement of innovation and environmental targets.
- Short contract lengths will increase prices and restrict environmental improvements and social value; the market is moving away from short terms.

- Linking extensions to performance helps incentivise innovation and eliminate stagnation.
- Completed works are paid for in arrears upon completion and approval, which lessens the financial risk to the Council.

### **3. Proposed Commissioning Approach**

3.1 The current commercial model is a single operator contract. This has been a successful commission, and it is proposed that this commercial model will be carried forward to the new arrangement. The benefits of this model are:

- it provides a single point of contact for Council staff, consistency of service provision, and the efficiencies gained through the ability to programme a high volume of work on an annual basis.
- higher spend with an individual contractor is likely to enhance best value due to lower overheads, and
- it will encourage better and more long-term investment and collaboration into the service in the following areas:
  - Environmental
  - Social Value
  - Innovation
  - Early Contractor Involvement
  - Best value

3.2 A multi-contractor/lot option, as per the 2013 contract, and a Framework option were considered but discounted for the following reasons.

- By delivering the entire service through two or more providers, the per contractor spend will be lower resulting in a reduction of best value compared with using a single provider.
- The lower volumes of work reduce the ability of the individual providers to efficiently programme the works to deliver high service quality and best value.
- Multiple points of contact for KCC engineers complicate scheme planning.
- The advantages that this model can provide, such as resilience to one contractor's failure, are of limited use. We have seen consistently high contractor performance and much of the market is served by large well-established contractors at low risk of service failure.
- Multiple contractors will increase the contract management workload for KCC.
- Annual mini competitions via a Framework hinders programme management; long term programme visibility helps the market to plan; this effective planning reduces risk and keeps prices competitive. It also significantly hinders the investment that a contractor can put into the services which would have negatively affect environmental targets.

3.3 Delivering this service through an existing commission, or through a new commission encompassing a number of highway and construction related services was also considered. This was ruled out due to the following reasons:

- A contract which covers the delivery of multiple services often results in a lack of focus on specific services.

- A commission which includes reactive/urgent works will often divert resources from planned/programmed works to respond to these, reducing the quality of service.
  - Service failures in one area can impact contractor viability across all areas.
- 3.4 It is proposed that the initial contract period be for five years, to drive down costs and increase investment and innovation, with up to five years of extensions based on performance. Supplier performance will be regularly monitored using Service Performance Measures (SPMs). The contract will include break clauses to enable termination in the event of poor performance.
- 3.5 Tenderers will first be required to submit a Selection Questionnaire, answering a set of mandatory questions and submit case studies so that we can assess their previous experience and accreditations, and therefore test their suitability to proceed to the Invitation to Tender stage.
- 3.6 Contract award will be determined by the Lowest Notional Tender Value (NTV) above the Minimum Quality Threshold (MQT) evaluation methodology. Tenderers must achieve a minimum score for each tailored quality question before being evaluated based on the lowest price. This approach ensures that the successful bid meets a satisfactory quality standard, allowing the Council to benefit from the lowest price. We may then hold negotiation and clarification meetings with tenderers, to clarify any uncertainties and explore any opportunities for further driving down risk and therefore prices. If that process results in any changes, we will then issue an Invitation to Submit Final Tender.

#### **4. Next steps**

- 4.1 Following agreement, the formal procurement of the contract will begin, and this will comply with the requirements of Public Contract Regulations 2015.
- 4.2 Following a successful conclusion of the tendering process, a 'Recommendation to Award' report will be presented to the Director of Highways and Transportation to ratify the contractual arrangements with the chosen supplier.
- 4.3 The new contract will start from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2025.

#### **5. Financial Implications**

- 5.1 This paper is seeking to update committee members on our intended approach to commissioning the next Road Asset Renewal contract and is not seeking to make any specific policy decision. It therefore does not have direct financial implications.
- 5.2 We have spent around £20-25m per annum using the existing Road Asset Renewal contract over the last four years (though the quantity of planned road renewal works delivered each year has reduced given that neither DfT capital grants nor KCC capital funding has increased in line with annual inflation, as explained in paragraph 2.2). Whilst there is considerable uncertainty around

future government capital grants for maintenance, we would expect a similar level of annual spend going forward.

## **6. Legal implications**

- 6.1 There are no specific legal implications. However, the delivery of road asset renewal works is a vital part of our carefully considered approach to highway maintenance, as set out in KCC's Highways Asset Management Plan for 2021/22-2025/26, which helps us to demonstrate that we are a competent highway authority and are fulfilling our duty under the Highways Act 1980 to maintain a safe network.

## **7. Equalities implications**

- 7.1 There are no equalities implications.

## **8. Other corporate implications**

- 8.1 N/A

## **9. Governance**

- 9.1 N/A

## **10. Conclusions**

- 10.1 The approach to commissioning road asset renewal services from 2025 outlined above will reduce risk so far as is reasonably possible in today's market, thereby achieving best value. A five-year initial period plus up to five years of extension will provide market certainty and buying power for the chosen contractor. It will also facilitate capital investment, including in respect of reducing their carbon footprint, and encourage innovation.

11. **Recommendation(s):**

11.1 The Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee is asked to consider and endorse or make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport on the proposed decision to:

(i) APPROVE the procurement and contract award of a zero value Road Asset Renewal contract;

(ii) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Highways and Transportation, to take relevant actions to facilitate the required procurement activity;

(iii) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Highways and Transportation, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, to take relevant actions, including but not limited to, awarding, finalising the terms of and entering into the relevant contracts or other legal agreements, as necessary, to implement the decision; and

(iv) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Highways and Transportation, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, to award extensions of the contract in accordance with the extension clauses within the contract (5 years + up to 5 years extension),

as shown at Appendix A.

• **Appendices and Background Document**

- Appendix A Proposed Record of Decision
- Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment
- Highways Asset Management Plan 2021/22 to 2025/26 - *A safer, more sustainable and more resilient highway network*

This document can be found via the following link - <https://www.kent.gov.uk/about-the-council/strategies-and-policies/transport-and-highways-policies/managing-highway-infrastructure>.

**12. Contact details**

Report Author:  
Alan Casson, Strategic Asset  
Manager  
03000 413563  
alan.casson@kent.gov.uk

Relevant Director:  
Haroon Chughtai, Director – Highways &  
Transportation  
03000 412479  
haroon.chughtai@kent.gov.uk



# KENT COUNTY COUNCIL –PROPOSED RECORD OF DECISION

**DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY:**

Neil Baker, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

**DECISION NO:**

24/00043

**For publication**

**Key decision: YES / NO**

**Subject Matter / Road Asset Renewal Contract**

**Decision:**

As Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, I agree to:

- (i) APPROVE the procurement and contract award of a zero value Road Asset Renewal contract;
- (ii) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Highways and Transportation, to take relevant actions to facilitate the required procurement activity;
- (iii) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Highways and Transportation, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, to take relevant actions, including but not limited to, awarding, finalising the terms of and entering into the relevant contracts or other legal agreements, as necessary, to implement the decision; and
- (iv) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Highways and Transportation, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, to award extensions of the contract in accordance with the extension clauses within the contract (5 years + up to 5 years extension).

**Reason(s) for decision:**

The delivery of road asset renewal works is a vital part of the Council’s approach to highway maintenance, as set out in KCC’s Highways Asset Management Plan for 2021/22-2025/26, which helps us to demonstrate that we are a competent highway authority and are fulfilling our duty under the Highways Act 1980 to maintain a safe network.

**Cabinet Committee recommendations and other consultation:**

Members of the Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee will consider the proposal at their meeting on 21 May 2024

**Any alternatives considered and rejected:**

Other approaches have been discounted as they would not achieve the right conditions to maximise best value whilst maintaining quality standards. They would also not encourage and maximise materials innovation and cost-effective investment in plant and equipment to contribute to carbon reduction.

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

.....  
signed

.....  
date

This page is intentionally left blank

## EQIA Submission – ID Number

### Section A

**EQIA Title**

Road Asset Renewal Contract

**Responsible Officer**

Alan Casson - GT TRA

**Approved by (Note: approval of this EqIA must be completed within the EqIA App)**

Andrew Loosemore - GT TRA

### Type of Activity

**Service Change**

No

**Service Redesign**

No

**Project/Programme**

No

**Commissioning/Procurement**

Commissioning/Procurement

**Strategy/Policy**

No

**Details of other Service Activity**

No

### Accountability and Responsibility

**Directorate**

Growth Environment and Transport

**Responsible Service**

Highways and Transportation

**Responsible Head of Service**

Andrew Loosemore - GT TRA

**Responsible Director**

Haroona Chughtai - GT TRA

### Aims and Objectives

We are commissioning a new contract to provide road asset renewal and reconstruction services to KCC, to replace current contractual arrangements that expire at the end of 2024. The future contract will cover the whole county and is a key part of our overall approach to road maintenance (as set out in KCC's Highways Asset Management Plan for 2021/22-2025/26, which has it's own EqIA), and enables us to fulfill our legal duties under the Highways Act 1980. Effective road maintenance benefits all members of society including those with protected characteristics.

### Section B – Evidence

**Do you have data related to the protected groups of the people impacted by this activity?**

Yes

**It is possible to get the data in a timely and cost effective way?**

No

**Is there national evidence/data that you can use?**

No

**Have you consulted with stakeholders?**

Not Applicable

**Who have you involved, consulted and engaged with?**

The new contract we are seeking to commission replaces the current one, and does not seek to change our

approach significantly. The new contract will benefit all members of society by providing well maintained roads to enable the transportation of people and goods across and through the county.
<b>Has there been a previous Equality Analysis (EQIA) in the last 3 years?</b>
Yes
<b>Do you have evidence that can help you understand the potential impact of your activity?</b>
Yes
<b>Section C – Impact</b>
<b>Who may be impacted by the activity?</b>
<b>Service Users/clients</b> Service users/clients
<b>Staff</b> Staff/Volunteers
<b>Residents/Communities/Citizens</b> Residents/communities/citizens
<b>Are there any positive impacts for all or any of the protected groups as a result of the activity that you are doing?</b>
Yes
<b>Details of Positive Impacts</b>
Effective maintenance of KCC's road network to enable effective transportation of people and goods across and through Kent.
<b>Negative impacts and Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>19. Negative Impacts and Mitigating actions for Age</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for age?</b>
No. Note: If Question 19a is "No", Questions 19b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Details of negative impacts for Age</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating Actions for Age</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for Mitigating Actions – Age</b>
Not Completed
<b>20. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Disability</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Disability?</b>
No. Note: If Question 20a is "No", Questions 20b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Details of Negative Impacts for Disability</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Disability</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for Disability</b>
Not Completed
<b>21. Negative Impacts and Mitigating actions for Sex</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Sex</b>
No. Note: If Question 21a is "No", Questions 21b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Details of negative impacts for Sex</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Sex</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for Sex</b>

Not Completed
<b>22. Negative Impacts and Mitigating actions for Gender identity/transgender</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Gender identity/transgender</b>
No. Note: If Question 22a is "No", Questions 22b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Gender identity/transgender</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Gender identity/transgender</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Gender identity/transgender</b>
Not Completed
<b>23. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Race</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Race</b>
No. Note: If Question 23a is "No", Questions 23b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Race</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Race</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Race</b>
Not Completed
<b>24. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Religion and belief</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Religion and belief</b>
No. Note: If Question 24a is "No", Questions 24b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Religion and belief</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Religion and belief</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Religion and Belief</b>
Not Completed
<b>25. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Sexual Orientation</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Sexual Orientation</b>
No. Note: If Question 25a is "No", Questions 25b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Sexual Orientation</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Sexual Orientation</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Sexual Orientation</b>
Not Completed
<b>26. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Pregnancy and Maternity</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Pregnancy and Maternity</b>
No. Note: If Question 26a is "No", Questions 26b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Pregnancy and Maternity</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Pregnancy and Maternity</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Pregnancy and Maternity</b>

Not Completed
<b>27. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>
No. Note: If Question 27a is "No", Questions 27b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>
Not Completed
<b>28. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Carer's responsibilities</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Carer's responsibilities</b>
No. Note: If Question 28a is "No", Questions 28b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Carer's responsibilities</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Carer's responsibilities</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for Carer's responsibilities</b>
Not Completed

From: **Neil Baker, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation**  
**Simon Jones, Corporate Director for Growth, Environment and Transport**

To: **Cabinet Committee for Environment and Transport – 21 May 2024**

Subject: **Kent Travel Saver – Pass Cost Increase - 2024**

Key decision No

Classification: **Unrestricted**

**Past Pathway of report:** N/A

**Future Pathway of report:** N/A

**Electoral Division:** All electoral divisions and all local Member/s affected

**Summary:** The Kent Travel Saver (KTS) is a discretionary concessionary travel product for those in school years 7-11. It provides free travel on application payment or by free allocation. Operators are re-imbursed for travel, and the cost of the scheme rises on annual basis as a result of operation inflation.

In 23/24, the cost of the standard KTS pass was held at the prevailing cost because funding from the Bus Service Improvement Plan was made available to support. Had the BSIP funding not been available, then there would have been a significant increase in the cost to users of the scheme, at the time of a cost-of-living crisis.

For 24/25, scheme costs are expected to rise again and the cost of the KTS will need to rise. We will make use of BSIP funding to limit the extent of the pass increase. From application window opening in June, the cost of the standard pass will rise from £450 to £550.

The low-income pass will remain at £120 and there will be no other changes to the scheme.

The 16+ Travelcard will rise in price, alongside the KTS, to maintain the differential in price. The Travelcard will rise in price to £600.

**Recommendation:**

The Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE and COMMENT on the report.

## 1. Introduction

1.1 The Kent Travel Saver (KTS) is a discretionary concessionary travel product, for those attending school in years 7 to 11.

- 1.2 The scheme provides free travel at point of use, within core hours and there is no limit on the buses can be used during those core hours. The scheme is available on all local bus services in Kent.
- 1.3 Access to this concessionary product is by means of an application and associated payment, with a discounted rate for those on low income and for specific groups i.e. in care, passes are allocated at no charge (namely, receiving full KCC subsidy).
- 1.4 On annual basis the charge for accessing the scheme, including the low-income group is reviewed.
- 1.5 This paper sets out the plan in respect of pricing for the KTS in the financial year of 2024/25.

## **2. Background**

- 2.1 The current cost of the Kent Travel Saver is £450 and is £120 for those on low income.
- 2.2 In 23/24, the KTS budget was £14.558M gross, income of £9,483M and a net budget of £5,075M. The budget set reflected that the provision for gross operator inflation (fares increases) increased gross costs by £2.5M and needed to be offset by raising the income derived from passes (£2.5M) as set out in the paper to ETCC in May 2023, and in key decision [23/00053](#). By using anticipated pass numbers at the time, to deliver this net budget would have required the cost of the standard KTS pass to rise from £450 to £620. This would have been a very significant increase, at a time when it was recognised that the UK was going through a cost-of-living crisis.
- 2.3 However, with Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) funding, a two-year one-off package of funding, KCC had secured revenue funding from DfT, to support the cost of the KTS in 23/24 and this enabled the cost of the pass to be retained at £450.
- 2.4 For 24/25, a budget for KTS of £15,022M gross cost, £9,946M income and £5,075M has been set. This budget incorporates an increase in gross cost of £564,000 to account for anticipated operator inflation. Once again, through BSIP, we have funding available to support the price of the KTS to users, alongside other fare initiatives. It should be noted that, as per 2.3, BSIP is one off funding and there is no indication that there will be future funding.
- 2.5 Taking account of the anticipated increased cost to the KTS scheme and the BSIP funding available, for 24/25 it is necessary to increase the cost of the pass from £450 to £550, but to retain the low-income pass at £120. There are no other structural changes to the scheme.
- 2.6 This increase in the cost of the pass, whilst significant, is being kept lower due to the BSIP funding. Without BSIP, the price of the KTS would have historically risen to £620 and to potentially £650 for 24/25.



- 2.7 Even at £550 the pass is still considered to provide value to the user. When compared over 190 school days, the KTS will still deliver a daily cost of £2.89 or £1.45 per trip. This is lower than commercial daily bus fares and lower than the £2 fare cap, which ends December 24. The KTS also still provides significant value against a number of operator period tickets, which can range in price from £550 to £1400 per academic year.
- 2.8 There is no limit on the number of bus services that can be used within the core hours of the scheme, the pass can be used during selected school holidays and there are further operator add-ons, which provide additional secondary value to the product.
- 2.9 KTS will continue to provide the option to pay up front or spread the cost across eight direct debit payments.
- 2.10 The application window for the 24/25 KTS is planned to open on the 3rd June 2024 and the deadline for applications, to ensure a pass is at school by the beginning of September is expected to be the 11th August 2024.
- 2.11 In line with the increase to the standard cost of the KTS, the 16+ Travelcard will rise to £600 on the same date. The increase in cost reflects the differential in price maintained between the KTS and the 16+ Travelcard.

### **3. Financial Implications**

- 3.1 The KTS budget for 24/25 has been set at £15,022 gross, £9.946M income, so delivering a net budget of £5,075.
- 3.2 Increasing the cost of the standard pass from £450 to £550, based on current pass numbers of 13,736, would deliver income of £7.555M. In addition, income from low-income pass sales, based on 2,500 users, would generate an additional £300K of revenue. Taking total sales revenue to £7.855M.
- 3.3 Under BSIP, revenue funding has been provided to support ticketing initiatives including supporting the price of KTS. This funding will be used to close the gap between the income received and the budgeted income.
- 3.4 It should be noted that standard passes account for 70% all issued, with 13% for low income and 17% for passes allocated at no cost. For those in receipt of the low-income pass or allocated a free pass, the level of subsidy per pass from KCC is greater than the standard pass and this is a key component of the KTS scheme.

### **4. Legal implications**

- 4.1 There are no legal implications.

### **5. Equalities implications**

- 5.1 There are no equality implications from this price increase, as there are no changes to the structure of pass charging/allocation.

## **6. Other corporate implications**

6.1 There are other corporate implications.

## **7. Conclusions**

- 7.1 KTS is a discretionary concessionary travel scheme, the cost of the KTS scheme to KCC rises each year because operator fare increases are recognised within the re-imbusement provided to bus operators.
- 7.2 In 23/24, KCC was able to maintain the cost of the pass to users at the then current rate of £450, despite significant increase in scheme cost, due to funding being provided by the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP). This BSIP funding enabled the cost of the pass to be maintained, during a cost-of-living crisis.
- 7.3 For 24/25, scheme costs are expected to rise again, and while BSIP funding is available to support ticketing initiatives, it will be necessary to raise the price of the standard KTS pass from £450 to £550. The low-income pass will remain at £120 and there will be no other changes to the scheme for 24/25.
- 7.4 The revised price will come into force, when the KTS application window opens on the 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2024.

## **8. Recommendation**

8.1 The Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE and COMMENT on the report

## **9. Contact details**

Report Author: Phil Lightowler  
Job Title: Head of Public Transport  
Telephone number: 03000 414073  
Email: philip.lightowler@kent.gov.uk

Relevant Director: Haroona Chughtai  
Job title: Director of Highways and Transportation  
Email: haroona.chughtai@kent.gov.uk

From: Rob Thomas, Cabinet Member for Environment  
Simon Jones, Corporate Director, Growth, Environment and Transport

To: Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee – 21<sup>st</sup> May 2024

Subject: **New Contractual arrangement for the receipt and processing of Street Sweepings and Highway Mechanical Arisings – (SC240015)**

Decision Number: 24/00035

Decision Title: Approval to commission and award a new contractual arrangement for the for the receipt and processing of Street Sweepings and Highway Mechanical Arisings – (SC240015)

Classification: **Unrestricted**

**Past Pathway of report:** N/A

**Future Pathway of report:** For Cabinet Member Decision

**Electoral Division:** all Divisions are affected

**Summary:** Resource Management and Circular Economy is seeking to enter new contractual arrangements in order to continue to receive and process street sweepings and highway mechanical arisings at the Waste Transfer Stations by all the Waste Collection Authorities across Kent.

This is required in order to fulfil KCC's Statutory Duty as the Waste Disposal Authority operating under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

**Recommendation(s):** The Cabinet Committee is asked to consider and endorse or make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for the Environment on the proposed decision to

(i) COMMISSION and award a contract for the receipt and processing of street sweepings and highway mechanical arisings for up to 4 years and

(ii) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Environment and Circular Economy in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community and Regulatory Services to take relevant actions, including but not limited to, awarding, finalising the terms of and entering into the relevant contracts or other legal agreements, as necessary, to implement the decision as shown at Appendix A.

## 1. Introduction

1.1 This report provides information concerning the option to commission and award a Street Sweeping (SS) and Highway Mechanical Arisings (HMA)

contract for materials collected by the Waste Collection Authorities. These materials can be mechanically treated by disaggregation, to produce materials for reuse for civil engineering and restoration schemes.

- 1.2 KCC currently has a contract for the delivery of these services which is due to expire on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2024. The contract had an option to be extended for a further period of up to 24 months and KCC's original intention was to extend the contract and had commenced discussions with the incumbent in Sept/October 2023 on that basis.
- 1.3 In December 2023, the incumbent notified KCC of challenges they were experiencing in delivering the services and sought additional compensation and an increase to the contracted costs.
- 1.4 In January 2024, the provider submitted their final extension proposal which included a significant price increase and was beyond that included within the anticipated with the revenue budget.
- 1.5 Furthermore, the incumbent Provider's extension moved away from a fixed cost and sought to include quarterly price reviews.
- 1.6 In order for KCC to determine next steps, commercial market engagement and benchmarking was undertaken in order to informed whether the increased costs were in line with prevailing market rates and to determine the wider market appetite for this material.
- 1.7 The results suggested that KCC could achieve lower and more affordable prices by running a competitive procurement process.
- 1.8 As a result, KCC is undertaking an accelerated procurement process to ensure there is no gap in service delivery and that the Authority is able to meet its statutory duty as the Waste Disposal Authority in providing facilities for the disposal of waste.
- 1.9 It should be noted that KCC while had hoped to be able to resolve the challenges presented by the incumbent the protracted nature of these discussion means that an accelerated procurement process is required to ensure service continuity.

## **2. Relevant History**

- 2.1 Street Sweepings and Highway Mechanical Arisings are swept material from streets and roads which are predominantly made up of stones, sand, metals, glass, soil, leaves, organic matter and litter.
- 2.2 The treatment results in a 99% disaggregated recycled product which can be reused within civil engineering operations while any organic material produced is able to be fully used within land restoration.
- 2.3 The current provider, Thanet Waste Services was unable to continue to process the amount of organic waste that was present within the street sweepings,

particularly during the Autumn period, when leaf-fall is high and road vegetation formed a significant component of the overall material collected.

- 2.4 The market engagement exercise informed the contract length of 2 + 2 years as being the most attractive to the industry, whilst giving KCC flexibility to review the arrangements based on performance.
- 2.5 The plan is to secure three geographically based contracts (West Kent / Mid Kent / East Kent). Providers can bid for a single lot, a combination of lots, or all lots. The allocation of contracts in this way will allow more efficient haulage cost/provision, the opportunity to compare performance and cost, and to have multiple suppliers available in the event of market failure.
- 2.6 The Authority will seek composite gate fees that take account for any rebate related to the subsequent sale of materials, as well as the seasonal prices where the composition may vary (namely, taking account of the variable organic element).
- 2.7 KCC will not guarantee the quality or quantity of materials collected, and this risk will sit with the provider who will determine how best to provision for this uncertainty.
- 2.8 The tender process is seeking local disposal arrangements, (where waste infrastructure allows) to reduce its carbon footprint in delivering these materials, and as such the impact on haulage rates will be considered as part of the tender evaluation.
- 2.9 The objective remains to work towards zero waste to landfill by continuing to divert approximately 11,000 tonnes of Street Sweepings and HMA per year from landfill by using treatment and recycling facilities.

### 3. Options considered

Option		Comments
1	Do nothing – the current arrangements will continue;	This is not a viable option as the incumbent’s extension proposal is not financial sustainable for the Authority.
2	Discontinue accepting the HMA waste from the Collection Authorities;	This is not an option due to KCC’s obligation to take this waste as the Waste Disposal Authority.
3	Continue to accept the waste, but utilise alternative disposal options by using landfill or incineration;	This is not an option as there is an obligation to comply with the waste hierarchy, and to meet landfill diversion targets. Furthermore, to send this material to incineration would be costly against a treatment option.
4	<b><u>The recommended preferred option</u></b> Undertake an accelerated	Undertake a commissioning activity before the end of the existing contract (31 <sup>st</sup> May 2024) to secure a Provider who is able to treat and utilise the waste material meeting the circular economy desired outcomes and is both financially and environmentally beneficial for the

commissioning activity	Authority.
------------------------	------------

#### **4. Financial Implications**

- 4.1 The annual cost of this commission has been estimated at £660,000 based on current gate fee and market engagement results: total contractual cost over 4 years is projected to be circa £2.64m.
- 4.2 The gate fee will be composite and will include treatment type offered at the facility, seasonal quality consideration and any re-sale prices.
- 4.3 Haulage costs are accounted for within existing Transfer Station contracts, but will be considered as part of the life-cycle evaluation.
- 4.4 The cost will be met by existing revenue budgets;

#### **5. Legal implications**

- 5.1 A key function of the Waste Disposal Authority operating under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, Section 51 states that:

It shall be the duty of each Waste Disposal Authority to arrange:

- a) for the disposal of the controlled waste collected in its area by the waste collection authorities;
- b) for places to be provided at which persons resident in its area may deposit their household waste and for the disposal of waste so deposited.

- 5.2 The Commercial and Procurement Division (CPD) have supported the service in extension discussions with the incumbent Provider and have recommended that a competitive procurement process is undertaken.

#### **6. Equalities implications**

- 6.1 The Equality Impact Assessment undertaken concluded that no Protected Characteristics will be impacted upon either positively or negatively as a result of this contract award. This is due to the contract delivering a business-to-business service.

#### **7. Governance**

- 7.1 The Service Director will inherit the main delegations via the Officer Scheme of Delegation due to the potential financial value of this contract.

#### **8. Conclusions**

In order to continue to meet its Statutory Duty as Waste Disposal Authority KCC will be undertaking an accelerated procurement process to secure new provider(s) for the receipt and processing of Street Sweepings and Highway Mechanical Arisings.

#### **9. Recommendations**

- 9.1 The Cabinet Committee is asked to consider and endorse or make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for the Environment on the proposed decision to
- (i) COMMISSION and award a contract for the receipt and processing of street sweepings and highway mechanical arisings for up to 4 years and
  - (ii) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Environment and Circular Economy in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community and Regulatory Services to take relevant actions, including but not limited to, awarding, finalising the terms of and entering into the relevant contracts or other legal agreements, as necessary, to implement the decision as shown at Appendix A.

## 10. Appendices

Appendix A – Proposed Record of Decision  
Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment

## 11. Contact details

### Report Author

- Kay Groves – Service Delivery Manager, Resource Management and Circular Economy
- 03000 411642
- [kay.groves@kent.gov.uk](mailto:kay.groves@kent.gov.uk)

### Relevant Director:

- Matthew Smyth, Director of Environment and Circular Economy
- 03000 416676
- [Matthew.smyth@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Matthew.smyth@kent.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank



# KENT COUNTY COUNCIL –PROPOSED RECORD OF DECISION

**DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY:**

**Robert Thomas, Cabinet Member for Environment**

**DECISION NO:**

24/00035

**For publication**

**Key decision: YES / NO**

**Subject Matter** Approval to commission and award a new contractual arrangement for the for the receipt and processing of Street Sweepings and Highway Mechanical Arisings – (SC240015)

**Decision:**

As Cabinet Member for Environment, I agree to:

- (i) COMMISSION and award a contract for the receipt and processing of street sweepings and highway mechanical arisings for up to 4 years and
- (ii) DELEGATE authority to the Director of Environment and Circular Economy in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community and Regulatory Services to take relevant actions, including but not limited to, awarding, finalising the terms of and entering into the relevant contracts or other legal agreements, as necessary, to implement the decision.

**Reason(s) for decision:**

Resource Management and Circular Economy is seeking to enter new contractual arrangements in order to continue to receive and process street sweepings and highway mechanical arisings at the Waste Transfer Stations by all the Waste Collection Authorities across Kent.

**Cabinet Committee recommendations and other consultation:**

Members of the Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee will consider the proposal at their meeting on 21 May 2024

**Any alternatives considered and rejected:**

**Option 1 – Do nothing –** the current arrangements will continue; This is not a viable option as the incumbent’s extension proposal is not financial sustainable for the Authority.

**Option 2 – Discontinue accepting the street sweeping and highway mechanical arisings waste from the collection authorities in Kent;** this is not an option due to KCC’s obligation to take this waste as the Waste Disposal Authority.

**Option 3 – Continue to accept the waste but utilise alternative disposal options by using landfill or incineration;** this is not an option as there is an obligation to comply with the waste hierarchy and to meet landfill diversion targets. Furthermore, to send this material to incineration would be costly against a treatment option

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

signed

date

## EQIA Submission – ID Number

### Section A

**EQIA Title**

Contract for processing Street Sweepings and Highway Mechanical Arisings

**Responsible Officer**

Kay Groves - GT - ECE

**Approved by (Note: approval of this EqIA must be completed within the EqIA App)**

Susan Reddick - ECE

### Type of Activity

**Service Change**

No

**Service Redesign**

No

**Project/Programme**

No

**Commissioning/Procurement**

Commissioning/Procurement

**Strategy/Policy**

No

**Details of other Service Activity**

No

### Accountability and Responsibility

**Directorate**

Growth Environment and Transport

**Responsible Service**

Service Delivery/Resource Management and Circular Economy

**Responsible Head of Service**

Susan Reddick - ECE

**Responsible Director**

Matthew Smyth - GT - ECE

### Aims and Objectives

KCC currently has in place contractual arrangements that are due to expire 31st May 2024, and therefore is seeking new contractual arrangements for processing of street sweepings and highway mechanical arisings collected by the Collection Authorities in Kent. The contract is proposed to be up to a 48-month term with a 2 year break period included.

As a Waste Disposal Authority, the provision of such Waste processing services is a statutory obligation under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

From 1st June 2024, Kent County Council will secure a Provider to process this material that has been collected by local councils in Kent, which will be disposed of at the County's Waste Transfer Stations and hauled to the final disposal outlet for treatment and processing.

This EQIA supports the commission and its intended beneficiaries, being the residents of Kent.

As the Waste Disposal Authority, Kent County Council is responsible for ensuring that all waste collected in Kent is disposed of correctly in the most financially efficient way. The disposal of this waste is a 'back office' procedure, with all 'customer facing' elements of this process the responsibility of the Waste Collection

Authority (WCA).

There are no Protected Characteristics that will be impacted upon either positively or negatively - No Change

## Section B – Evidence

**Do you have data related to the protected groups of the people impacted by this activity?**

Yes

**It is possible to get the data in a timely and cost effective way?**

Yes

**Is there national evidence/data that you can use?**

No

**Have you consulted with stakeholders?**

Yes

**Who have you involved, consulted and engaged with?**

Staff members, Providers and wider waste industry via Market Engagement.

**Has there been a previous Equality Analysis (EQIA) in the last 3 years?**

No

**Do you have evidence that can help you understand the potential impact of your activity?**

Yes

## Section C – Impact

**Who may be impacted by the activity?**

**Service Users/clients**

No

**Staff**

Staff/Volunteers

**Residents/Communities/Citizens**

No

**Are there any positive impacts for all or any of the protected groups as a result of the activity that you are doing?**

No. Note: If Question 17 is "No", Question 18 should state "none identified" when submission goes for approval

**Details of Positive Impacts**

None identified

## Negative impacts and Mitigating Actions

19. Negative Impacts and Mitigating actions for Age

**Are there negative impacts for age?**

No. Note: If Question 19a is "No", Questions 19b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval

**Details of negative impacts for Age**

Not Completed

**Mitigating Actions for Age**

Not Completed

**Responsible Officer for Mitigating Actions – Age**

Not Completed

20. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Disability

**Are there negative impacts for Disability?**

No. Note: If Question 20a is "No", Questions 20b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval

<b>Details of Negative Impacts for Disability</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Disability</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for Disability</b>
Not Completed
<b>21. Negative Impacts and Mitigating actions for Sex</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Sex</b>
No. Note: If Question 21a is "No", Questions 21b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Details of negative impacts for Sex</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Sex</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for Sex</b>
Not Completed
<b>22. Negative Impacts and Mitigating actions for Gender identity/transgender</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Gender identity/transgender</b>
No. Note: If Question 22a is "No", Questions 22b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Gender identity/transgender</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Gender identity/transgender</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Gender identity/transgender</b>
Not Completed
<b>23. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Race</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Race</b>
No. Note: If Question 23a is "No", Questions 23b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Race</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Race</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Race</b>
Not Completed
<b>24. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Religion and belief</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Religion and belief</b>
No. Note: If Question 24a is "No", Questions 24b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Religion and belief</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Religion and belief</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Religion and Belief</b>
Not Completed
<b>25. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Sexual Orientation</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Sexual Orientation</b>
No. Note: If Question 25a is "No", Questions 25b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval

<b>Negative impacts for Sexual Orientation</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Sexual Orientation</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Sexual Orientation</b>
Not Completed
<b>26. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Pregnancy and Maternity</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Pregnancy and Maternity</b>
No. Note: If Question 26a is "No", Questions 26b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Pregnancy and Maternity</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Pregnancy and Maternity</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Pregnancy and Maternity</b>
Not Completed
<b>27. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>
No. Note: If Question 27a is "No", Questions 27b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>
Not Completed
<b>28. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Carer's responsibilities</b>
<b>Are there negative impacts for Carer's responsibilities</b>
No. Note: If Question 28a is "No", Questions 28b,c,d will state "Not Applicable" when submission goes for approval
<b>Negative impacts for Carer's responsibilities</b>
Not Completed
<b>Mitigating actions for Carer's responsibilities</b>
Not Completed
<b>Responsible Officer for Carer's responsibilities</b>
Not Completed

**Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee – Draft Agenda and Work Programme (Updated 13 May 2024)**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Cabinet Committee to receive item</b>
Verbal Updates by Cabinet Members and Corporate Director	At each meeting
Performance Dashboard	At each meeting
Work Programme	At each meeting
Draft Budget	Annual
Biosecurity and Tree Health Report	Annual (January)
Corporate Risk Register	Annual (March)
Winter Service Policy	Annual (September)
Environment Agency - Presentation	Bi-Annual
Southern Water - Presentation	Bi-Annual

<b>9 July 2024</b>		
<b>No.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
Page 67	Verbal Updates by Cabinet Members and Corporate Director	At each meeting
	Performance Dashboard	At each meeting
	Work Programme	At each meeting
	High Weald National Landscapes (AONB) Management Action Plan	Postponed from May's meeting
	Biosecurity and Tree Health Report	Postponed from January's meeting
	Annual Update on the Energy and Low Emissions Strategy	Postponed from May's meeting
	South West Organics - Green Waste West Kent Contract	Added at agenda setting meeting on 29 November, postponed from May's meeting
	Southern Water Presentation	Bi-annual
	Entry/Exit System	'standing item' until end of 2024

<b>Items for Consideration that have not yet been allocated to a meeting</b>	
Highways and Transportation fault reporting and enquiry form - Update	Requested at ETCC on 19 January 2023
A review of highway aspects of planning applications - Report	Requested at ETCC on 7 March 2023 For information
Climate Change Adaptation Plan	

