

CABINET

Minutes of the meeting held on 25 July 2024 at 7.00 pm in Council Chamber, Council Offices, Cecil Street, Margate, Kent.

Present: Councillor Rick Everitt (Chair); Councillors Whitehead, Albon, Bright, Duckworth, Keen and Yates

In Attendance: Councillors J Bayford, Dawson, Kup, Pugh, Rattigan, Rogers, Austin, Bright and Wing

12. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies made at the meeting

13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

14. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Councillor Everitt proposed, Councillor Yates seconded and Members agreed the minutes as a correct record of the meeting held on 25 June 2024.

15. REVISIONS TO THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (LDS - LOCAL PLAN WORK PROGRAMME)

Cabinet considered revisions to the Local Development Scheme. There was a legal requirement for Councils to have a Local Development Scheme, which sets out the programme of work for Local Plan preparation, review and updating.

In June 2022, Cabinet agreed a new [Local Development Scheme](#) (LDS), but for various reasons, the LDS needed to be updated to reflect changes in circumstances affecting Local Plan progression. The Cabinet report set out proposed changes to the work programme for updating the adopted Local Plan, and other Local Plan-related documents, including the new statutory Design Codes.

Councillor Pugh spoke under Council Procedure Rule 20.1.

Councillor Everitt proposed, Councillor Albon seconded and Cabinet agreed the proposals for the revised Local Development Scheme.

16. HEALTH AND SAFETY STRATEGY 2024-2027

Cabinet discussed the Health and Safety Strategy for 2024-2027. During 2023/24, the Council experienced several significant changes to its management structure. These changes led to positive changes in the way health and safety was managed throughout the Council. In addition, some of these changes were also informed by an audit of health and safety across the Council carried out by the East Kent Audit Partnership, which provided a limited assurance opinion. In response to this, strengthened governance arrangements were introduced alongside an action plan to address the issues raised within the audit report, which was being monitored by the Corporate Management Team.

The Health and Safety Strategy for 2024-2027 had been developed to support our aim of promoting and ensuring high standards of Health and Safety in all that we do. This Strategy looks to support the strategic and operational management of the Council and

go beyond the more traditional health and safety role of simply preventing harm. The Strategy would commit the Council to continually improve the health and safety of its staff and any other person affected by its activities.

The Strategy was not just about achieving compliance. It was also aimed to develop, implement and embed:

- Efficient, proactive and pragmatic systems of delivering H&S,
- A safe and healthy environment for staff and those affected by our activities,
- A robust health and safety culture across all departments, and
- Effective means of protecting stakeholders, including staff and all those affected by our activities from harm.

The Strategy describes in broad terms what the approach to health and safety was and what the Council intended to do, which in turn was supported by an action plan and a robust H&S Policy.

Councillor Yates proposed, Councillor Keen seconded and Cabinet agreed the Health and Safety Strategy in Annex 1 to the Cabinet report, which aims to develop, implement and embed the following:

1. Efficient, proactive and pragmatic systems of delivering H&S;
2. A safe and healthy environment for staff and those affected by our activities;
3. A robust health and safety culture across all departments of the Council;
4. Effective means of protecting stakeholders, including staff and all those affected by our activities from harm.

17. PUBLISHING INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING STATEMENTS

Members considered the infrastructure funding statements for the expenditure of Section 106 Agreement funds. The item that was put to Cabinet was to note the publishing of 3 years' worth of financial information between 2019-2022, outlining the money that the Council had secured, received and spent in relation to Planning Obligations from Section 106 Planning agreements.

The Council had used Section 106 agreements attached to planning permissions for a number of years to secure contributions to mitigate the impact of development proposals to make them acceptable in planning terms. The publishing of this information had been delayed for a number of years due to staff resourcing, as work had been required to ensure that the data was accurately recorded and validated. Following the appointment of the Council's Section 106 and Infrastructure Delivery Officer last year, the Council was now in a position to report on 3 years' worth of data with the Infrastructure Funding Statements for 2022-23 and 23-24 to be published before the end of the current financial year.

Councillor Everitt proposed, Councillor Duckworth seconded and Cabinet noted the report.

18. HRA TOWER BLOCKS REFURBISHMENT AND RETROFIT PROGRAMME

Cabinet discussed proposals for the tower block refurbishment and retrofit programme that would see transformational works to five of the tower blocks owned by Thanet district council. Some of the work being carried out was essential for health and safety. For example, the replacement of the external wall insulation. The increased scope of this project was due to the discovery of essential fire safety works, which had contributed to the additional costs.

Most of the increased cost was due to the external wall system remediation. A more expensive system had been chosen for its improved fire rating, reduced ongoing maintenance requirement and increased durability. The cost of this would be fully funded by Homes England. These works were non-negotiable and the Building Safety Regulator would not give approval for the project without addressing these issues. Once the health and safety works were completed, the waking watch could step down. The waking watch had been posted at each tower to mitigate the fire risk. This would mean the HRA revenue account could move from deficit to surplus.

Other works would ensure the buildings were fit for purpose into the future, for example the replacement of windows and the roof. It was recognised that costs may be a challenge for some leaseholders, but they would benefit from the improvements to their homes, which would include the energy efficiency measures that will contribute to lower energy consumption. During this project, there had been a lot of consultation with residents, for example, the consultation to choose the colour and design for the outside of the towers. At key stages in the project, there had been face-to-face events at the blocks so residents had an opportunity to speak to council officers, architects, contractors and consultants.

The two Resident Liaison Officers held a large estate presence and were on hand to answer questions. There was a new High Rise Living resident group that met once a quarter. At these meetings they discuss issues regarding building safety but this was also a forum to discuss concerns regarding the project.

Finally, much of this project was externally funded. The Building Safety fund was provided to resolve safety issues with cladding in buildings over 18 meters and would fund 100% of the cost of the work to remediate the external wall system. £4.2 million had been awarded from the Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund, which was in place to address energy efficiency measures in the blocks. It was the award of the funding that made this programme of work affordable to the council, which would ultimately provide cost efficiencies when completed, as the Council should not have to carry out scaffold dependent cyclical works, like window replacement or balcony refurbishment for 30-40 years.

Councillor Bayford spoke under Council Procedure Rule 20.1.

Councillor Whitehead proposed, Councillor Yates seconded and Cabinet agreed the following:

1. An increase in the scope of the project to include emergency health and safety work;
2. Note the increase in the value of the overall project, in line with the approved capital programme;
3. The letting of a Design and Build contract with Mears Ltd to deliver the main Tower Block Refurbishment and Retrofit Programme, as set out in the Cabinet report.

19. ROYAL CRESCENT - CAPITAL PROJECT

Cabinet discussed recommendations for the capital works regarding Royal Crescent. Royal Crescent is a Grade II listed building of historical significance that sits on the seafront of Ramsgate West Cliff. The Council owned two blocks in the building. It was in need of essential structural and fire safety works, which would ensure the buildings were fit for purpose into the future. The complex nature of the building had impacted the timeframe and costs of this project as laid out in this report.

It was recognised that the cost was a challenge for leaseholders, to help with this; there was the opportunity to add the cost of the works as a charge against the property. The council would also refer this project to the first tier land tribunal, who would make a judgement on if the costs were reasonable. Once the works were complete, the leaseholders would benefit from the improvements to their homes

Councillor Bayford spoke under Council Procedure Rule 20.1.

Councillor Whitehead proposed, Councillor Yates seconded and Cabinet agreed the following:

1. The letting of a contract for the completion of the works at Royal Crescent, Ramsgate as set out in this report;
2. The change in the scope of works to remove the improvement of the basement.

20. LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSING FUND (LAHF) ROUND 3 FUNDING

Members considered proposals for Local Authority Housing fund (LAHF) Round 3 funding. In December 2022, the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) launched the Local Authority Housing Fund. This was a £500 million capital fund for local authorities in England to obtain accommodation for families with housing needs who had arrived in the UK after fleeing the war in Ukraine, and families on Afghan resettlement and relocation schemes. The reason for this was to help ensure that those communities who wished to actively support those in central resettlement schemes were supported in creating extra capacity, rather than providing from within current capacity.

This was the third potential tranche of funding that the Council applied for and as with the previous two rounds, it had very specific conditions attached to it. The properties were to be made available in line with the timescales set out by the previous government for resettlement schemes, and then revert to general usage, becoming part of the Council's overall housing stock.

Last year, as part of the second round of the LAHF project, the Council was awarded £694,000. The usage of this was approved by Cabinet members on the 16th November 2023, and the Council had been awarded £619,500 as part of the Government's £450m two-year expansion to the scheme, which aimed to provide local authorities with a longer-term pipeline of support and to unlock more new supply and developments.

Due to Cabinet's very proactive acquisitions programme, the Council had been able to secure the four properties that the funding required of the Council through the criteria for round three. These homes had been secured through Vistry at Westwood Point. Four properties were now being proposed for purchasing. These were; three x 3-bedroom properties (one for TA and two medium-sized resettlement properties) and one x 4-bedroom property (again, for the resettlement element). These properties were being acquired from Vistry at Westwood Point.

This was also the location of the fourteen properties acquired by the Council with LAHF round 1 & 2 funding. The Council had a strong working relationship with Vistry and was confident that these properties would be high quality and would serve both the initial purpose required by the funding criteria and then ultimately be good assets to transfer into the Council's HRA stock.

Discussion had been conducted on the mechanisms of the Local Authority Housing Fund many times within council; and as indicated before, the use of this fund allowed for the creation of a virtuous circle. The Council was being externally funded to provide local housing that would not only serve to support those fleeing conflict, but would also in the long term become part of its general housing stock. Both morally and financially choosing

to use this funding made absolute sense and Cabinet felt assured that this initiative was well supported by Council. Members supported this programme because it provided support for both those fleeing conflict and local residents.

Councillor Whitehead proposed, Councillor Duckworth seconded and Cabinet agreed that:

1. The Council proceeds with the acquisition of the four homes at Westwood Point - being acquired through Vistry for £1,255,000;
2. The properties are provided as per the LAHF Round 3 funding criteria, i.e. one for temporary accommodation and three for resettlement purposes.

21. THANET PATHFINDER PROJECTS - PROCUREMENT APPROVALS

Cabinet was requested to approve to enter into new contracts for works and service for the delivery of six projects, which form part of for the Pathfinder Scheme in Margate and Ramsgate. Firstly, works contracts for Margate Town Deal Coastal Wellbeing intervention, including the Walpole Bay Pavilion, the lift structure and the skatepark.

The Ramsgate Levelling Up Fund scheme for Newington community centre, which included the refurbishment and extension to the building. This was also using the funding that had already been approved from the HRA. The Future High Street Fund and Levelling Up Fund scheme for Broad Street, which was delivering a creative and community hub. The Council had already purchased the building.

There was also the contract for services for the Margate Town Deal Theatre Royal and 19 Hawley Square that required restoration and modernisation. This included the full design teams for the next stage. Clearly, this was an exciting time for the Council to be able to move these schemes forward to the next stage of delivery.

The report outlined the approved budget and procurement route for each of the schemes identified. Cabinet was asked to authorise the procurement and award of contracts for a number of procurements for projects in the Simplification Pathfinder Project. These are as follows:

1. Margate Town Deal Walpole Pavilion - works contract;
2. Margate Town Deal Skatepark - works contract;
3. Margate Town Deal Access Walpole Lift Structure - works contract;
4. Levelling Up Fund Newington Community Centre Refurbishment and Extension - works contract;
5. Future High Street Fund and Levelling Up Fund Broad Street Project - works contract and;
6. Margate Town Deal Theatre Royal Margate & 19 Hawley Square Restoration, Conservation and Modernisation - professional service contracts.

Councillor Kup and Councillor Rattigan spoke under Council Procedure Rule 20.1.

Councillor Duckworth proposed, Councillor Yates seconded and Cabinet authorised the procurement and award of contracts for a number of procurements for projects in the Simplification Pathfinder Project. These are as follows:

1. Margate Town Deal Walpole Pavilion - works contract;
2. Margate Town Deal Skatepark - works contract;
3. Margate Town Deal Access Walpole Lift Structure - works contract;
4. Levelling Up Fund Newington Community Centre Refurbishment and Extension - works contract;
5. Future High Street Fund and Levelling Up Fund Broad Street Project - works contract;

6. Margate Town Deal Theatre Royal Margate & 19 Hawley Square Restoration, Conservation and Modernisation - professional service contracts.

22. APPROVAL OF THE TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION POLICY

Cabinet discussed proposals for the Temporary Accommodation Policy presented to members at the meeting. Heightened temporary accommodation usage was placing a financial strain on all local authorities' General Funds, it was essential that the Council had a strong and transparent policy in place that clearly showed how it approached the placement of homeless households both inside and outside of the Thanet boundary.

The Council worked with households to prevent homelessness occurring wherever possible however, regrettably, it was not possible to prevent homelessness in cases and some households would therefore require the use of temporary accommodation. The proposed policy document set out Thanet District Council's approach to the placement of homeless households in temporary accommodation inside and where unavoidable, outside of the Thanet District.

The Temporary Accommodation Policy set out the principles the Council would apply to recover some of the cost of providing temporary accommodation through reasonable charging (i.e. for the use and occupation of the accommodation provided and in many cases those households would be entitled to either full or partial housing benefit payments), as provided within the legislation.

The policy took into account the statutory requirements on local authorities to find suitable accommodation and relevant case law. It also importantly considered the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.

Councillor Bayford spoke under Council Procedure Rule 20.1.

Councillor Whitehead proposed, Councillor Keen seconded and Cabinet agreed:

1. To endorse and Thanet District Council adopt the proposed Temporary Accommodation Policy;
2. That the Policy be reviewed on an annual basis by officers and be signed off by the Head of Housing and Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing.

23. ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AND ALCOHOL PSPO

Members discussed recommendations for the adoption of the Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO), which tackles anti-social behaviour and regulates alcohol consumption in Thanet District. The PSPO was introduced to tackle anti-social behaviour, as well as public disorder related to alcohol consumption in public places. Kent Police also requested this Order.

This included anti-social group congregations, misuse of public space, using foul or abusive language, excreting bodily fluids, street drinking, public intoxication, and disturbances caused by alcohol-related activities, and the PSPO had been successful in reducing these issues thereby improving the safety and well-being of the community. This included the new submissions of the use of legal psychoactive substances and intoxicants and inappropriate harmful and degrading related activity. The PSPO also allowed alcohol to be confiscated and disposed of without the need for a Fixed Penalty Notice being issued. Education and communication were also key to reducing such instances and their recurrence. The PSPO also allowed anti-social behaviour to be tackled with education and communication prior to enforcement.

The recommended combining of the ASB and Alcohol PSPO would allow Thanet to be covered with the PSPO restrictions in the four main urban areas, Ramsgate, Margate, Broadstairs and Birchington and allow the previously location based restricted ASB PSPO, covering Margate and Ramsgate, to be geographically expanded. This would allow education and enforcement of the PSPO to take place within the designated area and 'hot spot' areas to be tackled more effectively. Officers in the Community Safety Team would continue to monitor the effectiveness of the Order and assess the potential for any necessary adjustments to ensure it remained an effective tool in regulating ASB and alcohol consumption in public places. This would mean that this PSPO would be initially introduced for the period of one year.

The team would also continue to work closely with the Police and other partners to ensure consistent education and enforcement of the Order. The Council was committed to creating a safer and healthier community for residents and visitors. Extending the PSPO would support this goal and combat anti-social behaviour, public disorder and alcohol related negative behaviour in public spaces for the benefit of all.

Members were asked to note that an amendment to the Order as published was proposed in restriction 3 of the proposed order, which concerned using foul language. In this restriction, it was proposed the words, 'offence and upset' were removed from the version of the order that had been published. This was so that the restriction imposed was the least restrictive to achieve its objectives. It was proposed that the amended restriction read, '*all persons are prohibited from using foul or abusive language in such a manner that is loud and can be heard by others and cause either alarm or distress to any other person in any public place.*'

A further amendment was proposed to the published report in that it was proposed that the Order be made for a period of one year, as opposed to the three years set out in the report for publication. This would allow officers time to continue to monitor and review anti-social behaviour across the restricted area, gather further evidence and consider the appropriateness of more targeted restrictions in the future. Members were asked to note that a report would be represented to Cabinet within the one year period, following careful analysis of further evidence and any appropriate consultation, to consider any extension or variation to the Order proposed.

The following Members spoke under Council Procedure Rule 20.1:

Councillor Rogers;
Councillor Austin;
Councillor Pugh;
Councillor Wing.

Councillor Keen proposed, Councillor K. Bright seconded Cabinet agreed:

1. That the two current PSPOs be combined and adopted for the period of one year to cover Thanet's main urban areas (Margate, Birchington, Ramsgate, Broadstairs) (as reflected in the updated PSPO document attached);
2. To delegate any minor amendments and extensions of the PSPO to the Chief Executive.

24. TRANSITION OF SHARED SERVICES

Cabinet's authority was sought for the creation of a Local Authority Trading Company, to be jointly owned together with Dover and Canterbury councils. The company would deliver Revenue, Benefits and Customer Services to the three Councils, which were currently being provided under contract by Civica. The current contract with Civica would

expire in January 2025 and the new Local Authority Trading Company would take on the running of those services thereafter.

The company would be known as PartnershipOne, and approving these recommendations would allow the company to be formally registered at Companies House. Work could then commence in respect of the further establishment of the company, as detailed in the body of this report.

Members were advised that updates were made to the Shareholders Agreement and Articles of Association and Articles of Association attached as annexes to the minutes.

Councillor Yates proposed, Councillor seconded Duckworth and Cabinet agreed the following:

1. Agree to exit from the contract with Civica UK Limited for the delivery of the Revenue, Benefits and Customer Services;
3. Approve the LATCo service delivery vehicle as the preferred option for future service delivery of Revenue, Benefits and Customer Services;
4. Approve the Business Case at Annex 1 setting out the rationale for the delivery of the aforementioned services by a Joint Teckal Company, a Local Authority Trading Company (LATCo), together with Dover and Canterbury, pursuant to Article 2 (2)(b) of the Local Government (Best Value Authorities) Power to Trade)(England) Order 2009;
5. Agree the updated Shareholders Agreement and Articles of Association [attached to the published decision notice and minutes to the Cabinet meeting];
6. Authorise the East Kent Services Committee, to the extent that it is not otherwise authorised to do so, to exercise the powers and functions of the Council to form the LATCo and to enter into the contract with it, (to include but not limited to); making decisions on behalf of the Council in relation to:
 - i. Establishing the LATCo and enter into any associated shareholders agreements.
 - ii. Appointing officers to the LATCo.
 - iii. Subscribing for shares in the LATCo
 - iv. Advancing money by way of loan capital to the LATCo to finance its capital requirements.
 - v. Entering into a contract with LATCo for the delivery of the Revenue, Benefits and Customer Services on behalf of each of the councils.
 - vi. Managing the contract.
 - vii. Renegotiating the contract.
 - viii. Varying the contract.
 - ix. Assigning the contract.
 - x. Novating the contract.
 - xi. Terminating the contract.
 - xii. Enforcing the contract.
 - xiii. The doing of anything in relation to the exercise of the powers and functions under Part II of the Deregulation and Contracting Out Act 1994 and the orders and regulations made under it.
 - xiv. Authorising entry into contracts* with third parties in relation to any functions of the Council which are not the Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services Functions but which can usefully be entered into in connection with or in order to facilitate contracts entered into, or to be entered into with regard to the Revenues, Benefits and Customer Service Functions.

*the contracts shall be entered into in accordance with each local authority's respective Contract Standing Orders.

(xv) Anything which is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive to or otherwise expedient to (i) to (xiv) above.

7. Authorise the East Kent Services Committee, to the extent that it is not otherwise authorised to do so, to exercise the powers and functions of the Council in its capacity as a shareholder of the LATCo, including the giving of any consent, approval or permission under the provisions of any shareholders agreement, BUT NOT the giving of any approval under the shareholders agreement to carry out any matters which are specified as Reserved Matters under the shareholders agreement;
8. Agree that a report be considered by EKSC on final contract terms and, if approved, authorisation of entry into the contract and associated documentation;
9. Agree that a new collaboration agreement be entered into between the authorities dealing with and reflecting:
 - (a) The fact that the existing collaboration agreement makes specific reference to Civica (UK) Limited;
 - (b) The management of the service contract with the LATCo and the rights of liabilities of the councils (inter se) in relation to the service contract with the LATCo;
 - (c) The reduced number of services now being delivered as shared services e.g. ICT and Human Resources are no longer delivered as shared services.
 - (d) The changes to the procurement regime effected by the Procurement Act 2023;
 - (e) Data protection matters;
 - (f) Such other matters as are considered appropriate by the monitoring officer.
10. That the terms of such new agreement be determined by the Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Leader of Council.

25. PORT OF RAMSGATE FUTURE DELIVERY - PROJECT UPDATE AND BUDGET CHANGE PROPOSAL

Cabinet discussed proposals for a budget change to the Port of Ramsgate Project. The report considered at the meeting provided an update on two closely linked projects which were fundamental to the future of the Port of Ramsgate. The report also proposed a transfer of funds between projects in the Ramsgate levelling up funded programme and the agreement to offer a grant contribution to the operator for the required works at the port.

Following a Cabinet Decision on 2 March 2023 officers in collaboration with external lawyers, had developed a tender strategy and suite of documents for the operation of a large part of the port. This included two of the roll-on roll-off ferry berths. This opportunity was scheduled to be tendered on the open market next month and would offer a concession agreement and lease with the objective of re-establishing a scheduled cross channel service.

In parallel with the port concession operator project, the closely linked port infrastructure project had been developed further. The design and extensive survey work on the latter project had allowed an updated and higher confidence cost estimate for the required capital works to be produced. This confirmed the news that was shared in the regeneration update report in January that the estimated value of the works was substantially beyond the LUF budget currently allocated to the port infrastructure work and beyond what cabinet would be prepared to allocate from the overall Ramsgate award.

Proposals were for the transfer of funds from two other projects in the Ramsgate levelling up programme that could no longer be delivered. This proposal would increase the budget available for the works from just over £3m to £7.2m. This new higher budget value would, if approved, be sufficient to undertake the capital dredging required, fund remaining project management costs and also offer a grant of £4.5m to the successful port operator as a substantial contribution towards the cost of the works.

The agreed direction and the delivery strategy from the start of this project had been one of risk mitigation both in terms of financial risk to the authority in the delivery of the project and the long term operational and financial risk at the port. The proposal for the port concession operator to carry out the works in compliance with strict grant conditions was well aligned with the project risk objectives as it removed exposure to future project delivery risks. There was no change in that all the LUF money would be spent at the port of Ramsgate in delivering the project and using LUF funds to lever in outside investment was one of the government's original objectives.

It was reported in the January Ramsgate Regeneration Update report that the Fishing Facilities project was no longer deliverable as originally proposed and would not deliver the required project outputs. A smaller scale project to enhance fishing facilities at the harbour was still planned and this report sought Cabinet's approval for the majority of that budget being reallocated to the port infrastructure project. The Cabinet report also proposed the reallocation of funds from the Visitor Accommodation Opportunities project budget to the Port Infrastructure budget.

The proposal to transfer funds to the port infrastructure project was an entirely separate matter that played no part in the rationale for not taking those projects forward. The test of this was that neither of these projects could proceed using the LUF funding even if the port infrastructure project was aborted at this point. This was clearly disappointing but it was not news and in part, it was a product of the way this funding was allocated through a short-notice bidding competition, which allowed very limited early project development.

The report also provided an update on the planned approach to the proposal from Brett Aggregates, the established aggregates operator at the port to lease additional land. The approach to this would change, but measures were in place to ensure best value was achieved and importantly, plans were still aligned with the recommendation approved by Cabinet in March 2023.

Despite the increase in the estimated project costs, there were no plans to divert from the original project objectives and previous cabinet decision. However, the delivery of projects in the Ramsgate levelling up funding was time bound. The report set out some scoping work currently being undertaken on alternative options for the future use of the port, which could be developed further and with less overall programme impact in the event that the port concession tender exercise does not yield suitable or compliant bids.

Cabinet did not commit any funds at this meeting. However any proposed decision to do so would be taken to the Overview and Scrutiny Panel for pre-decision review and then to a public meeting of Cabinet for decision. The tendering process would answer the questions people have about the third-party appetite for operating from the port of Ramsgate in short order. It would hinge on whether the infrastructure works were affordable within the context of a third party's business plan. Cabinet would only find that out through the process. Cabinet acknowledged that there were no guarantees. Any debate at this stage on whether it would be successful could only be speculative and performative, rather than useful. Members would be able to find out in the next few months.

The following Members spoke under Council Procedure Rule 20.1:

Councillor Rogers;
Councillor Pugh;
Councillor Wing;
Councillor Austin.

Councillor Everitt proposed, Councillor Albon seconded and Cabinet agreed to:

1. The transfer of a total of £4.12m from the Fishing Facilities project and the Visitor Accommodation Opportunities project to the Port Infrastructure project;
2. The mechanism of a grant payment of £4.5m, to be funded from the Port Infrastructure project Levelling Up Fund budget, to the successful port concession operator to contribute to the cost of the required enabling works.

26. EQUALITIES

Cabinet considered proposals for adopting a new Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy and feedback from the outcome of the Cabinet Advisory Group review of the proposals. The advisory group had been set up to consider equalities and diversity issues within the Council and came up with the proposals that were presented to Cabinet. Cabinet was asked to agree the new Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy as proposed.

The Council had a legal duty to consider equality and inclusion in all its decisions. The Cabinet Advisory Group (CAG) would review the Council processes to ensure that all its legal obligations regarding Equality, Diversity and Inclusion were met regarding decision-making and service delivery. The CAG would also be producing a report with recommendations to the Constitutional Review Committee seeking to make Equality, Diversity and Inclusion training for all councillors compulsory.

Councillor Dawson spoke under Council Procedure Rule 20.1.

Councillor Keen proposed, Councillor Whitehead seconded and Cabinet agreed to:

1. The Council's new Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy appended to the Cabinet report;
2. The Council's new Equalities Screening Tool and Equalities Impact Assessment;
3. That a report be presented to the Constitutional Review Committee to consider the proposal that a change be made to the Constitution making it mandatory for all Councillors to attend Equalities training.

Meeting concluded : 9.01 pm