Agenda

COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday
22 October 2026
7.00 pm

Lord Mayor: Councillor Alister Brady
Joint Chief Executives: Suzi Wakeham, Peter Davies

canterbury city council

Everyone is welcome to record meetings of the Council and its Committees using whatever non-disruptive methods you think are suitable. If you are intending to do this, please mention it to the Democratic Services Officer and do not use flash photograph unless you have previously asked whether you may do so. If you have any questions about this, please contact Democratic Services (members of the press please contact the Press Office).

Please note that the Chair of the meeting has the discretion to withdraw permission and halt any recording if in the Chair's opinion continuing to do so would prejudice proceedings at the meeting. Reasons may include disruption caused by the filming or recording or the nature of the business being conducted.

Anyone filming a meeting is asked to only focus on those actively participating but please also be aware that you may be filmed or recorded whilst attending a council meeting and that attendance at the meeting signifies your agreement to this if it occurs. You are also reminded that the laws of defamation apply and all participants whether speaking, filming or recording are reminded that respect should be shown to all those included in the democratic process.

Persons making recordings are requested not to put undue restrictions on the material produced so that it can be reused and edited by all local people and organisations on a non-commercial basis.

If a meeting passes a motion to exclude the press and public then, in conjunction with this, all rights to record the meeting are removed.

Canterbury City Council
14 Rose Lane
CANTERBURY CT1 2UR

14 October 2026

To: The Members of the CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL

We hereby summon you to attend **A MEETING OF THE CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL** to be held at **THE GUILDHALL, ST PETER'S PLACE, CANTERBURY ON THURSDAY 22 OCTOBER 2026 at 7.00 pm** for the transaction of the business described in the following agenda.



Joint Chief Executives

Agenda

1 Apologies for absence

2 Declaration of interests by councillors or officers

TO RECEIVE any declarations for the following in so far as they relate to the business for the meeting:

a. Disclosable Pecuniary Interests
b. Other Significant Interests (what were previously thought of as non-pecuniary Prejudicial interests)
c. Voluntary Announcements of Other Interests i.e. relevant memberships

Voluntary Announcements of Other Interests not required to be disclosed as DPI's or OSI's, i.e. announcements made for transparency reasons alone, such as:

- Membership of outside bodies that have made representations on agenda items, or
- Where a Councillor knows a person involved, but does not have a close association with that person, or
- Where an item would affect the well-being of a Councillor, relative, close associate, employer, etc but not his/her financial position.

[Note: an effect on the financial position of a Councillor, relative, close associate, employer, etc; OR an application made by a Councillor, relative, close associate, employer, etc, would both probably constitute either an OSI or in some cases a DPI].

3 Petitions or questions from the public

Any member of the public may present a petition or put a question, provided that it is supported by not less than 15 signatories, **and provided that notification has been given to Democratic Services by 12.30pm two working days before the meeting.**

The Joint Chief Executive will report verbally any notifications received within the prescribed time limit regarding any petitions or questions for the meeting.

Other than in accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme, no debate shall take place upon any matter put before the Council by way of petition.

No debate shall take place upon any matter put before the Council by way of question except at the discretion of the Lord Mayor, when the Leader or Chair of an appropriate committee may respond. The Leader or the Chair may agree to a written response being sent on behalf of the Council.

The Lord Mayor, at their discretion, may determine the order in which the petitions and / or questions are taken.

It is the usual practice to refer any petitions or questions to the relevant decision-making body or, if there is a related item on the agenda, they will be considered at the meeting.

Under the Council's Petition Scheme:

Duplicate Petitions will not be accepted (Where more than one petition is received in time for a particular meeting, each supporting the same outcome on one matter, each petition organiser will be treated as an independent organiser, but only the petition organiser of the first petition will be invited to address the relevant meeting).

Repeat Petitions will not be accepted (Where a petition will not normally be considered where they are received within six months of another petition being considered by the authority on the same matter).

4 Announcements

TO RECEIVE any announcements by the Lord Mayor, the Cabinet Members or the Joint Chief Executive.

5 Recommendations to Full Council from Cabinet

There are no recommendations to Full Council from Cabinet for this meeting.

6 Recommendations to Full Council from Committees and Boards

Councillors are asked to view the reports considered by the various committees at the hyperlinks provided before considering the following recommendations to Full Council.

(a) Review of Harbour Charges 20272028

At its meeting on 9 October 2026, the Whitstable Harbour Board (Minutes to be published here following publication of this agenda) recommended:

That the proposed Schedule of Charges was approved, with the following amendment: That the Fuel Levy remains unchanged, rather than applying the proposed 1.5% increase.

(The report that the Committee considered should be viewed online.)

7 Councillors questions

To answer any questions from Councillors under Rule 10 of the Council Procedure Rules.

Details of any questions received will be reported at the meeting.

(Note: There is a time limit of one minute for asking a question and three minutes for its answer, with supplementary questions being allowed, with a total of 30 minutes for all questions).

8 Notices of Motion

(a) Motion: Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) – Checks for new Members

Proposed by: Councillor Beth Forrester
Seconded by: Councillor Paul Prentice

Council notes:

1. The importance of safeguarding.
2. The role elected members play in discharging functions relating to and engaging with vulnerable residents in our district.
3. The employment of DBS checks at whatever level are designed for employees and volunteers where individuals have direct contact, in person or remotely, with children and vulnerable people.
4. That something being shown on a DBS check does not prohibit anyone from standing or working as a councillor but may result in an assessment on whether any risk management is necessary.
5. That DBS checks are not mandatory for councillors at any level of local authority. It is best practice, but not mandatory, for those discharging education or social services functions to undergo an enhanced DBS check.
6. The importance of the role that councillors play in our communities and the importance for residents to know that they can trust and be safe with their councillors.

Council believes:

7. That adopting of voluntary basic DBS checks is a proportionate and reasonable safeguarding measure for members who may have unsupervised interaction with residents.

Council resolves:

1. That such checks will ordinarily be undertaken prior to the exercising of their duties by any member who is willing, starting with those elected in the May 2027 elections.
2. To request, following a debate at full council, that the Joint Chief Executive develop and implement a clear protocol covering:

- The handling, storage, and confidentiality of DBS information;
- The process for considering any information disclosed;
- Roles and responsibilities in decision-making;
- The options available where concerns arise, including how these interact with Council or group decision-making processes.

3. To authorise the Joint Chief Executive to make the necessary administrative arrangements for the delivery of basic DBS checks in accordance with the agreed policy.
4. To request that the Leader write to the Secretary of State at MHCLG advising them of this motion and requesting that a recommendation for basic DBS checks for all councillors is considered in the LGR reforms.
5. To request that the Leader recommend that basic DBS checks for all councillors and enhanced checks for those discharging education or social care functions are recommended by Canterbury City Council in the development of the East Kent Unitary Authority.

(This relates to a matter that can be dealt with at the Council meeting.)

(b) Motion: Declaration of Rights of the Stour (Kent)

Proposed by Councillor Pat Edwards
Seconded by Councillor Peter Campbell

Background
The Stour (Kent) is one of only +/- 200 chalk streams in the world. The Great Stour and Little Stour/Nailbourne run through Canterbury district, with major tributaries in its catchment including the Wingham River in particular, and the Sarre Penn in the north east.

Chalk streams are a globally rare habitat which support highly diverse and sensitive wildlife.

England holds 85% of the world's chalk streams, most of which are located in the South East where development pressures are intensive.

The river catchment of the Stour (Kent) includes nationally important areas of wetland and the internationally important Ramsar site at Stodmarsh[1].

However, rivers across the UK (including the Stour, Kent) face increasing pressure from pollution, over abstraction, development, habitat degradation, invasive species, light and climate change.

With only 14% of UK rivers in good ecological health and 0% in good chemical health, it is clear that current environmental laws and enforcement activities are failing our rivers.

Engagement with communities throughout our district demonstrates that residents care deeply about the health of our rivers and wetlands, not only for their value to humans but also for their intrinsic value.

Over the last four years, the Great Stour Riverfest has highlighted the significance of the Kentish Stour from the ecological, cultural and historical perspectives, and shone a light on the problems that it faces.

To address the growing threats to our rivers and wetlands, and to uphold our responsibilities to future generations, the Council notes the international movement to respect and promote the rights of rivers as living ecosystems.

This approach is embodied in the Universal Declaration on the Rights of Rivers and is providing an innovative way to change our relationship with nature - from one of dominance to one of interdependency.

The idea of extending legal personhood to non-human entities is not a new concept.

These rights have already been extended to corporations to provide distinct legal status.

The Rights of Rivers approach has been endorsed and adopted by a growing number of local authorities across the UK.

A pioneering local authority in this regard has been Lewes District Council in East Sussex, which has worked together with the Love Our Ouse community group and other local partners, to develop and endorse a Declaration on the Rights of the River Ouse.

This identified the following eight rights to be protected:

1. The right to exist in its natural state
2. The right to flow
3. The right to perform essential natural functions within the river catchment
4. The right to feed and be fed from sustainable aquifers
5. The right to be free from pollution, including light
6. The right to native biodiversity
7. The right to regeneration and restoration
8. The right to an active and influential voice

Canterbury City Council has a long track record of support for the River Stour. It adopted a Canterbury Riverside Strategy in 2015 (updated in 2023), a Green Infrastructure Strategy in 2018, a Climate Change Emergency Declaration in 2019, a Biodiversity Emergency Declaration in 2023 and it is currently in the process of finalising a Biodiversity Strategy.

The council has convened the Canterbury Riverside Group for over ten years and has played a key role, alongside community groups, in the delivery of the Great Stour Riverfest.

Following on from these commitments, and in the spirit of the national and international movement to respect the rights of rivers, Canterbury City Council resolves, as far as existing resources allow:

- To recognise and support the above rights for the Stour (Kent) catchment within the jurisdiction of the council; to establish how they should be enforced and to create a Charter which stakeholders pledge to uphold.
- To work with community groups, statutory bodies and environmental experts to identify and support the practical recognition of those rights and to establish the standards, targets and data needed for this purpose.
- To embody the above rights into future Council policies, particularly those concerning planning, development, land use, water quality, water management and biodiversity, and to introduce institutional arrangements to

give a voice to our rivers and ensure that they are represented in the consideration of such policies.

- To work together with local authorities in the Stour Catchment and the new unitary authority in East Kent to ensure that the rights of rivers and wetlands are adopted more broadly.
- To publish regular public reports on the work of Stour Environmental Credits company (SEC) to help ensure that the SEC makes a tangible difference to the health of our rivers and wetlands.
- To raise public awareness of the importance of the Kentish Stour and support local initiatives and citizen science water testing to protect and restore the health of our rivers and wetlands;
- To request that the Environment Agency publishes an annual 'State of the Rivers' report to track progress in protecting river ecosystems.
- To hold water companies to account to protect public health, preserve river ecosystems and prevent environmental degradation caused by over-abstraction and raw sewage spills.
- To advocate to regional and national bodies that they should adopt a river rights framework and enhanced protection for our chalk streams and freshwater ecosystems, including other water courses within our local authority.

(This relates to a matter that can be dealt with at the Council meeting.)

9 Constitution updates - October 2026 (Pages 10 - 35)

TO CONSIDER the report of Peter Davies and Suzi Wakeham, Joint Chief Executive, and Matthew Archer, Head of Corporate Governance.

10 Changes to memberships of committees and boards and notification of changes to lead councillor roles (Page 36)

TO ACCEPT the nomination(s) of the political group leaders.

11 Minutes

TO CONFIRM as a true record the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on (insert date).

(a) Council - Wednesday, 16 September 2026 (Pages 37 - 40)

12 Report back on Notices of Motion

There are no update reports on previous motions for the meeting.

13 To receive the following minutes of the meetings specified and to receive questions and answers on any of the minutes

(Note: By virtue of Article 17.03 of the Council Procedure Rules there shall be no amendment to resolved minutes, save on the written advice from the Monitoring Officer and/or the Chief Financial Officer).

(a) Cabinet - Monday, 5 October 2026 (Pages 41 - 50)

(b) General Purposes Committee, Wednesday 16 September 2026 (Pages 51 - 55)

(c) Licensing Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 9 September 2026 (Pages 56 - 63)

(d) Licensing Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 23 September 2026 (Pages 64 - 68)

(e) Overview Committee - Thursday, 10 September 2026 (Pages 69 - 75)

(f) Planning Committee - Tuesday, 15 September 2026 (Pages 76 - 78)

(g) Scrutiny Committee - Wednesday, 2 September 2026 (Pages 79 - 83)

14 Notices of urgent decisions made by the Joint Chief Executives under delegation

Decisions reported here have been consulted on with the Chair of the Scrutiny Committee and the relevant portfolio holder.

15 Any other urgent business to be dealt with on the night

Council

22 October 2026

Subject: Constitution updates - October 2026

Officer: Joint Chief Executives and Head of Corporate Governance

Director and Head of Service:

Matthew Archer, Head of Corporate Governance

Cabinet Member:

Connie Nolan, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Engagement & Inclusion

Key or Non Key decision: Non Key

Decision Issues:

These matters are within the authority of the Council

Is any of the information exempt from publication:

This report is open to the public.

CCC ward(s): All

Summary and purpose of the report:

This report asks Council to note changes to the Constitution arising from its decision on 16 July 2026 and advises Council in advance of further amendments required by new legal requirements for planning decisions.

The Head of Legal Services will make those further amendments under the delegation in Part 8.1, E26, for implementation by 31 October 2026.

To Note:

1. The amendments to Part 6, Part 8.1 and Appendix E of the Constitution set out in the appendices to this report.

2. That Council is being advised in advance that the Head of Legal Services will exercise the delegation in Part 8.1, E26, to update the relevant delegations to reflect changes in legislation, with the amendments to be implemented by 31 October 2026.

Next stage in process:

Following Council's consideration of this report, the Head of Legal Services will exercise the delegation in Part 8.1, E26, to make the required planning-related amendments to the Constitution.

Those amendments will be implemented by 31 October 2026.

Any reply from the Minister will be reported or circulated when received.

1. Introduction

This report covers two sets of changes to the Constitution. The changes agreed in July 2026 to the Council's executive arrangements and the powers delegated by Council to officers have now been incorporated into the Constitution. The relevant extracts from Part 6 (Executive Functions) and Part 8.1 (Delegations to Officers by Council) are included at Appendix 1.

The remainder of the report focuses on the further amendments required to implement the changes to planning legislation and the national scheme of delegation for planning functions with effect from 31 October 2026.

2. Detail

On 8 July 2026, the Governance Committee considered the introduction of the national scheme of delegation for planning and made recommendations to Council. Council considered those recommendations on 16 July 2026.

At minute 202a (1), Council resolved that the proposed amendments should be approved to reflect the national scheme of delegation for planning functions, to be added to the Constitution before the legislation took effect. The national scheme was subsequently given effect by the Town and Country Planning (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026 (SI 2026/854).

Council also considered whether, before the final wording was incorporated into the Constitution on 31 October 2026, the Leader should write to the Minister asking for the draft national scheme of delegation to be reviewed again and for further clarification to be provided before final adoption.

It was noted that any response from the Minister could be taken into account when formulating the Council's guidance. In the absence of a response, however, implementation of the Regulations would still be required by 31 October 2026.

Following that decision, the Leader wrote to the Minister of State for Housing and Planning. The letter is included at Appendix 2. No reply had been received at the time of writing. This does not affect the Council's obligation to implement the statutory arrangements by 31 October 2026.

The Regulations were made on 15 July 2026 and come into force on 31 October 2026. The Constitution has therefore been reviewed and the necessary amendments to Part 8.1 and Appendix E have been prepared so that the Council's decision-making arrangements comply with the new legislation from that date.

Councillors have also been briefed on the new planning arrangements and their practical effect.

The national scheme places planning applications into two statutory categories. Details of the application types within Schedule 1 and Schedule 2 are set out at Appendix 3.

Schedule 1 applications must always be determined by officers; there is no local discretion to refer them to committee.

Schedule 2 applications will be determined by officers unless they pass the statutory gateway test and are referred to the Planning Committee. A referral may be made only after the application has been assessed and the statutory criteria are met.

The gateway criteria cover an own-interest application that warrants committee consideration in the interests of transparency and public accountability, an economic, social or environmental issue of significance to the local area, or a significant planning matter having regard to the Development Plan and other material considerations.

The Regulations require a Nominated Member and Nominated Officer to consider referrals. Part 8.1 names the Chair of the Planning Committee, or the Vice-Chair in their absence, as the Nominated Member, and the Head of Planning and Health, or the Planning Manager (Development Management) in their absence, as the Nominated Officer.

A Schedule 2 or own-interest application will be referred to the Planning Committee only if the Nominated Member and Nominated Officer agree that the statutory test is met. If they do not agree, the application must be determined by an officer.

The amendments to Appendix E explain the revised process for ward councillor involvement and referrals. They record the statutory starting point that applications are determined by officers, with referral to committee available only where the gateway test is satisfied. A public record will identify the cases considered, the outcome and the reasons.

Council is being advised of these changes before the Head of Legal Services exercises the delegation in Part 8.1, E26, in consultation with the Head of Corporate Governance, to update the relevant delegations to reflect the new legislation.

The amendments must be implemented by 31 October 2026 and will apply to applications determined from that date, regardless of when they were submitted.

3. Relevant Council policy, strategies or budgetary documents

The Council's Constitution, in particular Part 6, Part 8.1 and Appendix E.

4. Consultation planned or undertaken

(a) General consultations

The Governance Committee considered the constitutional changes for Local Government Reorganisation on 8 July 2026 before Council approved them on 16 July 2026. Councillors have been briefed on the planning changes.

5. Options available with reasons for suitability

The report is for noting. It records the changes arising from Council's earlier decision and advises Council in advance of the further planning-related amendments that the Head of Legal Services will make under the delegation in Part 8.1, E26, so that the Constitution complies with the law by 31 October 2026.

6. Reasons for supporting option recommended, with risk assessment

As above

7. Implications

(a) Financial

There are no direct financial effects. Decisions made under the revised powers must stay within the approved budget, procurement rules and the Council's financial rules.

(b) Legal

The Local Government Reorganisation changes reflect Council's decision at minute 202 and clarify political and officer roles. The planning changes are required to

comply with the Town and Country Planning (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026, which come into force on 31 October 2026. The Head of Legal Services is authorised under Part 8.1, E26, in consultation with the Head of Corporate Governance, to update delegations to take account of changes in legislation. Council is being advised of the intended amendments before that power is exercised. Implementing the revised arrangements by 31 October 2026 reduces the risk of a planning decision being challenged because it was made by the wrong decision maker.

(c) Equalities

None

(d) Environmental including carbon emissions and biodiversity

None

Other implications [delete as appropriate]

(e) Planning including building regulations

The changes affect who decides certain planning applications. They do not change the planning issues or material considerations that apply. Officers must decide Schedule 1 applications. Officers will also decide Schedule 2 and own interest applications unless the Nominated Member and Nominated Officer agree that the legal test for referral to the Planning Committee is met.

Contact Officer: Matthew Archer, Head of Corporate Governance

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Relevant extracts from Part 6 (Executive Functions), Part 8.1 (Delegations to Officers by Council) and Appendix E (Planning Code of Good Practice)
- Appendix 2 – Letter from the Leader to the Minister of State for Housing and Planning
- Appendix 3 – The national scheme of delegation Schedule 1 and Schedule 2 application categories

Additional document(s) containing information exempt from publication:

No

Appendix 1(1)

Changes to Part 6 – Executive Functions, Rules and Procedures

Part 6 – The Executive Functions, Rules and Procedures 1
Part 6.1 – Executive Functions 1
Annex A to Part 6.1 – Members of the Cabinet 5
Annex B to Part 6.1 – Cabinet Portfolios 6
Annex C to Part 6.1 – Cabinet Member Role Descriptions 11
Annex D to Part 6.1 – Collective Decisions 13
Annex E to Part 6.1 – Cabinet Boards and Committees 14
Part 6.2 – Cabinet Procedure Rules 15
Part 6.3 – Call-In Rules of Procedure 20
Part 6.4 – Decision making 24

Part 6 – The Executive Functions, Rules and Procedures

Part 6.1 – Executive Functions

1. Executive Functions

1.1 Executive functions are exercised by:

a) The Cabinet;

b) Cabinet committees, if any;

c) The Leader and other individual cabinet members;

d) Officers, under delegated powers (see Officer Delegations, Part 8 of this Constitution);

e) Ward councillors, to the extent that the executive function is exercisable in relation to the ward for which the councillor is elected.

1.2 It is the responsibility of the Leader to decide on the delegation of executive functions and to maintain a written record of such delegations. Executive functions can be also delegated to other local authorities, other organisations, and may be contracted out.

1.3 This scheme of delegation has been prepared by the Leader, in accordance with those provisions. The executive in all its forms is responsible for initiating and developing policy and taking decisions within the budget and policy framework, in respect of all the functions of the Council, other than those which, whether by law or under the Constitution, cannot be the responsibility of the executive. Such functions are referred to in this scheme as 'executive functions'.

1.4 **Members of the Cabinet**

The councillors appointed to the Cabinet by the Leader are set out in Annexe A to this Part 6. Each Cabinet member may have a portfolio of responsibilities.

1.5 An outline of the responsibilities included in each portfolio is set out in Annexe B.

1.6 A full description of the cabinet role is set out in Annexe C. The Leader will determine any question arising as to whether a policy area or executive function falls within a particular portfolio.

1.7 Annexe D sets out the executive functions that will be determined by the executive collectively as the Cabinet.

1.8 In addition, the Leader has appointed a deputy leader of the Council to exercise the following powers and duties:

a) deputising for the Leader in their absence;
b) chairing Cabinet meetings in the absence of the Leader;
c) agreeing Cabinet agendas in the absence of the Leader;

d) acting as the Council's spokesperson on all key corporate issues, consistent with the Council's overall budget and policy framework, in the absence of the Leader;
e) holding, leading or assisting on any portfolio the Leader may allocate.

1.9 No deputies will be appointed in respect of portfolio holders and, in their absence, their duties and responsibilities will be undertaken by the Leader and, in their absence, by the Deputy Leader or such other portfolio holder as the Leader may nominate.

1.10 **Duties and responsibilities of the Leader**

The duties and responsibilities of the Leader include the following:

Purpose

a) To have overall responsibility for the Council's vision and corporate objectives, and for ensuring their delivery.

b) To be the Council's principal political spokesperson and to represent its views to the public and to organisations with which the Council has contact.

c) To provide community leadership.

Responsibilities

a) Leading the work of the Cabinet, including its programmes and priorities.

b) Promoting collaborative working with stakeholders and partners.

c) Addressing matters relating to Local Government Reorganisation.

d) Responding to matters addressed to the leader of the council relating to Local Government Reorganisation after taking advice from the Joint Chief Executives and other relevant statutory officers

e) Representing the Council's policy agenda locally, regionally and nationally, as appropriate.

f) Development, implementation, monitoring and review of the Council's vision and strategic objectives.

g) Development and implementation of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy and Capital Strategy.

h) Political responsibility for the effective corporate governance of the Council.

i) Providing strong and clear leadership in the co-ordination of strategies and policies.

j) Responsibility for the discharge of any Cabinet function not delegated to another individual or body.

k) Performance monitoring.

Annex A to Part 6.1 – Members of the Cabinet (updated 1 October 2026)

Details of councillors' addresses can be found at:
https://democracy.canterbury.gov.uk/mgMemberIndex.aspx?bcr=1

Name	Ward
Councillor Alan Baldock **Leader of the Council, Strategy and Finance**	Northgate
Councillor Mel Dawkins Cabinet Member for Environment and Sustainability	St Stephens
Councillor Charlotte Cornell Cabinet Member for Council Services, Culture and Heritage	Seasalter
Councillor Chris Cornell Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Regeneration	Gorrell
Councillor Pip Hazelton **Deputy Leader of the Council** Cabinet Member for Housing	Westgate
Councillor Connie Nolan Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Engagement and Inclusion	Barton
Cllr Paul Prentice Cabinet Member for Transport and Planning	Barton

Annex B to Part 6.1 – Cabinet Portfolios

Cllr Alan Baldock – Leader (Strategy & Finance)

Overarching Strategy and Policy • Corporate Communications • Corporate Plan • Local Plan • CIL Governance
Consultation and Engagement • Neighbourhood Plans • Customer Services/Contact Centre
Emergency Planning
LGR
Procurement • Ethical Procurement Policy • Modern Day Slavery Policy
HRA Income Recovery (reporting/compliance)
External Funding (financial reporting)
Payroll
Treasury Management
Income Exchequer • Revenues and Benefits
Partnership One • Business Rates • Council tax
Fraud prevention
Concurrent Funding
Internal Audit

Cllr Pip Hazelton – Deputy Leader (Housing)

Housing Needs (Strategy & Policy)
Operational Housing Model
Housing Benefits Advice
Private Sector Housing • Houses of Multiple Occupancy • Short term letting
Public Sector Housing
Tenancy Management • Neighbourhood Locality
Facility Management
Homelessness • Rough Sleeping
Housing Stock • Repairs and Maintenance (inc. CARDO) • Refurbishment & Replacement

Corporate Health & Safety

Cllr Chris Cornell – Economic Development & Regeneration

Economic Development • BID • EKSDC • UKSPF • Government Grants (as appropriate) • BID • Visit Kent
Licencing • Pubs • Clubs and Venues • Events • Taxis • HMO Licencing
Markets
Property (CCC owned) Oversight • Property Asset Register • Concessions • Property Disposal
Non-Domestic Property Condition Oversight
Whitstable Harbour • Foreshore • South Quay Shed
Voluntary Sector support • Rent Concessions • RISE Grants

Cllr Charlotte Cornell – Council Services, Culture & Heritage

Caneco • Domestic recycling • Domestic waste collection • Public toilets • Street Cleaning • Fly tipping & graffiti removal • Community litter picks • On street recycling
CCC Owned Event Venues • Kings Hall, Horsebridge, Whitstable Castle
Culture Strategy
Events

Museums • Whitstable/Herne Bay Community Museums • Beaney House of Knowledge • Roman Museum • Museum Collection (including disposals)
Heritage • Canterbury Tales of England • LUF Project Delivery • Heritage Design Strategy & Policy
Corporate Projects • Performance • Digital & ICT

Cllr Connie Nolan – Community Safety, Engagement & Inclusion

Civil Enforcement • Control Room • Parking • Fly Tipping/Graffiti • NES Contract
Community Safety Partnership
Poverty Reduction • Crisis Resilience Fund • Poverty Action Partnership
Strategic Health Alliance • Marmot Coastal Programme
Circular Economic Opportunities
Youth Engagement • Liaison with Higher & Further Education
Safeguarding • Domestic Abuse • Community Resettlement Programmes
Human Resources
International Partnerships • Via Francigena • Twinning
Leisure Development • Active Life Oversight
Governance • Democratic Services • Parish Charter • Community Governance Review • Rural Liaison

Cllr Mel Dawkins – Environment and Sustainability

Climate Change

• 2030 Decarbonisation Pledge • Air Quality Strategy
Coastal Engineering
Rivers & Water Quality • River Engineering
Grounds Maintenance
Environmental Protection • Air Quality Monitoring
Biodiversity (Strategy & Planning)
Parks and Open Spaces
Cemeteries

Cllr Paul Prentice – Transport & Planning

Planning
Development Management • Planning Enforcement • Environmental Enforcement • Conservation Areas (including action plan) • Building Control
Transport • Car Parking Strategy
Active Travel • Cycling & Walking Plan • Bus First Strategy • Transport Strategy Implementation • Park and Ride

No further changes to the remainder of Part 6

Appendix 1(2)

Changes to Part 8.1 – Scheme of delegations from Council to officers

Description of delegation	Responsibility delegated from
General section **Joint Chief Executives and Directors** Where reference is made to a delegation being performed by 'a' Joint Chief Executive it will be taken in collaboration with the other Joint Chief Executive whenever practicable. Allowing either officer to take a decision avoids delay and ensures decisions can continue to be taken in the event of absence or other reasons (i.e. potential conflict of interest).	
Local Government Reorganisation	
The following powers may be exercised only by the Joint Chief Executives	
49. To take such steps, and to provide such information, responses, submissions, assurances and supporting material to any Government department, Minister, or other public authority as the Joint Chief Executives consider necessary or expedient in connection with Local Government Reorganisation, subject to consultation with the Leader.	
50. To authorise the extension of contracts and partnership agreements beyond vesting day of the creation of the new unitary authority, where necessary and in compliance with procurement rules and the council's contract standing orders.	
Powers of the Council delegated to officers	
Powers D55-D72 are also delegated to the Head of Planning and Health	
As to Development Management:	
D55. Subject to D56 below, to determine all types of notifications and requests and issue all types of notices under the Town and Country Planning Acts 1990, 2006 and 2008 (as amended), and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), ~~and The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007, and The Environment Act 1995 and the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, the Localism Act 2011, the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations) 2011 (as amended) and the Growth and Infrastructure Act 2013 providing such matters are in~~	C

Description of delegation	Responsibility delegated from
~~accordance with either adopted planning policy or emerging planning policy.~~	
D56. All applications falling within Schedule 1 to the Town and Country Planning (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026 must be determined by an officer of the Council. Subject to D57, all applications falling within Schedule 2 to those Regulations, and all applications in which the Council has an interest (referred to as 'Own Interest' applications), must be determined by an officer of the Council.	C
D57. The delegated power in D56 shall not be exercised where the Nominated Member and Nominated Officer agree to refer the application to the Planning Committee. Where they do not agree, the application shall be determined by an officer. For the purposes of D57: • the **Nominated Member** is the Chair of the Planning Committee or, in their absence, the Vice-Chair; and • the **Nominated Officer** is the Head of Planning and Health or, in their absence, the Planning Manager (Development Management). ~~Subject to D55 and D56 above, such delegated power shall not be exercised in the following circumstances, which may be varied from time to time by Council:~~ ~~(a) Where a councillor requests an application is brought before committee for consideration and material planning grounds for doing so are given.~~ ~~(b) Applications by councillors and officers and for Council development (whether involving council owned land or not). This power shall not be exercised for:~~ ~~i. Applications by councillors and officers or their spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom they are living as if they were a married couple or civil partners;~~ ~~ii. Applications in relation to land or property owned by councillors and officers or their spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom they are living as if they were a married couple or civil partners;~~ ~~iii. For Council development (whether involving council owned land or not) excluding applications for improvements to existing council housing or community buildings.~~ ~~(c) Where the Director of Place or Head of Planning and Health considers it is in the public interest for the application to be debated and determined by the planning committee.~~	C

Description of delegation		Responsibility delegated from
	~~*The delegations in D57 (a) and (c) are qualified by the following- In circumstances where the Head of Planning and Health is of the view that the referral to the Planning Committee should not be made, they will consult the Chair of Planning (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) before finalising that decision.*~~	
~~D58.~~	~~To determine, pursuant to Section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), planning applications for a period not exceeding two years subject to there being no material changes in the planning issues. If there are any material changes the application will be referred back to the Planning Committee for further consideration.~~	C
~~D59.~~	~~The power to amend, in respect of Section 106, planning agreements in cases where they and the Head of Legal Services are satisfied that the amendment is technical and makes no material change in the outcomes of the planning agreement or the related planning permission.~~	C
~~D60.~~	~~The power to agree, enter into or amend agreements under section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 on behalf of the Council as local planning authority where the application to which it relates is determined under paragraph D57 above (in consultation with the Head of Legal Services).~~	C
D61.	To decide what information is needed before a decision can be taken on any application including making a screening decision to assess whether the proposed development requires an Environmental Impact Assessment.	E
D62..	To make determinations and take actions in accordance with the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017 including: (i) to adopt and issue screening opinions; (ii) to adopt and issue Appropriate Assessments.	E
~~D63.~~	~~To decide any applications for determinations as to whether the prior approval of the local authority will be required under Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.~~	C
No changes D64 - D70		
Listed buildings:		
~~D71.~~	~~To implement the powers of the Council set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) with regard to listed buildings, buildings of special architectural or historic interest, conservation areas and buildings in conservation areas.~~	
D72.	To administer, including authorising increases to grants made under the Listed Building and Conservation Grant Schemes.	
No changes D73 - D84		

Appendix E

Changes to Planning – Local Code of Good Practice (extract)

Sections 1-5 – no change

6. Development proposals submitted by councillors, officers and Council development

6.1 Proposals submitted by serving and former councillors, officers and their close associates and relatives can easily give rise to suspicions of impropriety. So indeed can proposals for the Council's own development.

6.2 It is perfectly legitimate for such proposals to be submitted. However, it is important to ensure that they are handled in a way which gives no grounds for allegations of favouritism. Therefore the following will apply;

a. Prior written notification should be given to the Service Director of Place when a councillor, a member of staff or a consultant employed by the Council acts on their own planning matter, or on behalf of someone else, or when a planning matter is known to involve a family member, close friend or business associate of that councillor, member of staff or consultant

~~b. Applications by councillors and officers and for Council development (whether involving Council owned land or not) must be dealt with by the Planning Committee.~~

c. Councillors who submit their own proposal to the Council which they serve should take no part in its processing

d. Councillors who act as agents for people pursuing a planning matter with the Authority should play no part in the decision-making process for that proposal.

e. Proposals for the Council's own development must be treated in accordance with Government advice and in the same way as those of private developers

7. Lobbying of and by councillors

7.1 Lobbying is a normal part of the planning process. Those who may be affected by a planning decision, whether through an application, a site allocation in a development plan or an emerging policy, will often seek to influence it through an approach to their ward councillor or to a member of the planning committee. As the Nolan Committee's 1997 report stated:

"It is essential for the proper operation of the planning system that local concerns are adequately ventilated. The most effective and suitable way that this can be done is through the local elected representatives, the councillors themselves".

7.2 Lobbying, however, can lead to the impartiality and integrity of a councillor being called into question, unless care and common sense is exercised by all the parties involved. When being lobbied, members of the Planning Committee should take care about indicating that they have already made up their mind on the issue before they consider the matter in Committee. In such situations, they should restrict themselves

to giving procedural advice, including suggesting to those who are lobbying, that they should speak or write to the Head of Planning and Health in order that their opinions can be included in the report to the Planning Committee or the delegated report. If they do express an opinion, they should make it clear that they will reserve their position as to how they will vote until the meeting of the Planning Committee which considers the application.

7.3 If any councillor, whether or not a committee member, speaks on behalf of a lobby group at the decision-making committee, they should withdraw once any public or ward councillor speaking opportunities have been completed in order to counter any suggestion that members of the committee may have been influenced by their continuing presence.

7.4 It is very difficult to find a form of words which conveys every nuance of these situations and which gets the balance right between the duty to be an active local representative and the requirement when taking decisions on planning matters to take account of all arguments in an open-minded way. It cannot be stressed too strongly, however, that the striking of this balance is, ultimately, the responsibility of the individual councillor.

a. Planning decisions cannot be made on a party political basis in response to lobbying; the use of political whips to seek to influence the outcome of a planning application is likely to be regarded as maladministration.

b. Members of the Planning Committee should avoid organising support for or against a planning application and avoid lobbying other councillors.

c. Councillors should not put pressure on officers for a particular recommendation or decision, and should not do anything which compromises, or is likely to compromise, the officers' impartiality or professional integrity.

~~d. Where an application is referred by a councillor to the Planning Committee, where it would otherwise normally be determined under the delegated authority, reasons for the referral should be submitted in writing and to refer solely to matters of material planning concern. The referral should be sent to the Head of Planning and Health within 21 days of the application being published on the Council's website.~~

d. Ward Councillors will liaise with planning case officers on cases where they consider it appropriate

d.1 all schedule 1 planning applications must be decided by the officers.

d.2 for schedule 2 applications, where there are valid planning reasons why the planning committee could decide an application, the matter will be referred to the Nominated Officer and Nominated Member to review. Where they do not agree, the application shall be determined by an officer.

d.3 For "own interest" applications these will be decided by Officers unless the Nominated Officer and Nominated Member decide whether the application should be reported to the planning committee. Where they do not agree, the application shall be determined by an officer. An own interest application is one that is made by an officer or member of the Council or an application made on or on behalf of the Council.

d.4 The Nominated Member and Nominated Officer will then decide whether there are planning reasons that would warrant the planning application being decided by the planning committee. This decision will be made having regard to the Government Guidance which says:

In determining whether a referral is made, the presumption should be that decisions are delegated to officers and only exceptionally be referred to committee. At a minimum, at least one of the following statutory criteria must be met for a referral to committee to be considered to meet that threshold:

- *A. where the application raises a significant planning matter having regard to the development plan and any other material considerations*
- *B. where the application raises an economic, social or environmental issue of significance to the local area*

For the purpose of criteria A, the following circumstances are unlikely to raise a significant planning matter:

- *where the application for development broadly complies with a detailed site allocation and other relevant policies set out in a local or neighbourhood plan and national decision making policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Significant planning matters may arise if new material considerations are raised by the application*
- *where a specific planning matter (e.g. highways or flood risk) was initially raised by a statutory consultee as a concern, but the development proposal has been modified to make it acceptable in the view of the statutory consultee (unless the nominated officer has compelling reasons to consider otherwise)*

A record of the cases that have been considered for referral to committee, the outcome of the consideration and the reasons for the decision will be kept and made public.

e. Councillors who openly support a particular outcome prior to the debate at Committee should declare their position at the committee meeting and may speak but shall then withdraw from the meeting and not take part in the vote. (See the advice on bias and predetermination above).

f. A councillor is not prohibited by the above bullet point from visiting a site and/or listening to what their constituents have to say.

g. When a Planning Committee member, who is also a single ward councillor or parish councillor, is canvassed/lobbied by constituents and wishes to remain impartial, they may ask a neighbouring ward councillor to speak on their behalf. If this is not possible and the councillor decides to speak on behalf of constituents prior to the Committee meeting, they may not vote.

h. Where a councillor has received written representations directly in relation to a planning application they should pass the correspondence to the Head of Planning and Health in order that those representations may be taken into account and referred to in any committee report.

i. Unless they have an interest in the item being discussed, members of the Planning Committee are encouraged to remain in the meeting for the whole time that an item is being debated and are strongly encouraged not to vote on the matter unless they have done so.

j. Members of the Planning Committee should not leave the meeting to discuss decisions just taken with applicants/objectors, since to do so may give the wrong impression to the public.

8. Pre-application discussions

8.1 Discussions between a potential applicant and Council officers prior to the submission of an application can be of considerable benefit to both parties and are encouraged by the Audit Commission. It is also encouraged by the Local Government Association, the National Planning Forum and the Planning Advisory Service. With the recognition of the need to allow and encourage councillors to be champions of their local communities, there has followed a realisation that councillor engagement in pre-application discussions on proposed development, in particular major schemes, is necessary to allow councillors to fulfil their role.

8.2 However, it would be easy for such discussions with councillors to become, or be seen (especially by objectors) to become, part of a lobbying process. The Localism Act, particularly S25, has given councillors much more freedom to engage in pre-application discussions. Although the term 'pre-application' has been used, the same considerations should apply to any discussions which occur before a decision is taken. In order to avoid perceptions that councillors might have fettered their discretion, such discussions should take place as follows;

a. Clarity at the outset that the discussions will not bind the Council to making a particular decision and that any views expressed are personal and provisional. By the very nature of such meetings not all relevant information may be at hand, nor will formal consultations with interested parties have taken place. An acknowledgement that consistent advice should be given by officers based upon the development plan and material planning considerations.

b. Officers should be present with councillors' at all pre-application meetings.

c. Councillors should avoid giving separate advice on material considerations as they may not be aware of all the issues at an early stage. Neither should they become drawn into any negotiations, which will be done by officers to ensure that the Council's position is co-ordinated.

d. A written record of meetings, correspondence and telephone calls will be maintained by the planning officer and kept on the case file to ensure a public record is maintained. If there is a legitimate reason for confidentiality regarding a proposal, a note of the non - confidential issues raised or advice given can still be placed on the file to reassure others not party to the discussion.

e. The planning officer will make all necessary arrangements for meetings.

f. Care shall be taken to ensure that advice is impartial, otherwise the subsequent report or recommendation to committee could appear to be advocacy.

~~8.3 These guidelines would apply to major development, defined as follows;~~

~~a. residential development of more than 10 dwellings or where the site area is larger than 0.5 hectares;~~

~~b. commercial development where the floor space is larger than 1000 sq. metres; or~~

~~c. any development where the site area is larger than 1 hectare.~~

8.4 Councillor engagement in the pre-application process will take one or more of the following forms:

~~a. developer presentations to committees to be held in public to ensure transparency;~~

~~b. ward councillor briefings by officers on pre- application discussions.~~

Ward Councillors can request a briefing about a pre-application request they have seen on the weekly list.

The role of Ward Councillors at this stage will be to pass on any local knowledge that might be helpful to the Officer when reviewing the scheme. This will include factors that might be of importance to the local communities which they consider should be considered/addressed in any subsequent planning application.

8.5 Any opinion expressed by planning officers on a pre-application proposal is an informal view and does not bind the planning authority to a particular decision. Officers from other departments should make it clear that their comments relate only to their own professional area and should not be construed as a "planning view". Officers should only give advice in accordance with the guidance given by any professional bodies to which they belong as this may prejudice planning decision making.

8.6 Councillors must not discuss development proposals or planning applications which may come before the Council with developers, architects or landowners on their own. ~~In normal circumstances councillors should not attend pre-application meetings with officers and developers, unless in one of the forms set out above.~~

8.7 The ward councillor can identify any application from the weekly list of planning applications for which they require a briefing from the case officer and contact the officer to arrange.

In the briefing the officer will explain the application and the relevant policies against which it will be decided. This will ensure that the ward councillor is able to answer questions from the public should they arise

Alternatively, the ward councillor can ask for a briefing from the officer at any time for example as and when they are contacted by residents about an application.

8.8 A briefing will be arranged for planning committee members on strategic development sites, before the agenda is published.

In that briefing the officers will explain the scheme and any amendments that have been made since submission. Officers will also outline the consultation responses and

provide a summary of the representations that have been received. Councillors will not be permitted to debate the merits of the case but can ask for clarification of the facts

9. Reports to committee

9.1 As a result of decisions made by the courts and ombudsman, officer reports on planning applications must have regard to the following:

a. Reports should be accurate and should include the substance of any objections and other responses received to the consultation.

b. Relevant information should include a clear assessment against the relevant development plan policies, relevant parts of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), any local finance considerations, and any other material planning considerations.

c. Reports should have a written recommendation for a decision to be made.

d. Reports should contain technical appraisals which clearly justify the recommendation.

e. If the report's recommendation is contrary to the provisions of the development plan, the material considerations which justify the departure must be clearly stated. This is not only good practice, but also failure to do so may constitute maladministration or give rise to a Judicial Review challenge on the grounds that the decision was not taken in accordance with the provisions of the development plan and the Council's statutory duty under s38A of the Planning and Compensation Act 2004 and s70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

f. Any oral updates or changes to the report should be recorded in the minutes.

g. Reports should include a clear and reasoned recommendation based on the local plan and any material considerations.

9.2 Only material planning considerations will be reported to Committee and taken into account in decision making.

9.3 Only representations that are material planning considerations will be taken into account by the Head of Planning and Health in the exercise of their delegated powers.

Sections 10-15 are unchanged

Date: 17 August 2026
Your Ref: -
Our Ref: CCC-2026-002 AB
Ask for: Charlotte Delo
Direct dial: 01227 910790
E-mail: charlotte.delo@canterbury.gov.uk

Matthew Pennycook MP
Minister of State for Housing and Planning
Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
2 Marsham Street
London SW1P 4DF

Dear Minister

National scheme of delegation for planning functions

I am writing on behalf of Canterbury City Council following consideration by our Governance Committee of the forthcoming national scheme of delegation for planning functions. The Council recognises the Government's objective of securing greater consistency, clarity and efficiency in planning decision-making, and understands that local planning authorities must ensure their constitutional arrangements are compliant before the regulations come into force on 31 October 2026.

However, members have asked me to raise a number of concerns about the practical and democratic implications of the proposed arrangements, particularly in light of the change of Government. The Council would be grateful to know whether there is any possibility that the legislation or associated guidance might be reviewed before final implementation, especially in relation to the removal of local councillor call-in arrangements.

The issue of local call-in rights is of particular concern. At present, those arrangements provide an important and visible route through which ward councillors can ensure that applications raising local sensitivity or community concern are considered in a public committee setting. Members are concerned that the new framework, by preventing referral in certain categories and making committee consideration exceptional in others, may reduce opportunities for residents to feel that their views have been heard through the democratic process.

The Committee also discussed the new role of the nominated officer and nominated member in deciding whether applications capable of referral should proceed to Planning Committee. While the Council accepts the need for a clear and auditable process, members considered that further national guidance would be helpful on how the statutory test should be interpreted and applied in practice. In particular, clarification would be welcomed on what is meant by issues of economic, social or environmental significance to the local area, and significant planning considerations having regard to the development plan and other material considerations.

Additional guidance would also assist authorities in managing the relationship between professional planning judgement, member oversight and public confidence. This includes the approach to be taken where the nominated officer and nominated member disagree, how potential conflicts of interest should be managed, and how councils should explain decisions not to refer applications to committee where there is strong local concern.

The Council is not seeking to avoid compliance with the new statutory framework. In the absence of any change or further clarification, we will implement the regulations by the required date. Our request is instead that the Government consider whether the balance struck by the scheme gives sufficient recognition to local democratic accountability, and whether supplementary guidance could provide greater certainty for councillors, officers, applicants and residents.

I would therefore be grateful if you could confirm whether the Government intends to review the legislation or guidance following the change of Government, and whether further clarification will be issued before the national scheme takes effect. Any response received would assist the Council in finalising its local guidance and ensuring that the new arrangements are implemented in a way that is lawful, transparent and capable of maintaining public confidence in the planning process.

Yours sincerely



Councillor Alan Baldock
Leader of the Council
Canterbury City Council

Appendix 3

THE NATIONAL SCHEME OF DELEGATION – Schedule 1 & 2

Overview

The National Scheme of Delegation establishes two categories of planning application which set out how the government require applications to be processed. These are now known as Schedule 1 and Schedule 2 applications.

Applications or processes which fall outside of these remain with the Council.

Schedule 1 applications

Schedule 1 applications are those which must always be determined by officers – there is no local discretion.

Schedule 1 categories include:

Application Category	Application Types
Small-scale permissions	Applications for planning permission for: • Householder development • Minor commercial development (ground floor level works that do not involve an increase in floorspace to buildings in use as shops, financial and professional services, restaurants and cafes, drinking establishments and hot food takeaways) • Minor residential development (up to 9 dwellings, on a site smaller than 0.5 hectares)
Technical / legal status	• Permission in principle • Lawful Development Certificates • Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development • Prior approval (for permitted development rights) • Applications linked to Schedule 1
Post-permission details	• Non-material amendments • Applications for the approval of details pursuant to conditions • Approval of Biodiversity Gain Plans
Linked follow-on applications	• Reserved matters below strategic threshold • Applications to vary or delete conditions imposed on schedule 1 applications • Applications to modify or discharge planning obligations linked to Schedule 1 applications

Schedule 2 Applications

Applications falling within this schedule may (subject to the triage and gateway process) be referred to committee.

Schedule 2 categories include:

Applications relating to listed buildings	• All applications for listed building consent • All applications for planning permission connected to an application for listed building consent • All applications to vary or delete conditions imposed on any listed building consent
Retrospective applications	• All retrospective applications for planning permission
Other applications	• All applications for advertisement consent • All applications for consent to carry out works to trees protected by a TPO
Linked follow-on applications	• Reserved matters applications pursuant to an outline planning permission for • 500 or more dwellings and/or • Provision of buildings where the floorspace created would be 50,000 square metres or more • Applications to vary or delete conditions imposed on schedule 2 applications • Applications to modify or discharge planning obligations linked to Schedule 2 applications
Any application for planning permission that is not:	• A householder application • A minor commercial application; or • A minor residential application

An application may only be referred to committee where an assessment of the application has taken place and it has been determined either that the application is an “own interest” application which warrants referral to committee in the interests of transparency and public accountability, or where it is concluded that the proposed development raises an economic, social or environmental issue of significance to the local area; or a significant planning matter having regard to the Development Plan and other material considerations. This is known as the statutory “gateway process”.

Changes to Memberships of Committees and Boards
October 2026

Whitstable Harbour Board

Remove Councillor Grace Paget as a member.

Remove Councillor Robert Jones as a substitute and add as a member.

CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL duly convened and held on Wednesday, 16th September, 2026 at 7.00 pm in The Guildhall, St Peter's Place, Canterbury

Present: Councillor Alister Brady (Lord Mayor)

Councillor Steph Jupe, Councillor Alan Baldock, Councillor Mike Bland, Councillor Keith Bothwell, Councillor Dane Buckman, Councillor Jean Butcher, Councillor Peter Campbell, Councillor Rachel Carnac, Councillor Lee Castle, Councillor Charlotte Cornell, Councillor Chris Cornell, Councillor Mel Dawkins, Councillor Michael Dixey, Councillor James Flanagan, Councillor Beth Forrester, Councillor Andrew Harvey, Councillor Liz Harvey, Councillor Pip Hazelton, Councillor Stuart Heaver, Councillor Robert Jones, Councillor Harry McKenzie, Councillor Tom Mellish, Councillor Keji Moses, Councillor Connie Nolan, Councillor Peter Old, Councillor Grace Paget, Councillor Paul Prentice, Councillor Alex Ricketts, Councillor Dan Smith, Councillor Ian Stockley, Councillor Jeanette Stockley, Councillor David Thomas, Councillor Clare Turnbull and Councillor Dan Watkins

269 **Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mike Sole, Naomi Smith. Pat Edwards, and Simon Warley

270 **Declaration of interests by councillors or officers**

Councillors Baldock, Ricketts, Carnac and Andrew Harvey each made a statement that any declarations of interests by councillors in their respective groups that were recorded in the minutes presented to the meeting were deemed to be declared again by any of those councillors present at the meeting.

Councillor Castle made a voluntary announcement that he is a Parish Councillor for Littlebourne Parish Council.

271 **Petitions or questions from the public**

There were no petitions or questions from the public.

272 **Announcements**

Councillor Alan Baldock, Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategy and Finance, announced that Councillor Paul Prentice would join the Cabinet from 1 October 2026. Further details regarding portfolio responsibilities would follow.

273 **Recommendations to Full Council from Cabinet**

There were no recommendations from Full Council from Cabinet for this meeting.

274 **Recommendations to Full Council from Committees and Boards**

There were no recommendations from Full Council from Committees and Boards for this meeting other than those from General Purposes Committee held prior to Council (Item 9 Community Governance Review: First round consultation results).

275 **Councillors questions**

There were no Councillors' questions for this meeting.

276 **Notices of Motion**

There were no Notices of Motion for this meeting.

277 **Community Governance Review: First round consultation results**

Councillor Flanagan as Chair of General Purposes Committee introduced the report for Council that detailed the steps that were required to protect city status, and the title of Lord Mayor, both Letters Patents and associated civic traditions, including the retention of the Sheriff title in light of the legal advice received by the council.

The report considered the responses made during the first round of public consultation regarding the Community Governance Review (CGR) and sought agreement of the Draft Recommendations developed by the cross-party councillor working group. A second round of public consultation would be initiated upon the specific recommendations agreed.

The recommendations from General Purposes Committee held prior to Council on 16th September 2026 were debated, and clarifications provided by the Head of Corporate Governance and the consultant.

Councillors comments were noted by officers and would be included as part of the second round of consultation.

Councillor Flanagan proposed, and Councillor Campbell seconded, and it was

RESOLVED

1. That, following legal advice from King's Counsel and noting the desire to preserve city status, the Lord Mayoralty and associated civic traditions for Canterbury, a parish is not created for the unparished area of Canterbury at the present time and, instead, Charter Trustees are installed, and that the CGR continues but with the recommendation for no change in Canterbury itself.

2. That the Draft Recommendations for the CGR be approved, launching the second round of public consultation.

3. That consultation be undertaken with parish and town councils on the deferment of parish and town council elections from 2027 to 2028, and recommendations submitted to Council on 14 January 2027.

4. That the Terms of Reference for the review to be formally amended, specifically bringing the planned date of completion forward to 1 March 2027, with special meetings of General Purposes Committee and Full Council arranged for purpose.

5. That the Leader be invited to write to the Secretary of State to urge government to establish a clear mechanism by which a Community Governance Review (CGR) for the Canterbury city area can be completed as soon as practically possible, including the creation of a parish council if supported by residents, while also preserving Canterbury's city status, Lord Mayoralty and associated civic traditions; and the council works with other similarly affected councils to jointly promote this aim with Government.

Record of voting:

For (34): Councillor Alan Baldock, Councillor Mike Bland, Councillor Keith Bothwell, Councillor Alister Brady, Councillor Dane Buckman, Councillor Jean Butcher, Councillor Peter Campbell, Councillor Rachel Carnac, Councillor Lee Castle, Councillor Charlotte Cornell, Councillor Chris Cornell, Councillor Mel Dawkins, Councillor Michael Dixey, Councillor Beth Forrester, Councillor James Flanagan, Councillor Andrew Harvey, Councillor Liz Harvey, Councillor Pip Hazelton, Councillor Robert Jones, Councillor Steph Jupe, Councillor Harry McKenzie, Councillor Tom Mellish, Councillor Kejj Moses, Councillor Connie Nolan, Councillor Peter Old, Councillor Grace Paget, Councillor Paul Prentice, Councillor Alex Ricketts, Councillor Dan Smith, Councillor Ian Stockley, Councillor Jeanette Stockley, Councillor David Thomas, Councillor Clare Turnbull, Councillor Dan Watkins
Against (0):
Abstained (1): Councillor Heaver

278 **Changes to memberships of committees and boards and notification of changes to lead councillor roles**

The changes to memberships of committees and sub-committees, as set out on page 9 of the agenda, were noted.

The election of a new Planning Committee Chair would be agreed at the next Planning Committee on 13th October.

279 **Minutes**

279.1 **Council - Thursday, 16 July 2026**

Councillor Baldock proposed, and Councillor Hazelton seconded, approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 16th July 2026 and it was so

RESOLVED

Record of voting
For (34): Councillor Alan Baldock, Councillor Mike Bland, Councillor Keith Bothwell, Councillor Alister Brady, Councillor Dane Buckman, Councillor Jean Butcher, Councillor Peter Campbell, Councillor Rachel Carnac, Councillor Lee Castle, Councillor Charlotte Cornell, Councillor Chris Cornell, Councillor Mel Dawkins, Councillor Michael Dixey, Councillor Beth Forrester, Councillor James Flanagan, Councillor Andrew Harvey, Councillor Liz Harvey, Councillor Pip Hazelton, Councillor Stuart Heaver, Councillor Robert Jones, Councillor Steph Jupe, Councillor Harry McKenzie, Councillor Tom Mellish, Councillor Kejj Moses, Councillor Connie Nolan, Councillor Grace Paget, Councillor Paul Prentice, Councillor Alex Ricketts, Councillor Dan Smith, Councillor Ian Stockley, Councillor Jeanette Stockley, Councillor David Thomas, Councillor Clare Turnbull, Councillor Dan Watkins

Against (0)
Abstained (0)
Not voted (1): Councillor Peter Old

280 **Report back on Notices of Motion**

There were no updates on previous motions for this meeting.

281 **To receive the following minutes of the meetings specified and to receive questions and answers on any of the minutes**

281.1 **Audit Committee - Tuesday, 14 July 2026**
It was proposed by Councillor Jones and seconded by Councillor Prentice and AGREED by general assent that the minutes of the meeting above be received.

281.2 **Cabinet - Tuesday, 30 June 2026**
It was proposed by Councillor Baldock and seconded by Councillor Hazelton and AGREED by general assent that the minutes of the meeting above be received.

281.3 **Licensing Committee - Monday, 6 July 2026**
It was proposed by Councillor A Harvey and seconded by Councillor Liz Harvey and AGREED by general assent that the minutes of the meeting above be received.

281.4 **Licensing Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 1 July 2026**
It was proposed by Councillor A Harvey and seconded by Councillor Liz Harvey and AGREED by general assent that the minutes of the meeting above be received.

281.5 **Planning Committee - Tuesday, 21 July 2026**
It was proposed by Councillor Prentice and seconded by Councillor D Smith and AGREED by general assent that the minutes of the meeting above be received.

281.6 **Planning Committee - Tuesday 18 August 2026 - CANCELLED**

281.7 **Standards Committee - Monday, 15 June 2026**
It was proposed by Councillor McKenzie and seconded by Councillor Ricketts and AGREED by general assent that the minutes of the meeting above be received.

281.8 **Whitstable Harbour Board - Friday, 26 June 2026**
It was proposed by Councillor Chris Cornell and seconded by Councillor Dixey and AGREED by general assent that the minutes of the meeting above be received.

282 **Notices of urgent decisions made by the Joint Chief Executives under delegation**

There were no urgent decisions to bring before this meeting.

283 **Any other urgent business to be dealt with on the night**

There was no other urgent business.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 8.16 pm

Date Published: 9 October 2026

Any decision in the minutes below will come into force, and may be implemented, on the expiry of three clear working days after the publication of the decision, unless a valid request has been received by a Joint Chief Executive objecting to the decision and asking for it to be called in.

CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL

CABINET

Minutes of a meeting held on Monday, 5th October, 2026 at 7.00 pm in The Guildhall, St Peter's Place, Westgate, Canterbury

Present: Councillor Alan Baldock (Chair)
Councillor Charlotte Cornell
Councillor Chris Cornell
Councillor Mel Dawkins
Councillor Pip Hazelton
Councillor Connie Nolan
Councillor Paul Prentice

In attendance Councillor Tom Mellish*
Councillor David Thomas

Officers:			
	Suzi Wakeham	-	Joint Chief Executive
	Peter Davies	-	Joint Chief Executive
	Lauren Wheeler	-	Democratic Services Officer
	Nick Churchill	-	Senior Economic Development Officer
	Martin Hall	-	Senior Environment Manager
	William Hicks	-	Director for Place
	Lora McCourt*	-	Head of Locality Services
	Leo Whitlock	-	Head of Policy and Communications

(*present for part of the meeting)

296 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

297 **DECLARATION OF ANY INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

Later in the meeting, Councillor Paul Prentice made a voluntary announcement that he was an employee of Network Rail.

298 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Members welcomed Councillor Prentice to his first meeting of Cabinet as Portfolio holder for Transport and Planning.

Councillor Chris Cornell provided an update regarding horse-drawn carriages operating in the city following a petition earlier this year. The relevant statute that applied and the rationale for removing the item from the Public Forward Plan were clarified.

The council has so far been unable to find any legislation that provides a way for the current operation to be controlled or banned. KCC have been approached about the potential to use their powers under a TRO. Officers would prepare a report for Cabinet in the new year once additional legal advice had been explored. The Animal Welfare Act is policed by trading standards officers who can carry out welfare checks following a resident complaint. Residents can report concerns to Kent Trading Standards on 03000 41 20 20.

Councillor Hazelton announced that curtains were now included in the Household Support Fund and urged councillors to consider eligible residents that may be suitable to receive support under the scheme. Further information was available online.

Councillor Prentice reminded members that the Travel Choices survey remained open until 26 October and encouraged residents across the district to share their views and travel experiences to help inform future transport planning.

Councillor Dawkins attended a Trees Action Plan event that encouraged partnership working and ongoing engagement with stakeholders and residents' groups to help identify suitable planting locations. A plan would be produced by spring with further tree planting scheduled for the autumn.

A Canterbury Climate Change Business Breakfast would be held on 21 October at the Westgate Hall for businesses to consider their resilience to climate change and to learn more about any support available. A People's Emergency online briefing for councillors would be held on 18 November.

Councillor Dawkins encouraged councillors to share details of the Great British Energy Community Fund with local community groups that may be interested in developing suitable projects. Further information was available online; applications would be subject to viability assessments.

St. Peters House had won a Highly Commended award recently in the Development and Regeneration category at the Kent Housing Excellence Awards 2026. Councillor Dawkins attended the event with officers and tradespeople who worked on the project to celebrate the achievement.

299 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

There were two speakers registered to speak on agenda item 9, Right to Grow – report back to Cabinet.

300 **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30 JUNE 2026**

The minutes of the 30 June 2026 were agreed as a true record by general assent.

301 **REFERENCES FROM COMMITTEES**

The minutes from the Overview Committee on 10 September 2026 were noted and the comments were discussed at the relevant agenda item.

302 **CHANGE IN ORDER OF THE AGENDA**

The revised order was agreed by general assent – agenda item 9 would be taken first, followed by 11, 7, 8, 10 and item 12 in that order.

303 **RIGHT TO GROW - REPORT BACK TO CABINET**

Councillor Mellish and Lucy Platel (Herne Bay in Bloom) spoke directly before the item.

Councillor Mel Dawkins Cabinet Member for Environment and Sustainability introduced the report that presented the outcomes, learning and recommendations following completion of the two-year Right to Grow (RtG) pilot, which tested community cultivation on four council owned sites and assets. Learning from the pilot had informed the recommendations for any future RtG scheme.

There were three options for Cabinet to consider within the report:

Option 1. Continue Right to Grow in a revised form (as detailed in the report).

Option 2. Continue with Right to Grow operating in line with the original criteria and concept of the pilot, with the requirement of groups to enter into a legally binding licence which means groups will need to be a legal entity to participate. Continue to support the existing Salt Marsh Lane scheme.

Option 3. Do not progress

Officers provided clarification where necessary, and the Cabinet discussed the report including the following points:

- Members reflected on the two-year pilot and observed that this period had provided valuable learning, and the opportunity to establish projects and to understand what worked in practice. The pilot had highlighted several challenges around legal structures, community engagement and the capacity of local groups.
- The requirement for a formal legal entity had created barriers for some groups. Alternative approaches were explored by environment officers along with property and legal colleagues to help increase participation and identify solutions to some of the challenges. These included less formal partnership arrangements and memorandums of understanding,
- Engaging with objectors had produced positive results in some cases. Individuals who had initially raised concerns had been invited to join steering groups and had gone on to become active contributors after gaining a better understanding of the projects.
- A public-facing website and expression of interest process were proposed in the revised recommendations to help community groups come forward with ideas. It was recognised that expectations would need to be managed and

that it would be beneficial if support was provided to smaller groups that wished to work together on projects.

- The benefits of a partnership approach were emphasised, particularly when working with established community groups. It was suggested that encouraging early conversations and involving communities from the outset could improve project outcomes and increase local support.
- The wider benefits of community-led initiatives included improved wellbeing, stronger local networks and opportunities to identify alternative uses for land.
- The preferred and agreed approach by Cabinet for the scheme going forward would focus on working in partnership with community groups, with support, oversight and governance provided through the Open Space Biodiversity Group.

It was then proposed, seconded and when put to a recorded vote

RESOLVED

To continue the Right to Grow scheme, delivered in accordance with the revised approach and recommendations set out in Option 1 of the report.

Record of the voting:
For (7): Councillors Baldock, Charlotte Cornell, Chris Cornell, Dawkins, Hazelton, Nolan and Prentice
Against (0)
Abstained (0)

Reason for decision: Option 1 provided a more accessible and flexible model while reducing the legal burden on community groups and the council. The use of a clear criteria checklist and public-facing webpage would help retain the ability to support and formalise appropriate, robust RtG schemes, in line with Corporate Plan objectives.

304 **CITY AND TOWN CENTRE STRATEGIES**

Councillor Chris Cornell, Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Regeneration introduced the report that provided information on structured delivery planning that is required following the adoption of the City and Town Centre Strategies at Cabinet in February. The report set out three-part delivery framework: project directories for each place, place panels for strategic stewardship and partnership advocacy, and a focused CCC action plan setting out the commitments the council can realistically progress ahead of LGR.

The report included a summary of the feedback from Overview Committee on 10 September on the proposed next steps, primarily on the creation of place panels. Overview Committee recommended to Cabinet that the proposal to create place panels be approved (Option 1 below).

The three options for Cabinet to consider within the report were:

Option 1: Approve the establishment of three strategic place panels, underpinned by project directories and a focused CCC action plan.

Option 2: Continue with project directories and an action plan but delay the establishment of place panels.

Option 3: Rely on existing service planning and do not create place panels, project directories or a specific CCC action plan.

Officers provided clarification where necessary, and the discussion by members included the following points:

- The strategies introduced a new, community-led approach to supporting high streets and local areas following extensive public engagement with over 1,000 residents and set out a long-term vision for the next 15 to 20 years.
- Feedback gathered through engagement was developed into the project directories that were intended to be 'live' documents that continued evolving with new ideas and projects added over time by residents and partner organisations. A process for which would be outlined and introduced.
- Officers confirmed they would begin progressing actions from the plan while work continued to develop and refine project proposals in the directories.
- The introduction of Place Panels, supported by Overview Committee were proposed to help shape priorities and support delivery. They were intended to be community-led rather than officer-led and to provide a mechanism for ongoing local involvement.
- The panels were expected to focus on identifying 'quick wins' where possible, prioritising areas requiring investment, and helping move early ideas into deliverable projects. They were intended to be supported by residents and local anchor organisations.
- A transparent process to recruit independent members to the panels would take place to include open applications and interviews, with independent chairs. A timetable and appointment arrangements would be confirmed but would be similar to the process used to recruit independent members to the Whitstable Harbour Board. This can also be refined if required.
- Officers confirmed that the panels would work alongside existing governance arrangements and would not replace or bypass established democratic decision-making processes. Formal decisions would remain with the appropriate bodies.
- Membership arrangements would remain flexible to reflect local circumstances and priorities. Where vacancies arose, appointments would be reviewed by the Director of Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member, based on the needs of the panel rather than automatically filled by a representative from the same organisation.

It was then proposed, seconded and when put to a recorded vote

RESOLVED

That the Council:
1. establishes place panels for Canterbury, Herne Bay and Whitstable; and
2. delegates authority to the Director of Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member responsible for overseeing the place panels, to: a. invite identified local anchor institutions, partnerships and key community organisations to nominate representatives to serve as non-elected members of the panels; and b. appoint, following an open invitation for applications, individuals to serve as non-elected members of the panels, with those appointments reported to Full Council for noting.

And Cabinet NOTED:

• Project directories for Canterbury, Herne Bay and Whitstable.
• Canterbury City Council's City & Town Centre Strategies action plan.

Record of the voting:
For (7): Councillors Baldock, Charlotte Cornell, Chris Cornell, Dawkins, Hazelton, Nolan and Prentice
Against (0)
Abstained (0)

Reason for decision: This option would provide the clearest route from strategy adoption to strategic place stewardship, while managing expectations, preserving officer delivery responsibility and supporting transition through LGR.

305 **DRAFT CIL ACTION PLAN 2026**

Councillor Baldock, Cabinet Member for Strategy and Finance introduced the report that seeks agreement of the final CIL Action Plan (2026), to deliver the priority projects from within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, based on the agreed approach to distributing and ringfencing CIL monies.

There were three options for Cabinet to consider within the report:

Option 1 – To approve the CIL Action Plan (2026) as per the recommendations of the CIL Spending Advisory Board

Option 2 – Partially accept the spending recommendations of the CIL Action Plan (2026)

Option 3 – Reject the CIL Action Plan (2026)

Cabinet discussed the report and officers provided clarification as required, including the following points:

- The establishment of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Advisory Board was welcomed, with the first meeting having recently taken place.
- Officers outlined the proposed CIL Action Plan and summarised the allocation of funding towards a range of transport, education and community infrastructure projects. The role of CIL funding in supporting the Local Plan and wider strategic priorities was acknowledged.
- The importance of maintaining an open, transparent and collaborative approach to prioritising infrastructure investment across the district was highlighted.
- Monitoring of the impact of funded projects would be essential to ensure that measurable benefits were delivered for residents and contributed to the council's longer-term objectives.
- Future cycle hire funding and any extension of the existing scheme would be considered across the district.
- Members discussed the future allocation of funding within unparished areas; officers confirmed that proposals could be suggested and brought forward through the Advisory Board and Cabinet. Arrangements for local engagement

and the process of funding distribution (including smaller 'pots') would require further development, particularly in unparished areas, to ensure a fair and strategic approach across the district.

- Cabinet expressed support in principle for greater local involvement in identifying spending priorities, including the potential role of upcoming Place Panels in suggesting projects for unparished areas to ensure that funding reflected local needs.
- Current resource pressures for officers were acknowledged, comments raised during the discussion would be considered and brought forward for future consideration where appropriate.

It was then proposed, seconded and when put to a recorded vote

RESOLVED

That:

(1) The CIL Action Plan (2026) be approved as per the recommendation of the CIL Spending Advisory Board.

(2) Authority be delegated to the Joint Chief Executives, in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader, to approve expenditure of up to 10% above the project budgets set out in the CIL Action Plan (2026). (Option 1)

Record of the voting:
For (7): Councillors Baldock, Charlotte Cornell, Chris Cornell, Dawkins, Hazelton, Nolan and Prentice
Against (0)
Abstained (0)

Reason for decision: Approval of the recommended CIL allocations would enable the council to begin delivering infrastructure necessary to support planned growth across the district and implement key priorities within the emerging Local Plan, Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Transport Strategy. The recommended projects identified in partnership with infrastructure providers would help to secure external funding opportunities, address infrastructure capacity pressures and support sustainable development.

306 **CANTERBURY DISTRICT COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP - REPORT BACK ON 25/26 AND DELIVERY PLAN 26/27**

Councillor Connie Nolan, Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Safety and Enforcement introduced the report that presented the annual review and Scrutiny committee's feedback to Cabinet, and summarised partnership achievements during 2025/26 and priorities for 2026–2029.

The Cabinet discussed the report, and officers were praised for their strong partnership working that underpinned community safety activity across the district.

Strong relationships with local organisations, volunteers and educational institutions continued to make a valuable contribution in achieving positive outcomes in reducing crime, tackling exploitation, improving community reassurance, and addressing issues such as domestic abuse, environmental crime and road safety.

Work was ongoing to support victims of domestic abuse and to progress the council towards accreditation in this area. The importance of understanding and responding to the needs of vulnerable groups, including women experiencing rough sleeping, was highlighted by members.

Officers confirmed that the impact of recent prisoner release schemes would be monitored and they would continue to work closely with partners to manage any emerging community safety issues.

The following was

NOTED by general assent:

1. The Community Safety Partnership's achievements during 2025/26;
2. The Community Safety Partnership's new priorities and actions for 2026–2029; and
3. The feedback provided by the Scrutiny Committee and the operational updates made in response.

307 **PROVISION OF TOILETS ON HERNE BAY SEAFRONT**

Councillor Charlotte Cornell, Cabinet Member for Council Services, Culture and Heritage introduced the report that set out an options appraisal for the relocation of the public toilets currently attached to The King's Hall, Herne Bay, required as part of the wider Kings Hall refurbishment works.

Officers answered questions and provided additional information that included costs, strengths and weaknesses for the following options:

Option 1: Kings Hall site - modular public toilets

Option 2: Near the new beach huts / East Cliff Promenade - modular public toilets

Option 3: NCI & coastguard lookout building, East Cliff Parade

The Cabinet discussed the report including the following points:

- Members expressed support for option 2 which was considered the best option by officers for accessibility and increased provision during the Kings Hall refurbishment.
- The scheme would be funded from the existing toilets budget which would also include additional (modular) toilet provision for Hampton to be completed at the same time. An update on related projects in Herne Bay would be provided in due course.
- Members suggested ideas for additional facilities, including external amenities. Officers would review the suggestions; some nearby facilities were already in place.

It was then proposed, seconded and when put to a recorded vote

RESOLVED

1. That Cabinet agrees that new modular public toilets are provided at the East Cliff Promenade, near the new beach huts (Option 2), funded from the existing public

toilets budget, and that officers proceed to develop this option through the necessary governance, design and procurement stages.
2. The proposal is that the new modular toilet block consists of one accessible and baby changing facility, and two further toilets. See SK02 Plans and Elevations. Total provision three toilets. Costs in this report refer to this size of modular unit.

Record of the voting:
For (7): Councillors Baldock, Charlotte Cornell, Chris Cornell, Dawkins, Hazelton, Nolan and Prentice
Against (0)
Abstained (0)

Reason for decision: A new modular toilet block near the beach huts on the East Cliff Promenade best supports the council's wider ambitions and increased footfall at the East Cliff Promenade and avoids undermining the improvements at The King's Hall.

It is the lowest-cost option, at an estimated £135,000, and could be delivered within around six months, potentially avoiding the circa £12,000 cost of temporary portaloos.

308 **ADOPTION OF THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT BIODIVERSITY PLAN – A NATURE RECOVERY STRATEGY**

Councillor Mel Dawkins, Cabinet Member for Environment and Sustainability introduced the report and the Canterbury District Biodiversity Plan that followed involvement of the Open Space and Biodiversity Group, a three-month public consultation and presentation to Overview Committee.

The report seeks Cabinet approval to adopt the Canterbury District Biodiversity Plan – a nature recovery strategy, as a supporting document to the draft Local Plan.

The three options for Cabinet to consider were:

Option 1: Adopt the Canterbury District Biodiversity Plan

Option 2: Do not adopt the Canterbury District Biodiversity Plan

Option 3: Request a redraft and further consultation

The Cabinet discussed the report including the following points:

- Members welcomed the Biodiversity Plan and recognised the significant amount of work undertaken by officers and stakeholders to reach this stage. The strategy was praised as a well-evidenced document with a clear and ambitious long-term vision.
- Extensive consultation and engagement, including input from specialist groups and feedback from Overview Committee, had strengthened the document and helped to ensure that the proposed actions were practical and deliverable.
- The strategy's importance as a supporting evidence document for the Local Plan was acknowledged. It provided a clear framework and would be used as a resource to inform and inspire, and to help guide future decision-making and development proposals.
- Officers were thanked and congratulations were given to all those involved in preparing the strategy for its content quality and presentation. It was

suggested that some of the images could be displayed in the public-facing council offices to showcase the work and further increase public engagement with the strategy.

It was then proposed, seconded and when put to a recorded vote

RESOLVED

That Cabinet adopt the Canterbury district biodiversity plan 2026-2042/43.

Record of the voting:
For (7): Councillors Baldock, Charlotte Cornell, Chris Cornell, Dawkins, Hazelton, Nolan and Prentice
Against (0)
Abstained (0)

Reason for decision: Option 1 respects the council's biodiversity declaration, supports delivery consistent with the Regulation 19 Local Plan policies and informs the council's biodiversity duty.

309 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday 3rd November 2026

310 **ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS TO BE DEALT WITH IN PUBLIC**

There was none.

311 **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

Not required.

312 **ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS WHICH FALLS UNDER THE EXEMPT PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 OR THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 OR BOTH**

There was none.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 9.10 pm

CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held on Wednesday, 16th September, 2026 at 6.00 pm in The Guildhall, St Peter's Place, Westgate, Canterbury

Present: Councillor Flanagan (Chair)
Councillor Bland
Councillor Butcher
Councillor Campbell
Councillor Moses
Councillor Old
Councillor I Stockley
Councillor J Stockley
Councillor Prentice (substitute)

In attendance

Officers:	Matthew Archer	-	Head of Corporate Governance
	Richard Beesley	-	Consultant
	Jan Guyler	-	Head of Legal & Monitoring Officer
	Andrea James	-	Democratic Services Officer
	Peter Davies	-	Joint Chief Executive
	Leo Whitlock	-	Head of Policy and Communications
	Nicci Mills	-	Director of Finance and Procurement

260 **APOLOGIES**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Warley.

261 **SUBSTITUTES**

Councillor Prentice was present as a substitute for Councillor Warley.

262 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Campbell, Moses and Old each made a voluntary declaration that they were members of the Community Governance Review Working Group.

263 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 April 2026 were agreed as a true record by general assent.

264 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Chair advised that there were six public speakers who would be heard before the relevant item.

265 **COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW: FIRST ROUND CONSULTATION RESULTS**

[Councillors Campbell, Moses and Old each made a voluntary declaration that they were members of the Community Governance Review Working Group.]

[Bob Todd (representing Chestfield Parish Council), Richard Norman, Paul Smith (representing Barham Parish Council), James Hodgkinson (representing Kent Association of Local Councils), Cllr Chris Cornell and Cllr Clare Turnbull addressed the committee as public speakers.]

The Head of Corporate Governance introduced the report, explaining that it was partitioned into Sections A and B.

Section A addressed the protection of Canterbury's city status, Lord Mayoralty, Sheriff title and associated civic traditions in the context of local government reorganisation (LGR). It recommended a parish council not be created for the currently unparished area of Canterbury at this time and Charter Trustees pursued instead as the most reliable available mechanism to preserve civic rights and traditions.

Section B set out the draft recommendations arising from Stage 1 of the Community Governance Review (CGR). These would be put forward for public consultation. A number of changes to parish groupings and boundaries had been suggested.

For the currently unparished coastal towns, the report recommended creating a new Herne Bay parish served by Herne Bay Town Council. For Whitstable, the recommendation was for a more localised structure with separate parish arrangements for Tankerton, Whitstable and Seasalter.

The Consultant emphasised that the draft recommendations for change would be subject to further review following Stage 2 consultation. This was entirely normal: changes to the recommendations in the light of evidence and feedback was to be expected and welcomed.

Stage 2 of the consultation would involve direct leaflet drops to affected neighbourhoods, in-person public events and online briefings / presentations.

Following the general introduction, councillors first discussed Recommendation 1, which concerned Section A – City Status.

Councillors asked questions and made comments including the following, with clarifications being provided by the Head of Corporate Governance and the Consultant.

- The status of the city of Canterbury, the Lord Mayor and Sheriff was very important. Rochester had lost its city status; it was vital that Canterbury avoided doing the same.
- The proposal to use Charter Trustees to protect the city status was welcomed and strongly supported.
- The Structural Changes Order (under LGR) would set out the specification for the Charter Trustees and which (unitary) wards they would represent. It was

envisaged that the wards would include the current four city wards, plus the unparished area of Wincheap. Elected representatives of those wards would automatically become Charter Trustees.

- The city would need a clear timeframe for re-starting the CGR process once the protection of its status had been resolved. When could the community governance work re-start?
- Further work on Canterbury's community governance could be timetabled once the Council had received Government assurance that the Letters Patent could be amended. This meant that the city's review would be delayed and would not be in step with those of the coastal towns.
- It was understood that some residents very much supported Canterbury having a town council, but its city status needed to be protected first.
- The Working Group had got as far as working up town council proposals for Canterbury before King's Counsel advice was received, which flagged this important issue. It had been disappointing that the advice had been received late in the day, but once received, it made the proposed course of action (Charter Trustees) the logical next step.

It was proposed, seconded and when put to a vote AGREED to

RECOMMEND (to Full Council):

Section A

1. That, following legal advice from Kings Counsel and noting the desire to preserve City Status, the Lord Mayoralty and associated Civic traditions for Canterbury, a parish is not created for the unparished area of Canterbury at the present time, and instead Charter Trustees are installed, and that the CGR continues but with the recommendation for no change in Canterbury itself.

Record of the vote:
For (9): Councillor Bland, Butcher, Campbell, Flanagan, Moses, Old, Prentice, I Stockley, J Stockley
Against (0): none
Abstained (0): none

Councillors then discussed Section B, with recommendations 2-5 as set out in the agenda.

Comments, clarifications and points raised included the following:

- The draft Working Group recommendations should be taken forward to Stage 2 irrespective of Local Government Report (LGR) timing, so that work could continue under the current administration, before abolition. There would be no advantage in delaying.
- Councillors should encourage residents to get involved and have their say so that as broad a range of views as possible were heard. Any recommendation could be amended or dropped if the consultation evidence supported this.
- Stage 2 consultation was the best place for the public to make their cases where feeling was strong.
- In the areas where consultation was taking place, other novel configurations relating to the recommendations could be considered by the Working Group at the end of the Stage 2 consultation.

- Some people held very strong views on the draft recommendation concerning Chestfield and Swalecliffe. The public's views would be heard further during the Stage 2 consultation and would be taken into consideration. There was still lots of listening to be done and nothing was set in stone.
- Strategic place panels, which had been discussed at an Overview Committee meeting the previous week and were due to be discussed by Cabinet on 6th October, would work alongside parish/town councils. The place panels, if set up, would have a close focus on town centre renewal, economic growth and co-working with local business. Parish and town councils could be represented on place panels. The model for them was common across the country and included 'pride in place' panels.
- Members of the CGR Working Group may have been unaware of the place panels project over the summer, but the agenda for Overview Committee containing the report had been available since 2 September and the issue would be discussed again at Cabinet in October.
- Place panels and parish/town councils were different entities with separate goals that could co-exist effectively.
- A councillor asked whether the assets of parish councils would be merged if two or more parishes fully combined to create a new parish or an existing parish was extended to include a new area. The officer responded that a parish council should take its own advice on such matters, but in principle it should be possible for financial arrangements to be put in place to ring-fence reserves for a specific (historic) geographical area or purpose, if that was the will of the council.

An amendment to Recommendation 2 (That the Draft Recommendations for the CGR be approved, launching the second round of public consultation) was proposed and seconded as follows, with these words to follow on from the original text:

'The Consultation will proceed on the basis that Chestfield remains as an independent parish council, and Swalecliffe is established as a parish council in its own right with 5 councillors.'

Councillors then debated the proposed amendment, and made comments including the following:

- The strength of feeling concerning Chestfield and Swalecliffe was understood. The Working Group had done its work and made its draft recommendations in good faith. Maybe some of those draft recommendations were sub-optimal. The local community would always know an area better than councillors. But this meeting was not the place to make these specific changes without regard to the rest of the 'jigsaw'. The Stage 2 consultation would enable the issue to be reconsidered in the round and a properly informed decision to be made.
- When asked, the Consultant reiterated that in Stage 2, any suggestions about any parish that had had change recommended in Stage 1 could be submitted and considered. Stage 2 was the time to work up detailed proposals on the best way forward for all the parishes recommended for some sort of change in Stage 1.
- Different configurations of all proposed changes could now be considered. It was only change that had not been flagged at all in Stage 1 that could not be considered in Stage 2.

When put to the vote, the amendment FELL

Record of the vote:
For (2): Councillors Flanagan, Old
Against (7): Councillors Bland, Butcher, Campbell, Moses, Prentice, I Stockley, J Stockley
Abstained (0): none

It was then proposed, seconded and when put to a vote AGREED to

RECOMMEND (to Full Council):

Section B

2. That the Draft Recommendations for the Community Governance Review be approved, launching the second round of public consultation.

3. That consultation be undertaken with parish and town councils on the deferment of parish and town council elections from 2027 to 2028, and recommendations submitted to Council on 14 January 2027.

4. That the Terms of Reference for the review be formally amended, specifically bringing the planned date of completion forwards to 1 March 2027, with special meetings of General Purposes Committee and Full Council arranged for purpose.

5. That the Leader be invited to write to the Secretary of State to urge Government to establish a clear mechanism by which a Community Governance Review (CGR) for the Canterbury city area can be completed as soon as practically possible, including the creation of a parish council if supported by residents, while also preserving Canterbury's city status, Lord Mayoralty and associated civic traditions; and that the Council works with other similarly affected councils to jointly promote this aim with Government.

Record of the vote:
For (9): Councillor Bland, Butcher, Campbell, Flanagan, Moses, Old, Prentice, I Stockley, J Stockley
Against (0): none
Abstained (0): none

266 **ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS TO BE DEALT WITH IN PUBLIC**

There was no other urgent business to be dealt with in public.

267 **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

This item was not required.

268 **ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS THAT FALLS UNDER THE EXEMPT PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972, OR THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000, OR BOTH**

There was no other urgent business that fell under the exempt provisions.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 7.17 pm

CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held on Wednesday, 9th September, 2026 at 10.30 am in The Guildhall, Westgate, Canterbury

Present:	Councillor Harvey (Chair)		
	Councillor Butcher		
	Councillor J Stockley		
	Councillor Castle (Reserve)*		
In attendance			
Officers:	Andrea James	-	Democratic Services Officer
	Briony Williamson	-	Licensing Officer
	Peter Kee	-	Principal Lawyer (Regulatory)
	Stephanie Williamson	-	Democratic Services Officer

(*present for part of the meeting)

1 **Apologies for absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

2 **Substitute Councillors**

There were no substitute councillors.

3 **Declaration of any Interests by Councillors or Officers**

No declarations of interest were made.

4 **Minutes of the meetings held on 24 June and 1 July 2026**

The minutes of the meetings held on 24 June and 1 July 2026 were agreed as a true record by general assent.

5 **Order of business**

The Order of Business was noted.

6 **Licensing Act 2003 - Premises Licence for Ola Hola 10C Burgate, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 2HG**

In addition to the Sub-Committee members and Canterbury City Council officers, present at the meeting were:

Oluwaseun Akinyemi and Olalekan Soyoye – The Applicants

Mary Nelder - The Applicants' Representative
Susan Ginever – Canterbury City Council (CCC) Licensing Enforcement Officer
Mike Bee – an 'Other Person' who had submitted a written representation

The Licensing Officer introduced the application for a Premises Licence for Ola Hola, 10C Burgate, Canterbury. She advised that Members had undertaken a site visit prior to the hearing and outlined the amended hours and conditions that had been agreed between the applicant and Canterbury City Council's Licensing Enforcement Officer following consultation. She further advised that one representation had been submitted anonymously and, in accordance with the statutory guidance, should not be considered. Two valid representations remained before the Sub-Committee.

The applicant's representative, Mary Nelder, presented the application to the Sub-Committee. Points raised included the following:

1. The application had been substantially revised following engagement with Licensing Enforcement Officers.
2. The premises would operate as a low-capacity, food-led café and restaurant rather than a drinking venue.
3. Alcohol would only be supplied to seated customers receiving waiter or waitress service and would be ancillary to food consumption.
4. Vertical drinking would be prohibited.
5. The kitchen would remain operational whenever alcohol was being served.
6. The applicant had voluntarily reduced the maximum operating capacity from 60 to 40 persons to assist with crowd control and public safety.
7. The licensed hours had been reduced to align more closely with the Council's core hours policy.
8. An entertainment noise limiter, smoking policy, dispersal policy and staff training framework would be implemented.
9. The premises aimed to provide a cultural, community-focused dining experience and was not intended to attract binge drinking or nightclub-style activity.
10. Kent Police had not objected to the application.
11. CCTV, staff training, incident recording procedures and partnership working with Canterbury BID would support the prevention of crime and disorder.
12. Fire safety measures, first aid provision and capacity controls would be implemented.
13. Measures to minimise public nuisance would include closed doors and windows, a managed dispersal policy, customer signage and a dedicated contact route for residents.
14. The premises would open from 8.00am primarily to serve breakfast and refreshments and not to encourage early alcohol consumption.

The Sub-Committee members then asked questions of the applicants and their representative, the questions and clarifications including the following:

15. Customers would be encouraged to leave quietly through staff intervention, customer communications and signage.
16. The venue's small capacity would assist staff in monitoring customer behaviour and dispersal.
17. Staffing levels would vary according to demand, and additional staff could be called upon when required.
18. The applicant intended to operate primarily through a combination of bookings and walk-in customers.

19. The applicant had previous experience operating similar hospitality premises in Nigeria.
20. Smoking and vaping would not be permitted within the premises and the number of customers smoking outside would be managed.

The Licensing Enforcement Officer, Susan Ginever, advised that no formal representation had been submitted by her as agreement had been reached with the applicant regarding amended hours and five additional conditions which, in her view, promoted the licensing objectives.

The Legal Adviser sought clarification regarding several conditions contained within the operating schedule. Clarification included the following:

21. Conditions agreed with the Licensing Enforcement Officer would take precedence where any ambiguity existed.
22. Responsibility for compliance with licence conditions rested with both the Designated Premises Supervisor and the Premises Licence Holder.
23. CCTV footage would be made available to both Kent Police and Licensing Authority officers upon request.
24. References to full-size bottles of spirits being placed on tables were not required as part of the operating model and would be removed.
25. Conditions relating to customer self-service of alcohol were clarified and retained within the operating schedule.

The Other Person present then asked questions of the applicants and their representative, points raised included the following:

26. There were concerns regarding public nuisance arising from customer dispersal, smoking and noise associated with a licensed premises operating near residential properties.
27. Customers could congregate in nearby sheltered areas and create disturbance for residents.
28. The sound transmission through adjoining historic buildings, which contained residential accommodation, should be considered.
29. Extending the use of the premises from its previous retail and studio uses would adversely affect nearby residents.
30. Existing activity associated with nearby licensed premises caused a nuisance, and there was the potential for additional disturbance from customer movements between venues.
31. It was suggested that more restrictive hours, ending at 11.00pm, would be appropriate in the first instance, with any extension considered following a period of successful operation.

In response to questions, the applicants confirmed that an environmental health-approved noise limiter could be installed with an agreed maximum level.
The Legal Adviser clarified that conditions relating to live and recorded music were restricted by legislation and could only be imposed in certain circumstances or following a licence review.

The applicants were then invited to summarise the application. They advised that they wished to work positively with neighbouring residents, remained open to communication and would seek to address concerns wherever possible.

At this stage, the Licensing Sub-Committee members retired with the Legal Adviser to make their decision.

Upon the panel's return, the Chair thanked all those who had attended. He advised that, having considered the evidence before it, the Sub-Committee had decided to grant the application and invited the Legal Adviser to outline the decision.

The Legal Advisor said that in making their decision the panel had taken into account the agenda pack and reports, the representations made by all parties at the hearing, the observations made on a site visit earlier that day, the statutory guidance and the Council's statement of licensing policy.

Having considered these matters, and having deliberated in private, it was:

RESOLVED - to grant a premises licence for the modified hours applied for (as set out in the Licensing Officer's report) subject to certain conditions. The hours of the licence shall be as follows:

a) Open to the public
   i) Mon-Thur 08:00-23:00
   ii) Fri & Sat 08:00- 00:30
   iii) Sunday 08:00 – 00:00
b) Plays, Films, Dance, Live Music, Recorded Music, Alcohol on sales:
   i) Mon to Thurs 08:00 to 22:30
c) Plays, Films, Dance, Live Music, Recorded Music, LNR, Alcohol on sales
   i) Fri & Sat: 08:00 to 00:00
d) Plays, Films, Dance, Live Music, Recorded Music, LNR, Alcohol on sales
   i) Sunday 08:00 – 23:30

2) The conditions are –
(*Conditions 1 to 5 come from the agreement with the CCC Licensing enforcement officer*)

(1) The premises shall operate primarily as a food led café/restaurant,
(2) Alcohol shall not be sold or supplied otherwise than for consumption by persons who are seated in the premises and served by a waiter/waitress. The consumption of alcohol by persons seated at a table shall be ancillary to taking food and/or light refreshment there
(3) Vertical drinking is strictly prohibited at the premises
(4) The kitchen, as marked on the accompanying plan, shall remain open and fully functional during permitted hours
(5) Only one Bar is permitted at the premises as marked on the first floor plan.

(*conditions 6 onwards derive from the proposals made by the applicant in its application form*)

(6) Staff shall be comprehensively trained before commencing work, on topics including
   (a) Responsible alcohol service and the law on underage sales
   (b) Challenge 25 policy and acceptable forms of identification, and age-verification procedures,
   (c) Recognition of signs of intoxication and refusal of service procedures
   (d) The premises' seating-led operating model and the prohibition of vertical drinking
   (e) Safeguarding awareness and the protection of children from harm
   (f) Emergency and incident response procedures
   (g) to monitor consumption continuously and to refuse further service to any customer showing signs of intoxication

(7) Training records will be kept on the premises and will be made available to the licensing officers of the council upon request.
(8) A strict Challenge 25 policy will be operated at all times. Any customer who appears to be under the age of 25 will be required to produce valid photographic proof of age before alcohol is served. Acceptable identification:
    (a) A valid UK or international passport
    (b) A full or provisional driving licence bearing a photograph
    (c) A PASS-accredited proof of age card
(9) Prominent Challenge 25 signage will be displayed throughout the premises.
(10) Refusals of service will be recorded in the incident log.
(11) Ola Hola will operate as a seating-led café-bar at all times.
(12) Alcohol may only be consumed by customers seated at tables.
(13) Vertical drinking (the consumption of alcohol) while standing is strictly prohibited.
(14) Clear signage to this effect will be displayed prominently at all entrances and throughout the premises.
(15) Staff will actively monitor compliance and will refuse service to any customer attempting to consume alcohol while standing.
(16) A CCTV system is to be installed and operational at the premises, covering:
    (a) All customer areas on the ground floor and first floor
    (b) All entrances and exits
    (c) The service counter and all areas where alcohol is served or consumed
(17) The system operates 24 hours a day during opening hours.
(18) Footage is to be retained for a minimum of 31 days and will be made available to the police and licensing officers of the council upon request.
(19) Clear CCTV signage is displayed to inform customers that they are being recorded.
(20) A written incident log will be maintained on the premises at all times, recording any incidents of crime, disorder, refusals of service, ejections, or other relevant matters.
(21) The log will be made available to licensing officers of the council upon request.
(22) The Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS), will take overall responsibility for ensuring compliance with all licence conditions and the promotion of the licensing objectives. The premises licence holder is equally responsible for compliance with all licence condition and the promotion of the licensing objectives.
(23) The DPS will be present or contactable during all licensed hours and will act promptly on any concerns raised by responsible authorities.
(24) The management of Ola Hola will maintain a cooperative and transparent relationship with Kent Police, Canterbury City Council and all other responsible authorities.
(25) Contact details for the local licensing officer will be kept on the premises at all times. Any serious incident will be reported promptly.
(26) All staff trained to recognise and manage challenging behaviour, with clear procedures for refusing service and asking disorderly persons to leave calmly.

(27) A written incident log maintained on the premises recording all incidents, ejections, and refusals of service. prompt reporting of any serious incidents.

(28) Active cooperation with Kent Police and Canterbury City Council's licensing team with prompt reporting of any serious incidents

(29) The premises will be maintained in a safe and clean condition at all times, in full compliance with relevant health and safety legislation.

(30) Where appropriate, toughened-glass or shatter-resistant drinkware will be used.

(31) Full-sized bottles of wine (including sparkling wine) placed on tables will be limited in number and supervised by a member of staff at all times.

(32) Empty bottles will be cleared promptly.

(33) Staff are to be trained to monitor consumption continuously and to refuse further service to any customer showing signs of intoxication.

(34) Fire safety equipment including fire extinguishers, smoke alarms, and emergency lighting will be installed, tested regularly, and maintained in good working order.

(35) A fire risk assessment will be carried out and reviewed regularly.

(36) Clear, unobstructed emergency exit routes will be maintained on both floors at all times, with exit signage clearly displayed.

(37) The maximum capacity of under 40 covers will not be exceeded at any time.

(38) First aid equipment will be kept on the premises and at least one member of staff on duty at any time will be trained in basic first aid.

(conditions 39-41 apply to live and recorded music only at the time when these are licensable activities)

(39) Noise levels will be managed carefully at all times.

(40) Live music and performances will be kept at a level that does not cause disturbance to neighbouring properties.

(41) Doors and windows will be kept closed during performances where necessary to contain noise.

(42) A managed dispersal policy will be operated to ensure that customers leave the premises in a calm, quiet and orderly manner.

(43) Signage encouraging customers to leave quietly and respect neighbours will be displayed at exits.

(44) Staff will be present at all times to prevent loitering or congregation outside the premises.

(45) Customers will not be permitted to congregate outside the entrance.

(46) Any queuing will be managed actively to avoid disruption to pedestrians and neighbouring businesses.

(47) Waste will be managed responsibly. Bins will be secured and collections arranged at appropriate times to avoid obstruction or nuisance.

(48) Any deliveries or collections will be managed to minimise disturbance to neighbouring properties.

(49) The DPS will regularly monitor the exterior of the premises during trading hours to ensure no nuisance is being caused in the immediate vicinity.

(50) No alcohol will be served to or consumed by any person under the age of 18 under any circumstances.
(51) Any refusals will be recorded in the incident log.
(52) In groups containing both adults and supervised under-18s, all alcohol service including full-sized bottles, spirits, or wine must be administered by a member of staff at all times.
(53) Self-service or pouring by customers is strictly prohibited, regardless of table composition.
(54) Staff will pour and serve all drinks at the table and will monitor consumption continuously, particularly where under-18s are present.
(55) Staff are to be trained to intervene immediately if an under-18 appears to be attempting to access alcohol.
(56) Staff retain the right to refuse service where there is any concern regarding potential underage consumption.
(57) Children under 18 will not be permitted to remain on the premises after 21:00 unless accompanied by a responsible adult aged 18 or over.
(58) Clear signage will be displayed throughout the premises informing customers that unaccompanied children are not permitted on the premises after 21:00.
(59) All staff will receive training in safeguarding awareness and will know how to respond appropriately if there are any concerns about the welfare of a child on or near the premises. All incidents or interventions will be recorded in the incident log.

17) It was explained that the LSC cannot put a condition on the licence which purports to require the holder to control the behaviour of customers after they have left the premises.
18) It was explained that no conditions can apply to live or recorded music at a time when they are not licensable activities. Conditions can only be put on live and recorded music at a time when they would otherwise not be licensable activities in the event of a review under sections 51 to 53 of the Licensing Act 2003.
19) The legal officer pointed out that live music and recorded music are only licensable activities in certain circumstances, for example they are not licensable activities when they take place on licensed premises between 08.00 and 23.00 and the premises are open for the purposes of being used for the supply of alcohol for consumption on the premises, (though see Schedule 1, particularly paragraph 12A, and section 177A of the Licensing Act 2003 for the full and precise details and rules on this). The modified hours applied for e.g. for live music and recorded music from 08.00 to 22.30 Monday to Thursday are such that provided the requirements in paragraph 12A of Schedule 1 and of section 177A of the 2003 Act are met then live and recorded music would not be licensable activities at those times.
20) It should also be noted that from Monday to Thursday from 22:30 to 23:00 alcohol cannot be supplied for consumption and hence the requirement in section 177A(1)(b) would not be satisfied. This means that on those days between those timings live and recorded music would not be permitted.
21) LNR is by definition the supply of hot food or hot drink to the public for consumption on or off premises between 23.00 and 05.00. The original application applied for the provision of LNR between 08:00 and 23:00 Monday to Thursday – when LNR is not a licensable activity.
22) The performance of a play, the exhibition of a film and the performance of dance are only licensable activities in the circumstances set out in Schedule 1 to the Licensing Act 2003 and insofar as the LSC grants the application in

respect of these activities it does so only insofar as they are licensable activities.

The parties were informed of their right of appeal under Section 181 of, and Schedule 5 to, the Licensing Act 2003.

7 **Any other urgent business**

There was no other business.

8 **Exclusion of the press and public**

This item was not required.

9 **Any other urgent business which falls under the exempt provisions of the local government act 1972 or the freedom of information act 2000 or both**

There was no other urgent business that fell under the exempt provisions.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 12.40 pm

CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held on Wednesday, 23rd September, 2026 at 10.30 am in The Guildhall, Westgate, Canterbury

Present: Councillor A Harvey (Chair)
Councillor L Harvey
Councillor J Stockley
Councillor Butcher* (reserve)

In attendance

Officers:	Andrea James	-	Democratic Services Officer
	Briony Williamson	-	Licensing Officer
	Peter Kee	-	Principal Lawyer (Regulatory)

(*present for part of the meeting)

1 **Apologies for absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

2 **Substitute Councillors**

There were no substitute councillors.

3 **Declaration of any Interests by Councillors or Officers**

There were no declarations of any interest by councillors or officers.

4 **Order of business**

The order of business was noted.

5 **Licensing Act 2003 - Premises Licence for Diamond Shisha Lounge, 1A Kirbys Lane, Canterbury CT2 8AN.**

In addition to the Sub-Committee members and Canterbury City Council officers, present at the meeting were:

- Daniel Sbhatlab – the applicant
- Stefan Collins – a friend and representative of the applicant
- Diane Attenborough – Canterbury City Council (CCC) Licensing Enforcement Officer
- PC Danielle Rolfe – Kent Police

Three representations had been received from 'Other People' and included in the agenda pack, but none of these people were present for the hearing.

The Licensing Officer introduced the application for a Premises Licence for the Diamond Shisha Lounge, 1A Kirby's Lane, Canterbury CT2 8AN. She explained that the Sub-Committee members had conducted a site visit earlier in the day when they viewed only the outside of the premises as the applicant had not been present. The agenda had been prepared and published in accordance with the relevant legislation and the Council's constitution.

The applicant then presented the application to the panel and covered points, including the following:

1. This was the first time he had taken part in a formal licensing hearing.
2. Council officers had been in discussion with him about his application, and he had also been researching what was needed for a successful application from Google and Chat GPT. He had improved his understanding of the licensing requirements regarding safeguarding children, reducing noise and suchlike.
3. His friend had accompanied him today as he could be part of the business management going forward.
4. It was true that the street where the premises were located was frequently littered, but this was not the fault of his business.
5. He was intent on improving his business. Profits form the business at the moment were not enough. More hours and a licence would help make it more profitable. He was also intending to start providing food and a greater variety of soft drinks.
6. He would work with the neighbours to ensure they were not disturbed.
7. He had applied to open from 10.00 to 00:00 Monday to Sunday, with alcohol for sale from midday each day until 23:00.
8. He had been training his staff on the basics of good practice: how to deal with drunks, drugs, under-age drinkers, etc.
9. There were five CCTV cameras on 24 hours per day at the business.
10. Standards of hygiene around the premises had been increased.

The Sub-Committee members then asked questions of the applicant and his friend, the questions and clarifications including the following:

11. Only Shisha, tea and soft drinks were served at the moment. The applicant wanted to expand the business to include food and alcohol so that he could make a better profit.
12. The applicant had run the business since July 2022.
13. The applicant had not been aware of the site visit that morning.
14. It was clarified that the letter sent to the applicant about the day's proceedings had not included mention of the site visit. The panel therefore agreed that they took no account of the non-attendance of the applicant to the visit, as it was not his fault that he had not attended.
15. It was noted that there was currently no signage at the venue asking patrons to leave quietly. The applicant replied that he would put up signs and also clean the street around his business.
16. Footage from the CCTV screens could be viewed inside the premises. The applicant would improve the coverage if it was felt it was insufficient.

The Responsible Authority representatives then asked questions of the applicant and his representative, the questions and clarifications including the following:

17. The representative of Kent Police noted that there had been problems of anti-social behaviour in the area since the shisha lounge had opened in 2022, and

the addition of an alcohol licence would make those issues worse. The applicant had done nothing to combat the issues raised, despite them being raised with him by Kent Police on a number of occasions. The applicant agreed that he needed to do more to improve things.

18. The representative of Canterbury City Council (CCC) Licensing Enforcement asked why the application included off-sales, when the applicant had told her when she had previously visited the premises that he would not be seeking an off-sales licence. The applicant replied that his agent had filled out the application form and had made a mistake: the applicant did not want a licence for off-sales.

The Responsible Authorities then made their representations, the representative of Kent Police going first. Points she covered included the following:

19. The applicant had made several previous applications, which Kent Police had objected to.
20. Representatives of Kent Police had visited the premises in December 2024 with CCC licensing enforcement staff and given detailed advice on the regulation of hours, provision of security staff on the door, and safeguarding measures including Challenge 25 and Ask Angela. However, the current application contained no meaningful amendments or additions and the applicant did not seem able to demonstrate an understanding of the licensing law and objectives.
21. None of the issues raised by Kent Police had been properly addressed and no further conditions offered.
22. The applicant responded that his agent had submitted the application on his behalf.
23. It was noted that the applicant did not appear to understand the detail of the licensing objectives or how to promote them. He had not given any information on practical measures he would take to assist the licensing objectives.
24. The Police representative questioned the applicant about the problems of the locality. He accepted that there was antisocial behaviour, crime and disorder in the area, but was unable to provide a view on how an alcohol licence might make this worse.
25. A concern for Kent police was that the premises had generated complaints and required police attention despite not having a licence. The problems included general noise at night, multiple vehicles in the street with revving engines, horns blowing and groups gathering, urination in the street, spitting and verbal abuse. The premises was attracting individuals whose behaviour had generated complaints and required police management.
26. On 7 July 2026 there had been a fight in Kirby's Lane involving people who had been watching football at the premises. A suspect was arrested after the incident, and the victim sustained injuries which could amount to Grievous Bodily Harm.
27. Kent Police were continuing to monitor the situation in Kirby's Lane as the neighbourhood was experiencing on-going issues and a higher-than-expected level of demand for police assistance.
28. There were concerns regarding hygiene standards at the premises, the use of an outdoor barbeque for heating coals for shishas, and also concerning lack of ventilation in the shisha area.
29. In 2024 police representatives had seen alcohol present and on display at the premises, when there was no licence in place. They had directed the applicant to remove the alcohol immediately.

30. There had been four previous applications lodged for this premises, all of which had failed to progress due to non-compliance. This raised concerns over the applicant's understanding and ability to comply with licensing guidance.

The representative of CCC Licensing Enforcement, Diane Attenborough, stated that all her observations were contained within her written representation in the agenda, and that she would not go over them again in the hearing. In short, she did not believe the applicant had a clear understanding of the licensing regime and was not confident he would uphold the licensing objectives.

Questions and points were then clarified with the Responsible Authority representatives and applicant, clarifications including the following:

31. Regarding the alcohol that was seen at the premises in 2024: the applicant clarified that this had belonged to the staff he had employed at the time, that it was not for sale but the employees had drunk it after finishing their work hours. He had recruited better staff since then.
32. The neighbourhood suffered from anti-social behaviour such as large gatherings of people and late-night noise already, without alcohol being served at the premises.
33. There was a hostel on the lane that was a source of anti-social behaviour and gatherings of people.
34. The highest number of people the applicant served on a usual day was 10. Fights did not take place in his premises. He was responsible for the business and wanted to protect it. Customers had watched the football at his premises in the summer but they had been well behaved while there.

The applicant and his representative were then invited to summarise the application. Points covered included the following:

35. The applicant was ambitious and wanted to improve the business and his neighbourhood.
36. The problems in the neighbourhood were largely caused by gatherings of homeless people and users of the hostel next door.
37. Street drinking was a problem, but the shisha lounge did not contribute to it. The premises was a place for people to come and relax quietly.

At this stage, the Licensing Sub-Committee members retired with the Legal Advisor to make their decision.

Upon the panel's return, the Chair thanked all those who had attended. He said that after full consideration of all the evidence, the panel had decided to refuse the application. He then invited the Legal Advisor to speak.

The Legal Advisor said that in making their decision the panel had taken into account the agenda pack and reports, the representations made by all parties at the hearing, the observations made on a site visit earlier that day, the statutory guidance and the Council's statement of licensing policy.

He reported that having considered these matters, and having deliberated in private, it was RESOLVED – to refuse a premises licence.

The reasons for the refusal included the following:

a) Many of the applicant's representations had been in very general terms about what he hoped to do in the future, but the panel needed to have specific clear information and plans setting out precisely how he would address the issues raised in the Police and CCC Licensing Enforcement representations – particularly the detail on how he would address the issues of preventing public nuisance and preventing crime and disorder.
b) The panel could not be confident that the applicant was capable of upholding the licensing objectives of preventing public nuisance and preventing crime and disorder.
c) The panel took into account the Police and CCC representations concerning anti-social behaviour (ASB) in the area. The panel accepted that the Diamond Shisha Lounge was not the sole cause of the ASB in the road. However, they noted the open terrace-like area in front of the premises and considered that the sale of alcohol would change the nature of the business and exacerbate ASB problems.
d) The panel noted that the applicant was struggling with his business, and they had sympathy for him in this regard, but this was not a consideration which engaged the four licensing objectives.
e) The panel noted that at the hearing, the applicant's representative had offered to be involved in the management of the premises. His offer came at a very late stage. The panel had no information about Mr Collins' experience in running a licensed business, or whether he held a personal licence.

The parties were informed at the conclusion of the hearing of their right of appeal under section 181 of, and Schedule 5 to, the Licensing Act 2003.

6 **Any other urgent business**

There was no other urgent business.

7 **Exclusion of the press and public**

This item was not required.

8 **Any other urgent business which falls under the exempt provisions of the local government act 1972 or the freedom of information act 2000 or both**

There was no other urgent business that fell under the exempt provisions.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 12.01 pm

CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL

OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held on Thursday, 10th September, 2026 at 7.00 pm in The Guildhall, St Peter's Place, Westgate, Canterbury

Present: Councillor Pat Edwards (Chair)
Councillor Beth Forrester
Councillor Mike Bland
Councillor Dane Buckman
Councillor Jean Butcher
Councillor Rachel Carnac (present as a substitute)
Councillor James Flanagan
Councillor Liz Harvey
Councillor Stuart Heaver
Councillor Tom Mellish
Councillor Peter Old
Councillor Alex Ricketts
Councillor David Thomas

In attendance Chris Cornell - Cabinet Member for Economic Development & Regeneration
Mel Dawkins - Cabinet Member for Environment and Sustainability

Officers:

Pippa Tritton	-	Democratic Services Officer
William Hicks	-	Director for Place
Nick Churchill	-	Senior Economic Development Officer
Martin Thomas*	-	Tree and Woodland Officer
Andrew Miller*	-	Project Support Officer (Environment)

(*present for part of the meeting)

237 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence had been received from Councillor J Stockley.

238 **SUBSTITUTE COUNCILLORS**

Councillor Carnac was present as a substitute for Councillor J Stockley.

239 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In relation to Item 6 – Adoption of the Canterbury District Biodiversity Plan, Councillor Buckman and Councillor Carnac made a voluntary announcement that they were members of the Open Space Biodiversity Group (OSBG).

240 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Chair advised that there were two public speakers who would be heard before the relevant item.

241 **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 JUNE 2026**

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2026 were agreed as a true record by general assent.

242 **ADOPTION OF THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT BIODIVERSITY PLAN**

(Councillor Buckman and Councillor Carnac made a voluntary announcement that they were members of the Open Space Biodiversity Group (OSBG)).

(Members of the public Michelle Crowther and Thomas Crowther spoke prior to the debate.)

The Tree and Woodland Officer gave a short presentation introducing the proposed Canterbury District Biodiversity Plan. He explained that it had been developed following the council's 2023 biodiversity emergency declaration to guide nature recovery across the district. The plan had been prepared by the Open Space and Biodiversity Group, informed by public consultation, and set out a long-term vision focused on key landscape areas, habitat connectivity, partnership working and biodiversity enhancement. Cabinet was being asked to adopt the Strategy as a supporting document to the Local Plan, providing a framework to guide biodiversity enhancement and nature recovery across the district.

Councillor Dawkins, Cabinet Member for Environment and Sustainability, welcomed the proposed plan and clarified that the appendix formed part of the evidence base linked to the Kent and Medway Local Nature Recovery Strategy, with the numbering system indicating both the type of action and its intended delivery sequence.

Councillors debated the report and made comments, with clarification provided by the Tree and Woodland Officer and the Director of Place where necessary:

- Officers were thanked for their work producing the comprehensive and important plan.
- Surprise was expressed that the Broad Oak Reservoir, a significant project within the Local Plan, was not mentioned in the Biodiversity Plan, particularly given recent local water supply issues, and concerns that had been raised by parish councils, local groups and South East Water.
- It was noted that the reservoir could also have positive impacts, but it was felt that it should have been included and officers undertook to feed this back to the report author.
- Concern was expressed that the biodiversity and climate change were closely linked and that prolonged periods of drought were already impacting habitats and agriculture in the district.
- Residents often identified local authorities as contributing to biodiversity loss through maintenance practices, and staff training could help to assist this.
- The restoration of ancient ponds was welcomed, and officers were asked if the strategy would link to ongoing work with the water companies as there was a strong relationship between biodiversity enhancement, water management and measures such as riverbank habitat improvements.
- There was concern that the plan was not sufficiently integrated with the Local Plan and the relevant Local Plan policies did not currently reference the strategy which could weaken both documents.
- There were also questions on whether the identified funding was significant to deliver the 31 proposed actions.

- Could further measures be introduced to encourage biodiversity within resident gardens?
- The Director of Place confirmed that the strategic issues raised regarding links with the Local Plan would be discussed with the Local Plan team. In addition, officers were actively exploring funding opportunities through Section 106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy.
- In addition, he confirmed that discussions with water companies were ongoing, including the establishment of a stakeholder group with South East Water.
- It was important to understand that the Plan should be viewed as a living document which could adapt to changing circumstances.
- The inclusion of coastal, marine and marshland within the strategy was welcomed.
- Achieving the proposed 20% Biodiversity Net Gain target was ambitious.
- The public speakers were thanked for their attendance.
- Future planting schemes should take account of seasonal conditions.
- In response to a question regarding the local government reorganisation proposals, the Director of Place confirmed that work on the Local Plan would continue in accordance with the current timetable.
- There was a request for OSBG to be involved in reviewing and feeding back comments at an early stage through the pre-application process in order to maximise opportunities for biodiversity enhancement.
- Future reviews should consider the potential impacts of major infrastructure projects, such as data centres.
- Comments made would be used by Cabinet during their deliberations on the proposed adoption of the Biodiversity Plan.

There were three options available to councillors.

i. To recommend the adoption of the Canterbury District Biodiversity Plan.
ii. To not recommend the adoption of the Canterbury District Biodiversity Plan.
iii. To request a redraft and further consultation.

It was proposed, seconded and when put to a vote agreed to:

RECOMMEND (to Cabinet) that the Canterbury district biodiversity plan be adopted.

Record of voting:
For the proposal (13): Councillors Beth Forrester, Rachel Carnac, Mike Bland, Dane Buckman, Jean Butcher, Pat Edwards, James Flanagan, Liz Harvey, Stuart Heaver, Tom Mellish, Peter Old, Alex Ricketts and David Thomas
Against the proposal (0):
Abstained/absent for the vote (0)

243 **CITY AND TOWN CENTRE STRATEGIES**

The Director of Place introduced the report and gave a short presentation on the next phase of the town centre strategies for Canterbury, Herne Bay and Whitstable. This comprised proposals for three new place panels, along with project directories consisting of current initiatives and project ideas for the future, and an action plan for projects the council hoped to deliver by April 2028.

He advised that, although the timetable for Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) had changed, the proposed approach remained valid and would help strengthen the

three centres and prepare them for future governance arrangements. The report sought comments, particularly on the proposed place panels and their governance arrangements, before consideration by Cabinet.

At the end of the introduction, Councillor Chris Cornell, as Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Regeneration, addressed the committee supporting the proposals. He noted that the project directories and place panels would help provide a clear vision, encourage engagement and support investment in the district's town centres.

Councillors debated the report and made comments, with clarification provided by the Director of Place and the Senior Economic Development officer.

- Members expressed concern that the proposed recommendation did not provide a sufficiently robust approach to Place Panel membership. Particular reference was made to Herne Bay, where the lack of organisations such as a university or Business Improvement District might limit the pool of suitable members.
- Members noted that the establishment of the Place Panels presented an opportunity to adopt a positive and innovative approach. In respect of panel membership, it was suggested that a process similar to that used for the appointment of independent members to Whitstable Harbour Board be considered, whereby applications could be invited from interested individuals and community representatives, with appointments made through a formal recruitment process.
- It was noted that the Whitstable Harbour Board had attracted highly experienced and capable individuals via this method. Pride in Place panels had also used a similar approach effectively.
- The Senior Economic Development Officer advised that the public engagement process that had informed development of the strategies, had helped identify 25-35 possible panel members in each area. These participants had already given time and input into the development of the strategies and may wish to participate in the panels.
- A number of councillors shared similar concerns regarding the proposed selection process. It was also felt that the proposed criteria to identify panel members was over ambitious.
- Officers were urged not to make panel membership decisions without wider consultation.
- The public engagement process had resulted in involvement from individuals who would not normally participate in council consultation and engagement, and it was felt that the proposed arrangements narrowed participation rather than broadened it.
- It was suggested that many of the organisations identified from the previous consultation exercises were unlikely to come from the Herne Bay area.
- Concern was also raised about the proposed size of the Place Panels with and the risk of the panels becoming 'talking shops'.
- Although public engagement events had attracted a range of participants, some preferred to simply provide feedback rather than becoming more involved.
- Members asked how the current financial pressures at Herne Bay Sports Centre had informed the proposals. It was noted that the site was connected to the Kavanagh Cinema and former co-working hub.
- Several site-specific proposals were raised or commented on by councillors. The Chair advised that these be sent to the team by email so that they could be considered and responded to.

- Several proposals were dependent on Kent County Council and Southern Water and concern was expressed about their level of engagement.
- Local talent should be prioritised where possible in relation to mural and public art projects.
- There was a strong creative community within Herne Bay.
- The land train in the summer had been very popular, and it was hoped that this could return in future.
- The Director of Place reiterated that Cabinet would be asked to consider the overall governance arrangements, and not individual projects. The projects within the directory had originated from the consultation responses and engagement exercises and were intended to be dynamic working documents which would be reviewed. The Place Panels would be responsible for considering and prioritising projects.
- The Wincheap project in Canterbury directory seemed to focus mainly on transport and movement links and more emphasis on residents was needed.
- The Whitstable strategy seemed to focus heavily on tourism and visitors. It was felt that projects needed a stronger emphasis on the needs of its vibrant residential community and maritime heritage.
- Some councillors had been expecting to see more of a broad, strategic framework rather than project proposals, and asked why the project directories had been published before the Place Panels had been established.
- Councillors asked how they would relate to statutory authorities on issues such as highways, and officers reiterated that the proposed panel structure included both a councillor and officer from Kent County Council.
- It was noted that the volume of information presented to councillors for the meeting had been considerable.
- The Director of Place stated that the directories should be viewed as sitting alongside the strategies, place panels and action plan. The directories were intended to be live, dynamic working documents which would be consistently reviewed and updated.
- The Senior Economic Development officer explained that the directories had captured a range of ideas from the public engagement for the strategies. Council teams and some of its partners had also contributed ideas. The creation of the directories would avoid potentially valuable projects and information from being lost.
- Officers had developed an online tool to enable organisations and stakeholders to submit new projects.
- The online submission process needed to allow applicants to submit a project without being affiliated with an organisation.
- Elected members needed opportunities to comment on projects affecting their communities.
- Concerns were raised regarding vehicle movements associated with activities around Wimereux Square.
- Higher car park charges could deter visitors from visiting coastal areas.
- The former co-working hub in Herne Bay was raised as an example of a council-owned building that had remained vacant for a prolonged period.
- Reservations were expressed about extending the cycle hire schemes to Herne Bay due to the council's older demographic and the usage of mobility scooters.
- St George's toilet block needed to be brought back into use.
- The Place Panels would be strategic and advisory forums involving councillors, but also business and community representation. They were intended to inform and add value to council governance processes but would not replace formal decision-making.

- The Senior Economic Development Officer advised that the Chair of each Place Panel would be elected from the non-elected membership of the Panel, but councillors would have the opportunity to engage with panel discussions and projects.
- It was felt that there was significant overlap between Place Panels, future town councils and Community Governance Review discussions and there was potential for public confusion regarding the different governance structures. Officers advised that the Place Panels would inform and support decision making but would not replace formal decision-making arrangements.
- Not all councillors had been aware of the Place Panel proposals. The officer emphasised that each adopted strategy recommended the creation of place panels.
- The Canterbury strategy had generally achieved a balance between its role of major visitor destination and the needs of residents, but greater emphasis should be placed on connections between outer communities and the city centre, for example via the underpasses and other routes used by those living outside the city centre.
- Councillors would form part of the elected membership of the panels. The Terms of Reference would also allow panels to invite individuals with valuable local expertise and experience to attend for specific agenda items. This would include councillors who wished to engage with panel discussions and projects.
- Given the Government had not allocated Pride in Place funding to any of the three places, it was felt that there would be a lack of funding for the more ambitious ideas in the project directories and thought needed to be given to alternative funding sources.

It was proposed and seconded:

To Recommend (to Cabinet):

• That place panels are created for Canterbury, Herne Bay and Whitstable.
• That authority is delegated to the Director of Place, in consultation with the cabinet member, to invite identified local anchor institutions/partnerships and key community representatives to join the non-elected membership of the three panels.

To Note: • Project directories for Canterbury, Herne Bay and Whitstable. • Canterbury City Council's City & Town Centre Strategies action plan (to April 2028).

Following discussions, the recommendation was amended by the original proposer. It was seconded and when put to a vote, it was AGREED to:

RECOMMEND (to Cabinet)

- That place panels are created for Canterbury, Herne Bay, and Whitstable.
- That authority is delegated to the Director of Place, in consultation with the cabinet member to invite public applications from institutions/ partnerships and community representatives to join the non-elected memberships of the three panels using a process similar to that used to appoint independent members of Whitstable Harbour Board and that they recommend panel members to Council or Appointments Committee (as relevant committee) to be ratified.

NOTED:
• Project directories for Canterbury, Herne Bay, and Whitstable.
• Canterbury City Council's City & Town Centre Strategies action plan (to April 2028).

Record of voting:
For the proposal (11): Councillors Beth Forrester, Rachel Carnac, Mike Bland, Dane Buckman, Jean Butcher, Pat Edwards, James Flanagan, Stuart Heaver, Tom Mellish, Alex Ricketts and David Thomas
Against the proposal (1): Councillor Liz Harvey
Abstained/absent for the vote (1): Councillor Peter Old

244 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

7pm, Thursday 8 October 2026.

245 **ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS TO BE DEALT WITH IN PUBLIC**

There was no business under this item.

246 **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

247 **ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS WHICH FALLS UNDER THE EXEMPT PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 OR THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 OR BOTH**

There was no business under this item.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 9.05 pm

CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held on Tuesday, 15th September, 2026 at 7.00 pm in The Guildhall, St Peter's Place, Canterbury

Present: Councillor Paul Prentice (Chair)
Councillor Keith Bothwell
Councillor Michael Dixey
Councillor Pat Edwards
Councillor Tom Mellish
Councillor Keji Moses
Councillor Dan Smith
Councillor Ian Stockley
Councillor David Thomas

In attendance

Officers:	Stevie Andrews	-	Planning Manager
	Cath Wallen	-	Principal Solicitor
	Jon Hughes	-	Democratic Services Officer

(*present for part of the meeting)

248 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor Harry McKenzie.

249 **SUBSTITUTE COUNCILLORS**

Councillor Tom Mellish was present as a substitute for Councillor McKenzie.

250 **DECLARATION OF ANY INTERESTS BY COUNCILLORS OR OFFICERS**

The following generic statement was read out on behalf of all committee members:

All or some councillors may have received correspondence from or spoken with applicants, agents, supporters or objectors and some of the public speakers may also be known to members of the committee due to their work as councillors. Neither circumstance prevents councillors from participating in the meeting.

However, any councillor who considers that they do not have an open mind, in respect of any item on the agenda, should not participate in the meeting when the relevant item is to be discussed.

In respect of application CA/23/00178 Augusten, 5 Puckle Lane, Canterbury, Councillor Dan Smith made a voluntary declaration that he owned a property on that road but that he remained open minded.

251 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The public speakers for the meeting were heard immediately before the consideration of the relevant application below.

252 **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING OF 21ST JULY 2026**

The minutes of the above meeting were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

253 **LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND PROPOSALS**

The Committee considered the planning applications, received the observations thereon of interested parties, the reports and recommendations of the Head of Planning, and the comments at the meeting from the public speakers on the applications referred to below. At the commencement of the consideration of the applications, the Committee received a presentation about each application, which included a display of plans, drawings and photographs.

Planning Application No. / Site / Page Nos.	Speakers
Item 6 Application No. CA/25/01783 Land at Church Farm, Hoath, CT3 4LA	Item WITHDRAWN from agenda.
Item 7 CA/23/01371 Great Pett Farm, Pett Hill, Bridge	1. Nick Shirley (objector) 2. Matthew Blythin (applicant)
Item 8 CA/23/00178 Augusten, 5 Puckle Lane, Canterbury	

254 **APPLICATION NO. CA/25/01783 LAND AT CHURCH FARM, HOATH, CT3 4LA**

This item was withdrawn from the agenda and will be considered at a later date.

255 **APPLICATION NO. CA/23/01371 GREAT PETT FARM, PETT HILL, BRIDGE**

Erection of 9 dwellings together with access, landscape, parking and ancillary works and infrastructure following demolition of existing agricultural buildings

Recommendation: Section 101 grant, subject to safeguarding conditions

A proposal was put that planning permission be GRANTED as described in the above application with the addition of an informative that the condition of the footpath be maintained after the development is completed.

When put to a vote the proposal was AGREED.

A record of the vote was taken as follows:
For the proposal (8): Councillors Dixey, Edwards, Mellish, Moses, Prentice, Smith, Stockley, Thomas
Against the proposal (0): none
Abstained from voting (1): Councillor Bothwell

256 **APPLICATION NO. CA/23/00178 AUGUSTEN, 5 PUCKLE LANE, CANTERBURY**

Two detached bungalows following demolition of existing bungalow

Recommendation: Grant, subject to safeguarding conditions

A proposal was put that planning permission be GRANTED as described in the above application with the addition of a condition requiring a construction management plan to be submitted to the Council for approval.

When put to a vote the proposal was AGREED.

A record of the vote was taken as follows:
For the proposal (9): Councillors Bothwell, Dixey, Edwards, Mellish, Moses, Prentice, Smith, Stockley, Thomas
Against the proposal (0): none
Abstained from voting (0): none

257 **PLANNING APPEALS - DECISIONS**

There was no planning appeals report for this meeting

258 **ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS TO BE DEALT WITH IN PUBLIC**

There was no business under this item.

259 **ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS WHICH FALLS UNDER THE EXEMPT PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 OR THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 OR BOTH**

There was no business under this item.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 7.45 pm

CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held on Wednesday, 2nd September, 2026 at 7.00 pm in The Guildhall, St Peter's Place, Westgate, Canterbury

Present: Councillor Rachel Carnac (Chair)
Councillor Clare Turnbull
Councillor Peter Campbell
Councillor Harry McKenzie
Councillor Tom Mellish
Councillor Grace Paget
Councillor Paul Prentice
Councillor Alex Ricketts
Councillor Simon Warley
Councillor Dan Watkins
Councillor Dan Smith (substitute)
Councillor Naomi Smith (substitute)

In attendance Councillor Alan Baldock
Councillor Charlotte Cornell

Officers:

Andrea James	-	Democratic Services Officer
Caroline Marlow	-	Head of Digital, Data and Improvement
Nicci Mills	-	Director of Finance and Procurement
Marie Royle	-	Director for People
William Hicks	-	Director for Place
Cheryl Ireland*	-	Head of Finance
Stephanie Williamson	-	Democratic Services Officer

(*present for part of the meeting)

226 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sole and Councillor Forrester.

227 **SUBSTITUTE COUNCILLORS**

Councillor D Smith was present for Councillor Sole, Councillor N Smith was present for Councillor Forrester.

228 **DECLARATION OF ANY INTERESTS**

The Director for People, Marie Royle, made a voluntary announcement that she was a Director of Canenco.

Cheryl Ireland, Head of Finance, made a voluntary announcement that she was also a Director of Canenco.

Councillor Harry McKenzie made a voluntary announcement that he worked in a supported accommodation unit and that the report referred to supported accommodation and housing benefit matters. He said he had discussed the matter with the Head of Legal and as there would be no discussion of the distribution of funds he did not need to withdraw from the chamber.

229 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Chair confirmed that there were no speakers for this meeting.

230 **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 24 JUNE 2026**

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a true record.

The Chair then proposed a change to the agenda order, in that Agenda Item 7 (Finance, Projects and Performance) be considered before Agenda Item 6 (Scrutiny Committee Topic Review and Timetable), as the discussion might inform the committee's consideration of the future work programme.

This was agreed by general assent.

231 **TOPIC: FINANCE, PROJECTS AND PERFORMANCE**

The Director of Finance and Procurement introduced the Financial Outturn 2025/26 report and highlighted that the Council had achieved an overall balanced position, with the General Fund reporting a small underspend and the Housing Revenue Account remaining in a healthy financial position despite ongoing pressures.

Members of the committee discussed the report and presentation, inviting officers and Cabinet Members to answer questions and make comments. Points made during the discussion included the following:

- The timing of scrutiny of the financial outturn report was highlighted, with the Chair noting that the report had already been considered by Cabinet. It was suggested that future timetabling should allow scrutiny comments to feed into budget-setting and decision-making processes at an earlier stage.
- The balanced budget position was welcomed, particularly given wider economic pressures facing local government. Officers advised that the General Fund had finished the year broadly on budget and that the Housing Revenue Account remained financially resilient.
- Rental income within the Housing Revenue Account had increased through annual rent reviews, improved income collection and the addition of new housing stock. It was noted that rents were moving towards a more sustainable position following previous restrictions on rent increases.
- The six-monthly budget monitoring reporting cycle attracted comment, with comparisons drawn to authorities that reported quarterly. Officers advised that financial monitoring took place continuously throughout the year, with regular review by budget managers and Management Team on a quarterly basis as a minimum with some budgets monitored more frequently.
- Councillors sought clarification on the capital programme slippage. Officers explained that delays arising from resources, planning, procurement and project delivery often resulted in expenditure moving between financial years and that this was common across larger projects and long-term capital programmes.

- Historic slippage levels and whether there were opportunities to improve project delivery timescales were identified as areas that may warrant further scrutiny.
- The financial impact of delays relating to Military Road was highlighted, particularly the ongoing costs associated with the site. Officers advised that negotiations remained ongoing and that nutrient neutrality issues had been a significant contributing factor to delays.
- The operation of earmarked reserves and the Budget Stabilisation Reserve was examined. Officers explained that reserves were used to manage known future liabilities and spread significant expenditure over a number of years, including ICT replacement programmes and election costs.
- Staffing vacancies within planning, engineering, property and enforcement services were considered. It was reported that recruitment performance had improved and that the relevant teams were now fully staffed. The more technical roles such as surveyors were more challenging to recruit to.
- Recruitment to enforcement roles had historically been challenging due to the skills and resilience required. The update that the enforcement team was now operating at full capacity and that activity levels had increased significantly was welcomed.
- The overspend within revenues and benefits was explained partly by benefit overpayments that required recovery over time and supported housing costs that were not recoverable in some cases due to criteria, from the government. Clarification was also provided regarding the Extended Producer Responsibility Grant, which had been fully utilised for its intended purposes.
- Temporary accommodation remained a significant financial pressure. Progress in acquiring additional properties, making use of Housing Revenue Account stock, preventing homelessness and securing external funding was highlighted as helping to reduce costs and improve outcomes for residents.
- Void property costs within the Housing Revenue Account were highlighted as an area of concern. Officers advised that poor property condition, compliance requirements and the need for refurbishment works all contributed to costs and delays, and that the issue continued to receive close attention and scrutiny via the Cabinet Advisory Committee (Housing) and also through East Kent Audit Partnership and Audit Committee.
- Local Government Reorganisation, capital programme slippage and lessons learned from Military Road were identified as potential topics for future scrutiny consideration.

The report was NOTED by general assent.

Members then received a presentation from Head of Digital, Data and Improvement on the Annual Impact Report 2025/26. She explained that it was intended to provide a public-facing summary of the Council's performance against the Corporate Plan, through a combination of performance indicators, case studies and narrative.

Points made during consideration of the report included the following:

- The purpose of the report generated considerable discussion, with differing views expressed regarding its role as both a public-facing publication and a document subject to scrutiny before consideration by Cabinet.
- The overall format of the report received mixed feedback. Some members welcomed the use of graphics, case studies and narrative, whilst others considered the document difficult to scrutinise due to the volume and presentation of information.

- The accuracy of a number of KPI figures was questioned and it was suggested that the draft report should be reviewed carefully before being presented to Cabinet.
- Benchmarking against comparable authorities was highlighted as an important omission. Reference was made to previous requests from Scrutiny for benchmarking information, particularly in advance of Local Government Reorganisation.
- The availability of recycling data continued to pose challenges due to reliance on information supplied by Kent County Council and the associated time lapse delay. Officers advised that verified figures were not available until well after the end of the reporting year.
- The presentation of housing performance indicators, including measures relating to Decent Homes Standard compliance and EPC ratings, was considered unclear in places and was identified as requiring additional explanation.
- Greater narrative around underperforming indicators and areas where data was unavailable was requested to provide better context for readers.
- Reduced newsroom visitor figures prompted discussion about changing communication methods and public engagement. It was noted that social media activity and other forms of engagement may provide a fuller picture of communication performance.
- The inclusion of hyperlinks to supporting reports, case studies, data sources, and news articles was suggested as a means of providing additional context whilst keeping the report accessible.
- The absence of data for some indicators, including cycling activity, was highlighted. It was suggested that future reports should either provide additional context or reconsider the presentation of indicators where meaningful data was not yet available.
- A written response to the detailed KPI questions submitted by Councillor Campbell was requested. It was agreed that responses would be circulated to all members and attached to the record of the meeting once ready.

The following comments were requested to be forwarded to Cabinet:

- Benchmarking information should be incorporated where possible
- Additional narrative and explanatory context should be provided throughout the report
- Identified inaccuracies should be reviewed and corrected prior to publication
- Hyperlinks to relevant supporting information should be included where appropriate

The report was NOTED by general assent.

232 **SCRUTINY COMMITTEE TOPIC REVIEW AND TIMETABLE**

The Director for People introduced the report and invited members to review the proposed work programme for the coming year.

Councillors discussed the timetable, proposed amendments and made several suggestions, including:

- Moving the Finance, Projects and Performance meeting earlier in the cycle so that Scrutiny comments could inform budget development more effectively and inform Cabinet before decisions are made

- Introducing an additional Scrutiny meeting in January 2027 using the reserved call-in date
- Including Local Government Reorganisation and Community Governance Review matters within the future programme
- Including Active Life contract performance within the Housing and Contract Management themed meeting, noting that some elements of this may be commercially sensitive
- Considering capital programme slippage, Military Road development delays and related lessons learned
- Including enforcement, waste management (Valencia), and fly-tipping within the Environment theme
- Ensuring Violence Against Women and Girls / White Ribbon activity was considered within the Community Safety Partnership discussion
- Reviewing whether KPI performance items lacking a natural reporting route should be incorporated into future themed meetings

Officers agreed to bring a revised theme timetable to the next meeting.

It was proposed, seconded and when put to a vote

RESOLVED:

That the timetable for the coming year be agreed [with the additional items suggested being timetabled where possible]

Record of the vote:
For (12): Councillors Carnac, Turnbull, Campbell, McKenzie, Mellish, Paget, Prentice, Ricketts, Warley, D Smith, N Smith, Watkins
Against (0): none
Abstained (0): none

233 **DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

7pm on Wednesday 25 November 2026

234 **ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS TO BE DEALT WITH IN PUBLIC**

There was no other urgent business to be dealt with in public.

235 **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

This item was not required.

236 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH FALLS UNDER THE EXEMPT PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 OR THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 OR BOTH**

There was no other business which fell under the exempt provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 or the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or both

There being no other business the meeting closed at 9.50 pm