

Kent Agreement 2 Consultation Report: Executive Summary

Analysis of the 73 responses from 49 organisations and partnerships across Kent (27/07/07 to 20/09/07)

8 Theme Summary Reports are available which reflect the detailed comments received during the consultation process from partners across the public, private, voluntary and community sector.

Taking into account the complex, and sometimes conflicting, responses, the Kent Partnership has suggested the following provisional suggestion to take the discussion forward to the next level. The revised outcomes featured below capture the essence of the majority of responses received and it is now for partners to consider our draft negotiating position. All comments on governance have been passed to the relevant working groups to progress.

This summary includes 34 possible **outcomes**, which need to be honed down further to “up to” 35 **indicators** (plus 17 DCSF). Some outcomes are likely to require several different indicators so work is required to hone down this list. It will be recalled that through the Kent Commitment a proposal was put forward to work on “six transformational” outcomes. The consultation has added a further two which coincide with the eight themes of the Vision for Kent.

Full details of the indicators that will support these high level outcomes will be considered when the 200 National Improvement Indicators are published in the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007.

Theme	Suggested Headline Priorities
Economic Success – Opportunities For All	Improving enterprise, competitiveness and productivity Promoting pathways to economic independence Promoting social and physical regeneration Creating a low carbon economy Promoting Kent as a premier tourism destination to deliver economic prosperity
Learning For Everyone	Enhancing education, employment and training opportunities Reducing the impact of child poverty on children's lives Raising aspirations and transforming skills for all Increasing involvement of businesses in schools and colleges
Improved Health, Care & Wellbeing	Reduce inequalities in health and wellbeing Reducing drug and alcohol misuse and the harm it causes Improve mental health, care and wellbeing Helping people live life independently for longer Improving the lives of young people through effective parenting
Environmental Excellence	Sustainable flood risk management Reducing Kent's carbon footprint Reducing waste generation in Kent Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and landscape in Kent
Stronger & Safer Communities	Improving the quality and appearance of the street scene and open spaces Reducing crime and the perception of crime Reducing the levels of reoffending Reducing the harm caused by domestic abuse Increasing community cohesion, participation and shared sense of belonging
Enjoying Life	Maximising the benefit and legacy of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games Promoting active lifestyles with regular exercise for all ages Participation opportunities for everyone to enjoy arts, sport, learning and cultural activities
Keeping Kent Moving	Improving Kent's strategic transport infrastructure Enhancing Kent's position as an international gateway Reducing the need to travel Improving accessibility to jobs and essential services by sustainable modes of travel Saving lives and reducing injuries on the roads and pavements
High Quality Homes	Increasing the supply of affordable housing of all types and tenures Delivering sustainable homes incorporating high quality design Improving access to high quality housing for all

Kent Agreement 2 Consultation Report: Economic Success – Opportunities For All

Analysis of the 73 responses from 49 organisations and partnerships across Kent (27/07/07 to 20/09/07)

Economic Success – Opportunities For All

What was the starting point for this theme?

Prior to the consultation period beginning, the Kent Partnership Support Group suggested 6 potential outcomes for the Economic Success theme. These featured in the consultation “square wheels” diagram.

A guide to the development process for these outcomes is available on: <http://www.kentpartnership.org.uk/kent-agreement-related-documents.asp>

These proposed outcomes reflected the partner aspirations in the Vision for Kent theme of the same name, and were also influenced by latest thinking in the Kent Prospects (Kent’s economic development and regeneration framework), the Regional Economic Strategy, Sub National Review, and local plans such as Area Investment Frameworks and District Sustainable Community Strategies.

What did the consultation tell us?

The Kent Partnership received 73 responses to the consultation process, which came from 49 different organisations/partnerships from across the public, private, voluntary and community sector. The responses ranged from individual, unit/teams, to a cluster of LSPs. Many partners recognised the importance of this theme, and chose to comment on the proposed outcomes. However responses took many formats, and not all chose to use the proforma which enabled outcomes to be ranked by “high”, “medium” or “low” priority. The collective weight of results from the proformas that were received can be seen below – but this is only one way of analysing the results and doesn’t reflect the complexity and detail of some responses.

The proforma findings show that the **Economic Success** outcomes were ranked in the following order:

Outcome
Promoting pathways to employment
Promoting regeneration opportunities for Kent’s diverse areas & communities
Skills transformation in specific sectors and for people of all ages
Improving enterprise, competitiveness and productivity
Maximising the economic and technological opportunities of climate change
Developing Kent’s rural knowledge economy

More detailed responses included suggestions to add new outcomes, merge existing outcomes, move outcomes from one theme to another and reword outcomes. Many partners also submitted their initial ideas for indicators – however this level of detail will be considered once the 200 National Improvement Indicator list is published in the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007.

All comments on governance have been passed onto the relevant working groups who are seeking to address these issues.

Below is summary of all the comments that the Kent Partnership received regarding this theme:

<i>Economic Success – Opportunities For All</i>	
Proposal	Your suggestions and comments
Additional Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Creating an attractive local environment for businesses and citizens” (sub national review outcome) ▪ “Ensuring that the economic competitiveness of Kent is enhanced through investing in infrastructure” ▪ “Investment in housing and infrastructure, particularly transport” (sub national review outcome) ▪ “Physical development and essential infrastructure” ▪ “Globalising Kent’s economy”
Merged Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3 suggestions to merge Outcomes 2 (pathways to employment) & 3 (regeneration opportunities) ▪ 9 suggestions to merge various combinations of O.2,4,8,10 & 11 (skills and aspirations) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Merge O.10 into O.2 ▪ Merge O.2 & 10 ▪ O.10 could be included as an element of Outcome 4. ▪ O.10: Link this to Outcome 4 (skills transformation) ▪ Merge O.10 with O.2 & 4 ▪ Potentially O.2,4 and 10 could be merged/linked ▪ O.2,4,8 & 10 are all similar ▪ Should O.10 & 11 be part of O.2? ▪ The potential to combine O.10 and 11 with 4 should be considered
Moved Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ O.2 (pathways to employment) could be in Stronger & Safer Communities ▪ O.3 (regeneration opportunities) could be in Stronger & Safer Communities ▪ O.4 (skills transformation) could be moved to Learning For Everyone ▪ O.6 (rural knowledge economy) could be in Learning For Everyone theme ▪ 3 suggestions that O.31 (tourism) is a key economic sector for Kent and perhaps ought to be covered within the Economic Success theme

Reword Outcomes	
O.1: Improving enterprise, competitiveness and productivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amend to read: Improving enterprise, competitiveness and productivity in ways that enhance Kent's reputation for environmental excellence ▪ Suggest that this is too encompassing and should be broken down to at least two outcomes and preferably three
O.2: Promoting pathways to employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Could this be represented as "Reducing worklessness and economic inactivity" ▪ May be better defined as "Reducing economic inactivity/worklessness and supporting independence" ▪ "Promoting Diverse Pathways to Employment" ▪ Replace with "Promoting pathways to economic independence" ▪ Should be "Reducing welfare dependency"
O.3: Promoting regeneration opportunities for Kent's diverse areas & communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should be on coastal communities and other areas of significant need ▪ Far too broad – should focus on growth areas and coastal towns ▪ " Focus regeneration investment and activities on addressing disparity of opportunity and economic prosperity in Kent's communities" ▪ Amend to read: "Promoting regeneration opportunities that are environmentally sustainable for Kent's diverse areas & communities" ▪ 'Diverse areas and communities' is a vague reference to redressing Kent's economy disparity ▪ Don't forget pockets of deprivation and town centre regeneration ▪ Replace with "Sharing the economic prosperity of Kent" ▪ The growth areas and areas with regeneration opportunities should be the focus of activity within the county ▪ Tweak wording to "Promoting social and physical regeneration..."
O.4: Skills transformation in specific sectors and for people of all ages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should read: "Skills transformation in specific sectors and for people of all ages to address localised skills gaps". ▪ Replace with "Transforming the skills of the current and future workforce" ▪ Suggested rewording "Skills transformation of the working age population to support the existing and future economy" ▪ The focus should be on 'specific sectors'. There is more chance of achieving real impact within the LAA timescale.
O.5: Maximising the economic and technological opportunities of climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amend to read: "Adapting to meet the challenges of climate change, including maximising its economic and technological opportunities" ▪ 4 suggested changes to "Creating a low carbon economy" ▪ Reword to "Maximise economic and technical opportunities to address climate change" ▪ Wider issue here involving reducing the carbon footprint of all activity, including sustainable construction. ▪ Do we need to change wording to "climate change adaptation and mitigation"? ▪ "Maximising the economic & technological opportunities and preparing for the impacts of climate change"
O.6: Developing Kent's rural knowledge economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "Diversifying Kent's rural economy" ▪ Sustainable development of Kent's rural economy is important, not only of the knowledge economy ▪ Why just the rural knowledge economy? Growing the knowledge economy across Kent as a whole is essential ▪ Would not want this outcome to be confined to only the 'rural' economy, as we view knowledge economy as being important at the County level

How will the consultation findings influence and shape the proposed outcomes?

All the suggestions above need to be taken into account and considered, so that we can amend the proposed outcomes. This will enable the Kent Partnership to present an informed view of what Kent Partners would like to be included in Kent Agreement 2. This can then be matched and merged with the 200 National Improvement Indicators, to suggest up to 35 indicators for negotiation.

With so many partners contributing to this process it is understandable that there are conflicting opinions on what the outcomes should now look like – however this is first attempt to reflect as many of the comments above as possible.

Taking this into account, some strong suggestions for revision include:

- **Add outcome on "Developing Kent's essential strategic infrastructure" – but place this in the Keeping Kent Moving theme**
- **Merge O.4 and 10 (skills), but place this in the Learning For Everyone theme**
- **Move O.31 (tourism) to this theme**
- **O.6 is now covered by the skills outcome**

Suggested Headline Priorities

Improving enterprise, competitiveness and productivity

Promoting pathways to economic independence

Promoting social and physical regeneration *(with locally determined indicators for growth areas, coastal towns, town centres etc)*

Creating a low carbon economy

Diversifying Kent's rural economy

Promoting Kent as a premier tourism destination to deliver economic prosperity

Kent Agreement 2 Consultation Report: Learning For Everyone

Analysis of the 73 responses from 49 organisations and partnerships across Kent (27/07/07 to 20/09/07)

Learning For Everyone

What was the starting point for this theme?

Prior to the consultation period beginning, the Kent Partnership Support Group suggested 5 potential outcomes for the Learning For Everyone theme. These featured in the consultation "square wheels" diagram.

A guide to the development process for these outcomes is available on: <http://www.kentpartnership.org.uk/kent-agreement-related-documents.asp>

These proposed outcomes reflected the partner aspirations in the Vision for Kent theme of the same name, and were also influenced by latest thinking in the Kent Prospects (Kent's economic development and regeneration framework), the Kent Children & Young People's Plan, 14-19 Learning Strategy and District Sustainable Community Strategies.

What did the consultation tell us?

The Kent Partnership received 73 responses to the consultation process, which came from 49 different organisations/partnerships from across the public, private, voluntary and community sector. The responses ranged from individual, unit/teams, to a cluster of LSPs. Many partners recognised the importance of this theme, and chose to comment on the proposed outcomes. However responses took many formats, and not all chose to use the proforma which enabled outcomes to be ranked by "high", "medium" or "low" priority. The collective weight of results from the proformas that were received can be seen below – but this is only one way of analysing the results and doesn't reflect the complexity and detail of some responses.

The proforma findings show that the **Learning For Everyone** outcomes were ranked in the following order:

Outcome
Raising learning, job and skills aspirations for disadvantaged and vulnerable groups
Enhancing opportunities for looked after children, children leaving care, young carers and NEETs
Increasing the involvement of businesses in education
Reducing the impact of child poverty of children's lives
18 former DfES targets

More detailed responses included suggestions to add new outcomes, merge existing outcomes, move outcomes from one theme to another and reword outcomes. Many partners also submitted their initial ideas for indicators – however this level of detail will be considered once the 200 National Improvement Indicator list is published in the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007.

All comments on governance have been passed onto the relevant working groups who are seeking to address these issues.

Below is a summary of all the comments that the Kent Partnership received regarding this theme:

Learning For Everyone	
Proposal	Your suggestions and comments
Additional Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2 suggestions for "Raising the number of adults participating in learning" ▪ Replace O.8 with "To improve the achievement and quality of life for young carers by implementing the Young Carers Strategy" and "Reduce the incidence and impact of bullying in school and the community"
Merged Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 9 suggestions to merge various combinations of O.2,4,8,10 & 11 (skills and aspirations) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Merge O.10 into O.2 ▪ Merge O.2 & 10 ▪ O.10 could be included as an element of Outcome 4. ▪ O.10: Link this to Outcome 4 (skills transformation) ▪ Merge O.10 with O.2 & 4 ▪ Potentially O.2,4 and 10 could be merged/linked ▪ O.2,4,8 & 10 are all similar ▪ Should O.10 & 11 be part of O.2? ▪ The potential to combine O.10 and 11 with 4 should be considered ▪ Will O.8 & 9 be covered within the 17 DCSF targets in O.7?
Moved Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ O.4 (skills transformation) could be moved to Learning For Everyone ▪ O.6 (rural knowledge economy) could be in Learning For Everyone theme ▪ O.8 (enhancing opportunities) could move to Improved Health, Care & Wellbeing ▪ O.9 (child poverty) is a worthwhile cause but this may be better dealt with in terms of employment opportunities for parents and improving housing - not really a Learning For Everyone issue ▪ O.9 (child poverty) could move to Improved Health, Care & Wellbeing

Reword Outcomes	
O.7: 17 DCSF targets	No comments made – perhaps due to the fact these 17 targets will be in addition to the “up to 35 indicators” required for Kent Agreement 2, and that these will be specified in the 200 National Improvement Indicator list in CSR07.
O.8: Enhancing opportunities for looked after children, children leaving care, young carers and NEETs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should read “Enhancing education, employment and training opportunities for looked after children...”. ▪ Sounds a bit “hotchpotch” – these groups have very different needs ▪ We are talking about skills and job achievements not just ‘opportunities’
O.9: Reducing the impact of child poverty of children’s lives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Improving health, widening opportunities and raising attainment of children in poverty” ▪ “Reducing the number of children living in poverty in Kent and the associated effects on their health, education and safety, and improve their life chances”
O.10: Raising learning, job and skills aspirations for disadvantaged and vulnerable groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Raising learning, job and skills aspirations for all, particularly disadvantaged and vulnerable groups” ▪ “Continuing to engage in learning to job and skills aspirations” ▪ “Increase engagement and participation by young people in education, employment and society in order to prevent disaffection and improve security” ▪ Would like the focus of this outcome to be broader than ‘disadvantaged and vulnerable groups’ to include all residents
O.11: Increasing the involvement of businesses in education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replace with “Raising the level of enterprise learning across all age groups” ▪ Use “schools and colleges” rather than “education”

How will the consultation findings influence and shape the proposed outcomes?

All the suggestions above need to be taken into account and considered, so that we can amend the proposed outcomes. This will enable the Kent Partnership to present an informed view of what Kent Partners would like to be included in Kent Agreement 2. This can then be matched and merged with the 200 National Improvement Indicators, to suggest up to 35 indicators for negotiation.

With so many partners contributing to this process it is understandable that there are conflicting opinions on what the outcomes should now look like – however this is first attempt to reflect as many of the comments above as possible.

Taking this into account, some strong suggestions for revision include:

- **Merge O.4 and 10 (skills), and place this theme**
- **Suggestions to add an outcome on number of adults in learning could actually be an indicator in O.8 rather than an outcome**
- **Difficult decision for O.9 (child poverty) – as an outcome does this really sit in a “learning theme” or is it a much more complex, cross cutting issue that should be covered in indicators across several themes?**
- **O.7 (Former 18 DfES targets) should be deleted as this will be covered by the 17 additional Dept for Children, Schools and Families targets**

Suggested Headline Priorities

Enhancing education, employment and training opportunities

Reducing the impact of child poverty on children’s lives

Raising aspirations and transforming skills for all

Increasing involvement of businesses in schools and colleges

Kent Agreement 2 Consultation Report: Improved Health, Care & Wellbeing

Analysis of the 73 responses from 49 organisations and partnerships across Kent (27/07/07 to 20/09/07)

Improved Health, Care & Wellbeing

What was the starting point for this theme?

Prior to the consultation period beginning, the Kent Partnership Support Group suggested 4 potential outcomes for the Improved Health, Care & Wellbeing theme. These featured in the consultation “square wheels” diagram. A guide to the development process for these outcomes is available on: <http://www.kentpartnership.org.uk/kent-agreement-related-documents.asp>

These proposed outcomes reflected the partner aspirations in the Vision for Kent theme of the same name, and were also influenced by latest thinking in Choosing Health, Active Lives, Kent Public Health Strategy and District Sustainable Community Strategies.

What did the consultation tell us?

The Kent Partnership received 73 responses to the consultation process, which came from 49 different organisations/partnerships from across the public, private, voluntary and community sector. The responses ranged from individual, unit/teams, to a cluster of LSPs. Many partners recognised the importance of this theme, and chose to comment on the proposed outcomes. However responses took many formats, and not all chose to use the proforma which enabled outcomes to be ranked by “high”, “medium” or “low” priority. The collective weight of results from the proformas that were received can be seen below – but this is only one way of analysing the results and doesn’t reflect the complexity and detail of some responses.

The proforma findings show that the **Improved Health, Care & Wellbeing** outcomes were ranked in the following order:

Outcome
Reducing inequalities in health and emotional wellbeing
Helping people to live life independently for longer
Improving family stability
Improving access to mental health services for all

More detailed responses included suggestions to add new outcomes, merge existing outcomes, move outcomes from one theme to another and reword outcomes. Many partners also submitted their initial ideas for indicators – however this level of detail will be considered once the 200 National Improvement Indicator list is published in the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007. All comments on governance have been passed onto the relevant working groups who are seeking to address these issues.

Below is summary of all the comments that the Kent Partnership received regarding this theme:

Improved Health, Care & Wellbeing	
Proposal	Your suggestions and comments
Additional Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Separate obesity outcome (no wording suggestion provided) ▪ “Reducing teenage conceptions”
Merged Outcomes	No suggestions made to merge outcomes within this theme
Moved Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ O.8 (enhancing opportunities) could move to Improved Health, Care & Wellbeing ▪ O.9 (child poverty) could move to Improved Health, Care & Wellbeing ▪ O.25 (domestic abuse) & 26 (drugs and alcohol) may sit in Improved Health, Care & Wellbeing ▪ 3 suggestions that O.26 (drugs and alcohol) could be better placed under “Improved Health, Care and Wellbeing”
Reword Outcomes	
O.12: Reducing inequalities in health and emotional wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Reduce the difference in life expectancy within different areas in districts as well as across the County” ▪ “Reducing inequalities in health and improve emotional wellbeing” ▪ Remove word “emotional” – “Reduce inequalities in health and wellbeing” ▪ Reword to read “Reducing inequalities in health and wellbeing” ▪ Reword: “Reduce inequalities in health and well being”
O.13: Improving access to mental health services for all	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Reducing the effects of mental ill health”. ▪ Suggest that this changes to “Reducing the effects of mental ill health” ▪ “Improve mental health, care and well being”. ▪ Is the issue around mental health services confined to access or does it also include the quality of the services themselves? ▪ Reword to “Improving emotional wellbeing and access to mental health services for all” ▪ Reword to “Improve mental health, care and well being”.
O.14: Helping people to live life independently for longer	No comments were received regarding the wording of this outcome
O.15: Improving family stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kent Children’s Trust would put focus on “Improving parenting” ▪ Reword to “Improving the lives of young people”. ▪ Reword to “Improving the lives of young people”.

How will the consultation findings influence and shape the proposed outcomes?

All the suggestions above need to be taken into account and considered, so that we can amend the proposed outcomes. This will enable the Kent Partnership to present an informed view of what Kent Partners would like to be included in Kent Agreement 2. This can then be matched and merged with the 200 National Improvement Indicators, to suggest up to 35 indicators for negotiation.

With so many partners contributing to this process it is understandable that there are conflicting opinions on what the outcomes should now look like – however this is first attempt to reflect as many of the comments above as possible.

Taking this into account, some strong suggestions for revision include:

- **Move O.26 (drugs & alcohol) into this theme**

Suggested Headline Priorities

Reduce inequalities in health and wellbeing
Reducing drug and alcohol misuse and the harm it causes
Improve mental health, care and wellbeing
Helping people live life independently for longer
Improving the lives of young people through effective parenting

Kent Agreement 2 Consultation Report: Environmental Excellence

Analysis of the 73 responses from 49 organisations and partnerships across Kent (27/07/07 to 20/09/07)

Environmental Excellence

What was the starting point for this theme?

Prior to the consultation period beginning, the Kent Partnership Support Group suggested 6 potential outcomes for the Environmental Excellence theme. These featured in the consultation "square wheels" diagram.

A guide to the development process for these outcomes is available on: <http://www.kentpartnership.org.uk/kent-agreement-related-documents.asp>

These proposed outcomes reflected the partner aspirations in the Vision for Kent theme of the same name, and were also influenced by latest thinking in the Kent Environment Strategy, proposed Kent Climate Change Action Plan, Kent & Medway Structure Plan, Biodiversity Action Plan and District Sustainable Community Strategies.

What did the consultation tell us?

The Kent Partnership received 73 responses to the consultation process, which came from 49 different organisations/partnerships from across the public, private, voluntary and community sector. The responses ranged from individual, unit/teams, to a cluster of LSPs. Many partners recognised the importance of this theme, and chose to comment on the proposed outcomes. However responses took many formats, and not all chose to use the proforma which enabled outcomes to be ranked by "high", "medium" or "low" priority. The collective weight of results from the proformas that were received can be seen below – but this is only one way of analysing the results and doesn't reflect the complexity and detail of some responses.

The proforma findings show that the **Environmental Excellence** outcomes were ranked in the following order:

Outcome
Improving the appearance of the street scene
Reducing Kent's carbon footprint
Protecting and enhancing biodiversity in Kent
Improving waste management in Kent
Improving energy efficiency
Reducing Kent's water consumption

More detailed responses included suggestions to add new outcomes, merge existing outcomes, move outcomes from one theme to another and reword outcomes. Many partners also submitted their initial ideas for indicators – however this level of detail will be considered once the 200 National Improvement Indicator list is published in the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007.

All comments on governance have been passed onto the relevant working groups who are seeking to address these issues.

Below is a summary of all the comments that the Kent Partnership received regarding this theme:

Environmental Excellence	
Proposal	Your suggestions and comments
Additional Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "Improving recycling and reducing energy consumption of households and communities" ▪ "Dealing with the impacts of climate change and developing the need for robust strategies for adaptation" ▪ 3 suggestions for "Sustainable flood risk management" ▪ "Improving sustainable procurement across Kent"
Merged Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ O.17 (reducing carbon footprint) seen as a key outcome for this theme which could absorb other outcomes from both within the Environmental Excellence theme, and others. ▪ 3 suggestions to merge O.20 into O.17 ▪ 2 suggestions to merge O.17 with O.19 & 20 & 32 ▪ O.17 could be a merger of O.18,19,20 and 33 ▪ O.17 could be merge of O.19, 20 and 33 ▪ Merge O.17-21 to "Achieving an environmentally and socially sustainable economy with high organisational resource efficiency and low environmental impact"
Moved Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ O.16 (appearance of street scene) could sit more appropriately under 'Stronger and Safer Communities' or 'Enjoying Life'

PTO.

Reword Outcomes	
O.16: Improving the appearance of the street scene	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "Improved appearance of the street scene in priority areas for regeneration" ▪ Needs to include ' and public open space' within the outcome definition ▪ Proposed change to "Improving the quality and accessibility of the local environment" ▪ Proposed change to "Improving the quality and accessibility of the local environment"
O.17: Reducing Kent's carbon footprint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would be better to try to establish what the carbon footprint is – an enormous task that could take three years ▪ "Reduction in total CO2 emissions" ▪ We need to understand what Kent's footprint actually is first ▪ "Reducing Kent's carbon footprint by improving energy efficiency, reducing transport emissions and increasing renewable energy"
O.18: Improving waste management in Kent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed change to "Reducing waste generation in Kent" ▪ Proposed change to "Reducing waste generation in Kent" ▪ Reword to "Reduce the amount of waste being transported to landfill and incineration"
O.19: Reducing Kent's water consumption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should it be water sufficiency and water quality? ▪ Change "consumption" to "Reduction in water demand" ▪ Emphasis in the outcome must be on "Reducing demand for water overall" ▪ Recast this as "Better water management" ▪ "Reducing demand for water overall" ▪ "Reducing Kent's water consumption as part of a programme of measures to secure the quality and sufficiency of the water resource" ▪ "Reducing overall water consumption"
O.20: Improving energy efficiency	No comments were received on the wording this outcome
O.21: Protecting and enhancing biodiversity in Kent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add "wider landscape and designated areas" to biodiversity ▪ Proposed change to: "Delivering a robust ecological network of natural habitats for wildlife and people" ▪ "Delivering a robust ecological network of natural habitats for wildlife and people" ▪ "Protecting & enhancing biodiversity" ▪ "Protecting and enhancing, landscape and biodiversity in Kent"

How will the consultation findings influence and shape the proposed outcomes?

All the suggestions above need to be taken into account and considered, so that we can amend the proposed outcomes. This will enable the Kent Partnership to present an informed view of what Kent Partners would like to be included in Kent Agreement 2. This can then be matched and merged with the 200 National Improvement Indicators, to suggest up to 35 indicators for negotiation. With so many partners contributing to this process it is understandable that there are conflicting opinions on what the outcomes should now look like – however this is first attempt to reflect as many of the comments above as possible.

Taking this into account, some strong suggestions for revision include:

- **Add outcome on "Sustainable flood risk management"**
- **Merge O.19 (water) and 20 (energy efficiency) into O.17 (carbon reduction)**
- **Move O.16 (street scene) to Stronger & Safer Communities theme**

Suggested Headline Priorities

Sustainable flood risk management
Reducing Kent's carbon footprint
Reducing waste generation in Kent
Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and landscape in Kent

Kent Agreement 2 Consultation Report: Stronger & Safer Communities

Analysis of the 73 responses from 49 organisations and partnerships across Kent (27/07/07 to 20/09/07)

Stronger & Safer Communities

What was the starting point for this theme?

Prior to the consultation period beginning, the Kent Partnership Support Group suggested 7 potential outcomes for the Stronger & Safer Communities theme. These featured in the consultation "square wheels" diagram.

A guide to the development process for these outcomes is available on: <http://www.kentpartnership.org.uk/kent-agreement-related-documents.asp>

These proposed outcomes reflected the partner aspirations in the Vision for Kent theme of the same name, and were also influenced by latest thinking in the Kent Policing Plan, Kent Fire & Rescue Performance Plan, Community Safety Action Plans and District Sustainable Community Strategies.

What did the consultation tell us?

The Kent Partnership received 73 responses to the consultation process, which came from 49 different organisations/partnerships from across the public, private, voluntary and community sector. The responses ranged from individual, unit/teams, to a cluster of LSPs. Many partners recognised the importance of this theme, and chose to comment on the proposed outcomes. However responses took many formats, and not all chose to use the proforma which enabled outcomes to be ranked by "high", "medium" or "low" priority. The collective weight of results from the proformas that were received can be seen below – but this is only one way of analysing the results and doesn't reflect the complexity and detail of some responses.

The proforma findings show that the **Stronger & Safer Communities** outcomes were ranked in the following order:

Outcome
Reducing crime and the fear of crime
Reducing the harm caused by drug and alcohol misuse
Increased community cohesion, participation and shared sense of belonging
Increasing volunteering
Reducing the levels of re-offending
Reducing the effects of domestic abuse
Reducing inequalities in crime levels across the county

More detailed responses included suggestions to add new outcomes, merge existing outcomes, move outcomes from one theme to another and reword outcomes. Many partners also submitted their initial ideas for indicators – however this level of detail will be considered once the 200 National Improvement Indicator list is published in the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007. All comments on governance have been passed onto the relevant working groups who are seeking to address these issues.

Below is a summary of all the comments that the Kent Partnership received regarding this theme:

Stronger & Safer Communities	
Proposal	Your suggestions and comments
Additional Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "Sustainable flood risk management" ▪ "Planning and recovery linked to flood risk management" ▪ "Reducing the risk of flood and the fear of flood"
Merged Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3 suggestions to merge O.23 into O.22 (crime reduction) ▪ Merge O.27 and O.3 ▪ 2 suggestions to merge O.28 into O.27 ▪ 2 suggestions to merge O.27 & 28 into O.36 ▪ Merge O.27 and O.30 and use O.27 wording ▪ Would make sense to pull together outcomes 27, 28, 30 and 36 under the title 'Increased Community Cohesion & Creating Sustainable, Integrated Communities'.
Moved Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ O.2 (pathways to employment) could be in Stronger & Safer Communities ▪ O.3 (regeneration opportunities) could be in Stronger & Safer Communities ▪ O.16 (appearance of street scene) could sit more appropriately under 'Stronger and Safer Communities' or 'Enjoying Life' ▪ O.25 (domestic abuse) & 26 (drugs and alcohol) may sit in Improved Health, Care & Wellbeing ▪ 3 suggestions that O.26 (drugs and alcohol) could be better placed under "Improved Health, Care and Wellbeing" ▪ Not convinced O.27 (community cohesion) sits in S&S (perhaps cross cutting over all themes?) ▪ 2 suggestions to move O.28 (volunteering) in Stronger & Safer Communities to Enjoying Life ▪ O.30 (community & recreational facilities) could be in Stronger & Safer Communities ▪ 2 suggestions for O.34 (saving lives on roads and pavements) to move to Stronger & Safer

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities O.36 (sustainable communities) could be in Stronger & Safer Communities
Reword Outcomes	
O.22: Reducing crime and the fear of crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about using "fear" rather than "perception" Should be on fear of crime only Should be "Reducing crime and the perception of crime" (not fear) Suggest re-wording and expanding as "Reducing crime and the fear of crime, increasing confidence in partnership working, and improving quality of life in priority areas."
O.23: Reducing inequalities in crime levels across the county	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must relate to reducing crime in neighbourhoods across the county where crime or any specific category of crime is above the county average Need to aim for performance being equalised upwards, rather than averaged "Reducing inequalities in crime within Districts" Should be on reduction in actual crime levels only Should read "Reducing inequalities in crime and the perception of crime across the county" Suggest re-wording as "Working together to eradicate pockets of high crime and poor performance."
O.24: Reducing the levels of re-offending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Reducing the levels of re-offending and reduce the number of people entering the Criminal Justice System" Should also relate to the "Reduction/prevention of initial offending"
O.25: Reducing the effects of domestic abuse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should read "Reducing domestic abuse and its effects" Should read "Reducing the harm caused by domestic abuse" Suggest re-wording as "Reducing repeat victimisation and increasing victim support during the judicial process."
O.26: Reducing the harm caused by drug and alcohol misuse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Reducing the effects of substance misuse" Should be re-worded to "Reducing drug and alcohol abuse and the harm it causes." Suggest re-wording as "Reducing the harm caused to individuals and the wider community by drug and alcohol abuse."
O.27: Increased community cohesion, participation and shared sense of belonging	No comments were received about the wording of this outcome
O.28: Increasing volunteering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Expanding volunteering opportunities" "Increasing volunteering for all" Should be about "Greater volunteering opportunities"

How will the consultation findings influence and shape the proposed outcomes?

All the suggestions above need to be taken into account and considered, so that we can amend the proposed outcomes. This will enable the Kent Partnership to present an informed view of what Kent Partners would like to be included in Kent Agreement 2. This can then be matched and merged with the 200 National Improvement Indicators, to suggest up to 35 indicators for negotiation.

With so many partners contributing to this process it is understandable that there are conflicting opinions on what the outcomes should now look like – however this is first attempt to reflect as many of the comments above as possible.

Taking this into account, some strong suggestions for revision include:

- **Add outcome on "Sustainable flood risk management" – but place this in the Environmental Excellence theme**
- **Merge O.22 and 23 (crime reduction)**
- **Merge O.28 (volunteering) as an indicator within O.27 (community cohesion)**
- **Move O.16 (street scene) to this theme**
- **Move O.26 (drugs and alcohol) to the Improved, Health, Care & Wellbeing theme**

Suggested Headline Priorities

Improving the quality and appearance of the street scene and open spaces
Reducing crime and the perception of crime
Reducing the levels of reoffending
Reducing the harm caused by domestic abuse
Increasing community cohesion, participation and shared sense of belonging

Kent Agreement 2 Consultation Report: Enjoying Life

Analysis of the 73 responses from 49 organisations and partnerships across Kent (27/07/07 to 20/09/07)

Enjoying Life

What was the starting point for this theme?

Prior to the consultation period beginning, the Kent Partnership Support Group suggested 3 potential outcomes for the Enjoying Life theme. These featured in the consultation "square wheels" diagram.

A guide to the development process for these outcomes is available on: <http://www.kentpartnership.org.uk/kent-agreement-related-documents.asp>

These proposed outcomes reflected the partner aspirations in the Vision for Kent theme of the same name, and were also influenced by latest thinking in the Strategic Framework for Sport in Kent, Cultural Strategies, Kent 2012 Strategy and District Sustainable Community Strategies.

What did the consultation tell us?

The Kent Partnership received 73 responses to the consultation process, which came from 49 different organisations/partnerships from across the public, private, voluntary and community sector. The responses ranged from individual, unit/teams, to a cluster of LSPs. Many partners recognised the importance of this theme, and chose to comment on the proposed outcomes. However responses took many formats, and not all chose to use the proforma which enabled outcomes to be ranked by "high", "medium" or "low" priority. The collective weight of results from the proformas that were received can be seen below – but this is only one way of analysing the results and doesn't reflect the complexity and detail of some responses.

The proforma findings show that the **Enjoying Life** outcomes were ranked in the following order:

Outcome
Enhancing community & recreational facilities and opportunities for everyone to participate in arts, learning, and cultural activities
Promoting active lifestyles with regular exercise through sport & leisure opportunities for all ages
Promoting Kent as a premier tourism destination for visitors and residents alike

More detailed responses included suggestions to add new outcomes, merge existing outcomes, move outcomes from one theme to another and reword outcomes. Many partners also submitted their initial ideas for indicators – however this level of detail will be considered once the 200 National Improvement Indicator list is published in the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007.

All comments on governance have been passed onto the relevant working groups who are seeking to address these issues.

Below is a summary of all the comments that the Kent Partnership received regarding this theme:

<i>Enjoying Life</i>	
Proposal	Your suggestions and comments
Additional Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ " Promoting culture as a driving force for regeneration" ▪ 2 suggestions for "Maximise the benefit and legacy from the London 2012 Olympic & Paralympic Games" ▪ "Meeting the needs of young people" ▪ "Promote healthy/safe lifestyle choices to draw on and improve resilience in children & young people to help them make informed choices, and develop coping strategies" ▪ "Positive activities for young people"
Merged Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Merge O.29 and 30
Moved Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ O.16 (appearance of street scene) could sit more appropriately under 'Stronger and Safer Communities' or 'Enjoying Life' ▪ 2 suggestions to move O.28 (volunteering) in Stronger & Safer Communities to Enjoying Life ▪ O.30 (community & recreational facilities) could be in Stronger & Safer Communities ▪ 3 suggestions that O.31 (tourism) is a key economic sector for Kent and perhaps ought to be covered within the Economic Success theme

PTO.

Reword Outcomes	
O.29: Promoting active lifestyles with regular exercise through sport & leisure opportunities for all ages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amend to read "Promoting active lifestyles with regular exercise through sport & leisure opportunities for all ages in pleasant, accessible natural environments" ▪ Focus on "Increasing participation focused on those in need" eg obese, ill health, elderly
O.30: Enhancing community & recreational facilities and opportunities for everyone to participate in arts, learning, and cultural activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amend to read "Enhancing community & recreational facilities and spaces and, where appropriate, linking them to widen opportunities for everyone to participate in sports, arts, learning, and cultural activities" ▪ Add "sport" to "arts, learning & cultural activities" ▪ Could relate more to 'increasing participation' generally rather than 'opportunities for everyone'. ▪ "Increases in take-up (participation) of leisure/arts/sports generally cultural activities" ▪ Proposed change to "Improving access to the opportunities to enjoy the arts, culture, natural and historic environment in Kent" ▪ Proposed change to "Improving access to the opportunities to enjoy the arts, culture, natural and historic environment in Kent" ▪ Should read "Enhancing access to community & recreational facilities" ▪ This outcome should focus on enjoyment as a whole, which will cover both participation and access
O.31: Promoting Kent as a premier tourism destination for visitors and residents alike	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is not just about promoting it is about 'developing' ▪ Suggested rewording "Promoting Kent as a premier tourism destination for visitors and residents alike and supporting the tourism sector to deliver future economic prosperity"

How will the consultation findings influence and shape the proposed outcomes?

All the suggestions above need to be taken into account and considered, so that we can amend the proposed outcomes. This will enable the Kent Partnership to present an informed view of what Kent Partners would like to be included in Kent Agreement 2. This can then be matched and merged with the 200 National Improvement Indicators, to suggest up to 35 indicators for negotiation.

With so many partners contributing to this process it is understandable that there are conflicting opinions on what the outcomes should now look like – however this is first attempt to reflect as many of the comments above as possible.

Taking this into account, some strong suggestions for revision include:

- **Add outcome on "Maximising the benefit and legacy of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games"**
- **Suggestions for a new outcome for young people could be covered by indicators specifically for this group under existing outcomes**
- **Move O.31 (tourism) to Economic Success theme**

Suggested Headline Priorities

Maximising the benefit and legacy of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games

Promoting active lifestyles with regular exercise for all ages

Participation opportunities for everyone to enjoy arts, sport, learning and cultural activities

Kent Agreement 2 Consultation Report: Keeping Kent Moving

Analysis of the 73 responses from 49 organisations and partnerships across Kent (27/07/07 to 20/09/07)

Keeping Kent Moving

What was the starting point for this theme?

Prior to the consultation period beginning, the Kent Partnership Support Group suggested 3 potential outcomes for the Keeping Kent Moving theme. These featured in the consultation "square wheels" diagram.

A guide to the development process for these outcomes is available on: <http://www.kentpartnership.org.uk/kent-agreement-related-documents.asp>

These proposed outcomes reflected the partner aspirations in the Vision for Kent theme of the same name, and were also influenced by latest thinking in the Local Transport Plan, Kent & Medway Structure Plan and District Sustainable Community Strategies.

What did the consultation tell us?

The Kent Partnership received 73 responses to the consultation process, which came from 49 different organisations/partnerships from across the public, private, voluntary and community sector. The responses ranged from individual, unit/teams, to a cluster of LSPs. Many partners recognised the importance of this theme, and chose to comment on the proposed outcomes. However responses took many formats, and not all chose to use the proforma which enabled outcomes to be ranked by "high", "medium" or "low" priority. The collective weight of results from the proformas that were received can be seen below – but this is only one way of analysing the results and doesn't reflect the complexity and detail of some responses.

The proforma findings show that the **Keeping Kent Moving** outcomes were ranked in the following order:

Outcome
Saving lives and reducing injuries on the roads and pavements
Reducing the environmental impacts of transport by reducing the need to travel
Encouraging alternative, sustainable forms of transport

More detailed responses included suggestions to add new outcomes, merge existing outcomes, move outcomes from one theme to another and reword outcomes. Many partners also submitted their initial ideas for indicators – however this level of detail will be considered once the 200 National Improvement Indicator list is published in the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007.

All comments on governance have been passed onto the relevant working groups who are seeking to address these issues.

Below is a summary of all the comments that the Kent Partnership received regarding this theme:

<i>Keeping Kent Moving</i>	
Proposal	Your suggestions and comments
Additional Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "Harnessing the position of Kent as an International Gateway" ▪ "Enhancing Kent's position as a gateway to and from the UK" ▪ "Facing the challenges of Kent as a frontier county (e.g. freedom and safety of foreign vehicles and Operation Stack)" ▪ "Overnight parking of HGV's" ▪ "Improving Journey Times for All" ▪ "Maximise rail passenger flows throughout Kent and to and from London and the Continent" ▪ "Reducing congestion arising from Operation Stack" ▪ "Dealing with road congestion" ▪ "Improved strategic transport infrastructure and connections" ▪ "Improving Kent's transport infrastructure resilience to extreme weather events" ▪ "Minimise the risks, as well as costs, caused by the impact of extreme weather and flooding on public and road transport systems" ▪ "Secure better road and pavement maintenance" ▪ "Investment in housing and infrastructure, particularly transport" (sub national review outcome)
Merged Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2 suggestions to merge O.32 and 33
Moved Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2 suggestions for O.34 (saving lives on roads and pavements) to move to Stronger & Safer Communities

PTO.

Reword Outcomes	
O.32: Reducing the environmental impacts of transport by reducing the need to travel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Reducing the environmental impacts of transport” ▪ This is around the risk of isolation due to lack of access to services, rather than the risk of environmental impacts. ▪ Proposed change to “Reducing the need to travel” ▪ Proposed change to “Reducing the need to travel” ▪ The key basis of this outcome should be reducing the need to travel first.
O.33: Encouraging alternative, sustainable forms of transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to mention public transport specifically ▪ Proposed change to: “Improving accessibility to jobs and essential services by sustainable modes of travel” ▪ Proposed change to: “Improving accessibility to jobs and essential services by sustainable modes of travel”
O.34: Saving lives and reducing injuries on the roads and pavements	No comments were received on the wording of this outcome

How will the consultation findings influence and shape the proposed outcomes?

All the suggestions above need to be taken into account and considered, so that we can amend the proposed outcomes. This will enable the Kent Partnership to present an informed view of what Kent Partners would like to be included in Kent Agreement 2. This can then be matched and merged with the 200 National Improvement Indicators, to suggest up to 35 indicators for negotiation.

With so many partners contributing to this process it is understandable that there are conflicting opinions on what the outcomes should now look like – however this is first attempt to reflect as many of the comments above as possible.

Taking this into account, some strong suggestions for revision include:

- **New outcome on “Improving Kent’s strategic transport infrastructure”**
- **New outcome on “Enhancing Kent’s position as an international gateway”**

Suggested Headline Priorities

Improving Kent’s strategic transport infrastructure
Enhancing Kent’s position as an international gateway
Reducing the need to travel
Improving accessibility to jobs and essential services by sustainable modes of travel
Saving lives and reducing injuries on the roads and pavements

Kent Agreement 2 Consultation Report: High Quality Housing

Analysis of the 73 responses from 49 organisations and partnerships across Kent (27/07/07 to 20/09/07)

High Quality Homes

What was the starting point for this theme?

Prior to the consultation period beginning, the Kent Partnership Support Group suggested 4 potential outcomes for the High Quality Homes theme. These featured in the consultation "square wheels" diagram.

A guide to the development process for these outcomes is available on: <http://www.kentpartnership.org.uk/kent-agreement-related-documents.asp>

These proposed outcomes reflected the partner aspirations in the Vision for Kent theme of the same name, and were also influenced by latest thinking in the Kent & Medway Structure Plan, Kent Design Guide, Housing Green Paper, Local Development Frameworks and District Sustainable Community Strategies.

What did the consultation tell us?

The Kent Partnership received 73 responses to the consultation process, which came from 49 different organisations/partnerships from across the public, private, voluntary and community sector. The responses ranged from individual, unit/teams, to a cluster of LSPs. Many partners recognised the importance of this theme, and chose to comment on the proposed outcomes. However responses took many formats, and not all chose to use the proforma which enabled outcomes to be ranked by "high", "medium" or "low" priority. The collective weight of results from the proformas that were received can be seen below – but this is only one way of analysing the results and doesn't reflect the complexity and detail of some responses.

The proforma findings show that the **High Quality Homes** outcomes were ranked in the following order:

Outcome
Creating decent, sustainable communities
Improving housing stability and access to housing for vulnerable groups
Increasing sustainable housing completions
Increasing the supply of housing with a variety of types and tenures

More detailed responses included suggestions to add new outcomes, merge existing outcomes, move outcomes from one theme to another and reword outcomes. Many partners also submitted their initial ideas for indicators – however this level of detail will be considered once the 200 National Improvement Indicator list is published in the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007.

All comments on governance have been passed onto the relevant working groups who are seeking to address these issues.

Below is a summary of all the comments that the Kent Partnership received regarding this theme:

High Quality Homes	
Proposal	Your suggestions and comments
Additional Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "Provision of affordable housing" ▪ "Quality of design in new development" ▪ "Tackling the causes of homelessness" ▪ "Investment in housing and infrastructure, particularly transport" (sub national review outcome)
Merged Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Merge 35 & 37 (use O.35 wording) ▪ O.35 with O.37 & 38 ▪ O.38 into O.35 ▪ O.3 & 36 ▪ Merge O.36 with outcomes 35, 37 and 38.
Moved Outcomes	O.36 (sustainable communities) could be in Stronger & Safer Communities

PTO.

Reword Outcomes	
O.35: Increasing the supply of housing with a variety of types and tenures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add "in appropriate locations" ▪ "More homes to meet growing demands" ▪ Amend to read: "Increasing the supply of housing with a variety of types and tenures in places and in ways that do not increase (and if possible reduce) flood risk or damage the environment" ▪ Proposed change to "'Increasing the supply of affordable housing with a variety of types and tenures" ▪ Proposed change to "'Increasing the supply of affordable housing with a variety of types and tenures" ▪ Should relate to "Supply of affordable housing" and not to supply of housing generally
O.36: Creating decent, sustainable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amend to read: "Creating decent, sustainable communities that lead the way in their wise use of energy, water and other resources" ▪ "Well designed and greener homes, linked to good schools, transport and healthcare" ▪ Perhaps "Vibrant communities, incorporating high quality design". ▪ Proposed change to "Delivering high quality design" ▪ Proposed change to "Delivering high quality design" ▪ The outcome is too broad and unspecific as it stands. ▪ This Outcome is very broad, and perhaps to be more meaningful and achievable should focus strongly on high quality design ▪ " Increased community cohesion through the creation of decent, sustainable, integrated communities" ▪ Would be useful to distinguish between sustainable communities (empty homes) and sustainable homes (decent homes standard, energy efficiency)
O.37: Increasing sustainable housing completions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "Increasing sustainable and affordable housing" ▪ "More affordable homes to buy or rent" ▪ Proposed change to: "Delivering high standards of sustainable construction" ▪ Proposed change to: "Delivering high standards of sustainable construction"
O.38: Improving housing stability and access to housing for vulnerable groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "Housing stability" needs further explanation – doesn't apply to vulnerable people only ▪ Add the word Quality: "Improving housing quality and stability" ▪ Should be for all, not just selected groups ▪ The phrase 'housing stability' is ambiguous and should be deleted in favour of a reference to increasing the supply of supported housing for vulnerable groups

How will the consultation findings influence and shape the proposed outcomes?

All the suggestions above need to be taken into account and considered, so that we can amend the proposed outcomes. This will enable the Kent Partnership to present an informed view of what Kent Partners would like to be included in Kent Agreement 2. This can then be matched and merged with the 200 National Improvement Indicators, to suggest up to 35 indicators for negotiation.

With so many partners contributing to this process it is understandable that there are conflicting opinions on what the outcomes should now look like – however this is first attempt to reflect as many of the comments above as possible.

Taking this into account, some strong suggestions for revision include:

- **Merge O.35 (supply of housing) and 37 (housing completions)**

Suggested Headline Priorities

Increasing the supply of affordable housing of all types and tenures

Delivering sustainable homes incorporating high quality design

Improving access to high quality housing for all