

**MINUTES of the meeting of Council held at Council Chamber, The Shire Hall, St Peter's Square, Hereford, HR1 2HX on Friday 9 March 2018 at 10.00 am**

**Present:** Councillor DB Wilcox (Chairman)  
Councillor PJ Edwards (Vice Chairman)

**Councillors:** SP Anderson, PA Andrews, BA Baker, JM Bartlett, WLS Bowen, TL Bowes, H Bramer, CR Butler, ACR Chappell, E Chowns, MJK Cooper, PE Crockett, PGH Cutter, BA Durkin, CA Gandy, DW Greenow, KS Guthrie, DG Harlow, EPJ Harvey, JA Hyde, TM James, PC Jinman, AW Johnson, JF Johnson, JLV Kenyon, JG Lester, MD Lloyd-Hayes, PP Marsh, RI Matthews, RL Mayo, MT McEvelly, SM Michael, PD Newman OBE, FM Norman, CA North, RJ Phillips, AJW Powers, PD Price, P Rone, AR Round, A Seldon, NE Shaw, WC Skelton, J Stone, D Summers, EJ Swinglehurst, LC Tawn, A Warmington and SD Williams

**Officers:** Richard Ball, Annie Brookes, John Coleman, Matthew Evans, Alistair Neill, Martin Samuels, Adam Scott and Claire Ward

**50. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillors J Hardwick and EL Holton.

**51. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Agenda item no. 5: Election of Leader of the Council

Councillor JG Lester declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in agenda item no. 5 as a candidate for Leader of the Council.

Agenda item no. 8: Notices of Motion under Standing Orders

Councillor RJ Phillips declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item no. 8 as a member of Hereford and Worcester Fire Authority. (Councillor Phillips also declared on behalf of Councillors KS Guthrie, JLV Kenyon, RI Matthews and SD Williams).

Councillor DW Greenow declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item no. 8 as a member of Hereford and Worcester Fire Authority.

Councillor AJW Powers moved a proposal, in accordance with paragraph 4.1.32 of the constitution, to vary the order of the agenda. It was proposed that agenda item no. 10: notices of motion under standing orders was brought up the agenda to follow agenda item no. 6: questions from members of the public. The proposal was put to the vote and was lost.

**52. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2018 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.**

**53. CHAIRMAN, LEADER AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Council noted the Chairman and Chief Executive's announcements as printed in the agenda papers.

The Chairman corrected an announcement listed in his report; he had been unable to attend the Mayor of Bromyard's Community Service on 4 March as it had been cancelled due to the adverse weather.

The Chief Executive introduced his announcements and outlined the work undertaken by Balfour Beatty Living Places to respond to the adverse weather conditions recently experienced by the county. Thanks were expressed to those individuals across the county who had helped in efforts to clear roads and reach people cut off by the snow. Tribute was paid to the work of the 4x4 emergency response team in particular.

Councillor AJW Powers raised a query regarding the funding secured under the Building Better Opportunities Partnership and whether this had been secured for Herefordshire. The Chief Executive confirmed that the issue would be addressed following the meeting.

The Leader announced formally his resignation as Leader of the Council.

**54. ELECTION OF LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

Council considered the election of Leader of the Council.

Councillor JG Lester left the meeting room.

Councillor AW Johnson proposed Councillor Lester as the Leader of the council and Councillor BA Durkin seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations.

The motion was put to the vote and was carried.

Councillor Lester re-joined the meeting.

The Leader thanked the Council for his election as Leader and paid tribute to Councillor Johnson for his leadership of the Council. The success of the council recently and the challenges faced were outlined along with the approach that the new Leader would take.

**RESOLVED: That Councillor JG Lester is elected as Leader of the Council.**

**55. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC (Pages 11 - 16)**

A copy of the public questions and written answers, together with supplementary questions asked at the meeting and their answers, is attached to the Minutes at Appendix 1.

## 56. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL (Pages 17 - 22)

A copy of the Member questions and written answers, together with supplementary questions asked at the meeting and their answers, is attached to the Minutes at Appendix 2.

## 57. COUNCIL TAX SETTING

Council considered a report by the cabinet member finance, housing and corporate services to set the council tax and precepts for 2018/19.

The Leader introduced and moved the report which was seconded by Councillor NE Shaw. The cabinet member finance, housing and corporate services outlined the precepts that Herefordshire as the billing authority would combine in a single council tax charge and explained that the council tax reduction scheme was in place to assist those people who may struggle to meet their council tax liability.

Members made the points below in the debate which followed:

- Local residents should be made more readily aware of the full council tax liability. *The cabinet member finance, housing and corporate services explained that this detail was contained in the appendices to the report which provided a breakdown of the council tax charges by parish.*
- It was recognised that the council was being asked to do more with less money and the importance of the management of responsibilities was emphasised.
- The importance of raising awareness of help available to meet council tax obligations was raised. It was felt that the website should be clear and helpful to those in difficulty. *The cabinet member finance, housing and corporate services reminded members that it was also the responsibility of the local ward member to highlight to local residents what help was available.*
- The retention of business rates was raised. *The cabinet member finance, housing and corporate services explained that the Council had not been selected to participate in the proposal pilot from central government to share business rates.*
- It was noted that parish precepts had increased significantly as a result of lengthsman schemes being passed onto parish councils.
- It was recognised that the increase in the council's precept was necessary in order to sustain local services. The current collection rates were queried. *The cabinet member finance, housing and corporate services explained that the collection rates were reported to cabinet every 6 months as part of the performance report. The section 151 officer explained that the current rates were available on the website and all councillors would be made aware.*

A named vote was held to agree the recommendations set out in the report.

The recommendations were approved 48 votes in favour, 1 vote against and 2 abstentions.

For (48): Councillors SP Anderson, PA Andrews, BA Baker, JM Bartlett, WLS Bowen, TL Bowes, H Bramer, CR Butler, ACR Chappell, MJK Cooper, PE Crockett, P Cutter, BA Durkin, PJ Edwards, CA Gandy, DW Greenow, KS Guthrie, DG Harlow, EPJ Harvey, JA Hyde, TM James, PC Jinman, AW Johnson, JF Johnson, JLV Kenyon, JG Lester, MD Lloyd-Hayes, PP Marsh, RL Mayo, MT McEvilly, SM Michael, PD Newman, FM Norman,

CA North, RJ Phillips, AJW Powers, PD Price, P Rone, AR Round, A Seldon, NE Shaw, WC Skelton, J Stone, EJ Swinglehurst, LC Tawn, A Warmington, DB Wilcox, SD Williams.

Against (1) RI Matthews

Abstentions (2) EE Chowns, D Summers

**Resolved – that:**

**(a) the precepting authority details incorporated in appendices 1 to 5, relating to parishes, West Mercia Police and Hereford and Worcester Fire Authority is approved in accordance with sections 30(2), 34(3), 36(1) and section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended) and that the following amounts are approved for the year 2018/19 in accordance with sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, Regulation 6 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011):**

- |                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>(i) £329,365,327</b>   | <b>being the estimated aggregate expenditure of the council in accordance with section 31A (2) of the act, including all precepts issued to it by parish councils;</b>   |
| <b>(ii) £226,656,000</b>  | <b>being the estimated aggregate income of the council for the items set out in section 31A (3) of the act (including revenue support grant);</b>  |
| <b>(iii) £102,709,327</b> | <b>being the amount by which the aggregate at (a)(i) above exceeds the aggregate at (a)(ii) calculated by the council in accordance with section 31A(4) of the act, as its council tax requirement for the year (including parish precepts);</b>   |
| <b>(iv) £1,506.50</b>     | <b>being the amount at (a)(iii) above divided by the amount of the council tax base calculated by the council, in accordance with section 31B of the act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year (including parish precepts)</b>  |
| <b>(v) £4,264,327</b>     | <b>being the aggregate amount of all special items (parish precepts) referred to in section 34(1) of the act;</b>  |
| <b>(vi) £1,443.95</b>     | <b>being the amount at (iv) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (v) above by the amount of the council tax base calculated by the council, in accordance with section 34(2) of the act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no parish precept relates (Herefordshire Council band D council tax, excluding parishes)</b> |

**(b) it is agreed that the net tax base of 68,177.57 band D equivalent properties (being the gross tax base adjusted for an assumed collection rate) used for setting the budget requirement for 2018/19;**

- (i) is allocated to band D equivalent dwellings per precept area as shown in appendix 1; and
- (ii) the individual council tax allocations per valuation band of dwelling by parish (including fire and police precepts) as set out in appendix 5.

## 58. LEADER'S REPORT TO COUNCIL

Councillor AW Johnson as the outgoing Leader presented his report on the activities of the cabinet since the meeting of full council on 13 October 2017. Councillor Johnson explained to members that this was the last report he would present and that the Council was in a strong position and all members had accomplished remarkable success.

Questions were invited to the Leader which included those issues raised below:

- The call-in of the charity shop waste decision was a good example of work with the voluntary sector. It was a good example of assisting charities to receive more donations and reduce the amount of waste the county was required to handle. *Councillor Johnson acknowledged that the report should have included mention of the third sector.*
- It was requested that in future the Leader's report more clearly identify those decisions which were taken under the general exception procedure. *The Leader confirmed that this would occur.*
- The timing of the conclusion of the fairing funding consultation and the limited time that group leaders had available to comment was raised. It was felt that this was distinct from the LGA consultation and that detail had been shared with group leaders too late to provide a meaningful all-member representation. *Councillor Johnson explained there were two requests; the fairer funding consultation had been received in December 2017 but the LGA request had only been received at the end of February which had necessitated its late circulation to group leaders very close to the deadline for responses.*
- It was queried when data would be available for an assessment of the effectiveness of the city link road in reducing congestion in Hereford. The use of traffic lights along the road was questioned and it was requested that roundabouts should be considered before any more traffic lights were introduced. It was contended that data did exist which the council could consider. *Councillor Johnson explained that the city link road was part of a package of measures. Once complete the benefit of the city link road would be clearly seen. The cabinet member for infrastructure explained that data from the city link road could not be assessed until data modelling from the Hereford Transport package and the bypass had been completed.*
- The potential loss of restaurants from the Old Market development was raised and whether there was a waiting list of restaurants waiting for space. *The cabinet member economy and communications confirmed that there was a waiting list with restaurants waiting for space in the site.*
- The energy from waste plant was raised and it was queried how much plastic recyclate was currently being sent to the incinerator. *It was confirmed that currently no sorted plastics were being incinerated as there was a good market for the product. The cabinet member contracts and assets confirmed that a written response would be provided.*
- The proposed changes from central government to the national planning policy framework were raised and the impact on neighbourhood plans. *The cabinet member infrastructure explained that the council, which had adopted its core*

*strategy, and local parish councils who had produced a neighbourhood plan were in a good position.*

- It was acknowledged that good work had been completed with Worcester County Council to achieve savings but concern was expressed that the council had taken on significant levels of debt and sold a lot of assets which would result in high interest rates on loans in the future.

**RESOLVED: That the report is noted.**

## **59. NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

Councillor EPJ Harvey stated that she wished to withdraw her motion concerning the code of conduct.

Councillor BA Baker requested that his motion concerning verge parking be deferred to a later meeting date.

Council considered a motion concerning the introduction of video casting of council meetings.

In moving the motion Councillor AJW Powers made the following points:

- The introduction of video-casting would be in accordance with the openness principle contained within the councils PEOPLE ethos;
- The introduction of audio-casting was welcomed but in order to be fully visible and accountable to the public video-casting was required;
- The general public were not well treated when they attended public meetings and were sat in a confined space at a distance from the meeting taking place;
- Up to 111 local authorities across the UK were using video-casting and all Hereford's neighbouring authorities, except Shropshire, used the facility;
- Video was a method many people now used to access information; and
- The cost could be assumed to be £40k-£50k per year and an additional capital start-up cost which would represent value for money.

In seconding the motion Councillor FM Norman made the following points:

- The proposal would maximise openness at the council and ensure that all would have access to information;
- Members would become accustomed to the new facility very quickly;
- Video-casting would increase the democratic accountability of the Council.

The following principal points were raised by members in the debate:

- Meetings were open to the public;
- It was the contention of some members that the cost would not represent good value for money particularly if it could be spent on social workers instead. Other members felt that cost would be minimal and the investment worthwhile;
- There had been a trial of video-casting at a planning committee meeting which had been a success;
- It was not felt that the Shire Hall was an ideal venue for a webcasting facility;
- The motion asked for the executive to consider the facility which was a reasonable request;

- It was requested that the wording in paragraph (a) of the motion was changed to “to consider again the merits...” in place of the term “re-consider”. The change was acceptable to the proposer of the motion.

The motion was put to the vote and was carried.

**Resolved – that:**

**Recognising that, following It’s Our County’s proposal and after a nine month trial period, this council has recently decided to audio-cast public meetings and to adopt these recordings as audio minutes; and knowing that almost all our neighbouring authorities (Gloucestershire, Monmouthshire Powys and Worcestershire), and many others already routinely video-cat their meeting – an option originally rejected by this council on cost grounds.**

**That, to align this council with best practice elsewhere, the executive is asked:**

- a) **to consider again the merits of ‘up-grading’ from audio to live on-line video streaming so that the public meetings of Herefordshire Council and its elected members would be publically open and visible to those unable to attend, and that the recordings should be archived and made available on-line.**
- b) **To consider a trial period for live video streaming with the opportunity during the trial for feedback from elected members and the public.**

Council considered a motion to provide a protected corridor for an eastern river crossing from the Rotherwas Industrial Estate to the A438 at Tupsley.

In moving the motion Councillor JLV Kenyon made the following points:

- A change to the published motion was outlined to remove the first paragraph.
- Plans of the proposed route had been circulated.
- Some important developments in the area of the proposed road had occurred enhancing its feasibility. The Rotherwas access road from Grafton had opened and a private road to the bio-digester near Hampton Bishop.
- The proposed route crossed a site which was subject to planning permission which had expired. Any future planning permission for the site should include conditions to protect the route.
- The motion had no impact on the western bypass and the proposed route would remove traffic from the A49 travelling through Hereford city.
- A letter signed by local businesses in support of the route had been circulated which was five years old.

The following principal points were raised by members in the debate:

- Local residents in Lugwardine and Bartestree would only support the route with a weight restriction to prevent access by lorries. Only cars along the route would be supported by local residents.
- The proposal took a longer term strategic view of a potential solution to removing traffic from the centre of Hereford and ensured that the option of a road to the east was protected.
- The proposed route would support businesses at Rotherwas and the continued expansion of the site.

- It was recognised that the western bypass offered the opportunity for housing development but people would need to access services on the eastern side of the Hereford. The proposed route in the motion would facilitate this access and relieve congestion in the city.
- The local MP had expressed support for the route.
- The Core Strategy contained other long term strategic priorities which may never come to fruition.
- It was doubted that funding for the route would come from central government or Highways England.
- The proposed route was not a bypass but was intended to remove traffic from the city and relieve congestion.
- The proposed route was not sufficiently advanced or developed to reach a decision. The route would be required to extend northwards and would be considered a bypass to the east.
- If agreed the motion would pose a threat to the western bypass which was the only feasible route to relieve congestion from the city and facilitate growth. The opportunity for a bypass was a 'once-in-a-generation' possibility.
- The route in the motion represented another road proposed to reduce congestion. Alternative solutions to congestion should be investigated before road-building was considered.
- The proposed route would threaten the Lugg Meadows which had been an objection of central government previously.
- The motion proposed investigation of a protective corridor only and could provide an alternative if the route to the West did not materialise.

In seconding the motion Councillor SM Michael made the following points:

- The motion had become a west versus east debate which was not its intention.
- The motion proposed the route for investigation in the future; the motion ensured that it was future-proofed for consideration when appropriate.
- The local MP had expressed support for the route.

In responding to the debate Councillor Kenyon made the following points:

- The motion had nothing to do with the western bypass proposal;
- The motion called on the executive to investigate the proposed route.

Councillor Seldon proposed a named vote which was supported by at least eight members of the Council.

A named vote was held on the motion.

The motion was lost 16 votes in favour, 32 vote against and 2 abstentions.

For (16): Councillors TL Bowes, PE Crockett, PJ Edwards, EPJ Harvey, PC Jinman, J Kenyon, MD Lloyd-Hayes, PP Marsh, RI Matthews, SM Michael, AJW Powers, AR Round, A Seldon, D Summers, LC Tawn, A Warmington.

Against (32) Councillors SP Anderson, PA Andrews, BA Baker, JM Bartlett, H Bramer, CR Butler, MJK Cooper, EE Chowns, P Cutter, BA Durkin, CA Gandy, DW Greenow, KS Guthrie, DG Harlow, JA Hyde, TM James, AW Johnson, JF Johnson, JG Lester, RL Mayo, PD Newman, FM Norman, CA North, RJ Phillips, PD Price, P Rone, NE Shaw, WC Skelton, J Stone, EJ Swinglehurst, DB Wilcox, SD Williams.

Abstentions (2) Councillors WLS Bowen, ACR Chappell.

**60. FULL COUNCIL MEETING DATES 2018/19**

Council considered and agreed the following dates for meetings of the full Council in the 2018/19 municipal year:

- 13 July 2018
- 12 October 2018
- 1 February 2019
- 8 March 2019
- 24 May 2019

The meeting ended at 1.05 pm

**CHAIRMAN**



## Agenda item no. 6 - Questions from members of the public

Question Number	Questioner	Question	Question to
PQ 1	Mrs Clare Palgrave, How Caple	The Hereford Transport Package consultation asks respondents if they agree that a bypass should form part of a package. What percentage answering No to this question will result in the bypass proposals being dropped?	Cabinet member Infrastructure
<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>It would be wrong to set a percentage in relation to a single question as you propose – this is a consultation not a referendum. To do so would be to disregard the comprehensive evidence base which informed the Core Strategy adopted by Council in 2015 and which confirms that the bypass scheme is needed to deliver the county's growth.</p> <p>The Hereford Transport Package sets out how we will deliver the Core Strategy with a bypass and package of complementary measures that will deliver our growth, journey, safety, health, and environment objectives. This is what we are currently consulting on and we want to know people's views.</p> <p>The responses to the consultation will contribute to the evidence base used to inform our decision-making and, as with previous consultations and evidence, the results will be made available on the website in due course.</p>			
PQ 2	Dr Nichola Geeson, Hereford	Will Herefordshire Council recognise that information provided to the public for them to state their "preferred" bypass route is misleading, inaccurate and incomplete, and therefore responses to the current consultation may be void?	Cabinet member Infrastructure
<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>Absolutely not. There is comprehensive information in the public domain about the shortlist of bypass routes which will enable people to consider proposals and provide feedback. The information has been developed by our consultants from current data sources and presented in a format that enables the impact of each possible route to be seen. The level of detail is appropriate to the development of the shortlist of possible bypass routes and further detailed technical work alongside feedback to this consultation will inform the selection of a preferred route, which will be the subject of further consultation later in the year.</p>			
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>On the constraints map labelling of features such as Hereford Community Farm, and archaeological sites such as Warham Medieval Settlement has been missed off completely. Identification of the Woodland Trust's Drovers Wood, Pippin museum Orchard, and Green Bank Queen Elizabeth II Field in Trust, that is designated Local Green Space in Breinton's Neighbourhood Plan, is almost invisible. There are more similar issues, but people need all of this information. Otherwise, when they choose a route, they will believe there is little of significance in the way. Do you still believe the constraints map is fit for purpose?</p>			
<p><b>Cabinet member response to supplementary question</b></p> <p>Yes, the constraints map is fit for purpose. If local residents knew of constraints they should make the council aware through the consultation, such enquiries have already been followed up. Meetings had taken place with members of staff from the community farm and there was an understanding of their issues. In respect of Drovers Wood there was also an understanding of the issues. The consultation responses and social media posts showed people are aware of the constraints. The responses to the consultation would be considered in due course and the constraints map was fit for purpose.</p>			

PQ 3	Mr Richard Stow, Rowlestone	Principle A of Herefordshire's Code of Corporate Governance requires "demonstrating strong commitment to ethical values", and Principle B requires "ensuring openness". The Government's definition of openness states: "Information should not be withheld from the public unless there are clear and lawful reasons for so doing". In its decision making in 2017/18, has the Audit and Governance Committee demonstrated a "strong commitment" to openness?	Chairman of Audit and Governance Committee
<b>Response</b> Yes, the Audit and Governance Committee has demonstrated a commitment to openness. During the 2017/18 municipal year all matters before the committee have been discussed in open session with papers being made publically available in accordance with the access to information rules.			
PQ 4	Mr Stephen Wegg-Prosser, Breinton	The HTP2 brochure (p.8) states that in 2032 "a bypass will improve A49 north-south journey times ... [with] AM peak hour reduction by 8 minutes Northbound and 5 Minutes southbound". Please confirm that these journey time savings are for the minority number of drivers electing to use the A49 bypass route, estimated from modelling to be about 15% of the whole. What are the time savings for the other drivers?	Cabinet member infrastructure
<b>Response</b> The quoted journey times relate to traffic travelling over the full length of the existing A49 between its new junction with the Southern Link Road in the south and the new junction with the bypass in the north. Journey times on this existing A49 through the centre of the city will improve in the future with a bypass in place, relative to the current day. It isn't possible to list the extent of savings for other drivers in advance of the detailed traffic modelling currently underway.			
PQ 5	Mrs Elizabeth Morawiecka, Breinton	Friday is the only weekday where traffic flows show a significant and consistent level of variance from the weekday average. WSP/Parsons Brinkerhoff claim that Friday may not be representative of a 'normal' weekday in Hereford. Hence it was decided that traffic would be modelled on an average of the Monday to Thursday peak hour flows. Why is Herefordshire Council planning a transport package around just a 4 day working week?	Cabinet member infrastructure
<b>Response</b> The council isn't planning a transport package around just a 4 day working week but is following the traffic modelling requirement set out by the Department for Transport. This requires us to identify periods where traffic volumes and trip purposes are relatively consistent as the basis for estimating a representative hour for a traffic model. For this reason we do not survey during periods of known lower travel rates such as school holidays or periods of higher traffic volumes. Following this guidance mitigates the risk of distortion to the averaging process which could lead to unreliable model results. The 'average traffic conditions' resulting from this DfT-compliant approach are an appropriate basis for transport and environmental appraisal.			
<b>Supplementary Question</b> What will the peak journey times in and out of Hereford be on a Friday with or without a bypass compared to current times?			
<b>Cabinet member response to supplementary question</b> A written response would be provided to the questioner.  Written response provided on 19 April 2018:			

As those who live in and visit Hereford will be well aware, traffic flows in the city can be significantly higher on Fridays compared to the rest of the week. Indeed, the Report of Highways Surveys published on the Council's website identifies that traffic flows on a Friday are, on average across all monitoring sites, 3.7% higher than the average for weekdays. Tackling the levels of congestion and the adverse effects of traffic within the city are key objectives of the Hereford Transport Package and the benefits of the package would be seen every day of the week.

A robust traffic model based on sound data is necessary to assess and develop the Hereford Transport Package. In accordance with guidance published by the Department for Transport, the traffic model has been constructed to represent average weekday traffic conditions in the AM Peak, PM Peak and inter-peak periods. It is not possible to forecast traffic flows for specific days of the week.

It is important in building traffic models that they represent 'average' traffic conditions across the network and avoid specific days or events which can distort traffic movements. Models therefore typically avoid using data from weekends and school holidays for example, as outlined in the response given to the original question.

Following this guidance, the building of the model for Hereford has considered variations in traffic flows. As Friday flows exhibit a greater variation from the weekday average compared to other days, the model build has only included Monday to Thursday data in order to calculate average weekday traffic flows.

PQ 6	Ms Kate Sharp, Hereford	Cllr Price claimed Hereford cannot grow without a "bypass" yet the HTP plan shows 3 "sustainable urban extensions" but without information regarding how the 1,000s of houses in these areas will link to the education, employment, health service, leisure sites across the City. Why is the Council not proactively determining ways in which these areas could provide low-cost, sustainable homes that link to services without the need for a car?	Cabinet member infrastructure
------	-------------------------	--	-------------------------------

**Response**

The council has been proactive in ensuring that the urban extensions will be sustainable. The policies for the Hereford urban extensions are set out in the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy, which was adopted following independent examination in October 2015. The Local Plan is clear that the delivery of the proposed housing levels and distribution is dependent upon necessary infrastructure, the Hereford bypass is necessary infrastructure. The policies for the urban extensions provide a range of requirements to be provided as part of the development, including:

- affordable housing;
- educational provision;
- new employment land and jobs;
- open space and green infrastructure provision;
- health provision; and
- other community facilities.

The urban extensions are also expected to bring forward and enhanced pedestrian facilities and improved cycle links and better public transport.

PQ 7	Mrs Jackie Morris, Hereford	The local development scheme dated January 2015 gives a target date of Autumn 2016 for public examination of the Hereford Area Plan and winter 2016 for adoption of the HAP. What are the revised dates?	Cabinet member infrastructure
------	-----------------------------	--	-------------------------------

**Response**

The Hereford Area Plan is now expected to be submitted to the Secretary of State early in 2019 with adoption taking place, subject to consultations required on any modifications, following an Examination in Public. We are intending to update the Local Development Scheme by the end of April and this will set out revised timescales for the preparation of the remaining Development Plan Documents.

**Supplementary Question**

The Hereford Transport Package (HTP) gives no indication as to how urban extension areas will link with services in the city centre and other areas. Both the HTP and the HAP were to come forward together as

complementary and holistic plans. Why is the 'Hereford Bypass' being progressed ahead of the Hereford Area Plan?

**Cabinet member response to supplementary question**

The HAP is the effective neighbourhood plan for the city of Hereford and had a slow start because Hereford City Council did not want to proceed with it. Work on the bypass has been ongoing for 10 years and has been proactively pursued since the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2015.

PQ 8	Ms Ann Rowan, Brienton	The traffic modelling for Hereford shows that the greatest number of vehicle movements are for North East Hereford (Tupsley), generating many more car journeys than any employment area in Hereford. This area accommodates schools/colleges with well over 6,000 students. How do the HTP proposals promote safe, sustainable transport for young residents to access this area and reduce congestion in Hereford?	Cabinet member infrastructure
------	------------------------	--	-------------------------------

**Response**

Traffic modelling of the Hereford Transport Package is ongoing. When complete it will set out traffic movements in Hereford with a bypass in place. This information will be set out in the outline business case for the project later in 2018. The Hereford Transport Package is a combination of a bypass scheme and a package of complementary walking, cycling, bus and public realm improvements across the whole city. Improvements being considered include 20mph zones, improved walking and cycle paths, improvements to bus stops, junction improvements for pedestrians and cyclists and improvements to public realm in the city. These proposals form part of the current consultation and we would like people to feedback to enable us to develop the package measures further.

PQ 9	Mr Ben Poulter, Hereford	Many residents and business affected by the proposed 'bypass' were not contacted about these proposals. Herefordshire Council lost one statutory consultation, first round of consultation on the HAP/HTP and omitted it from the report to Cabinet in January 2018 i.e. the Environment Agency response. Why can't Herefordshire Council handle simple paper based communications, if Herefordshire council cannot manage simple tasks how it will manage a complex, highly-engineered road crossing?	Cabinet member infrastructure
------	--------------------------	--	-------------------------------

**Response**

As outlined in my response to a question from Mrs Poulter at Cabinet in February, although notification of the intention to discuss route options within the approved core strategy corridor at the January meeting of Cabinet had been in the public domain for some months there was an administrative error in our contractor's mailing process, for which they apologised. We have taken steps with our contractor BBLP to ensure lessons are learned from this error for future updates and communications.

We have not lost a statutory consultation response. The HAP/HTP combined consultation resulted in two consultation reports, one for the HAP and one for the HTP. The Environment Agency response to the consultation in 2017 primarily related to the HAP and was included in the Herefordshire Area Plan Issues & Options Paper Consultation Statement dated October 2017 and published on the council's website. Within this response the Environment Agency requested early involvement in the development of the bypass project and this ongoing engagement was reflected in paragraph 48 of the report to Cabinet in January.

PQ 10	Ms Jayne Angulatta, Hereford	The Local Development Scheme for delivery of the Core Strategy/Local Plan, dated January 2015 states that it will be updated and published annually. Can I ask whether later versions have been published and if so where can these be found?	Cabinet member infrastructure
-------	------------------------------	---	-------------------------------

**Response**

<p>The council has not revised its Local Development Scheme in the period since January 2015. However, we expect to publish a new Local Development Scheme by the end of April setting out revised timescales for the preparation of the remaining Development Plan Documents now that the Gypsy and Travellers DPD is progressing to examination in public.</p>			
PQ 11	Mr Peter Hands, Lower Breinton	<p>Why are the Conservative led Herefordshire Council going against the Conservative Prime Minister's vision and wishes of wanting to preserve ancient orchards and historical woodland's where new developments and roads are to be built?</p> <p>Herefordshire Council have proposed the western link routes pass through ancient apple orchards and the historical Drovers wood as laid out in the Breinton Plan.</p>	Cabinet member infrastructure
<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>The council holds to the aim of protecting the environment where new developments and roads are to be built. That does not mean that essential development can always be achieved with no impact on the natural environment.</p> <p>This shortlist of routes currently subject to consultation was developed from a long list of 24 possible routes within the adopted core strategy corridor. Of the 24 routes originally considered those that impacted on protected ancient woodland were sifted out as national planning policy protects such woodland area when other route alignments are available.</p> <p>Of the remaining seven possible routes some but not all routes impact on Drovers Wood and apple orchards in the Breinton area and we are asking people to tell us which route they would prefer based on the impact each has on these and other features and constraints along each bypass alignment.</p>			
PQ 12	Mr Clive Blunn, Hereford	<p>In the traffic modelling for the Hereford Transport Package no data could be collected in 2016 for Aylestone Hill or Hampton Park Road. Both of these roads provide important access to Hereford. In the case of Aylestone Hill it carried more traffic than the A49 Ross Road in 2015. How can a transport model for Hereford ignore traffic on either of these roads and when will the modelling be reviewed?</p>	Cabinet member infrastructure
<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>These roads haven't been ignored. Automatic traffic counts weren't carried out but alternative surveys were and these are listed in Table 2-1 of the Report of Highway Surveys available on the Council's website and are informing the traffic modelling.</p>			
PQ 13	Mr Robert Chappell, Hereford	<p>Will the Council please reopen its "Adopted Core Strategy" to consider removing the Three Elms Urban Expansion Zone from the Strategy until such time as the Council obtains its own independent expert advice as to whether the land in question is or is not suitable for development, given the ongoing issue of the underground water aquifers, rather than relying on advice being obtained by the Church Commissioners?</p>	Cabinet member infrastructure
<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>We have no plans reopen the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy. This forms the statutory development plan the county, and underwent independent examination in public prior to its adoption in 2015. Elements of the plan cannot be "reopened" or "removed" in isolation. Any planning application for the development of the Three Elms site will be proceed to determination in accordance with the appropriate regulatory processes.</p>			
PQ 14	Mrs Carole Protherough,	<p>The HTP modelling data shows "the combined two -way June and July 1 hour Monday to Friday flows at each HC ATC site show very little variation in flow between 2006 and 2016. This would indicate there has been little or no traffic growth within Hereford over this period", So what are Herefordshire Council</p>	Cabinet member infrastructure

		doing to tackle the real causes of increased congestion and delays?"	
<b>Response</b> The council has and will continue to deliver a range of measures to tackle congestion and delay and has already delivered a range of improvement schemes including the new City Link Road, the new Connect 2 bridge and other extensions to the cycle network in the city. In addition, we continue to deliver a range of behavioural change projects to encourage people to make more use of active travel modes. It is however the bypass as part of the Hereford Transport Package which will provide additional capacity and provide congestion relief on existing routes in the city.			

## Agenda item no. 7 - Questions from members of the council

Question Number	Questioner	Question	Question to
MQ 1	Councillor Marsh, Leominster South	I recently came out of Hereford station to a featureless expanse of tarmac with neither guidance to the town centre nor any sign of tree planting - or even places where they could be put. What is being done to make this important entry point to Hereford welcoming?	Cabinet member infrastructure
<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>The council is currently developing plans for a transport hub in this location which will see the regeneration of this area. This delivery of this hub will include the provision of good quality hard landscaping and planting. We will be consulting on this later this year to ensure users of the station and bus users and others have an input into the design.</p> <p>We are also working with the Hereford BID team to implement wayfinding signing throughout the city and this will include signing to city destinations from the train station. We are working towards the installation of this signing scheme by Summer this year.</p>			
MQ 2	Councillor Matthews, Credenhill	It is my understanding that when the contract was agreed with British Land in respect of the Old Market site, they were given an option on any further development on the adjoining land.  Can you tell Members if there are any indications from British Land that they will soon be taking up that option and if so, what will the financial benefits be to the ratepayers of Herefordshire?	Cabinet member for contracts and assets
<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>British Land have indicated they are considering the feasibility of exercising their option. Financial and other benefits will be a matter for consideration once any proposals have been submitted for consideration.</p>			
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>My understanding is the contract clearly states after main development they have to pay for future development for basically nothing. Can he confirm that option is within the contract?</p>			
<p><b>Cabinet member response to supplementary question</b></p> <p>A written response will be provided to the member.</p> <p>Response sent on the 3 April:</p> <p><i>The option defines the sale price as being the <u>market value</u>. If the value cannot be agreed then there is provision for this to be determined by an independent surveyor.</i></p> <p><i>Obviously it is important to add that any Phase 2 retail scheme would carry with it additional financial benefits including Business Rates income from developed units and the broader economic impact of attracting additional footfall to Hereford as a shopping destination.</i></p>			
MQ 3	Councillor Harvey, Ledbury North	Cabinet agreed on 15 February to continue paying £25,000 p.a. for Herefordshire Council to be an observer at West Midlands Combined Authority board meetings. Please would the	Leader

		Leader state the number of occasions during 2017 when he attended a WMCA board meeting?	
<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>I must correct Councillor Harvey. On 15 February Cabinet accepted the scrutiny committee's recommendation to continue to seek non-constituent membership of the West Midlands Combined Authority but did not agree to pay the £25k fee set for non-constituent members; instead it agreed to undertake negotiations to secure either a reduced observer status fee and/or clarification that benefits accruing to observers are analogous to those accruing to non-constituent members. No meetings were attended in the current financial year.</p>			
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>With no prospect of Herefordshire being able to do anything more than observe the decisions of others on the West Midlands Combined Authority for at least the next 4 years (at a membership cost to the county of potentially up to £100,000):</p> <p>How is the new leader intending to demonstrate value for money Herefordshire from whatever annual 'observation fee' ends up being agreed, and</p> <p>Is it the new leader's intention to actually attend future WMCA board meetings on Herefordshire's behalf or at least to begin to offer the board the courtesy of an apology on the occasions when he is absent?</p>			
<p><b>Cabinet member response to supplementary question</b></p> <p>The WMCA is a work in progress, the rules, shape and extent of the authority were developing. Meetings had been attended in previous years but they had been of little value. Minutes and briefing notes from all meetings were received and good relations had been developed with other Leaders through the authority. Herefordshire Council was currently on a waiting list to become a full member of the authority.</p>			
MQ 4	Councillor Chowns, Bishops Frome and Cradley	Why does the council have two different map-based systems for road defects, one for those 'in progress' and another for the much larger number of potholes reported but not yet actioned; and when will residents get an improved, service-oriented, single-map system that enables us to monitor council performance on addressing all road defects, and includes information on expected timeframes for inspection and repair of all potholes?	Cabinet member transport and regulatory services
<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>The 'report a defect' map allows new defects to be reported but also shows currently in progress defects; we are already exploring mechanisms to enable feedback on progress of reported defects.</p> <p>The corporate performance report received by Cabinet and published on the website quarterly includes information on overall performance regarding addressing road defects to enable monitoring of performance.</p>			
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>With reference to our existing standards and timeframes for inspection and repair of road defects what percentage of cases have been met in the past year and how does this compare to the previous year and neighbouring authorities?</p>			
<p><b>Cabinet member response to supplementary question</b></p> <p>A written response will be provided to the member.</p> <p>Response sent on 14 April:</p>			

## Overview

17/18 saw a significant increase in the number of Category 1 defects on the network. Despite this increase all category 1 defects were repaired within the timescales set out within the Highways Maintenance Plan (HMP). For Category 2 defects 17/18 saw a slight increase. It is inappropriate to do any major statistical analysis on this data due the changes in the HMP and repair timescales.

## Defect Volumes

Category 1 Defects	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Totals
17/18	197	115	111	138	134	121	119	121	117	269	412	317	2171
Performance	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
16/17	81	41	26	50	34	31	29	22	63	130	176	235	918
Performance	100%	100%	100%	98%	94%	97%	100%	100%	100%	88%	100%	100%	

Category 1 defects are emergency works needed to be carried out within a set period. Defects are required to be completed before the end of the next working day or within 7 days depending on the risk attributed to the defect. These defects are classed as higher risk due to the danger posed to the public.

Prior to December 2016 the Highways Maintenance Plan stipulated a response time of 24 hours for all Category 1 defects. The 2016/17 data is therefore not directly comparable with the 2017/18 data.

Category 2 Defects	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Totals
17/18	895	1586	2236	1440	1536	2926	1520	1221	1517	652	3284	3637	22450
Performance	100%	83%	93%	95%	94%	98%	97%	96%	98%	91%	94%	80%	
16/17	2653	3726	1920	1636	1606	1752	1580	1233	947	1237	888	824	20002
Performance	96%	96%	99%	96%	97%	98%	98%	98%	87%	85%	93%	91%	

Category 2 defects are works needed to be carried out within a set period. Category 2a has a timescale for defects to be addressed within 28 days and Category 2b has a timescale of 2 months. The categorisation of the defect will be based on the risk that it poses.

Prior to December 2016 the Highways Maintenance Plan stipulated a response time of 28 days for all Category 2 defects. The 2016/17 data is therefore not directly comparable with the 2017/18 data.

## Comparison with other highway authorities

The Council participates in the National Highways and Transport Survey, Customer Quality and Cost Efficiency Network which provides benchmarking information across 88 highway authorities across a range of strategic performance, customer satisfaction and cost measures. In relation to the % of Defects completed on time, Herefordshire is one of the highest performing authorities. Over the most recent monitoring period assessed (2017) Herefordshire's outturn for this indicator is 95% of defects completed in time. The average across all 88 highway authorities is 77.14% with many authorities performing much worse than this.

MQ 5	Councillor Bowen, Bircher	Can the Council and the citizens of Herefordshire be assured that all the monies returned to Herefordshire Council by Amey will be spent on the minor roads in Herefordshire: these roads are the lifelines of our large and rural county and have	Cabinet member Transport and Roads
------	---------------------------	--	------------------------------------

		suffered severe damage this winter and require urgent attention?	
<b>Response</b>			
The council has already allocated £5.1million from the Amey monies received to date to undertake additional highway maintenance works in the coming financial year. Further funds may become available, as matters are concluded with Amey and allocation of any further funding will be subject to the normal council decision-making processes. Investment is guided by the Highway Maintenance Plan.			
<b>Supplementary Question</b>			
The majority of the allocation would go where it was most needed but it needed to be remembered that local roads, between villages, in remote parts of the county were important lifelines.			
<b>Cabinet member response to supplementary question</b>			
The annual maintenance plan will shortly be published which will show the spend and investment across the highways network for the forthcoming year.			
MQ 6	Councillor Bartlett, Leominster East	What social and environmental standards will be set for any developments pursued through the Development Partnership, beyond statutory basics?	Cabinet Member contracts and assets
<b>Response</b>			
The partnership enables the council to exercise control of the quality and nature of developments and we will be able to specify the environmental standards expected for each development as proposals are brought forward for cabinet consideration.			
A number of commitments have been made by Keepmoat to deliver social benefits through the programme. These include using the local supply chain, supporting the local third sector, and contributing approximately 7.5% of its profit from residential sales to a community investment fund. The fund will be reinvested in community schemes through the partnership.			
<b>Supplementary Question</b>			
Can you also add anything on the setting of higher efficiency standards and environmental protections as well as access to public open spaces?			
<b>Cabinet member response to supplementary question</b>			
The control of quality and the nature of the development will be looked at when proposals are brought forward for the consideration of cabinet.			
MQ 7	Councillor Norman, Leominster West	What emergency plans were in place, and what additional support did the Council in fact provide, for vulnerable groups during the icy and snowy weather that severely affected Herefordshire for several days from 1st March 2018 – with particular reference to both street homeless people and housebound individuals?	Cabinet Member Health and Wellbeing
<b>Response</b>			
The council has longstanding robust arrangements in place to ensure the safety of vulnerable people during periods of severe weather, working with the providers of services to ensure care continues even in the face of travel disruption.			
These include arrangements for access to 4x4 transport for care staff and ensuring care can be delivered to those who need it most. Staff also maintained frequent contact with individual residents, ensuring they knew when they would next be visited and responding to emerging situations.			

We have long provided support to the night shelter at St Peter's and St James' Church House. The council's outreach worker also visits the shelter every morning to connect with each person who has stayed there. During the recent snowy weather, the council increased its level of engagement with potential rough sleepers to ensure they were able to access somewhere safe to stay overnight.

In addition, the council maintained an active programme of social media activity, designed to ensure people were aware of the full range of support available, provided advice on how to stay warm and avoid slips and trips, and encouraged people to look out for their neighbours who might be vulnerable.

I would like to place on record my thanks to all those staff, partners and members of the community who provided such a fantastic response during the recent extreme weather to ensure that those in most need were supported.

### **Supplementary question**

The response was focused on Hereford, what arrangements were there across the county in the market towns? Can the severe weather reserve be allocated to highways alone or can it be more widely disbursed?

### **Cabinet member response to supplementary question**

A number of smaller scale operations were in place across the market towns. The county-wide provision would be investigated and a response provided to all members. The severe weather reserve could be used for any aspect of Council business affected by adverse weather.

Response provided on 29 March:

*The council has longstanding robust arrangements in place to ensure the safety of vulnerable people during periods of severe weather, working with the providers of services to ensure care continues even in the face of travel disruption.*

*As part of its ongoing engagement with providers throughout the year, the council ensures that they have resilience/emergency plans in place to maintain delivery of services during cold and icy weather. This can include: arrangements for access to 4x4 transport for care staff in order to ensure care can be delivered to those who need it most; and enabling care home staff to stay overnight at the care home in order to reduce the need to travel. I should note that day activity services usually close for the health and safety of clients and staff who would have to travel to the venue.*

*During the recent snowy weather, the council actively supported care providers through a range of measures. A member of the broker team worked over the weekend to liaise and communicate with providers on any issues. It is of note that the brokers reported few issues of concern, with those that did arise being dealt with through other carers/providers supporting the client or accessing volunteer 4x4 support through social media.*

*Providers communicated with clients to inform them if they were going to be late to attend them at home. They also prioritised calls and, where possible, asked family and friends to support on calls where roads were not passable.*

*Our in-house service, Home First, also prioritised calls and had access to the resilience 4x4 volunteers if capacity permitted. As a result, this really helped the team to undertake the calls where the individual had no family or friends.*

*The council also has responsibility for supporting anyone who finds themselves at risk of sleeping rough. The council has long provided support to the night shelter at St Peter's and St James' Church House. The council's outreach worker also visits the shelter every morning to connect with each person who has stayed there. During the recent snowy weather, the council increased its level of engagement with potential rough sleepers to ensure they were able to access somewhere safe to stay overnight. While the shelter is in Hereford, the Rough Sleeper Outreach workers cover all of Herefordshire and the numbers reported are all rough sleepers across the county.*

*Historically, the Housing Solutions Team provided Homeless Surgeries in Leominster, Ross and Bromyard. With the opportunities and challenges presented through the Homelessness Reduction Act, we are hoping to re-instate this provision later in 2018/19, with details still being considered. The Homeless Surgeries were useful as they provided a presence locally for individuals, helped to prevent rural homelessness and established good links with local estate agents and landlords, which helped in securing private rented accommodation.*

*In addition, the council maintained an active programme of social media activity, designed to ensure people were aware of the full range of support available, provided advice on how to stay warm and avoid slips and trips, and encouraged people to look out for their neighbours who might be vulnerable.*