

## Minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held at online meeting on Thursday 3 December 2020 at 2.30 pm

**Present:** Councillor David Hitchiner, Leader of the Council (Chairperson)  
Councillor Felicity Norman, Deputy Leader of the Council (Vice-Chairperson)

Councillors Ellie Chowns, Pauline Crockett, Gemma Davies, John Harrington, Liz Harvey and Ange Tyler

Cabinet support members in attendance Councillors Jenny Bartlett, John Hardwick, Peter Jinman and Alan Seldon

Group leaders / representatives in attendance Councillors Terry James, Jonathan Lester, Bob Matthews and Diana Toynbee

Scrutiny chairpersons in attendance Councillors Carole Gandy, Jonathan Lester and Elissa Swinglehurst

Other councillors in attendance: Councillors Jennie Hewitt

Officers in attendance: Director for economy and place, Director for children and families, Solicitor to the council, Chief finance officer, Director for adults and communities and Interim Head of Legal Services

### 35. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies from members of the cabinet.

### 36. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Hitchiner declared a schedule 1 interest in relation to property in his ownership. He confirmed the monitoring officer had granted a dispensation for him to participate in the meeting and vote on the item.

### 37. MINUTES (To Follow)

This item was deferred.

### 38. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC (Pages 9 - 16)

Questions received and responses given are attached as appendix 1 to the minutes.

### 39. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS (Pages 17 - 18)

Questions received and responses given are attached as appendix 2 to the minutes.

### 40. PETERCHURCH PRIMARY SCHOOL REBUILD - DEVELOPED DESIGN

The cabinet member commissioning, procurement and assets introduced the item and stated she was pleased that the project was now moving forward. Challenging conversations had taken place around how best to proceed and how to deliver value for money with the project.

The cabinet member children and families also spoke to the report and highlighted the long development of the project. She acknowledged that the school building was now in very poor condition and that staff and pupils had managed well in these difficult conditions.

The head of educational development summarised the report, setting out the background to the proposal and that the next steps would retain flexibility for future development on the site including co-location with the high school or a specialist provision. The primary school was popular with parents and rated as Good by Ofsted. The council had already spent nearly £200k on reactive works and a considerable additional sum would need to be spent to repair and maintain the building going forward. A complete rebuild was recommended as the most cost effective option and it would also allow for an expansion in numbers to reflect future need in the area. The next piece of work would produce a developed design and more accurate costing.

In discussion of the report cabinet members noted:

- There was disappointment that the opportunity to create a through school had not generated more enthusiasm in the local community but this could be revisited at some point in the future;
- The costs would need to be considerably lower than the line entry in the current capital programme;
- The brief would seek to deliver Passivhaus certification as a minimum and a net gain in biodiversity on the site, this was a welcome step in aligning with the council's carbon reduction plans;
- It was unlikely that the primary school would convert to an academy, it would not be supported to convert as a standalone academy and the governing body were reported to be opposed to academisation;
- There would be opportunities for the children at the school to be involved with and learn from the build process.

Councillor Hewitt as the local ward member paid tribute to the school staff who had struggled for so long with a poor building. She stressed the need to focus on early years and on mental and emotional wellbeing in that phase. She thanked cabinet members for supporting the proposals and noted that the parish council was also supportive. The proposal for a complete new build would be less disruptive than other options considered.

Group leaders were invited to raise comments and queries on behalf of their group. There was general support for the proposals and it was noted that:

- The previous ward member had also supported this option;
- The reasons for not progressing a through school were understood and it was important to respect the views of the community;
- Higher building standards would have to become the norm and the achievement of Passivhaus status would have benefits for the running costs and for the pupils.

**It was resolved that:**

- (a) the council proceed to the next stage of replacing Peterchurch primary school and associated on-site facilities on its current site; and**
- (b) The Director Children and Families be authorised to commission a RIBA stage 3 developed design for the rebuild of Peterchurch primary school within a budget of not more than £300k including fees.**

**41. PURCHASE OF ACCOMMODATION AND REFURBISHMENT OF 4 & 5 BLACKFRIARS STREET TO MEET STRATEGIC HOUSING PRIORITIES, AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE RESTRICTIONS CAUSED BY COVID-19**

The leader of the council explained that this item had been added to the agenda as an urgent matter due to the deadlines to accept and spend the grant funding. He noted that the chairman of the general scrutiny committee had agreed to its inclusion on the agenda.

The cabinet member housing, regulatory services and community safety introduced the report. She explained that the grant funding had been provided in response to the covid situation and the need to provide safe accommodation for homeless individuals. Various accommodation options had been used and there were still around 90 households in temporary accommodation which was an ongoing revenue pressure for the council. The report sought approval to accept the grant award for the purchase of eight properties from the open market and the refurbishment of the council property at 4 and 5 Blackfriars Street. Given the buoyant housing market it was necessary to move quickly to secure suitable properties and spend the grant within the timescales required.

In discussion of the report cabinet members noted that:

- The proposal was in line with the homelessness strategy;
- The refurbishment of 4/5 Blackfriars Street would create 6 units in total and aim to reduce the carbon footprint as much as possible, it was hoped that the works would be delivered for less than was set out in the report but number 5 was known to be in a bad state of repair;
- Social value would be embedded in the contract, making use of local labour as much as possible.

Group leaders expressed support for the proposal but stressed the need to achieve value for money and monitor the project to ensure high standards were delivered.

**It was resolved that:**

- (a) Cabinet accepts the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) capital grant of £420k for the purposes of purchasing up to eight properties**
- (b) Approval is given to purchase up to eight properties within a budget of £1,120k and to refurbish 4 & 5 Blackfriars Street within a budget of £500k, to enable the council to protect and accommodate those currently in Covid-19 emergency accommodation from future homelessness.**
- (c) Authority to purchase the properties be delegated to the Director for economy and place, following consultation with relevant cabinet members and the Chief Finance Officer.**

#### **42. HEREFORD TRANSPORT STRATEGY REVIEW**

The leader of the council opened the discussion on this item, noting that it was eagerly awaited. He highlighted the climate emergency and that consideration of the planet was becoming more and more important. The decision to pause and review the transport strategy was felt to be correct in light of this and the impact of the coronavirus pandemic was a life changing shock which would have significant repercussions. Cabinet members had an important decision to make and should reflect on the ambitions in the adopted County Plan.

The cabinet member infrastructure and transport made an introductory statement. He reflected on the work that had taken place to review the options and find the best way forward. He commended the work and input of all involved and thanked members of the scrutiny committee for their thoughtful deliberations and recommendations. He concluded with an assurance that decisions would be based on sound evidence and made with the intention to deliver the best outcome for the future of the city and county.

The head of transport and access services introduced a presentation by officers. The presentation included comments from the consultant representing Mott Macdonald in relation to the peer review and critical friend work and from WSP in relation to the review of the Hereford Transport Strategy.

Cabinet members discussed the presentation and content of the report. The following key points were noted:

- The strategic business case for the southern link road had not been submitted to DfT so no formal response had been received on that report;
- There was an element of uncertainty on costs but the work within package A was scalable and did not have to be delivered all at the same time;
- The council needed vision led plans for the future to respond to the climate emergency and to make an investment in the city overall, the evidence was now in place to underpin that new vision;
- The report flagged the number of short trips taken each day within the city boundary, the majority of which were single persons, and reducing that figure would transform the experience of the city;
- The strategy needed to work for everyone, supporting the economy and levelling up access to affordable and regular transport options for those households that did not have access to private vehicles;
- There was a typographical error on page 56 of the WSP report (page 176 of the agenda pack) – the eastern link option c would link to the A438 Ledbury Road not Worcester Road as stated;
- There was support for the introduction of a second river crossing in the city, while the quantitative measures for the western and eastern options were felt to be not dissimilar the cost of the western route was significantly higher in the report;
- The impact of school travel on congestion was recognised and it was noted that this could be addressed by integrating elements from package B to improve school buses with the elements in package A to support safer walking and cycling routes;
- The bus priority elements of package B were important so that those using the bus did not end up sat in the same traffic as they would in a car, switching from car to bus was an easier choice to make in bad weather than use of cycling or walking;
- The health benefits of active travel measures should be considered;
- Elements from the various packages could be brought together as a blend of options;
- The bus options had significant revenue costs whereas other options in package C such as parking charges could generate revenue income to balance these out;
- Resilience of the transport network was an important element and was included in the assessment under the economy heading;
- The location of facilities such as park and ride sites should be carefully considered to manage how people came into the city from surrounding areas;
- Previous work to model the impact of the southern link road with a package of active travel measures showed a transfer of traffic from Belmont Road to Ross Road with a reduction in rat running through some of the rural roads, however the flow north of the river would not change much from the introduction of the southern link road alone;
- There was recognition that in rural areas there was little alternative to use of a car;
- It was possible that the longer term impact of covid might be an increase in home working which would alter travel patterns;
- Delivery of road schemes was estimated to take up to 10 years, including time to agree and design a specific scheme, receive democratic approval and planning consent and then to construct;
- Cabinet members were aware that feedback from many residents highlighted concerns about congestion and a wish that this be tackled as soon as possible,

however there were differing views as to how this should be achieved and in many cases residents did not have a specific preference on any one package of measures.

The meeting adjourned at 5:08 and resumed at 5:15. While hearing contributions from group leaders attendees agreed to extend the meeting beyond 3 hours.

Group leaders were invited to raise comments and queries on behalf of their groups. Views on which options should be progressed were mixed. The use of active travel measures and improvements in bus networks were widely supported. There was general recognition of the need for an additional river crossing to improve resilience of the network but no single view on where this should be. The following points were put forward:

- The selected transport strategy needed to support the local economy, create a resilient system deliver value for money and reduce carbon emissions;
- The A49 Hereford to Ross road should be upgraded and Highways England would need to play their part in progressing any packages put forward;
- Alternative river crossings should be explored both within and outside the city;
- Arguments in favour of an eastern link from Rotherwas to the Ledbury Road included improved access to the hospital, better access for emergency vehicles and reduced rat running through Hampton Bishop, Mordiford and Holme Lacy;
- Arguments in favour of a western route highlighted that the review, which had cost nearly £500k, showed that a western bypass was the best way to reduce congestion and that the original transport package proposed had already included active travel measures and more space for buses and cycle routes by diverting travel;
- The strategy should provide choice of movement and use options that unlocked the most potential for other aims, creating more growth would unlock land for houses and jobs that would be a greater return to the local economy;
- It was queried whether most people would have time to use buses and that there might only be a small number of locations in the city where bus priority schemes could be introduced, affordability of any package was also a concern, particularly sustaining increased revenue costs in the long term;
- It was frustrating that there were legislative challenges to establishing local bus services;
- The easy wins should be implemented first, road schemes could take considerable time to bring forward;
- The view that covid would significantly alter patterns in the long term was challenged but it was also noted that it provided an opportunity for everyone to consider how they commuted and to think about the importance of quality of life and access to the countryside.

The chairman of the general scrutiny committee presented the feedback and recommendations from the scrutiny session on the review report. He thanked all those who had taken part in the scrutiny meeting but questioned whether the committee had had enough time to do justice to all of the issues that needed to be considered. Of the 13 recommendations made a number queried if cabinet had all the information needed to make a judgement on how to proceed while a further recommendation highlighted the option to select a blend of measures from the various packages. The majority of the committee supported cancellation of the western bypass scheme and other major road schemes with the exception of an eastern river crossing. The chairman of the committee noted it was not a unanimous decision but that the committee was looking to move things forward. The final recommendation urged cabinet members to challenge the robustness of the report in their deliberations.

Cabinet members debated the points raised by group leaders and the recommendations of the scrutiny committee. Key points raised in this section of the debate were:

- Cabinet members were happy to look at all options, however some of the options raised by the scrutiny committee would take time to explore and were not covered in the scope of this review;
- Carbon offsetting would be explored in the next stages of the carbon management plan to see what was possible;
- With reference to options such as the river bus scheme mentioned in recommendation (d) it might be for community groups to take these forward;
- The critical friend work and peer review had been carried out to ensure the report was robust and a suitable evidence base on which to take decisions;
- Package A – walking and cycling measures – was scalable and some elements such as the transport hub and St Owen’s cycle contraflow would soon be in place;
- The view that a bypass would generate growth was challenged and as the top preference in the stakeholder analysis was investment in the bus network and reduction in fares it was disputed that the majority of people wanted a bypass, however it was also noted that the second highest preference was for new roads and a river crossing;
- The park and choose sites in Herefordshire would benefit from more investment;
- Some of the packages shared common options and some elements might be combined from different packages;
- Cabinet members felt that all of the recommendations from the scrutiny committee could be broadly accepted for further consideration with the exception of recommendation K as the preference was for any eastern route to be taken as far as the A438 Ledbury Road.

At the conclusion of the debate the cabinet member finance and corporate services proposed that the preferred strategic transport package to be taken forward be a combination of packages A, B and E with the parking elements from the demand management (option 11) included in package C. This was seconded by the cabinet member health and adult wellbeing.

The cabinet member finance and corporate services explained that if this was the preferred package to be taken forward then the cabinet would need to be clear that work on the western bypass and southern link road must cease and appropriate action be taken to allocate financial resources to cover the costs incurred.

The monitoring officer advised that in the event that cabinet supported this recommendation a further report would be prepared setting out the financial implications of ceasing work on the two road schemes and the impact on the policy framework. Cabinet could not take the final decision itself as the proposal was contrary to the adopted policy of the Council. Instead Cabinet would need to make a recommendation to a meeting of the full Council following consideration of that further report.

**It was resolved that cabinet:**

- notes and considers the review findings and the recommendations and comments of the general scrutiny committee;**
- identifies strategic transport packages A+ B + from package C demand management – option 11 car parking + E as the preferred options to take forward;**
- agrees the recommendations A to M of the general scrutiny committee which are set out at Appendix E with the exception of recommendation K;**
- seeks a further report to set out the implications of taking forward the preferred package(s) and confirms authority for subsequent work to proceed; and**
- with regard to the two road schemes (the southern link road and western bypass) is minded to recommend to**

- i. stop progress of the southern link road; and
- ii. stop progress of the western bypass.

The meeting ended at 6.23 pm

**Chairperson**



**PUBLIC QUESTIONS TO CABINET – 3 December 2020**

**Question 1**

**Mr I Morgan, Hereford**

**To: cabinet member, infrastructure and transport**

If the Cabinet decides to completely scrap the idea of a bypass and the Southern Link Road, can they guarantee the citizens of Herefordshire that the decision is not influenced by the impact of air pollution on environmental grounds as by 2030, under the Government's policy in ten years time, all cars and vans will have to be electric.

**Response**

The technical work presented in the Hereford Transport Strategy Review includes amongst other impacts an assessment of how air pollution in the city would be affected by the different packages. All modelling was carried out with a set date of 2026 in mind. For carbon emissions, this included applying Department of Transport estimates where we would be with the take-up of electric vehicles by 2026. It should be noted that the current Government policy is that there will be no new sales of petrol and diesel vehicles after 2030, although many will no doubt still be on the road after this date. The other, equally pertinent, consideration on the issue of environmental impact is the effect that the road building will have on the ecology and landscape of the land and also the amount of embedded carbon that the scheme will produce. These issues would need to be considered for any road scheme.

**Question 2**

**Ms N Goodwin, Hereford**

**To: cabinet member, infrastructure and transport**

The critical friend review states that: "planning for the future by solely looking in the rear-view mirror is no longer adequate in the face of the opportunities, threats and uncertainties ahead. Can the cabinet confirm what they will do to ensure that the environmental assessment of carbon and climate impacts meets current requirements and takes into account the "exceptional floods and record-breaking water levels in the River Wye in Feb 2020" and that Climate Emergency, Net Zero and Net Gain are strategic objectives against which options are assessed and progressed as part of any future work on the package?"

**Response**

The Hereford Transport Strategy Review has included explicit reference to carbon and climate emergency issues as a central part of its assessment methodology. It is accepted that any further work to progress a package (or packages) will need to also include assessment of these issues in line with government guidance at that time.

**Supplementary Question**

The use of the word "accepted" seems vague. Is it representative of the cabinet members' individual and collective views on carbon and climate emergency issues or are they able to assure the public that such issues will be prioritised in accordance with the council's declaration to set a target of zero carbon emissions by 2030?

**Response**

Yes I can give that assurance that that is our ambition and that it is our collective view on carbon and climate emergency issues and they will be prioritised in accordance with the council's declaration.

### **Question 3**

**Dr N Geeson, Hereford**

**To: cabinet member, infrastructure and transport**

The Southern Link Road route SC2 which is part of the South Wye Transport Package, was put forward in 2014. Is it the case that the previous Conservative administration could not claim funding to progress the Southern Link Road, even as late as spring 2019, because they could not finalise a strong enough business case?

### **Response**

This is not entirely accurate. A strategic outline business case had been developed for the scheme which indicated, in accordance with DfT guidance, good value for money. It was on this basis that funding was awarded, on the condition that when a full business case was submitted and approved the full amount would be released. Earlier in the scheme development DfT released a proportion of the funding. In line with DfT requirements, the full business case would have been scheduled to be submitted and tested by them when the contract for the road was confirmed and tendered costs known.

The full business case was not completed and submitted and therefore not tested by DfT as the procurement process which ran from May 2018 to November 2018 did not progress to the award of the contract on the advice of the council's statutory officers who did not consider the procurement process to be sufficiently robust. The process was terminated in 2019 by the new administration on the advice of the statutory officers. Subsequently, the administration determined to undertake this review.

### **Supplementary Question**

In considering the business case for the Southern Link Road, its major role would be to shunt traffic between the A465 Belmont Road and A49 Ross Road. It is likely that if this road were built, in order to escape congestion on the A465 Belmont Road a greater volume of traffic than now would use the A49 Ross Road to enter Hereford. We have recently learned that only 7% of traffic is through traffic in Hereford, and 93% has a source or destination (or both) within the City. Since the A465 and A49 converge to cross Greyfriars Bridge, do you agree that the Southern Link Road would bring only negligible advantage to traffic flow within Hereford City?

### **Response**

I recall that in the original feasibility work for the southern link road it was indeed projected that traffic would be increased on the A49 down the Ross Road because traffic would move across from the Belmont Road to try and enter Hereford on a different approach, so as a standalone project it certainly has some difficulties.

### **Question 4**

**Mr R Board, Hereford**

**To: cabinet member, infrastructure and transport**

Given that the Hereford Transport Strategy Review has now ruled out a Full A49 Eastern Bypass due to the environmental sensitivities of the Lugg Meadow, Could the Hereford Transport Strategy Review now include a seventh option, this being a Western Bridge ONLY Option, as it appears that this option would perform well against the other bridge options in terms of Climate Emergency, Environment and Society and also that a Western bridge appears to be the only option that would allow for Hereford to ultimately have a full A49 Western Bypass.

## **Response**

The review did not promote or rule out anything, its purpose was to assess transport options in line with national and local criteria. There were many considerations put forward for a new transport strategy and stakeholders feedback helped inform the Council and their consultants which of those should be taken forward for further consideration within the review. Cabinet is also not constrained by the transport options and packages which have been considered in the review and could continue to consider different options or variations of those options. At face value I do not see how such a proposal would work but I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further with Mr Board.

## **Question 5**

**Mr R Palgrave, How Caple**

**To: cabinet member, infrastructure and transport**

HM Treasury's Green Book provides guidance on how to appraise and evaluate policies, projects and programmes. It defines how interventions like transport measures are to be assessed and developed. A long list of possible measures is identified, then is sifted to produce a short list to be taken forward for more detailed evaluation. The shortlisting process carried out for the Hereford Transport Strategy appears to follow this path. Noting that the Southern Link Road was not included in the short list either on its own or in combination with other possible road schemes, how confident is the council that any future request for central government funding to build the SLR would be deemed compliant with the Green Book?

## **Response**

It is not correct to say that the southern link road was not included in our assessment. It forms part of the Western Bypass option (ref page 55 of report) and is therefore included in Package A+C+D (page 73 of report). On this basis the assessment is compliant with the Green Book.

## **Supplementary Question**

You responded to my question saying, "It is not correct to say that the southern link road was not included in our assessment." My question did not, however, say that the SLR was not included in the assessment - it said that the SLR is not included, either standalone or in combination, in the short list produced by the assessment. Now I have clarified that, can I have a response please?

## **Response**

A written answer would be provided.

## **Question 6**

**Mrs C Protherough, Clehonger**

**To: cabinet member, infrastructure and transport**

At the Scrutiny meeting Cllr Rone was very concerned about air pollution and the impact of vehicle pollution on Hereford residents, particularly those in South Wye. Modelling of the Southern Link Road showed that the scheme increased air pollution on the Ross Road and did little if nothing to reduce air pollution elsewhere in Hereford City. Which package in the Hereford Transport Strategy Review would deliver the best improvements not only to minimise air pollution but to also address the risk and impacts of Climate change?

**Response**

I presume you may be referencing studies done for the original assessment of the Southern Link road. I believe you are broadly correct, overall forecasted reduction in air pollution generally was not significant and there was a projected increase in air pollution and traffic numbers along the Ross Road. Whilst this recent review has not looked at the issue of air quality and carbon reduction in combination it has considered both issues for the city as a whole which has provided outputs in relation to each of the assessed packages. This indicates:

1. Overall carbon emissions in Hereford – Packages A, A+B and A+B+C are all forecast to have the largest impact on reducing carbon emissions (pages 76, 78 and 80 of report).
2. Impacts on the Air Quality Management Area – Package A+C+D is forecast to have the largest impact on reducing traffic flows through the AQMA (page 82 of report).

**Supplementary Question**

A further problem in the South Wye area, threatening life and wellbeing of adults and children, is a crisis of obesity. This area has the highest figures of all age groups in the County as evidenced in the Report on obesity (no 12) from HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL STRATEGIC INTELLIGENCE TEAM December 2016. For adults 16 plus, Belmont medical practice had an obesity rate of 17.8% compared with 9% nationwide. The figures for prevalence of obesity in reception at school ranged from 4.9 per cent in Greater Ledbury to 11.7 per cent in South West Wye. Taking into account the need to reduce obesity, especially starting young, what would be the best combination of measures to make lifetime health improvements in this area?

**Response**

That's quite a broad question and I'm not sure I'm the perfect person qualified to answer that. Obviously whatever support and help we can give in allowing people who live in that area to travel in an active way and whatever opportunity we can give to reduce congestion would be a priority but particularly the ability for children to walk and cycle safely to school by themselves or with their parents would be a really strong ambition. It is a possible ambition it's just a matter of priorities and putting the money and the effort into that strategy.

**Question 7**

**Mrs V Wegg-Prosser, Breinton**

**To: cabinet member, infrastructure and transport**

Appendix D the Peer Review HTP Technical Report (cl. 4.3.6) notes that the Bypass Stage 2 Environmental Assessment lacks a sufficient assessment of carbon and climate change impacts compared to current requirements.

Planning Application No. 162921, Land Drainage comments (IntConsResp 36) on the Three Elms Development note 'great uncertainty' with regard to the Western Bypass scheduled to travel

through this large urban extension ... where significant land for flood alleviation will be required, jeopardising delivery of the proposed employment land to the west of the proposed route.

Could the Cabinet member responsible for Infrastructure please explain whether the 'great uncertainty' associated with the Three Elms site was specifically factored in to the economic, social and environmental evaluation of the Bypass Stage 2 Environmental Assessment, and if not, why not?

### **Response**

I have been assured that the Hereford Transport Package Stage 2 Environmental Assessment Report did take into account the land use proposals for Three Elms and these informed the assessment of route options. In light of the climate emergency declarations and government policy direction we anticipate that DfT will be updating guidance on the environmental assessment of major transport schemes. It is possible a new assessment could produce different results based on that updated guidance.

### **Question 8**

**Mr P Chapman, Breinton Common**

**To: cabinet member, infrastructure and transport**

I understand that all the road schemes have been packaged with 'Demand Management', which thus includes some form of congestion charging, in order to minimise the effects of induced demand. Obviously, this could nullify any benefits from providing extra road capacity. What is the expected price point and average cost to the local motorist, at which such charging would retain the benefits of any new road scheme in tackling congestion and would the expansion of a cycling network further increase charges if demand is even further reduced?

### **Response**

The review has considered several possible components of a demand management strategy for Hereford (page 52 of report). However, no decision has been taken by cabinet on which aspects would be taken forward. It is not correct that all the road schemes include congestion charging and the report makes it clear that the more likely demand management measures to be considered further are the consolidation of off-street parking, parking pricing and/or a workplace parking levy. In the event that cabinet wished to progress a congestion charge further work would need to be undertaken to assess appropriate charging levels and extent of any scheme.

### **Question 9**

**Ms K Sharp, Hereford**

**To: cabinet member, infrastructure and transport**

In an answer to Mr P Price at the GSC meeting (9/11/2020, question 29) about the planning permission for the Southern Link Road, would officers please confirm whether the current planning approval (P151314/F), would deliver the road scheme or whether new designs would have to be prepared - and planning permission sought - increasing the height of the railway bridge crossing etc (see the Options Refinement Report dated November 2018, 4.3 - Changes after

Grant of Planning Permission - where ten 'significant' design changes to the scheme were identified by structural engineers) thus increasing the negative impact of the scheme?

### **Response**

The planning permissions for the scheme as granted remain valid. The refinement of the design identified potential changes which will need to be processed through the planning system in due course if the scheme progresses and the changes are adopted. Further amendments to planning consent would need to be approved by the planning authority as modifications have been made to the design.

### **Supplementary Question**

When the first planning permission for the SLR was determined in 2015 and 2016, there were lengthy discussions between Historic England and the council concerning the negative landscape impacts of the scheme. The Planning Officer Report records that measures (planting, noise barriers etc) would be designed into the scheme, particularly on the railway bridge with its embankment, to mitigate these impacts. The ten significant engineering changes that I referred to in my original question were first identified in 2017 - but were never progressed through planning - and included, amongst other things, raising the height of the railway bridge by 0.5 m. If planning permission is sought for the major changes, will the landscape considerations that were so controversial in 2016 be thoroughly re-examined given the structures along the entire route will have to be significantly widened, extended and increased in height?

### **Response**

Modifications will be needed there's no doubt about that and as a result a view on that would be needed from the planning officers and either a modification within the existing position or new permissions and I should imagine that if that is the case the other considerations will have to be taken into account. I will get a written answer from the head of planning to clarify that.

### **Question 10**

**Mr T Meadows, Hereford**

**To: cabinet member, infrastructure and transport**

When I asked at the Scrutiny meeting "If the full effects of induced demand were provided in the Hereford Transport Model, please state what would be the average journey time saving in minutes in Hereford on each of the key routes into the city?" the officers were unable to provide an answer of the journey time saving in minutes. Therefore I need to ask again, even if the full effects of induced demand are not included, according to the Hereford Transport Model, which is reported to overestimate the benefits of new roads, what would be the average journey time savings, for the average motorist, at peak time on each of the key routes into the city?

### **Response**

WSP have not provided, in their assessment of congestion reduction, journey times in a 'minutes saved' format. That information would be of interest. Chapter 7 of the review sets out the journey time reductions for the same key routes for each of the assessed packages. These are presented as percentage time savings compared with the do minimum. Further details on the indicator are provided in the table at page 60 of the review and the journey time indicator is 5.2 in the table.

### **Supplementary Question**

Percentages are meaningless when the average journey time is not referenced at all. This was acknowledged by Amey in their 2010 report when, they explained that “a statistic which is easier to understand and relates well to public perception is the Journey Time analysis”. The Amey report showed that a bypass would only improve a north-south journey time by just 1 minute more for cars than if sustainable transport measures were introduced and before allowing for the effect of induced demand from the new road. Can WSP confirm that all the percentages on journey time savings they have referenced for vehicles are on average less than 5 minutes, and that many of these journey time savings can be achieved more simply and cheaply by implementing sustainable transport measures?

### **Response**

That is a valid point and will be included in our discussion.

### **Question 11**

**Mrs E Morawiecka, Breinton**

**To: cabinet member, infrastructure and transport**

The most recent new road scheme delivered in Hereford City is the City Link Road. The publication of the evaluation of the new road scheme performance has still not been made public before the deadline for public questions for 3rd December. One of the key benefits of this scheme was that local residents, businesses and other users of the Hereford transport network would see improved management of traffic flows and speeds, with the majority of the scheme benefits forecast to be delivered through improved journey times on the city centre road network when compared to the no scheme scenario. As an indicator as to how new roads in Hereford deliver on the forecast outcomes, please confirm how the new City Link Road has improved journey times on the A49 trunk Road in Hereford and reduced air pollution in the AQMA.

### **Response**

Following the completion of the City Link Road element of the HCCTP an interim traffic flow evaluation was undertaken to evaluate the impact of the City Link Road on the traffic flows in the areas surrounding the road. The findings of this are contained within the HCCTP interim Traffic Flow Evaluation Report. I apologise that this was not published before the deadline for questions for today’s Cabinet Meeting. The report has been now published on the council’s website and can be found by following the link below:

<https://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/roads-1/hereford-2020/3>

The delivery of the city link road was not predicted to reduce traffic flows on the A49 but was to enable expansion of the city centre and regeneration of the area to the north of the inner ring road. This would include providing capacity to enable upgrading of Blueschool Street, Newmarket Street and Commercial Road for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport and to promote sustainable transport. This interim report shows, as forecast, reductions in traffic flows on Blueschool Street, Newmarket Street and Commercial Road. However, an increase in traffic flows on College Road has been observed which will be monitored and reviewed in the delivery of the remaining elements of the package.

A Monitoring & Evaluation Plan (MEP) for the HCCTP has been developed and this sets out the monitoring programme. The MEP outlines the monitoring of the journey time and air quality aspects, along with other aspects such as walking and cycling flows and confirms monitoring will be undertaken one year and five years after the completion of the whole package. This is on the basis that it is the full package that supports the mode shift to realise changes to these outcomes.

## Supplementary Question

Now the report is published, the answer is on page 7 of the evaluation report. This states that morning peak traffic flows have increased on Edgar St by 21%-25% and evening peak flows have increased 32%-68%. Whilst the City Link Road has reduced vehicles on Newmarket St, Blueschool St, it appears that this was at the expense of other roads, particularly residential ones such as College Road (vehicles up 42% & 15%) and Venns Lane (up 14% & 8%). This new road, has increased car use, congestion and air pollution on Edgar St, despite being part of the AQMA. With the changes in traffic volumes miles out from that modelled, and with some of the impacts particularly detrimental to residential areas and around schools and colleges, how can councillors have any confidence in the modelling for further road building?

## Response

It is a rhetorical question but it's a fair question and I think it's one that we've addressed in the past. We've discussed this issued that when we commission reports it's often best to try and stay away from specific metrics because you tend to concentrate on them for all sorts of reasons and it's particularly important to look at the ambition that you're trying to achieve. That said you need to monitor the projections that consultants give you to have faith in them and you need to follow up and see how the predictions line up with the realities after the event. I think they don't always line up very well and that is for a variety of reasons and sometime unavoidable but I think it's just something you bear I mind when we are looking forward at projections, that they are at the end of the day assumptions made either on data or on qualitative expertise.

**COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS TO CABINET – 3 December 2020**

**Question 1**

**Councillor Nigel Shaw, Bromyard Bringsty Ward**

**To: cabinet member infrastructure and transport**

The options refer to “demand management”. Can you explain what this involves in the context of Hereford?

**Response**

The review has considered several possible components of a demand management strategy for Hereford (page 52 of report). The report suggests that the more likely demand management measures to be considered further include the consolidation of off-street parking, parking pricing and/or a workplace parking levy. However, no decision has been taken by cabinet on which aspects would be taken forward.

**Supplementary Question**

To be clear, can you confirm that this administration has not ruled out congestion charging, and that a workplace parking levy will also be considered in Hereford?

**Response**

I can confirm that we’ve pretty much ruled out congestion charging and we have ruled out a workplace parking levy and in actual fact both of those elements factor very heavily in the packages for the western bypass.

