

MINUTES of the meeting of Council held at Council Chamber, The Shire Hall, St Peter's Square, Hereford, HR1 2HX on Friday 11 October 2019 at 10.00 am

Present: Councillor Sebastian Bowen (Chairman)
Councillor Kema Guthrie (Vice Chairman)

Councillors: Graham Andrews, Paul Andrews, Polly Andrews, Jenny Bartlett, Chris Bartrum, Christy Bolderson, Dave Boulter, Tracy Bowes, Ellie Chowns, Pauline Crockett, Gemma Davies, Toni Fagan, Elizabeth Foxton, Carole Gandy, John Hardwick, John Harrington, Jennie Hewitt, Kath Hey, David Hitchiner, Phillip Howells, Bernard Hunt, Helen I'Anson, Terry James, Peter Jinman, Tony Johnson, Graham Jones, Mike Jones, Jim Kenyon, Jonathan Lester, Trish Marsh, Bob Matthews, Mark Millmore, Jeremy Milln, Felicity Norman, Roger Phillips, Paul Rone, Alan Seldon, Nigel Shaw, Louis Stark, John Stone, David Summers, Elissa Swinglehurst, Paul Symonds, Kevin Tillett, Diana Toynbee, Ange Tyler, Yolande Watson and William Wilding

Officers: Director Children and Families, Head of Corporate Governance, Head of Democratic Services, Chief Finance Officer, Chief Executive Officer, Director Adults and Communities, Solicitor to the Council and Acting Assistant Director for Regulatory Environment and Waste

22. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Barry Durkin and Liz Harvey.

23. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor David Hitchiner declared a pecuniary interest in agenda items no. 6 questions from members of the Council and no. 11, Leader's Report as a resident of Dunan, in close proximity to the southern end of the proposed western bypass, and outlined the dispensation granted by the monitoring officer.

Councillor Roger Phillips declared *other* interests, in agenda items no. 4, Chairman and Chief Executive's, Announcements as the Chairman of the Marches European Structural Investment Fund and, agenda item no. 10, Youth Justice Plan 2019-20, as a justice of the peace and a member of the Hereford and Worcester Youth Court Panel.

There was one further declaration of interest during the meeting. See paragraph 32 below.

24. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2019 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

25. CHAIRMAN AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council noted the Chairman and Chief Executive announcements as printed in the agenda papers. In addition to the printed announcements the following items were also raised:

- The award won by the Revenues and Benefits team at the Council;
- The visit of the Chairman to the local Hereford and Worcester Cadets;
- The recent appointments to senior management; and
- The launch of the Children and Young People Plan

It was requested that a briefing note be circulated to all members as a matter of urgency regarding the suspension of planning applications in those wards affected by phosphate levels in the River Lugg catchment area. *The Chief Executive would arrange for a briefing to be provided.*

26. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

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.

27. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

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.

28. APPOINTMENTS TO COUNCIL COMMITTEES AND OUTSIDE BODIES

Council considered a report to agree the political proportionality of the Council and the allocation of seats on Council committees. The report was introduced by the monitoring officer who explained that Council was required to agree the allocation of seats on council committees and outside bodies and to make an appointment to a vacancy on the planning and regulatory committee that remained after proportionality had been recalculated.

Recommendation (a) in the report was proposed by Councillor Jonathan Lester, seconded by Councillor John Hardwick and agreed by a simple majority of the Council.

RESOLVED: that the allocation of committee seats to political groups as set out at paragraph 8 be approved.

Recommendation (b) in the report was proposed by Councillor David Hitchiner, seconded by Councillor Gemma Davies and agreed by a simple majority of the Council.

RESOLVED: that the allocation of seats on outside bodies to political groups as set out at paragraph 9 be approved.

Recommendation (c) concerned the allocation of a vacancy on the planning and regulatory committee which remained after proportionality had been calculated. Council was invited to nominate members for appointment to the committee.

Councillor Graham Andrews was proposed by Councillor John Hardwick and seconded by Councillor Alan Seldon for appointment to the planning and regulatory committee.

Councillor Graham Jones was proposed by Councillor Bob Matthews and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lester for appointment to the planning and regulatory committee.

A named vote was conducted and Councillor Graham Andrews was appointed to the committee by 25 votes to Councillor Graham Jones's 23 votes.

FOR - Councillor Graham Andrews (25) - Councillors: Paul Andrews; Jenny Bartlett; Dave Boulter; Tracy Bowes; Ellie Chowns; Pauline Crockett; Gemma Davies; Toni Fagan; Elizabeth Foxton; John Hardwick; John Harrington; Jennie Hewitt; Kath Hey; David Hitchiner; Peter Jinman; Jim Kenyon; Trish Marsh; Jeremy Milln; Felicity Norman; Alan Seldon; David Summers; Diana Toynbee; Ange Tyler; Yolande Watson; and William Wilding.

FOR - Councillor Graham Jones (23) - Councillors: Polly Andrews; Chris Bartrum; Christy Bolderson; Sebastian Bowen; Carol Gandy; Kema Guthrie; Phillip Howells; Bernard Hunt; Helen l'Anson; Terry James; Tony Johnson; Mike Jones; Jonathan Lester; Bob Matthews; Mark Millmore; Roger Phillips; Paul Rone; Nigel Shaw; Louis Stark; John Stone; Elissa Swinglehurst; Paul Symonds; and Kevin Tillet.

RESOLVED: that Councillor Graham Andrews is appointed to the vacancy on the planning and regulatory committee.

29. TRAVELLERS' SITES DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

Council considered a report by the cabinet member infrastructure and transport to approve the adoption of the Herefordshire travellers' sites development plan document 2018 – 2031. The cabinet member infrastructure and transport proposed the report and recommendation and explained that the development plan document (DPD) would form part of the core strategy. He went on to explain that the DPD incorporated a temporary stopping place on the A49 and that the proposal at Madley had not been pursued but would be considered as a potential growth location in future.

The report and recommendation was seconded by Councillor Alan Seldon.

During the discussion of the DPD members raised the principal points below:

- Clarification was required concerning the allocation for Bosbury in the report and whether this was in addition to recent additional pitches at the site. *The cabinet member infrastructure and transport agreed to provide the clarification following the meeting.*
- Support was expressed for the additional four pitches at Pembridge but it was felt that it would be difficult to support any further allocation which would be seen as disproportionate. The landscaping proposed at Pembridge required proper management to ensure it was successful and safety work was required to ensure that the adjacent Kingspan Road did not pose a risk to those children resident on the site.
- There was disappointment that the section of the plan concerning animals and animal welfare had been deleted from the final version of the DPD. It was important that sites provided facilities for the protection of animal welfare and the welfare of the community within which animals were kept.
- It was recognised that the implementation of sites was costly and the budget that was in place to establish and manage sites was queried.
- The safety of the fencing around the Bromyard site was queried which was located alongside an old quarry with a deep pool.
- It was queried how the Council would seek to achieve the objective in the DPD to respect the interests of the settled community on sites which were primarily private sites, such as Bosbury.

Councillor Alan Seldon in seconding the report and recommendation explained that the document would form part of the core strategy which was currently being reviewed.

The adoption of the Herefordshire traveller's sites development plan document 2018-2031 was approved by a simple majority of Council.

RESOLVED: that:

(a) the Herefordshire Travellers Sites Development Plan Document (DPD) 2018-2031 (appendix 4), incorporating the Planning Inspector's recommended main modifications (appendix 2) and the schedule of additional modifications (appendix 3) is adopted; and

(b) the Programme Director Growth be authorised to make any further minor modifications, (e.g. typographical) to ensure consistency with other development plan documentation.

30. GAMBLING POLICY 2019-2022 (REVIEW)

Council considered a report by the cabinet member housing, regulatory services and community safety to review and approve the gambling policy 2019 – 2022. The cabinet member housing, regulatory services and community safety proposed the report and recommendation and explained that the Gambling Act 2005 required Council to produce a statement of its Gambling Policy. She further explained that the policy was largely unchanged from the previous version and incorporated guidance from the Gambling Commission. Consultation had been conducted with West Mercia Police and holders of gambling licences and the draft policy had been considered by the general scrutiny committee and cabinet.

Councillor Tracy Bowes seconded the report and recommendation.

During the debate members raised the principal points below:

- It was recognised that the policy was produced in accordance with statutory requirements but this did not recognise the adverse impact that gambling could have on individuals. It was felt that central government should be pressured to legislate for the incorporation of addiction therapy provision in local gambling policies.
- The draft policy was considered by the general scrutiny committee which made 11 recommendations.
- It was recognised that gambling added to the local economy but a robust policy was required.
- It was queried whether it was felt that the local authority had sufficient powers to monitor gambling premises and if spot checks were undertaken to ensure adherence with policy.
- It was recognised that online gambling was a problem which could affect children and young people. It was felt that restrictions on advertising could help to address problem-gambling.
- Gambling addiction was considered a public health issue and It was queried whether part of the public health budget could be utilised to address problem-gambling locally.

In seconding the report and recommendation Councillor Tracy Bowes agreed that pressure should be put on the government to respond to gambling addiction.

The gambling policy 2019-2022 (review) was approved by a simple majority of Council.

RESOLVED: that the gambling policy 2019-2022 at appendix 1 is approved.

31. YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN 2019-2020

Council considered a report from the cabinet member children and families to approve the youth justice plan 2019-2020. The cabinet member children and families proposed the report and recommendation and explained that the youth justice plan was a partnership document which was produced on behalf of local councils by the youth justice service for West Mercia. She further explained that the indicators in the report showed improvement in issues relating to youth justice in Herefordshire including: a reducing trend in the number of first time entrants to the criminal justice system (CJS); the number of young people in custody in Herefordshire in the report stood at just one; and reoffending had improved. The plan had a proactive focus which sought to prevent entry to the CJS including mental health support and mentoring.

The report and recommendation was seconded by Councillor Jeremy Milln.

The principal points below were raised by members during the debate:

- The Plan was considered by the children and young people scrutiny committee which had expressed frustration with the plan as it contained an overview of previous period without up to date data. Part of the recommendations of the committee focused on the production of an addendum in future years which provided the latest statistics relating to youth justice.
- It was recognised that the basis of the statistics in the report were misleading for a small area such as Herefordshire and did not provide an accurate representation of the issues locally.
- The improvements reported in the Plan were welcomed.
- The priority in the Plan to ensure young peoples' mental health needs were met through increased training for practitioners was highlighted and it was queried whether enough was being done in pursuance of this priority. *The cabinet member children and families explained that more could always be done and this priority was being explored with partners.*
- It was noted that a new mental health initiative was focusing on young offenders when they were taken into custody.
- Concern was expressed regarding the court appearances in Kidderminster of cases on remand which was considered to be indicative of the downgrading of services in Herefordshire.

In seconding the report and recommendation Councillor Jeremy Milln explained that the trends in the report represented improvements across West Mercia and were encouraging.

The report and recommendation was approved unanimously by Council.

RESOLVED: That the youth justice plan 2019/20 in appendix a is approved.

32. LEADER'S REPORT TO COUNCIL

Council received and noted the Leader's report. The Leader introduced his report and provided clarification concerning the status of funding from the Marches Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). He explained that in respect of the funding of £27 million that had been dedicated to Herefordshire Council for the south wye and Hereford transport packages there was no legal justification for the LEP to recoup any funding. It was confirmed that at a recent meeting of the LEP board there had been no deadline set for the funding to be used or an amount proposed for the Council to repay to the LEP. The new administration at the Council had considered infrastructure projects and had taken a decision to pause and review those schemes in progress. The LEP had identified that there was a possibility that funding allocation to the infrastructure schemes would not be spent and in such circumstances it was hoped that the money would be reallocated to

other projects in Herefordshire. Discussions in relation to this matter were ongoing with the LEP. The potential of the loss of any funding did not provide sufficient reason to pursue the infrastructure schemes that were currently subject to pause and review; other considerations were required before a final decision was made on the projects including the response to the climate emergency.

The following was asked of the Leader:

- Why was the renewal of the council's insurance cover for a period of five years? *The Leader explained that a response would be provided following the meeting.*
- The indemnity of £850k to Nmite was queried and whether Council's money had been put at risk. It was asked whether the correspondence between Tony Bray and Shropshire Council be placed in public domain by the Leader. *The Leader explained that the risk was currently being assessed and he was discussing the potential release of the letter with the monitoring officer. He would confirm in due course if it could be released.*
- It was noted that the Enterprise Zone was close to breaching the peak 300 movement limit and it was queried how prospective new employers and their employees would access the site if the bypass is not built and Highways England did not support an increase in numbers? *The cabinet member infrastructure and transport explained that there was room for negotiating the movements cap at the enterprize zone with Highways England and a written response would be provided to the issues raised.*
- The Leader was asked whether he believed that the projects at skylon park including the shell store and cyber centre could succeed without key infrastructure projects such as the southern link road. *The Leader explained that the implications of infrastructure projects on the climate emergency would be assessed which would include the southern link road.*
- The Leader was asked whether the Council would express concern regarding the governance arrangements at the LEP and the role of the business board was queried and its support for the bypass. *The Leader explained that there was an issue with governance arrangements at the LEP which were being investigated. The role and statements of the business board also required clarification.*
- The Leader was asked how the three areas in the LEP could work together to ensure low-carbon projects were taken forward. *The Leader explained that there was a need to work together in the LEP and co-ordinate across the three areas.*
- The Leader was asked about the problems affecting the five year land supply and if this encouraged predatory development. *The cabinet member infrastructure and transport explained the core straetgy still carried weight and was out for review. The problems affecting the five year land supply had been ongoing for a long time and needed to be addressed. Part of the solution would be the construction of council housing and there was no expectation that development would be allocated to all villages.*
- The Leader was asked how the administration would seek to promote tourism in the County. *The Leader explained that the current position had been inherited by the administration and there was little expenditure on tourism. The LEP would look at the potential for combining an approach to tourism across the three regions.*
- It was important that the council worked closely with the LEP and was not too critical of the structures in place. A potential amalgamation of the LEPs may minimise Herefordshire's advantage from the arrangement. *The Leader explained that a priority was to work with the LEP but it was acknowledged that improvements were required to the governance arrangements.*
- The Leader was asked whether he thought that heavy goods vehicles posed a serious problem to air quality in Hereford or if they posed no hazard to health. It was asked what relief was planned for the impact of lorries. *The Leader*

explained that HGVs were harmful and their impact needed to be assessed in the wider decisions concerning infrastructure in Herefordshire. The cabinet member infrastructure and transport explained that there was no evidence that the bypass would relieve congestion or HGVs travelling through Hereford; other solutions were currently required to prevent HGVs idling through hereford such as withdrawing those traffic lights which inhibited traffic flow.

- It was noted that a primary source of congestion in Hereford was cars used by one person only; it was asked whether innovative approaches to address congestion would include car sharing apps. *The cabinet member infrastructure and transport explained that the approach would be looked at and explained that the majority of journeys undertaken in Hereford were under two miles which required a different solution to park and ride schemes.*
- It was asked how the fund to support Leominster town centre was being progressed. *The chief executive explained that it was being taken forward with partners and clarification of any conditions attached to the funding from central government was required.*
- It was asked whether the Leader felt that the future of the county would be best served by attempting to build its independence outside of the LEP or within its structures to assist economic development? *The Leader explained that he would work closely with the LEP and look at the wider, regional picture; tourism was an example of a benefit for all partners in the LEP. It was also important to seek innovation for Herefordshire which the enterprise zone was achieving as an initiative that was unique to the county in the Marches LEP structure.*

Councillor Christy Bolderson declared a pecuniary interest, under agenda item no. 11, Leader's Report, as a local resident to the proposed southern end of the Western Bypass and outlined the dispensation granted by the monitoring officer.

- There was concern regarding the five year housing supply. The Leader was asked if the pause and review and the suspension of planning applications in the North of the county undermined the delivery of the County's housing requirements and if the 5 year housing supply was not met how parish councils would be reassured that the neighbourhood development plans they had in place were worthwhile. *The Leader acknowledged that the five year housing supply was problematic; the latest data was available on the Council's website; and it was important that parish councils were reassured. The cabinet member infrastructure and transport explained that the core strategy was sound but the county had not kept up with the five year housing supply; a written response would be provided to the question.*
- The campaign literature used by the Leader during the election in May 2019 was queried and whether it contained a commitment to stop the bypass. *The Leader explained that his election material explained that he did not support road schemes.*

There was a brief adjournment at 12.55 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 1.05 p.m.

33. NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDERS

Motion 1 – Review of Governance Models

In moving the motion Councillor Alan Seldon made the following points:

- The Council would be the first unitary authority to implement the committee system if this was the outcome of the review;
- The review would be undertaken by the audit and governance committee which would ensure that the process was open and transparent; and

- The working group would be cross-party and would consider a number of options of governance models including the committee system.

The following principal points were raised during the debate:

- The motion would not be supported if the role of the working group was to introduce the committee system, it was understood that the review would consider a number of governance model examples.
- The experience of other councils introduction of the committee system was raised and the potential issues involved in its introduction at a top tier authority;
- Any model that was introduced should ensure that effective member engagement was realised;
- The proposed review was welcomed but the length of time before the recommendations of the working group were made was queried and whether a faster timeframe should be considered;
- A committee system would involve a large number of meetings which could be lengthy;
- Any changes which members wanted to see made to current practices to bring about improvements were encouraged. Such changes need not be reliant on the outcomes of the review of governance models;

Councillor Jim Kenyon proposed an amendment to the motion to include a review of the number of councillors in the county in the work of the working group. The proposal was ruled out of order by the Chairman as it did not concern a function of the Council.

The debate continued as below

- It was important that the review took into account the potential cost to the Council of a change in Governance Model.
- The Executive should ensure that a reasonable and comprehensive budget existed for the operation of the working group.
- The review would ensure that the work of the Council was transparent.
- The working group would look at the example of other areas and determine what was best for the Council.
- The committee system was a good model to ensure that decision making was undertaken across party lines and that common ground was found on decisions of the Council;

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

- The review would be open to all other options including hybrid models and would investigate good practice from other areas;
- The manner in which the cabinet system operated was not conducive to open and transparent decision making;
- The review would consider the speed of decision making and would take into account the issue of cost of transferring to an alternative system.
- It was important that the working group considered systems which ensured that all councillors had a voice.

In closing the debate Councillor Seldon explained that councillors were elected to serve the best interests of their local residents and it was important that a governance model was established in support of this role. It was noted that the proposed motion contained direction that the working group considers the resource implications of any proposed changes.

The motion was put to the vote and agreed by a simple majority of the Council.

RESOLVED:

That Herefordshire Council is committed to maintain high standards of corporate governance in order to achieve the council's vision of 'People, organisations and businesses working together to bring sustainable prosperity and well-being for all, in the outstanding natural environment of Herefordshire'. Good corporate governance, covering our systems, processes, culture and values, ensures that we provide the correct services to the right people in a timely, open and accountable way; it encourages better informed, longer-term decision making, using resources efficiently and being open to scrutiny with a view to improve performance and manage risk.

The way in which our current Cabinet and Leader system operates means that many of our more significant decisions are taken by a very small proportion of the elected members. To ensure that our governance arrangements are as effective as possible in supporting fulfilment of our corporate governance commitments, and to maximise the engagement of all elected members in decision making, the Council resolves that:

a) The Audit and Governance Committee oversee a review of governance models for a recommendation to Council no later than October 2020.

b) The review be undertaken by a cross-party working group, reporting to the Audit and Governance Committee. To contain representation from each political group, from the executive, scrutiny and other functions. The Monitoring Officer be authorised to determine membership following consultation with political group leaders.

c) The review should follow guidance from the Local Government Association and from the Centre for Public Scrutiny guidance; 'Rethinking Governance: Practical steps for councils considering changes to their governance arrangement, and

d) The review be undertaken having regard to the following guiding principles;

- To maximise member engagement and participation in decision making**
- Ensure decision making is informed, transparent and efficient**
- Welcome public engagement**
- Enable member and officers to perform effectively in clearly defined functions and roles**
- To assess any resource implications for any proposed changes.**

Councillor David Summers agreed a reordering of the motions to hear the General Permitted Development Order motion before his Mental Health Awareness Day motion.

Motion 2 – General Permitted Development Order (GDPO)

In moving the motion Councillor Elissa Swinglehurst made the following points:

- Class Q of the GDPO currently allowed for the development of up to five agricultural buildings into houses which would gain planning consent if specified criteria was fulfilled;**
- The rules undermined the planning process and local planning preference;**
- Agricultural buildings were usually located in the open countryside where applications for housing were not normally granted permission;**
- Local planning policy was not adhered to and development control and the planning system was negated;**

- The remote nature of some houses in the countryside developed from agricultural buildings also impacted upon the Council's service provision.
- The motion called on the executive to take the matter forward and write to the government to request a review of the legislation.

The following principal points were raised during the debate:

- Planning permission was required for the development of agricultural buildings to houses. The GDPO ensured that where criteria was met permission would be granted.
- The provision of council services was a concern to houses in remote parts of the countryside;
- The current large-scale housing developments proposed in Hereford was raised and it was felt that permission for five houses was minimal in comparison. Such smaller-scale development would provide jobs for local building firms;
- It was noted that a number of class Q applications concerned large, industrial-scale agricultural buildings which were of low quality and less sustainable than newly built houses;
- Class Q was felt to undermine the protection of the countryside and it was felt that article 4 should also be looked at, concerning direction;

In seconding the motion Councillor Yolande Watson made the following points:

- The longer term cost to the Council of class Q developments in unsustainable areas of the countryside should be acknowledged;
- The committee on climate changes had published a report which had recommended closing loopholes around change of use development;
- The legislation was not fit for purpose.

In closing the debate Councillor Swinglehurst thanked the Council for the debate and expressed interest in consideration around the article 4 issue.

The motion was put to the vote and agreed by a simple majority of the Council.

RESOLVED: That:

This Council has declared a climate emergency and must align policy to reflect this – we have a number of policies designed to encourage sustainability in terms of locality, design and build but the use of class Q (General Permitted Development Order as amended) is undermining the effectiveness of these policies.

This Council resolves that: the executive is requested to write to government to ask them to review the policy regarding part 3 class Q (General Permitted Development Order as amended) applications under the General Permitted Development Order.

Motion 3 – Mental Health Awareness Day

In moving the motion Councillor David Summers made the following points:

- The motion sought to establish a day in the calendar to raise awareness around mental health and support a better quality of life for all;
- Herefordshire was a rural county with a comparatively high suicide rate.
- It was important to look at the impact of mental health in the work place and working days lost.

- The awareness day would bring together all groups involved in mental health services locally;
- The establishment of a designated telephone line, magazine and a website, with the web address www.letslistenhereford.com, should be undertaken.

The following principal points were raised during the debate:

- The potential for linking the day to other events such as world mental health day was raised;
- Tribute was paid to Councillor Summer's committed campaigning on mental health issues.
- It was suggested that workshops could be arranged as part of the awareness day to provide practical events for people to undertake;
- There should be a focus on children and young people who suffer from stress and anxiety which could lead to mental health problems throughout their lives;
- The day should highlight mental health support that was available locally and also provide mental health first aid training;
- It was important that the day was a unique local awareness day for Herefordshire;

In seconding the motion Councillor Jim Kenyon made the following points:

- The timing of the proposed awareness day on the third Monday in January was apt coming at a time of year when people were particularly susceptible to mental health issues;
- The diminution of pastoral help in schools was raised and its importance to the mental wellbeing of pupils;
- There was concern with the growing use of anti-depressants in the over-65s;
- The awareness day should trend on Twitter and engage with local partners and businesses.

In closing the debate Councillor Summers explained that actions were now required to put together a wellbeing initiative to focus on people in Herefordshire.

The motion was put to the vote and agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED: That:

Mental illness has a huge social and economic impact, its effects can predispose a person to a range of negative health issues which in turn leads to depression or worse suicide. It's a matter of fact that mental health can affect a family member or anyone of us at any stage of life.

However, anyone who has been in crisis is well aware that there is still a stigma attached to it. For many of us simply having someone talk at us can increase those feelings of inadequacy and isolation. Conversely, just listening will allow a sense of being in charge.

Thankfully there is a wealth of mental health support already available in the county. To highlight this support and promote the need to listen without prejudice the Council resolves that:

The executive be asked to establish a designated annual mental health day to be named "Lets Listen Herefordshire" to be held every third Monday of each New Year from January 20th 2020 onwards.

The meeting ended at 2.12 pm

CHAIRMAN