

Supplement 1 to the agenda

Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 8 July 2025, 2.00 pm

Conference Room 1 - Herefordshire Council, Plough Lane Offices, Hereford, HR4 0LE

Contents

Item	Title and purpose	Page(s)
8.	Update on recommendations made by the Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee To provide the committee with an update to recommendations made by the committee.	3 - 26



Title of report: Update on recommendations made by the committee

Meeting: Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee

Meeting date: 08 July 2025

Report by: Statutory Scrutiny Officer

Classification

Open

Decision type

This is not an executive decision

Wards affected

All wards

Purpose

To provide the committee with a further update to recommendations made by the committee since July 2023.

Recommendation(s)

That the committee:

- a) **Notes the responses to recommendations that have been made by this committee and**
- b) **Decides any further course of action on any topic for which it has received responses to its recommendations.**

Alternative options

1. As the committee has previously agreed to make these recommendations, and to receive a report on their implementation, no alternative options are presented.

Key considerations

2. An important part of the scrutiny process is the recommendations made by a committee following its scrutiny of a given topic.

3. Paragraph 2.6.8 of Herefordshire Council's Constitution states that "*scrutiny committees can make reports and recommendations to the leader, Council and some partner organisations. The decision takers are not required to implement the recommendations but do have to consider any recommendations made.*"
4. Herefordshire Council has an established process for the consideration and implementation of scrutiny recommendations, contained in its Constitution. This states that "*The chief executive will notify the relevant scrutiny committee of the response of the executive within two months of receipt of the scrutiny report, with the exception of matters relating to statutory health scrutiny and issues relating to crime and disorder scrutiny which require a response from the relevant body within 28 days. If the cabinet or cabinet member wishes to extend the deadline a report will be made to the relevant scrutiny committee explaining why this is considered necessary. Decisions of the executive or Council on any scrutiny recommendations will be recorded in the usual way.*"
5. Appendix 1 of this report contains a list of every recommendation made by the Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee since its inception in 2022. The table also includes the response received (or whether that response remains outstanding).
6. The committee last received an update on responses to its recommendations at its meeting on 12 March 2025. At this meeting, the committee recommended that Herefordshire Council "ensures that the statutory scrutiny officer drafts a cross-scrutiny committee protocol, to ensure timely responses with faster escalation as required to outstanding recommendations.
7. Since this meeting, a protocol to expedite responses has been drafted and will be circulated with papers for the next round of scrutiny committee meetings. The committee has no recommendations for which a response is overdue.
8. The committee may wish to decide at this meeting which of the recommendations, for which has received a response, are now satisfied. It may also wish to determine which recommendations it wishes to receive a further updates on its implementation. Any recommendations which the committee determines are satisfied will be omitted from future editions of this report.

Community impact

9. The scrutiny function supports community development by holding the executive and its partners to account and making evidence-based recommendations that it believes will strengthen policy and practice in Herefordshire. Regularly reviewing reviews ensures that recommendations are considered and responded to, as well as providing feedback to committee in order to strengthen the quality of their recommendations.

Environmental impact

10. Herefordshire Council provides and purchases a wide range of services for the people of Herefordshire. Together with partner organisations in the private, public and voluntary sectors we share a strong commitment to improving our environmental sustainability, achieving carbon neutrality and to protect and enhance Herefordshire's outstanding natural environment.
11. All reports to scrutiny committees, as with all council committees, include appraisals of the impact of the report content on climate change. Scrutiny committee work programmes directly link to the council plan priorities, including the key priority to 'Protect and enhance our environment and ensure that Herefordshire is a great place to live'.
12. Whilst this is a report on back office functions and will have minimal environmental impacts, consideration has been made to minimise waste and resource use in line with the council's Environmental Policy. Examples include:
 - a. Creation of an online-only briefing programme, eliminating the need to travel to Hereford for a single meeting.

- b. Paper-free briefings and informal meetings, eliminating the need for printed paper.

Equality duty

13. Under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, a public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - a. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this act;
 - b. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - c. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
14. The public sector equality duty (specific duty) requires us to consider how we can positively contribute to the advancement of equality and good relations and demonstrate that we are paying 'due regard' in our decision making in the design of policies and in the delivery of services. As this report is primarily for information, we do not believe that accepting (or rejecting) this report will have an impact on our equality duty.

Resource implications

15. Effective scrutiny produces evidence-based recommendations. These can be informed by learning from best practice and an understanding of 'what works' at other similar local authorities, as well as developing a robust picture of what the situation is locally based on data, intelligence and insights. Where adopted, recommendations can help with the efficiency and effectiveness of services that can be delivered differently, as well as informing the development of current and new policies.
16. As this report is primarily for information, there are no direct resource implications arising from this report.

Risk management

17. Effective scrutiny is a feature of the council's governance arrangements, where the council is operating executive arrangements. There are a range of factors that could result in risks to council of not doing scrutiny effectively. These include the failure to:
 - a. challenge and hold decision makers to account
 - b. link scrutiny work to the delivery of the council's priorities and risk management
 - c. carry out thorough and appropriate research to make evidence-based recommendations
 - d. engage partners and providers
 - e. ensure that structures and models of operation are fit for purpose and match ambition and available resources
 - f. ensure that scrutiny can operate as the voice of communities and
 - g. draw on member knowledge and experience to inform policy development.
18. To mitigate, tolerate or eradicate these risks, enablers for effective scrutiny include:
 - a. operating in an apolitical manner
 - b. clarity of vision and purpose

- c. scrutiny support availability, capability and capacity
- d. effective engagement and commitment by members and officers at all levels, including cabinet, opposition leaders, scrutiny chairs and senior officers who play a central role in setting the tone and direction
- e. robust work programming and prioritisation of topics with clear objectives and expected impacts
- f. ensuring that scrutiny work will add value to the council and communities e.g. through strong links between work programme topics and the integrated strategic plans that set out the actions and timescales to deliver the priorities in the County Plan
- g. access to and availability of robust data and intelligence and
- h. good relationships with partners and providers.

Consultees

19. None

Appendices

Appendix 1 Recommendations made by Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee, July 2023 – July 2025

Background papers

None

Report Reviewers Used for appraising this report:

Please note this section must be completed before the report can be published		
Governance	John Coleman	Date 01/07/2025
Finance		Date Click or tap to enter a date.
Legal		Date Click or tap to enter a date.
Communications		Date Click or tap to enter a date.
Equality Duty	Click or tap here to enter text.	Date Click or tap to enter a date.
Procurement	Click or tap here to enter text.	Date Click or tap to enter a date.
Risk	Click or tap here to enter text.	Date Click or tap to enter a date.

Approved by	Click or tap here to enter text.	Date Click or tap to enter a date.
-------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------------

Please include a glossary of terms, abbreviations and acronyms used in this report.



Appendix 1 Recommendations made by Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee, July 2023 – June 2025

Wednesday 19 July 2023			
Pre-decision scrutiny of the forthcoming Cabinet decision on Review of New Hereford Library and Learning Resource Centre Location			
Rec. No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	Recommendations a) and b) in the Cabinet report be removed and the Maylords project paused rather than cancelled, pending the provision of a full business case for the Shirehall option, to ensure that the full capital and revenue cost implications are worked out, and to enable proper comparison of the two options, thus ensuring that adequate information is available to inform a decision that carries significant financial risks.	Accepted	Scrutiny recommendations upheld. 20 July 2023 Cabinet meeting decision (b) confirmed that 'the decision to relocate the Library and Learning Centre to the Maylord Orchards site is paused during the development of a Full Business Case for the Shirehall proposal'.
2	Detailed consideration is given in the full business case for the proposed Shirehall development in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decarbonisation of the Shirehall, in line with the council's existing commitment to become net zero carbon by 2030; • Clarifying the potential for expanding and enhancing the services provided, including providing indicative costings and indicating potential funding sources; and • Identifying and addressing potential impacts of any expanded and enhanced facilities and services, such as performance space, on commercial operators offering similar services to those envisaged at the Shirehall. 	Accepted	Scrutiny recommendation acknowledged. The Full Business Case will focus solely on the relocation of Hereford Library and Learning Centre at Shirehall as was agreed in the original Cabinet decision. The wider renovation of Shirehall is part of a separately funded £4.2m capital project. This phased renovation includes improvements to the sustainability and decarbonisation of Shirehall (subject to listed restrictions) within phases 1 and 2. The potential for expanding and enhancing services at Shirehall is captured in a phased plan up to 2029. This will be subject to further capital bids and other external funding potential, where possible. The Full Business Case will outline opportunities for commercial sustainability within Shirehall, to include an events and performance space in the Assembly Hall library space and sensory room/ makerspace hire. The wider Shirehall project includes the potential for meeting room hire, court hire (meeting spaces, inquests and film/ TV hire) and a café /community kitchen offer.
3	The full business case addresses all of the 'Criteria for Review' points identified in the 'Scope of Review of New Hereford Library and Learning Resource Centre Location', with particular attention to ensuring that the criteria on Value for Money and Financial Viability are	Accepted	Scrutiny recommendation acknowledged. The Full Business Case will include all financial information including full capital budget breakdown of Library and Learning Centre works, income/expenditure forecasts, phased cost breakdowns for supporting Shirehall refurbishment works and resource costs.

	given adequate attention, given the concerning lack of information on these aspects in the report before Cabinet on 20 July 2023.		
	Scrutiny is supported to ensure that the full evidence base underpinning future reports, especially financial information, is published in sufficient time; and that requests for information from scrutiny committee members are responded to in good time.	Accepted	Council Officers support the recommendation and will ensure that any financial information and evidence are published in sufficient time, and responses actioned.
	An adequate Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) is produced in respect of the potential decision to terminate the Maylord Orchards capital project.	Accepted	Scrutiny recommendation upheld. The library team will carry out an EIA in respect to the potential decision to terminate the Maylord Orchards capital project to fully understand any impacts.

23 October 2023**Pre-decision scrutiny of the forthcoming Cabinet decision on 'Review of the Full Business Case for the Shirehall as a location for the future of Hereford City Library'**

Rec. No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	Clarify and include in the Shirehall business case the full costs of cancelling Maylord Orchards, including the implications of decapitalisation on revenue budgets.	Rejected	<p>As agreed in the Methodology Paper on the Shirehall full business case (FBC), following the Cabinet decision on 20 July 2023, the FBC was prepared as a standalone report, exploring the potential of the Shirehall on its own merit and to focus solely on the proposed library and learning centre development, acknowledging that this is part of a wider project to bring the whole Shirehall building back into use. It will consider the assembly hall and undercroft spaces and the wider key works required to enable access and operation of these parts of the building only. Estimates for the full capital costs to the Shirehall building will be developed in conjunction with this FBC and provided as contextual information. A standard FBC is used to set out all projects which meet the requirements of the Governments green boost, therefore the full cost of the Shirehall project were not included in the Shirehall business case. The refurbishment work to the Shirehall is clearly a dependency but the FBC is about placing the library and the learning centre into the allotted space within the Shirehall just as the business case for Maylord Orchards was about placing it, into that allotted space.</p> <p>The full sunk cost of the Maylords Orchard's project remains confidential at this stage due to the ongoing negotiations with contractors. Whilst there is acknowledgement there will be some cost in respect of Maylord Orchards, this Cabinet takes a strategic view point and that value for money means using resources</p>

			<p>effectively and efficiently, and safeguarding the Council's assets in their entirety. Thus, in respect of the sunk costs which are undesirable the right decision will provide us with a world class library.</p> <p>The original £3.5m library budget was funded from £3m from the Stronger Towns fund and £0.5m from Hereford Council capital receipts reserve. However, Stronger Towns top sliced £60k to pay for management costs of the project so that the final award was actually £2,439,633.</p> <p>Therefore, it has been assumed that the future budget of Shirehall Library will be £3.005m and this will be funded from the remaining capital funding - i.e. £3.5m, less £434.3k prior spend and the £60.4k top slice. This funding will support all of the works necessary to open the library service provision.</p>
2	Publish the full breakdown of the £4.2 million cost of the Phase 1 refurbishment of Shirehall.	Accepted	<p>The full breakdown of the £4.2 million cost of the Phase 1 refurbishment of Shirehall are:</p> <p>Build Works £2.079m</p> <p>Design and Preliminaries £682k</p> <p>Inflation £113k</p> <p>Fee, Risk, Contingencies £1.178m</p> <p>On costs/ Allowances £140k</p> <p>Confirmed that no further level of detail would be provided to prevent weakening the future competitive process.</p>
3	Publish the estimated costs of phases 2-5 of Shirehall refurbishment.	Rejected	<p>The continued phased refurbishment project of Shirehall does not form part of the Shirehall Full Business Case and has not been agreed. The phase 1 refurbishment work will bring the whole building back into use.</p>
4	Recalculate the BCR of the Shirehall proposal, to include the cancellation costs of the Maylord Orchards and the £4.2m Phase 1 refurbishment costs required to make the library viable.	Rejected	<p>All Herefordshire Stronger Towns Fund projects are independently modelled and analysed as part of a Benefit Cost Ratio exercise by Rose Regeneration. This methodology has been considered and agreed by Chamberlain Walker working on behalf of Central Government. To allow a fair comparison with Maylord Orchards, the new Shirehall full business case (FBC) was independently analysed by Rose Regeneration using this same Government model. This is an independent process with no council involvement.</p> <p>The assessment of economic benefits for this Towns Fund scheme has been undertaken in full compliance with the latest HM Treasury Green Book (2020) and relevant Departmental guidance, such as Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC). The economic modelling includes a</p>

			<p>number of monetised benefits, consistent with Government guidance. These included regeneration benefits, social benefit skills, enterprise and tourism (cultural benefits).</p> <p>The additionality factor in the BCR calculation is 66% as stated on page 47 of the FBC. The additionality factor figure of 0.65 in Table 18 was written in error but the calculation has been made using the correct additionality factor of 66%. (It is also noted that this same error exists within the Maylord Orchard FBC).</p> <p>The methodology used in the BCR calculation for Shirehall FBC is wholly consistent with all Towns Fund projects. Rose Regeneration confirmed that no extraneous costs, for example building repair costs or purchase costs, were used in the Maylord Orchards FBC calculation or any of the other 15 Towns Fund projects, so are immaterial to the overall calculation and should not be included.</p> <p>Therefore the Maylords Orchards BCR did not include the cost of £4.147m to purchase the lease for Maylords Orchards and therefore in maintaining a level playing field, Cabinet will be recalculating the BCR.</p>
5	Include full costs of operating Shirehall in the revenue budget to enable a comparison between both business cases.	Rejected	<p>An operational revenue budget currently exists for Shirehall. Whilst it is true to say that the use of the site is limited at this time, some aspects would show very little variance - for example, the main building is currently heated via a single pipe system meaning the heating is either on or off. To ensure that the building does not deteriorate, and in recognition that an area is still manned 24/7, the heating is turned on in line with the normal operational cycle. We would look to see a reduction in future heating costs as part of the decarbonisation works.</p> <p>The revenue budget table set out in the Cabinet report covers Library Service costs associated with the HLLC occupying either site. If all operational costs were to be factored into the Shirehall FBC, then further work would need to be undertaken for both business cases as the FBC's for either location have never included the wider asset costs so in that respect, they are both actually equitable.</p> <p>For clarity, the £42k figure shown in the proposed Service revenue budget to occupy Maylord Orchards is to cover off payment of non-domestic rates. The row heading says 'rent/ rates' and, as Scrutiny pointed out, no rental was intended to be charged if the HLLC occupies Maylord Orchards. However, all</p>

			operational costs for occupation of Maylord Orchards need to be budgeted for as these are new costs to the Council.
6	Ensure that the Shirehall risk matrix include detailed mitigation of listed risks.	Rejected	There is sufficient mitigation in terms of specialist contractor requirements or volatile construction market. It is accepted as a risk but the risk is low. The mitigation is that the project team will work with the Council's commercial services team and appointed contractor consultant to understand the market for such contractors. This is a relatively small area of risk that isn't covered by the everyday works, and large companies (who usually manage such contracts) are aware to look out for in this type of building but this will be covered by the Council's commercial services team.
7	Ensure that the risk relating to the £4.2m additional cost is included in the risk matrix.	No response	
8	Remove the recommendation to cancel Maylord Orchards project at this stage.	Accepted	This is accepted by Cabinet and will remove recommendation (d) from the Cabinet report.
9	Clarify anticipated commercial revenue from events.	No response	
10	Ensure that the business case makes sure that the proposed library is a welcoming space for all users regardless of their accessibility needs.	Accepted	It is the intention to make any and all of our buildings as accessible as possible. The decoration and internal design would make sure the space that the public will see is welcoming, as we would in any of our public buildings.
11	Reconsider how the project can maximise carbon reduction e.g. through insulation and glazing in line with the council's net zero commitment.	Accepted	Where possible we will make sure that our buildings meet all of our commitments. With net zero commitments we do have to realise that some buildings, especially those built over 200 years ago, are in themselves an icon and the extent of their iconic status is because of their quiriness in regard to glazing and certain aspects of their design that were never intended to be altered to modern requirements. There is no reason to say don't do it, but (in the Cabinet member's opinion) should be minimalistic rather than maximum. Where there are certain things that cannot be done, there lots of other initiatives or alterations to the building that can be made to improve this situation. The building to this Council is unique and iconic, and in the rest of the country there are thousands of such buildings which have been very sympathetically brought into the 21st century and we are sure the Shirehall will fulfil that as well.
12	Include and identify the cost of measures to improve pedestrian accessibility to the site.	Rejected	The question regarding access (crossing the road with the bus station in front of the Shirehall) has been addressed within the Hereford Master Plan. Confirmed that pedestrianisation of the area outside the Shirehall would be improved. But these things are not vitally necessary in the first year or two of doing the

			<p>installation and in the time it takes to make the changes to the Shirehall, pedestrianisation could be one of the things that was finished.</p> <p>Noted that access to the Shirehall via St Peter's Square from High Town was improved following St Owen's Street cycling street works carried out under the previous administration. With the courtesy crossing through and from the island, there are also dropped curbs allowing for northern access to the Shire hall. There have been no injuries or accidents reported in the last 10 years.</p>
--	--	--	--

8 November 2023			
Herefordshire Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan			
Rec. No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	That more and better secondary data be used, particularly that data beyond Strava is used for leisure, and that the LCWIP states and mitigates biases in that data.	Rejected	<p>Understanding existing and potential future travel patterns is a crucial step in developing a LCWIP network to ensure it reflects local demand. The analysis of travel patterns has been conducted through a combined approach, utilising three key datasets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Propensity to Cycle Tool (PCT): As recommended within the LCWIP guidance. • Strava Analysis: As suggested as a data source within Figure 6 of the LCWIP guidance. • Everyday Trip Analysis: Assessing relationships between 'origins' and 'destinations' within Herefordshire. <p>Regarding Strava Data, this data was used to provide additional information on trips 'on foot' (including walking, running, hiking, etc.) and trips 'on bike.' It was extracted from the Strava Metro website, gathered from Strava users recording walking, running, or cycling trips on their Strava app. The information, available free of charge to local authorities, aids in understanding mobility patterns, especially for leisure trips. Strava data is available in batches of three consecutive months and was obtained for June – August 2022, representing the three months with the highest activity levels from the previous year.</p> <p>However, it is crucial to recognise the limitations of this dataset. Strava data should not be as comprehensive as a single source of data as it only represents Strava users who choose to record their activities. For example, short trips to the shops may not be recorded. Whilst there are apparent limitations to this data and this is recognised, Strava data is still a powerful tool to help highlight severance created by showing routes and areas that cyclists avoid, as well as helping to build a wider picture of routes, particularly leisure routes, which are currently cycled. This supplements the other data, as PCT data does not take into account leisure trips. Everyday Trip Analysis helps to identify these 'short trips to the shops' that might not be picked up by the Strava data.</p>

			<p>It is important to note that the LCWIP has currently utilised an extensive range of data, taking inspiration from figure 6 within the LCWIP Guidance and expanding data sources above and beyond this list.</p>
--	--	--	--

2	<p>That public consultation be done, including but not limited to city, town and parish councils, walking and cycling groups, key local institutions and employers, in line with DfT LCWIP engagement guidance, and</p> <p>a. that significant funds be allocated to do this (noting that there is potentially £43k already available for this exercise);</p> <p>b. that this is done ASAP and certainly commenced before the end of this calendar year; that such consultation is done on a standalone basis without waiting for LTP and Local plan consultation;</p> <p>c. that such consultation acknowledges that in many cases there may be synergies between LCWIP and wider highway maintenance and improvements.</p>	Accepted	<p>We are currently undertaking a period of engagement with key stakeholder groups which began in September 2024 and will be completed by mid-November 2024 (this was initially scheduled for June-August 2024) however, due to the election period this had to be delayed). To date we have spoken with the following stakeholder groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Active travel groups - Business organisations - Neighbouring authorities - Rail organisations - Parish, town and city councils - Disability and Accessibility groups - Emergency services - Internal council teams (including highways, public rights of way, planning, major projects team, road safety, development control, economic development, communications, equalities, and public health) - The Garrison, Credenhill <p>We are due to engage with the following by mid November 2024:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Young people - Cabinet members <p>The engagement with key stakeholders has been invaluable in identifying alignments and known issues. These stakeholders, serving as active travel champions, have also provided valuable insights through their strong connections with the public.</p> <p>However, this engagement is not a substitute for the public consultation, and we are planning a wider public consultation at the end of this year.</p>
3	<p>That consultation is done on the LCWIP elements of the Hereford City Masterplan ASAP.</p>	Rejected	<p>The Hereford City LCWIP, developed as part of the draft Hereford City Masterplan has been incorporated into the countywide plan, and updated in line with LCWIP guidance, therefore, these will form part of the LCWIP public consultation which will take place at the end of this year, into early next.</p>

4	That Herefordshire Council coordinates with neighbouring local authorities sooner rather than later both in terms of information gathering and consultation on potential routes.	Accepted	We met with representatives from all our neighbouring authorities on 13th September 2024, including Gloucestershire, Monmouthshire, Worcestershire, Powys and Shropshire councils. Feedback was very positive, and the process for our countywide LCWIP aligned with our neighbouring authorities. No issues or concerns were raised by any officers and they are keen to be contacted again when we undertake public consultation on the draft plan.
5	That potential long distance routes including greenways are included in the LCWIP consultation and development process.	Accepted	<p>During the engagement process, the concept of 'greenways' was frequently raised by key stakeholders and parish councillors. After reflecting on the feedback and capturing their views, greenways have been added to our initial long list of schemes, which will be prioritised accordingly.</p> <p>Additionally, the engagement process provided information on a number of 'slow ways'—a network of routes that make use of public rights of way and low-traffic roads. These slow ways have also been included in our proposed network and added to our list of projects.</p> <p>It is important to note that Greenway schemes have undergone a comprehensive feasibility study, which identified several challenges to progressing these projects. The most significant issue highlighted in each Greenway feasibility report is the complexity of land ownership concerns.</p>

6	That the cycle network plan and walking network plan be published to scrutiny ASAP.	Rejected	<p>The cycle network and walking plan for Hereford City, along with the broader county-wide network plan, is currently undergoing a period of refinement and reflection following recent engagement, including an upcoming session with young people in November. After this phase, we will review the network plans and test them with internal officers across the county to ensure alignment, and explore opportunities for collaboration. We will then establish a phased approach for delivering the prioritised list of projects, taking into account factors such as time, complexity, and budget, which will be integrated into the final LCWIP report which we will provide to scrutiny for review.</p> <p>In response to feedback from the engagement process, we are planning to produce two distinct documents for the LCWIP: one technical document aligned with DfT guidelines for funding applications, which is particularly pertinent at this stage given anticipated news of funding from central government, and a separate, public-facing document that will explain the process and outline projects across the county.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the LCWIP once completed, will only be a first iteration, as the plan will be reviewed regularly and adjusted/updated according to latest data and intelligence. There will therefore be further opportunities to provide input into the plan in future.</p>
7	That a breakdown of the spending with PJA be provided.	Accepted	The below table provides a summary of LCWIP activities undertaken to date, or due to be undertaken by PJA including fees, broken down by the various stages outlined in the LCWIP guidance.
New Herefordshire Local Transport Plan			
Rec. No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	Publish in full all background materials, including but not limited to the carbon modelling exercise.	Accepted	<p>Appendices B and C are included in this report that set out the key areas of context and a summary of the output from the carbon emissions work referred to in the report. Further, more detailed information on which these appendices are based, can be made available to the committee.</p>

2	Address the inconsistency in the way that carbon emissions are presented (by mixing territorial and consumption); publish both consumption and territorial emissions for both overall emissions and journey length (if possible); and address the issue that this report underplays the importance of modal shift for short journeys.	Accepted	<p>It is acknowledged that the Midlands Connect model, used by local authorities across the region for carbon modelling, is not currently able to calculate the proportion of emissions within Herefordshire of any trip that may start or end outside the county. This means that active travel may have a greater role to play in reducing transport carbon emissions in the county, but that measures that seek to target medium and longer distance trips will still have the greatest overall impact. This is recognised in the report at para 14.</p> <p>Midlands Connect is currently updating its baseline emissions model to provide additional functionality and is exploring opportunities to geographically bound emissions by trip length and place type within individual local transport authority areas. If this change is agreed and implemented, further analysis will be possible as the LTP progresses.</p>
3	Engage immediately and closely with the Transport subgroup of the HCNPB as well as other key stakeholders, including National Grid.	Accepted	It is considered that engagement with stakeholders such as the HCNPB and national Grid, as part of the proposed upcoming engagement exercise alongside the Local Plan, will provide appropriate and timely input.
4	Engage ASAP with a wide range of stakeholders to collect data as well as consult on emerging priorities.	Accepted	It is considered that engagement, as part of the proposed upcoming engagement exercise alongside the Local Plan, will provide appropriate and timely input.
5	Consider the following suggested objectives: a. Improved road safety b. Improved residents health c. Improved range of transport choices including active travel and public transport, demand-responsive transport and reliable public EV charging infrastructure d. Improved access to services e. Carbon reduction (embodied and operational) f. Nature protection g. Supporting a sustainably thriving and prosperous economy.	Rejected	<p>a. Improved road safety - this is covered in the “Improving transport safety and security” objective.</p> <p>b. Improved residents’ health – this is covered in the “Enabling healthy behaviours and improving wellbeing” objective.</p> <p>c. Improved range of transport choices including active travel and public transport, demand-responsive transport and reliable public EV charging infrastructure – this is considered to be included in the “Enabling healthy behaviours and improving wellbeing” and “Tackling climate change” objectives as part of those objectives’ focus on walking and cycling becoming the natural choice for short trips and on providing viable low carbon options for most journeys.</p> <p>d. Improved access to services – this is covered in the “Supporting a thriving and prosperous economy” objective.</p> <p>e. Carbon reduction (embodied and operational) – this is covered by the “Tackling climate change” objective and the inclusion of both embodied and operational carbon is agreed.</p> <p>f. Nature protection – this is covered by the “Protecting and</p>

			enhancing the natural and built environment” objective. g. Supporting a sustainably thriving and prosperous economy. – this is covered by the “Supporting a thriving and prosperous economy” objective.
--	--	--	--

27 February 2024

The policy, prioritisation and delivery of section 106 funding

Rec. No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	Review the future schedule of rates for Section 106 as contained in the Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Obligations dated 1st April 2008 to ensure they reflect current costs, and are updated annually.	Accepted	To consider how the future schedule of rates for Section 106 as contained in the Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Obligations dated 1st April 2008 can be reviewed to ensure they reflect current costs and are updated annually.
2	Introduce interim arrangements for Section 106 funding to ensure changes to schedules of rates can be updated rapidly, while a decision on adopting Infrastructure Levy is reviewed.	Accepted	To consider how the interim arrangements for Section 106 funding to ensure changes to schedules of rates can be updated rapidly, while a decision on adopting Infrastructure Levy can be reviewed.
3	Improve parish council, councillor and local resident engagement in updating community wish lists.	Accepted	The council will review the current process of identifying community wish lists and will introduce changes where improvements can be made.
4	Invite parishes who do not currently have a neighbourhood development plan to submit a parish infrastructure development plan.	Accepted	The council will invite parishes who do not currently have a neighbourhood development plan to submit a parish infrastructure development plan.
5	Publish the community wish list in a more accessible format.	Accepted	The council will publish the section 106 wish list in a more accessible format.
6	Consider using interest on banked section 106 contributions to help expedite delivery of the Section 106 project backlog.	Accepted	The council will consider using interest on banked section 106 contributions to help expedite delivery of the Section 106 project backlog.
7	Ensure that the costs of Section 106 delivery are integrated into the S106 contributions collected to ensure that there is ongoing adequate capacity to enable prompt delivery of projects, both in terms of project management capacity and in terms of delivery capacity within the relevant service areas.	Accepted	The council will review how the costs of Section 106 delivery are integrated into the S106 contributions collected to ensure that there is ongoing adequate capacity to enable prompt delivery of projects, both in terms of project management capacity and in terms of delivery capacity within the relevant service areas.
8	Clarify how delivery of Section 106 projects will be managed once the Programme Management Office (PMO) backlog project comes to an end.	Accepted	The council will review how the costs of Section 106 delivery are integrated into the S106 contributions collected to ensure that there is ongoing adequate capacity to enable prompt delivery of projects, both in terms of project management capacity and in terms of delivery capacity within the relevant service areas.

9	Improve presentation of information on Section 106 funding received and spent, including greater graphical representation of funding, to enable greater public understanding of the process.	17-Oct-24	The council will review how it can improve presentation of information on Section 106 funding received and spent, including greater graphical representation of funding, to enable greater public understanding of the process.
10	Report back to the committee on the results of the Section 106 benchmarking exercise within three months.	17-Oct-24	The local planning authority will report back to the committee on the results of the section 106 benchmarking exercise.

10 July 2024**Affordable and social housing in Herefordshire**

Rec. No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	To prepare a report for the committee by the end of September, providing more detail on the issues raised in the meeting, including options to increase the delivery of social and affordable housing.	Accepted	This report was presented to the committee on 15 October 24

Public Realm Future Operating Model working group terms of reference

Rec. No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	The committee form a working group according to the terms of reference attached to the report as appendix 1.	Accepted	This working group has taken place and reported to the committee on 15 October 24

13 November 2024**Enterprise Zones**

Rec. No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	Create a management company with a volunteer board for Ross Enterprise Park by 31 March 2025, in order to develop the park's business plan with officer support.	Partly accepted	Partly agreed – It is intended that a representative board for bringing forward employment land across the county is established, rather than focussing on one area only. This will help ensure the council considers the needs of all areas, whilst ensuring the relevant skills and experience are in place to advise on the development of Ross Enterprise Park in particular.

2	Ensure adequate revenue funding is allocated in 2025-26 to lead development and delivery of Ross Enterprise Park, including management company support.	Accepted	Agreed – the Economic Development team base budget includes provision for supporting the development of employment land including Ross Enterprise Park
3	Consider the business case for retaining some or all of the freehold land as an asset for Herefordshire.	Accepted	Agreed
4	Retain at least one unit as a business incubation centre for south Herefordshire.	Partly Accepted	Partly agreed – the business case for an incubation unit needs to be established to understand if this is viable.
5	To collect data to measure the economic and social impact of Hereford Enterprise Zone, to compare and contrast with business parks in neighbouring counties.	Accepted	Agreed
Local Authority Housing Delivery Models			
Rec. No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	Progress at pace a pilot project to develop smaller sites owned by Herefordshire Council, subject to planning conditions and business plan.	Accepted	Agreed
2	Identify and begin the process of setting up a development company, using the lessons learned from other local authorities identified in the report.	Accepted	Agreed
3	Consider prioritising phosphate credits for developments with a higher percentage of social or affordable housing, such as those in the pilot project.	Accepted	Agreed – a review to consider the prioritisation of phosphate credits to be undertaken
4	Explore Local Government Pension Scheme options for funding the delivery of affordable housing.	Accepted	Agreed
5	Report these recommendations to the council's housing development working group.	Accepted	Agreed

15 January 2025			
Local Transport Plan			
Rec. No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	As per a previous recommendation from Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee, environmental protection and enhancement needs to be better reflected throughout the high-level Local Transport Plan objectives and throughout its priorities for the transport network. This should reflect and align with our climate and ecological emergency declaration.	Partly accepted	<p>Throughout the LTP there is strong focus on the need to support and focus on the way the plan can align and support the environmental protection of the county. There are five core objectives listed in the LTP, one being “Tackling climate change and protecting and enhancing the natural and built environment. By creating a transport system that offers viable low emission options for most journeys and influences travel behaviours and decisions.” The plan identifies actions needed to be taken to achieve this objective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the amount of traffic travelling through the city centre. • Transition to less polluting types of propulsion through providing more Electric Vehicle charging points. • Roll out zero emission buses in Hereford city. • Support transition of freight to sustainable modes in the city centre. <p>Within the plan there are also Action Plans for Hereford City and the Rural areas/Market Towns within these there are 11 objectives to support the Council Plan priorities –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work towards reducing county and council carbon emissions, aiming for net zero by 2030/31 and work with partners and communities to make the county more resilient to the effects of climate change. • Expand and maintain the transport infrastructure in a sustainable way and improve connectivity across the county. <p>Decarbonising maintenance Procurement Strategy Production of a Low Carbon</p> <p>Decarbonising maintenance considering carbon in scheme design Develop an approach to</p> <p>Decarbonising maintenance street lighting Reduce carbon emissions from</p> <p>Decarbonising maintenance signals Upgrade and enhance traffic</p>

			Transition to lower emission fuels public Electric Vehicle chargers Transition to lower emission fuels to-peer charging networks Transition to lower emission fuels Vehicle Charging Strategy Digital Access digital accessibility Transition to lower emission fuels charging networks Transition to lower emission fuels street charge points in all market towns Transition to lower emission fuels points in council car parks	Increased provision of Promote the use of peer- Regular update of Electric Promote online services and Promotion of peer-to-peer Delivery of LEVI funded on Delivery of EV charge
2	The Local Transport Plan team to work with other rural local transport plan teams in England, as well as our neighbouring authorities, to build on best practice and an alliance of rural local transport plans to strengthen the case for rural transport to the government.	Accepted	Since the Scrutiny meeting the council has filled the Transport Planning Service Manager post with an officer from a neighbouring rural authority and the remaining posts for the team are team are to be progressed through recruitment. There continues to be close links to neighbouring councils and other rural councils remains strong	
3	To provide the committee with a consultation strategy for the local transport plan, to include a timeline for the consultation and a list of consultees.	Partly Accepted	Cllr O'Driscoll has been liaised with regarding the planned consultation for the LTP and future cabinet/full council meetings. Officers were not aware of the requirement to return to scrutiny prior to the consultation.	
4	To ensure that any active travel projects are 'shovel-ready' for any funding that becomes available.	Accepted	Once the plan has been fully adopted it is anticipated that several priority projects will be identified and progressed through concept design, if funding is available. Progressing schemes to the colloquially referenced 'shovel ready' stage requires substantial external funding to be sought.	
Market Towns Investment Plans				
Rec. No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response	
1	Herefordshire Council to: Recognise that the market town investment plans are living documents with projects that are regularly reviewed and updated.	Accepted	Agreed	
2	Herefordshire Council to: Work with town councils to review annually the list of projects in each of the market towns' investment plans.	Accepted	Agreed	

3	Herefordshire Council to: Ensure regular communications between the council and Herefordshire's market towns.	Accepted	Agreed
4	Herefordshire Council to: Encourage town councils to engage with their rural hinterlands on their ambitions, thus strengthening the understanding and loyalty to their local service centre.	Accepted	Agreed

12 March 2025

Highways Winter Maintenance

Rec. No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	Review and update the primary and secondary routes on the gritting network.	Accepted	Officers will complete a review of the gritting network and present their findings to the Cabinet Member for Roads and Regulatory Services. It is likely that any changes, if required, would not come into effect until the 2026/27 winter season.
2	Undertake an audit of the number and location of local authority-owned grit bins.	Accepted	Officers will discuss with Balfour Beatty Living Places as to how an audit can be undertaken of grit bins as they re-filled as part of the normal preparations ahead of the winter season.
3	Carry out comprehensive publicity to demonstrate the value and effectiveness of the commissioned professional weather services resulting from accurate forecasting.	Accepted	Officers will arrange for such publicity as part of the communications plan for the 2025/26 winter season.

Update on recommendations made by the Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee

Rec. No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	Ensures that the statutory scrutiny officer drafts a cross-scrutiny committee protocol, to ensure timely responses with faster escalation as required to outstanding recommendations.	13-Mar-25	

3 June 2025

Cultural Strategy 2019-29

Rec. No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
----------	----------------	-------------------	----------

1	Herefordshire Council formally endorses the renewed Cultural Strategy 2025-2029 and the key findings of the 5th Sector report.		
2	Herefordshire Council to support Herefordshire Cultural Partnership to produce an implementation plan to deliver the renewed Cultural Strategy 2025-29.		
3	Herefordshire Council ensures there is a dedicated officer to work with the partnership to produce and deliver the strategy's implementation plan.		
4	Herefordshire Council to ensure the updated Cultural Strategy 2025-29 is reflected in economic development and health and social care service delivery, including the evolving Talk Community network.		
5	Herefordshire Council highlight the Cultural Strategy 2025-29 to town and parish councils and encourage engagement and support for local initiatives.		
6	Herefordshire Council assist with the development and promotion of co-working and creative hub spaces for creatives to access shared resources and facilities to support development of new culture-based businesses in Herefordshire.		

Local Transport Plan			
Rec. No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	That the draft Local Transport Plan is reviewed to ensure alignment with existing council plans and strategies.		Partly agreed – ongoing review of alignment to future council plans and strategies
2	That the Local Transport Plan gives particular consideration to the needs of children and young people		Partly agreed, the plan does consider the needs of all the transport users of the county therefore it is rejected that the plan would require amendment. However the engagement of the children and young people has been recognised by Officers and as discussed at scrutiny ways of engaging with them has been identified as an ongoing piece of work for all Transport Planning work and that is outside the LTP as regular engagement and support would give greater benefits to them rather than just focus on the LTP document
3	The duration of the Local Transport Plan is kept in alignment with the Local Plan and Transport Strategy to which it applies - namely 2016-2031.		Reject, this does not provide any benefit to the county and would incur significant costs to the council to create a new plan in 6 years. The alignment of the Local Plan with the Local Transport Plan is not

			<p>required by legislation nor is it a formal recommendation by government.</p> <p>As advised by officers at the meeting; throughout the development of the Local Plan there will be a continued review of the projects and recommendations needed in the Local Transport Plan which may result in a review and update of the LTP.</p>
4	Herefordshire Council work to increase the number of residents taking part in the Local Transport Plan consultation as a matter of urgency, extending the consultation deadline to 30 June to all members of the public.		Agreed, the public consultation will be extended until the 30 June.
5	The policy wording of the Local Transport Plan is tightened to ensure that it is meaningful and capable of being applied.		Rejected – It is important to acknowledge that severity of wording is subjective however it is felt that the wording of the LTP does allow it to be meaningfully applied
6	The Local Transport Plan recognises the full extent of existing new developments, for example Ledbury, and the infrastructure improvements necessary to accommodate this.		<p>Partly agreed – while the LTP will be fundamental in the development and decision making around infrastructure of new developments when a planning application is applied for, it is not a mechanism to resolve existing issues caused by previously built developments.</p> <p>However, as the new Local Plan is developed existing highway issues will be identified and recognised where any new development is recommended.</p>
7	The Local Transport Plan should include targets for the implementation of active travel measures.		Agreed
8	The Local Transport Plan recognises the inability of the power grid network to meet the needs of fast EV charging point.		<p>Rejected – the LTP is a transport policy document it is not an energy infrastructure plan and deviation into energy provision could over complicate and dilute the primary focus of the LTP which is transport. Officers developing and managing the LTP do not have access to detailed, real-time data on grid capacity or future demand forecasts to make such statements.</p> <p>Additionally, the LTP is a 16-year plan meaning such statement may quickly become outdated and inaccurate.</p>