

Agenda

Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee

Date: **Friday 23 October 2026**

Time: **10.00 am**

Place: **Conference Room 2 - Herefordshire Council, Plough
Lane Offices, Hereford, HR4 0LE**

Notes: Please note the time, date and venue of the meeting.

For any further information please contact:

Angharad Hawkes, Democratic Services Officer

Tel: 01432 260239

Email: Angharad.Hawkes@herefordshire.gov.uk

If you would like help to understand this document, or would like it in another format, please call Angharad Hawkes, Democratic Services Officer on 01432 260239 or e-mail Angharad.Hawkes@herefordshire.gov.uk in advance of the meeting.

Agenda for the meeting of the Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee

Membership

Chairperson	Councillor Ed O'Driscoll
Vice-chairperson	Councillor Frank Cornthwaite

Councillor Bruce Baker
Councillor Helen Heathfield
Councillor Rob Owens
Councillor Roger Phillips
Councillor Diana Toynbee

Agenda

	Pages
1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE To receive apologies for absence.	
2. NAMED SUBSTITUTES To receive details of any councillor nominated to attend the meeting in place of a member of the committee.	
3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST To receive declarations of interest in respect of items on the agenda.	
4. MINUTES To receive the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 20 July 2026 at 10.00 am.	13 - 28
HOW TO SUBMIT QUESTIONS	
The deadline for the submission of questions for this meeting is 5.00 pm on [insert date].	
Questions must be submitted to councillorservices@herefordshire.gov.uk .	
Questions sent to any other address may not be accepted.	
Accepted questions and the responses will be published as a supplement to the agenda papers prior to the meeting. Further information and guidance is available at www.herefordshire.gov.uk/getinvolved	
5. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC To receive any written questions from members of the public.	
6. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL To receive any written questions from members of the council.	
7. UKSPF PROGRAMME IN HEREFORDSHIRE	29 - 40
8. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING TASK AND FINISH GROUP	To Follow
9. WORK PROGRAMME 2026-27	41 - 84
10. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING	

The public's rights to information and attendance at meetings

You have a right to:

- Attend all council, cabinet, committee and sub-committee meetings unless the business to be transacted would disclose 'confidential' or 'exempt' information.
- Inspect agenda and public reports at least five clear days before the date of the meeting. Agenda and reports (relating to items to be considered in public) are available at www.herefordshire.gov.uk/meetings
- Inspect minutes of the council and all committees and sub-committees and written statements of decisions taken by the cabinet or individual cabinet members for up to six years following a meeting.
- Inspect background papers used in the preparation of public reports for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting (a list of the background papers to a report is given at the end of each report). A background paper is a document on which the officer has relied in writing the report and which otherwise is not available to the public.
- Access to a public register stating the names, addresses and wards of all councillors with details of the membership of cabinet and of all committees and sub-committees. Information about councillors is available at www.herefordshire.gov.uk/councillors
- Have access to a list specifying those powers on which the council have delegated decision making to their officers identifying the officers concerned by title. The council's constitution is available at www.herefordshire.gov.uk/constitution
- Access to this summary of your rights as members of the public to attend meetings of the council, cabinet, committees and sub-committees and to inspect documents.

Recording of meetings

Please note that filming, photography and recording of this meeting is permitted provided that it does not disrupt the business of the meeting.

Members of the public are advised that if you do not wish to be filmed or photographed you should let the governance support team know before the meeting starts so that anyone who intends filming or photographing the meeting can be made aware.

The reporting of meetings is subject to the law and it is the responsibility of those doing the reporting to ensure that they comply.

The council may make a recording of this public meeting or stream it live to the council's website. Such videos are made available for members of the public via the council's YouTube channel at www.youtube.com/@HerefordshireCouncil/streams

Public transport links

The Herefordshire Council office at Plough Lane is located off Whitecross Road in Hereford, approximately 1 kilometre from the City Bus Station.

Bus maps are available here: www.herefordshire.gov.uk/downloads/download/78/bus_maps

The seven principles of public life

(Nolan Principles)

1. Selflessness

Holders of public office should act solely in terms of the public interest.

2. Integrity

Holders of public office must avoid placing themselves under any obligation to people or organisations that might try inappropriately to influence them in their work. They should not act or take decisions in order to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family, or their friends. They must declare and resolve any interests and relationships.

3. Objectivity

Holders of public office must act and take decisions impartially, fairly and on merit, using the best evidence and without discrimination or bias.

4. Accountability

Holders of public office are accountable to the public for their decisions and actions and must submit themselves to the scrutiny necessary to ensure this.

5. Openness

Holders of public office should act and take decisions in an open and transparent manner. Information should not be withheld from the public unless there are clear and lawful reasons for so doing.

6. Honesty

Holders of public office should be truthful.

7. Leadership

Holders of public office should exhibit these principles in their own behaviour and treat others with respect. They should actively promote and robustly support the principles and challenge poor behaviour wherever it occurs.



Guide to Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee

Scrutiny is a statutory role fulfilled by councillors who are not members of the cabinet.

The role of the scrutiny committees is to help develop policy, to carry out reviews of council and other local services, and to hold decision makers to account for their actions and decisions.

Council has decided that there will be five scrutiny committees. The committees reflect the balance of political groups on the council.

The Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee consists of 7 councillors.

Councillor	Party
Bruce Baker	Conservative Party
Frank Cornthwaite (Vice-Chairperson)	Conservative Party
Helen Heathfield	The Green Party
Ed O'Driscoll (Chairperson)	Liberal Democrats
Rob Owens	Liberal Democrats
Roger Phillips	Conservative Party
Diana Toynbee	Independents for Herefordshire

Scrutiny functions

The committees have the power:

- (a) to review, influence policy or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge of any functions which are the responsibility of the executive,
- (b) to make reports or recommendations to the authority or the executive with respect to the discharge of any functions which are the responsibility of the executive,
- (c) to review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge of any functions which are not the responsibility of the executive,
- (d) to make reports or recommendations to council or the cabinet with respect to the discharge of any functions which are not the responsibility of the executive,
- (e) to make reports or recommendations to council or the cabinet on matters which affect the authority's area or the inhabitants of that area
- (f) to review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge by the responsible authorities of their crime and disorder functions and to make reports or recommendations to the council with respect to the discharge of those functions. In this regard crime and disorder functions means:
 - (i) a strategy for the reduction of crime and disorder in the area (including anti-social and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment); and

- (ii) a strategy for combatting the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances in the area; and
 - (iii) a strategy for the reduction of re-offending in the area
- (g) to review and scrutinise any matter relating to the planning, provision and operation of the health service in its area and make reports and recommendations to a responsible person on any matter it has reviewed or scrutinised or to be consulted by a relevant NHS body or health service provider in accordance with the Regulations (2013/218) as amended. In this regard *health service* includes services designed to secure improvement -
- (i) in the physical and mental health of the people of England, and
 - (ii) in the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of physical and mental illness
 - (iii) and any services provided in pursuance of arrangements under section 75 in relation to the exercise of health-related functions of a local authority.
- (h) to review and scrutinise the exercise by risk management authorities of flood risk management functions or coastal erosion risk management functions which may affect the local authority's area.
- (i) To track actions and undertake an annual effectiveness review

The remit of Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee

- Talk Business programme, advice and support
- Development investment plans - town, market town, rural, Hereford City
- Hereford Enterprise Zone
- Higher education development
- Adult and community learning programme
- Apprenticeships
- Fastershire programme
- Digital connectivity
- Heritage, culture and tourism
- Social value procurement policy
- Planning
- Licensing
- Regulatory
- Capital highway maintenance, asset management and infrastructure repair
- Council housing
- Statutory community safety and policing scrutiny powers

Who attends scrutiny committee meetings?

- Members of the committee, including the chairperson and vice-chairperson.
- Cabinet members, they are not members of the committee but attend principally to answer any questions the committee may have and inform the debate.
- Officers of the council to present reports and give technical advice to the committee.
- People external to the council invited to provide information to the committee.
- Other councillors can attend but can only speak at the discretion of the chairperson.

Minutes of the meeting of the Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee held in Conference Room 1 - Herefordshire Council, Plough Lane Offices, Hereford, HR4 0LE on Monday 20 July 2026 at 10.00 am

Committee members present in person and voting: **Councillors: Bruce Baker, Frank Cornthwaite (Vice-Chairperson), Robert Highfield, David Hitchiner, Ed O'Driscoll (Chairperson), Rob Owens and Stef Simmons**

Others in attendance:

R Allonby	Service Director Economy and Growth	Herefordshire Council
P Bate		AECOM
J Coleman	Democratic Services Manager	Herefordshire Council
S Gregory	Democratic Services Officer	Herefordshire Council
Councillor P Price	Cabinet Member Transport and Infrastructure	Herefordshire Council
Councillor E Swinglehurst	Cabinet Member Culture and Environment; Deputy Leader of the Council	Herefordshire Council
S Tompkins	Delivery Director - Infrastructure	Herefordshire Council
T v Vuren	Head of Digital Transport	Amey Consulting
D Webb	Statutory Scrutiny Officer	Herefordshire Council

10. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Committee received apologies for absence from Cllr Diana Toynbee, Cllr Roger Phillips and Cllr Helen Heathfield.

11. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Cllr David Hitchiner was present as the named substitute for Cllr Diana Toynbee. Cllr Robert Highfield was present as the named substitute for Cllr Roger Phillips. Cllr Stef Simmons was present as the named substitute for Cllr Helen Heathfield.

12. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A declaration of interest was made by Cllr David Hitchiner in relation to property matters in connection with item 7 on the agenda. A dispensation has been granted by the Monitoring Officer.

13. MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting were received.

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 July 2026 be confirmed as a correct record.

14. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC (Pages 13 - 16)

Documents containing questions received from members of the public and the responses given, plus supplementary questions and their respective responses were published as an appendix to the minutes.

15. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

No questions had been received from councillors.

16. HEREFORD BYPASS PHASE ONE – FULL BUSINESS CASE

The Service Director introduced the Full Business Case (FBC) for the Hereford Bypass Phase One and advised that it was the culmination of approximately two years of technical development, analysis and evidence gathering. It explained that significant work had been required to review policy alignment, planning matters, funding arrangements, traffic modelling and technical assessments before the scheme could be fully evaluated. The purpose of the FBC was to determine whether the scheme represented value for money and to provide Cabinet with sufficient evidence to support decision-making.

Members were informed that the FBC built upon earlier work completed in 2018 and included updates to the Hereford traffic model, a full design review, engagement with Network Rail and National Highways, ecological surveys, planning reviews and procurement planning. Extensive ecological work had also been undertaken over the previous eighteen months to support environmental licensing requirements.

The Service Director also explained that the FBC had been prepared in accordance with HM Treasury Green Book methodology and structured around the Five Case Model: Strategic, Economic, Financial, Commercial and Management Cases. Members heard that the scheme achieved a Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of 1.6, representing medium value for money under government guidance. The assessment identified benefits of more than £58 million, increasing to approximately £64 million when wider economic impacts were included, compared with discounted costs of approximately £39.6 million. Officers advised that Phase One demonstrated value for money in its own right and would deliver measurable benefits independently of any future phases.

The Committee was informed that the scheme remained forecast to be delivered within the approved £45.3 million budget. Value engineering exercises had identified potential savings of between £4 and £8 million, while a quantified risk assessment had established a contingency requirement of just over £3 million.

In concluding the presentation, the Service Director outlined the governance arrangements supporting delivery of the scheme, including oversight by a Member Steering Group, Project Board and external stakeholder forums. Members were advised that a joint risk management process was in place between the council, consultants and the contractor, and that a detailed evidence framework would accompany the report to Cabinet.

The Chair thanked officers for the short presentation and summary.

The Committee were invited to examine each section of the Full Business Case (set out in the accompanying papers for this item) using the previously circulated Lines of Enquiry document to guide discussions.

The principal points of the subsequent discussion are summarised below:

A. Strategic Case and Need for Intervention

A.1 The Committee considered the Strategic Case and discussed whether the FBC clearly demonstrated the need for intervention, its alignment with wider strategic objectives, and the consequences of maintaining the status quo. Members highlighted the importance of ensuring that Cabinet received a clear description of the "business as usual" scenario, including the likely impact of future growth on the existing road network should the scheme not proceed.

A.2 Officers advised that traffic modelling indicated worsening congestion and network performance over time without intervention and agreed to set out this information more explicitly within the assessment criteria presented to Cabinet.

A.3 Members also discussed the distinction between the consequences of taking no action (the Counter Factual) and the concept of opportunity cost. Concern was expressed that the FBC did not sufficiently explain how the proposed investment compared with other potential uses of public funding for other initiatives that may offer alternative solutions.

A.4 The Committee questioned whether alternative transport interventions had been adequately assessed. Members noted that the documentation gave limited prominence to options such as park and ride facilities, enhanced public transport, improved rail connectivity, bus priority measures and other sustainable transport solutions. It was argued that Cabinet should be able to understand not only why the proposed scheme had been selected, but also why other potential interventions had been discounted and whether those alternatives could achieve similar objectives.

A.5 Discussion also centred on the long-term effectiveness of bypass schemes. It was acknowledged that new roads can attract additional traffic over time; however, members heard evidence that the modelling had already taken account of induced traffic and that the scheme continued to demonstrate overall benefits despite anticipated increases in vehicle movements. A.6 The Committee was advised that, while traffic growth would occur, the appraisal concluded that the scheme would still provide a net positive outcome compared with no intervention being undertaken.

A.7 Members considered whether the strategic contribution of the scheme to broader transport and planning objectives had been sufficiently articulated. Particular attention was given to the relationship between the scheme, the Local Transport Plan and anticipated future housing and employment growth across the county. It was noted that future development requirements, including significant housing growth, would place additional pressures on the existing network and should be considered when assessing the need for infrastructure improvements.

A.8 In concluding the discussion, the Committee agreed that Cabinet would benefit from a clearer presentation of the strategic rationale for the scheme, including the case for intervention, the implications of maintaining existing conditions, the assessment of alternative options, the opportunity costs associated with investment decisions and the scheme's contribution towards wider transport and growth objectives.

A.9 The Committee requested that these matters should be more prominently reflected within the final report to support Cabinet's ability to take a more clearly informed decision.

B. Value for Money and Sensitivity Testing

B.1 The Committee considered the Value for Money (VFM) assessment and discussed whether the impacts of different growth scenarios had been sufficiently highlighted within the Full Business Case. Officers noted that sensitivity testing had been undertaken using high, medium and low growth forecasts. However, officers agreed to address committee members concerns that the implications of those scenarios should be more clearly presented to Cabinet. Officers confirmed that the final report could provide greater emphasis on the results of the sensitivity testing and direct Cabinet to the relevant sections of the Full Business Case.

B.2 The Committee heard that, whilst the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) provided an important measure of value for money, greater consideration should also be given to the assumptions underpinning both the benefits and costs of the scheme. The independent adviser highlighted that sensitivity testing should not focus solely on growth forecasts and benefits, but should also examine cost risks, optimism bias and the potential impact of unforeseen expenditure.

B.3 In this regard, members requested that a clearer explanation of the robustness of cost estimates would assist Cabinet in understanding the level of financial risk associated with the project.

B.4 Officers advised that affordability and cost certainty would be addressed in the final report through consideration of inflation, contingency allowances and project risk management. Particular emphasis was placed on the two-stage procurement process and the early involvement of the contractor in refining the design and construction approach. It was explained that this collaborative approach had enabled detailed review of potential risks, identification of efficiencies and improved confidence in cost estimates before entering into a construction contract.

B.5 The Committee discussed the importance of presenting information beyond the Benefit Cost Ratio alone. Members noted that while the BCR provided a single measure of value for money, it did not fully capture wider social, environmental and community impacts. Attention was drawn to a range of non-monetised considerations, including landscape, townscape, security, severance and environmental effects, which were recognised within Green Book appraisal guidance but were not always prominent within the assessment criteria being presented to Cabinet.

B.6 Concern was also expressed that the environmental appraisal and Environmental Impact Assessment findings had not been sufficiently integrated into the key considerations for Cabinet. Members noted that issues such as biodiversity, historic environment impacts, pedestrian severance and other environmental benefits and disbenefits formed an important part of the overall appraisal process. This should be presented alongside the economic assessment to provide a more balanced picture of the scheme's overall impacts.

B.7 Officers acknowledged the importance of ensuring that relevant environmental information could be more clearly referenced within the final report.

B.8 In summing up, the Committee agreed that Cabinet would benefit from a clearer presentation of sensitivity testing outcomes, cost risks, non-monetised benefits and environmental considerations alongside the Benefit Cost Ratio. Members considered that this would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the scheme's value for money and would strengthen the evidence available to support Cabinet's decision.

C. Risk, Uncertainty and Affordability

C.1 The Committee considered the management of project risks and whether the information contained within the existing appendices provided sufficient clarity for Cabinet. Members expressed concern that a number of risks recorded within Appendix D appeared to be out-dated and that some mitigation measures may no longer reflect the current position of the project. It was suggested that Cabinet would benefit from a simplified and updated risk register, written in Plain English, to support transparent and informed decision-making.

C.2 Officers advised that, as the project had progressed towards delivery, a more comprehensive risk management process had been established. Members were informed that a joint risk register was now maintained by the council, its consultants and the contractor, enabling both strategic and delivery risks to be monitored collectively. While officers considered that Cabinet already had access to detailed risk information, they acknowledged that the full register could be made available and that greater clarity around risks would assist.

C.3 Members proposed that the various risk registers contained within the business case documentation should be consolidated into a single, accessible document. It was suggested that such a document should clearly identify key risks, describe mitigation measures, indicate associated costs and provide explanations of affordability under different scenarios. Members emphasised the importance of presenting uncertainty in a way that could be easily understood by Cabinet and members of the public.

C.4 The Committee also explored the potential for project overspend and the management of unforeseen costs. Concern was expressed that, despite value engineering savings and contingency provisions, major infrastructure projects frequently encounter unknown issues during delivery. Members sought assurance regarding how any future cost overruns would be managed, and that Cabinet are able to explain what the financial implications would be if the scheme exceeds its approved budget.

C.5 Officers confirmed that the current forecast remained within the approved budget of £45.3 million, including land acquisition, development costs and consultancy fees. Members were advised that lessons from previous infrastructure projects had informed the project approach, particularly through the early involvement of the contractor in identifying risks and refining costs before construction commenced. It was noted that, whilst risks could be reduced through detailed planning and investigation. However, that there will always be unforeseen issues, such as unrecorded utilities and ground conditions, which in turn could increase risk/costs. These unforeseen risks are a feature of all major construction projects.

C.6 In concluding the discussion, the Committee agreed that Cabinet should receive a clearer explanation of project affordability, contingency provisions and the arrangements that would apply if costs exceeded budget forecasts. Members recommended that future reporting should provide a more accessible summary of key risks, mitigation measures and funding options in order to support Cabinet and enhance transparency for members of the public.

D. Environmental Risk, Planning and Affordability

D.1 The Committee considered the environmental and planning risks associated with the scheme, focusing particularly on the implications of potential planning amendments and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) requirements. Questions were raised around the potential implications of future supplementary or amended planning applications. Could these in turn trigger additional environmental assessment requirements, resulting in additional costs, delays and risks. Members

questioned whether the cumulative effects of future phases of the bypass had been adequately considered and whether sufficient provision had been made for these risks within the current project assumptions.

D.2 Officers advised that Phase One had been assessed as a standalone scheme and continued to demonstrate value for money independently of any future phases. It was reported that supplementary and temporary works planning applications would be required to support construction activities and that discussions had already taken place with planning officers regarding the level of environmental assessment necessary. Officers stated that they were satisfied that the current approach remained appropriate for Phase One but agreed to consider the concerns raised regarding future phases and cumulative impacts.

D.3 The Committee further discussed the potential legal and financial implications of environmental risks. Members highlighted the importance of ensuring that environmental assessments remained robust and up to date, particularly given the possibility of future development and growth proposals linked to the wider transport strategy. Views were expressed that environmental risks, whilst potentially low in probability, could have significant cost and programme implications if not fully addressed. Members suggested that Cabinet would benefit from clearer advice on these matters, including any legal implications relating to future phases of the project.

D.4 Consideration was also given to the management of project contingencies and value engineering savings. Members questioned whether the contingency allowance of £3.26 million, alongside identified value engineering savings, provided sufficient resilience against unforeseen costs. Officers explained that a number of value engineering measures had already been incorporated into the project budget, while additional options remained available should further cost pressures arise. It was reported that contingency arrangements had been informed by a quantified risk assessment and that opportunities for further efficiencies continued to be explored.

D.5 The Committee requested an update on ecological mitigation measures and environmental licensing. Officers advised that extensive ecological surveys had been undertaken over the previous eighteen months, covering protected species including dormice, great crested newts, bats and other sensitive habitats. Licence applications had been submitted to Natural England and discussions regarding mitigation requirements were ongoing. Members were informed that updates on licensing and environmental approvals would be provided to Cabinet before any final decision was taken.

D.6 In concluding the discussion, the Committee emphasised the need for Cabinet to receive a clear and accessible explanation of environmental risks, contingency arrangements, value engineering assumptions and funding options should projected costs increase beyond current forecasts. Members considered that presenting these matters transparently would strengthen the decision making process and provide greater assurance regarding the affordability and deliverability of the scheme.

E. Assessment Criteria

E.1 The Committee reviewed the assessment criteria proposed for Cabinet's consideration and discussed whether several appraisal factors had been omitted. Members highlighted a number of issues that were not explicitly included within the criteria. These included physical activity, journey quality, security, townscape, severance, vehicle operating costs, biodiversity, the water quality, the historic environment and uncertainty mitigation. It was suggested that Cabinet would benefit from greater visibility of these factors to ensure that all relevant impacts had been considered as part of their decision-making process.

E.2 Officers advised that some of these matters had been assessed within the Full Business Case but were not always referenced directly within the assessment criteria. It was noted, for example, that public rights of way, cycling links and access arrangements had been considered within the scheme design and that measures were in place to avoid creating significant severance.

E.3 The Committee heard that the Department for Transport's value for money framework includes a broader range of appraisal factors than those currently reflected in the assessment criteria. Members considered that these factors should either be included directly or supported by clear commentary demonstrating that they had been evaluated. It was suggested that a more detailed narrative would provide decision-makers with greater confidence that all relevant considerations had been examined and would reduce the need to navigate the extensive supporting documentation.

E.4 Officers acknowledged and agreed that greater explanation of these factors could be incorporated into the assessment framework presented to Cabinet.

E.5 Members discussed that some environmental and biodiversity assessments, including more recent ecological work, were not sufficiently visible within the material intended for Cabinet. It was argued that issues such as biodiversity impacts, pedestrian and cyclist severance, environmental mitigation measures and opportunities for active travel improvements should be presented more prominently. The Committee noted that some roads affected by the scheme could experience reduced traffic and potentially support enhanced walking and cycling provision, which represented benefits that should be more clearly articulated.

E.6 The Committee also discussed the wider transport and economic impacts of the scheme beyond the immediate route corridor. Members heard that reduced congestion within Hereford could lead to changes in traffic patterns across a wider area, affecting both urban and rural communities. It was noted that some impacts would not become fully apparent until after the road was operational and that before-and-after monitoring would be necessary to assess how traffic redistributed across the network and whether further interventions were required.

E.7 In concluding the discussion, there was broad agreement that the assessment criteria should be expanded to include a greater range of appraisal factors and supporting evidence. The Committee indicated that Cabinet should be provided with a more comprehensive and transparent framework, incorporating wider environmental, social and transport considerations alongside the core business case evidence. This was considered important both for the immediate decision-making process and for providing a clear record of how the decision had been reached.

F. Safety and Accident Impacts

F.1 Members heard that the assessment used standard Department for Transport assumptions relating to road type, speed and accident probability. Concern was expressed that the modelling indicated a small increase in fatal and serious collisions despite an overall reduction in slight injuries, and members felt this issue should be more clearly highlighted within the information presented to Cabinet.

F.2 Members discussed the need for greater transparency regarding the assumptions underpinning the accident forecasts. It was suggested that the assessment should provide a more detailed breakdown of accident types and severity levels, rather than relying solely on headline figures. The Committee considered that a clearer explanation of how the forecasts had been derived would

help Cabinet and the public understand the degree of uncertainty associated with the results.

F.3 Officers advised that the final assessment report would include evidence against each criterion together with a Red, Amber or Green rating. It was indicated that road safety would likely be classified as an amber issue, reflecting the fact that while the overall number of accidents was forecast to reduce, the introduction of a higher speed road created a greater potential for more serious collision outcomes. Officers agreed the importance of presenting both the benefits and associated risks more clearly within the report.

F.4 The Committee received clarification that the accident modelling was based on local accident records combined with nationally recognised Department for Transport accident rates. Members were informed that the appraisal forecast a small reduction in slight injuries but a marginal increase in fatal and serious injuries over the sixty-year assessment period. It was explained that these figures represented probabilities derived from national modelling assumptions rather than predictions of actual future incidents, with the design and safety auditing process intended to minimise such risks wherever possible.

F.5 Members questioned whether national assumptions fully reflected Hereford's unique circumstances, particularly the presence of a major route passing through the city centre and the existing interaction between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists. It was suggested that local accident patterns and the potential safety benefits arising from the removal of through traffic should be given greater consideration when presenting the results. The Committee also emphasised the importance of demonstrating how the scheme would accommodate future growth and the needs of all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists.

F.6 In concluding the discussion, the Committee requested that Cabinet be provided with a clearer explanation of the accident assessment methodology, associated assumptions and predicted outcomes. Members considered that a more detailed and accessible presentation of accident impacts, including the implications for different road users and the uncertainties within the modelling, would support a more informed Cabinet decision.

G. Benefits, Disbenefits and Distributional Effects

G.1 The Committee considered how benefits and disbenefits arising from the scheme would be presented to Cabinet and whether the assessment criteria adequately reflected both positive and negative impacts. Members noted that major infrastructure projects inevitably create both winners and losers and requested that Cabinet should receive balanced and unbiased information on these matters. This should clearly set out the principal benefits alongside any associated disbenefits and trade-offs. It was considered important that this information was presented in an accessible format rather than being dispersed throughout the extensive supporting documentation.

G.2 Discussion took place regarding the level of detail that should be included within the final Cabinet report. Whilst members recognised that the report could not replicate the full content of the Full Business Case, it was suggested that a concise summary of key issues, supported by evidence and appropriate ratings, would assist Cabinet and members of the public. The Committee emphasised the importance of drawing attention to significant impacts rather than requiring members or the public to navigate hundreds of pages of technical documentation.

G.3 The Committee also discussed localised impacts arising from traffic redistribution. Concern was expressed that while some routes would experience reduced traffic volumes and associated benefits, other roads could experience increases in traffic. Members highlighted examples where residents may face increased vehicle movements as a consequence of changes to travel patterns and queried whether sufficient information had been provided regarding mitigation measures and their associated costs.

G.4 In concluding the discussion, the Committee requested that the final report should present benefits, disbenefits and trade-offs in a clear and balanced manner. Members considered that Cabinet would be better placed to make an informed decision if the impacts on individual communities, traffic redistribution effects and any proposed mitigation measures were clearly summarised alongside the wider strategic benefits of the scheme.

H. Localised and distributional impacts

H.1 The Committee considered how localised and distributional impacts would be presented within the report to Cabinet. Officers advised that the Cabinet report would be supported by a concise appendix summarising the assessment criteria, identifying the relevant evidence within the Full Business Case and indicating whether each criterion had been met. It was explained that the intention was not to reproduce the extensive detail contained within the Full Business Case, but rather to provide Cabinet with a clear route to the supporting evidence whilst maintaining an accessible and publicly understandable report.

H.2 Members emphasised the importance of presenting information in plain English, particularly where communities could experience both positive and negative impacts arising from traffic redistribution. Concern was expressed that while some roads would benefit from reduced traffic volumes, other routes could experience increased traffic, potentially affecting residents who currently live on relatively quiet roads. The Committee considered that Cabinet should be provided with a clearer explanation of these distributional effects together with any proposed mitigation measures and the implications for affected communities.

H.3 The Committee heard that the modelling undertaken for the Full Business Case included a detailed distributional impact assessment showing changes in traffic levels, noise and air quality across the wider network. Members noted that this information could be presented more prominently within the final report, including examples of where increases or decreases in traffic were anticipated and how any adverse impacts might be managed. It was suggested that this would provide greater assurance that the consequences of traffic redistribution had been properly assessed and understood.

H.4 Discussion also focused on the wider economic and social benefits associated with the scheme, including opportunities for local businesses and contractors. Members sought assurances that local firms would benefit from the project and that robust payment arrangements would protect subcontractors throughout the supply chain. Officers confirmed that contractual requirements included prompt payment provisions, social value commitments, local employment opportunities and expectations relating to the use of local subcontractors where appropriate.

H.5 The Committee then considered environmental impacts and questioned whether sufficient prominence had been given to issues such as biodiversity, air quality, carbon emissions, noise and environmental mitigation measures. Members argued that Cabinet should receive a fuller understanding of both environmental benefits and disbenefits alongside the economic assessment. Officers acknowledged that while

environmental matters had largely been addressed through planning and appraisal processes, further information on issues such as carbon management, ancient woodland impacts and ecological mitigation could be highlighted within the final assessment report.

H.6 In considering air quality and emissions, members discussed the methodology used to assess pollution impacts and the distinction between construction-phase and operational impacts once the scheme was completed. The Committee was advised that traffic and emissions modelling had been undertaken at an individual road-link level and included assessments of carbon emissions, nitrogen oxides and particulate matter. Members noted that existing air quality trends within Hereford had improved significantly in recent years but agreed that Cabinet should receive a clear summary of the environmental appraisal, including projected changes in emissions, carbon impacts and mitigation measures, to ensure that environmental considerations formed a visible part of the final decision-making process.

Resolved:

- 1. The Full Business Case Appendix I includes the alternative options considered that could have achieved the strategic case for the scheme and the reasons presented for discounting these options.**
- 2. The Full Business case makes the strategic case for Hereford Bypass Phase One, based on SMART objectives that align with LTP5.**
- 3. The Executive includes in the full business case further details of the non monetised costs and benefits to the environment. This information should be pulled through from the Environmental Impact Assessment and other environmental appraisals and assessments undertaken, in line with the DfT Green Book requirements.**
- 4. Alongside the assessment criteria, the executive should include a document highlighting key risks, mitigations, and associated costs, drawn from appendices D, G and N, and to do so in Plain English.**
- 5. That the Full Business Case provides greater detail to support the optimism bias contained in 2.2.4 Appendix F at 11.8%, rather than the standard 20% as outlined in 5.2.4 of Appendix J.**
- 6. That collision data includes:**
 - a. Current safety outcomes**
 - b. Forecast safety outcomes**
 - c. Factors influencing those forecasts and**
 - d. Any mitigating measures available.**
- 7. The full business case should include information on the following criteria:**
 - a. Physical activity**
 - b. Journey time and quality**
 - c. Security**
 - d. Townscape/visual character of towns and villages near to the route**
 - e. Severance**
 - f. Vehicle operating costs, including changes in fuel consumption and vehicle costs**
 - g. Biodiversity**
 - h. Water environment**
 - i. Historic environment and**
 - j. Uncertainty and mitigation.**

8. The assessment criteria include a section on traffic distribution effects, taking into account:

- a. Localised impacts**
- b. Communities experiencing benefits and**
- c. Communities experiencing adverse effects.**

9. The assessment criteria include additional context regarding:

- a. Biodiversity and**
- b. Environmental mitigation measures.**

17. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING TASK AND FINISH GROUP

The Committee received an update on the Public Participation in Planning Task and Finish Group.

Members were advised that a draft report had been completed but further officer engagement had identified opportunities to strengthen both the report and future working practices.

The final report would therefore be presented to the Committee in September 2026. The Committee recorded its appreciation to the lead officer for the significant work undertaken on the review.

18. WORK PROGRAMME 2026-7

The Statutory Scrutiny Officer presented the draft work programme for the Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee.

Items scheduled for future meetings included:

- Broadband provision and infrastructure updates.
- UK Shared Prosperity Fund impacts.
- Year of Delivery performance review, including an update on progress relating to the John Haider temporary accommodation project.

19. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting is Tuesday 22 September 2026, 10:00 am.

The meeting ended at 1.29 pm

Chairperson

Agenda item no. 5 - Questions from members of the public

Question Number	Questioner	Question	Question to
PQ 1	Mr Hardy, Hereford	Under Biodiversity Net Gain (2.10.11) we are told that the loss of approximately 1.3 acres of Ancient Woodland as a result of the Phase One scheme, will be replaced with almost 12 acres of species-rich woodland and woodland edge. With the overall loss of such rare, valuable and irreplaceable habitat as ancient woodland and venerable trees and the removal of red listed species for which this is home, will the committee review where the new 12 acre woodland habitat is to be created and how this site will be protected & managed in perpetuity as offset, so that residents of South Hereford, most affected by the scheme, will benefit from this mitigation?	Chairperson of Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee
Response: Many thanks for your question. I will circulate your question to the committee in advance of its meeting to plan its lines of enquiry. However, I cannot guarantee that the committee will ask your question of the Cabinet members and officers in attendance.			
Supplementary question: Thank you for the answer to my question. The part of Phase 1 of the proposed bypass known as the Clehonger link involves the felling of two magnificent oak trees, one of which is listed on the Woodland Trust inventory of veteran trees. Would this committee review this decision in the light of the Council's agreement with an independent engineer's assessment that these trees could be spared by moving the route slightly to the north-east without affecting the viability of the road?			
Supplementary response: Thank you for your supplementary question. The committee's objective at its meeting is to scrutinise whether Cabinet has sufficient information with which to base its decision on the Hereford Bypass Phase One scheme. Your suggested line of enquiry is pertinent to the decision that Cabinet is required to make, and I recommend that you ask this question of Cabinet, as cost-effectiveness would form part of their consideration.			

Question Number	Questioner	Question	Question to
PQ 2	Mr Sherlock, Hereford	Much work has been done on identifying and calculating the financial benefits of the Hereford Bypass – Phase 1. However, there does not seem to be the same detailed work on identifying and calculating the loss of ancient woodland, venerable trees and the impact on historic landscapes and listed buildings of this area of Haywood, none of which can be replaced or fully mitigated. Will the committee review how TAG Unit 3 Environmental Impact Assessment (Published May 2026) has been applied to this road project and confirm that the Full Business case includes the cost of all these environmental and historic losses?	Chairperson of Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee

Response:

Thank you for your question. The committee's objective at the meeting is to scrutinise whether Cabinet has sufficient information with which to base its decision on the Hereford Bypass Phase One scheme. The committee will have sight of your suggested lines of enquiry when they plan their own lines of enquiry in advance of the meeting. However, they may choose to prioritise scrutinising other aspects of full business case to meet their stated objective.

Question Number	Questioner	Question	Question to
PQ 3	Mrs Morawiecka, Hereford	WebTAG uses a discount rate of 3.5% for the first 30 years of a project, falling to 3% thereafter. This road is to be funded by public borrowings of at least £40million. Current interest rates for a 40 year public loan are 6.5%. Will this committee review the financial costs of funding this road project and the impact this will have on Herefordshire residents and the local economy by increasing council tax bills by over £3million pa across Herefordshire for the next 40 years, a form of taxation which disproportionately affects lower income households and reduces disposable income across the county for decades.	Chairperson of Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee

Response:

Thank you for your question. The committee's objective at its meeting is to scrutinise whether Cabinet has sufficient information with which to base its decision on the Hereford Bypass Phase One scheme. As a result it will not be pursuing the line of enquiry that you suggest. Your suggested line of enquiry is pertinent to the decision that Cabinet is required to make, and I recommend that you ask this question of Cabinet.

Supplementary question:

Thank you. In assessing any business case for investment, the financing of a scheme should be considered, especially when funded nearly 90% by loan finance, and at a rate of 6.5% interest, 3% higher than the WebTAG discount rate.

Loan finance has implications on Council finances as well as directly on disposable household income and thus the local economy, for the next 40 years. IT is particularly important during a cost of living crisis and when the Council is in a capital rationing situation, lacking funding to complete other important capital projects that are running over budget and behind schedule.

Will the Committee review the implications of financing the scheme through loan finance, the sort of information needed in any good Business Case assessment alongside BCR and NPV, and therefore relevant to any good, well informed decision?

Supplementary response:

Thank you for your supplementary question. As already stated, the committee's objective at its meeting is to scrutinise whether Cabinet has sufficient information with which to base its decision on the Hereford Bypass Phase One scheme. As a result it will not be pursuing the line of enquiry that you suggest. Your suggested line of enquiry is pertinent to the decision that Cabinet is required to make, and I recommend that you ask this question of Cabinet.

Question Number	Questioner	Question	Question to
PQ 4	Ms Laan, Hereford	Economic case makes much of the benefits of defence and cyber security and being the Midlands Centre for cyber security located at HEZ. Will this committee consider whether this £45million road scheme to improve access from South West Hereford to HEZ, is the most cost effective and direct way to improve connectivity with the Midlands and the University of Wolverhampton, as well as linking to the Leominster and Ledbury "Functional Urban Areas" all of which lie to the East or North of the city?	Chairperson of Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee

Response:.

Many thanks for your question. The committee's objective at its meeting is to scrutinise whether Cabinet has sufficient information with which to base its decision on the Hereford Bypass Phase One scheme. Your suggested line of enquiry is pertinent to the decision that Cabinet is required to make, and I recommend that you ask this question of Cabinet, as cost-effectiveness would form part of their consideration.

Supplementary question:

As the Southern Link Road does not link with any of the sites mentioned for defence, cyber security, or Functional Urban Areas to the east and north, will the Committee recommend that it would be specious to include them as a wider economic benefit when there is no evidence that the scheme will improve connectivity with these areas, unlike a potential bridge to the East which would link more directly with them?

Supplementary response:

Thank you for your supplementary question. Any recommendation made by the committee will arise from the lines of enquiry pursued in the meeting. As such we cannot commit to making your suggested recommendation.

Question Number	Questioner	Question	Question to
PQ 5	Mr Milln, Hereford	Referring to agenda item 7 concerning the draft FBC for proposed Southern Link Road (aka W Bypass phase 1), on page 130 of Appendix 2, Table 1-4 shows Key Project Milestones for the scheme, including planning applications to be submitted in July 2026, and fully discharged in September 2026. Any costs in delay around approval would fall on Herefordshire Council and not the contractor. Will the committee review how the risks around issuing works contracts before they are determined could impact the scheme costs as well as require further works to deliver BNG?	Chairperson of Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee
Response: Thank you for your question. The committee's objective at its meeting is to scrutinise whether Cabinet has sufficient information with which to base its decision on the Hereford Bypass Phase One scheme, rather than reviewing and assessing risk around works contracts issued. As a result, it would not be appropriate to pursue the line of enquiry that you suggest. However your suggested line of enquiry is relevant to the decision that Cabinet is required to make, and I recommend that you ask this question of Cabinet.			



Title: UKSPF Programme in Herefordshire

Meeting: Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee

Meeting date: Friday 23 October 2026

Report by: Acting Head of Economy and Regeneration

Classification

Open.

Report purpose

To review the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF), with the emphasis placed on learning lessons from delivery, assessing the impact of the funding, and considering future funding opportunities for communities and the voluntary sector.

- To review the overall delivery and achievements of the UKSPF programme in Herefordshire.
- To understand the wider benefits generated by the programme and the extent to which UKSPF funding enabled projects that might not otherwise have proceeded.
- To identify lessons learned from the administration and management of the fund, particularly in relation to the experience of community organisations applying for funding.
- To consider what funding opportunities may exist following the end of the UKSPF programme and what role the council could play in supporting future community investment.

Background

1. It was agreed that the scrutiny review of UKSPF should be constructive and evidence-based, celebrating what had been achieved, while also examining lessons learned and exploring how communities can be supported once the programme ends. Members were particularly interested in understanding the full value delivered by the fund, the additional investment it attracted, and the options available to replace or supplement this source of funding.

Meeting objectives

2. In order for a full review of the UKSPF Programme to be undertaken, the report covers the following areas:
 - A summary of UKSPF delivery and achievements in Herefordshire.
 - Details of projects funded and headline outcomes achieved.
 - An assessment of lessons learned from the administration of the programme.

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Nadine Kinsey, Acting Head of Economy and Regeneration, email: nkinsey@herefordshire.gov.uk

- Information on challenges experienced by applicants and delivery teams.
- Data on match funding and any additional investment leveraged through UKSPF funding.
- Wider economic and community value generated by the programme.
- Details of potential replacement funding streams and opportunities available to community organisations.
- Commentary on future support for community projects, including any relevant local funding mechanisms available through the council.

Report information

3. UK Shared Prosperity Funding (UKSPF) was a successor programme to European Structural Funds, specifically the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and European Social Fund (ESF). The funding was allocated using a funding formula based on population and need.
4. Herefordshire Council was awarded £6,642,136 UKSPF (not including multiply) and £1,705,669 Rural England Prosperity Funding (REPF) for the 2022/25 programme and a further transition year allocation of £2172,966 UKSPF and £511,610 REPF in 2025/26.
5. Following significant engagement and consultation across council directorates, the wider community, organisations and individuals, and in collaboration with the stakeholder group, Herefordshire Sustainable Growth Strategy Board, the investment plan was submitted, and funding was awarded across the three priority interventions, including Communities and Place, Supporting Local Business and People and Skills.
6. UKSPF was a very welcome and broad ranging funding programme, however, it presented a number of administrative challenges for Economic Development (overseeing the delivery) and grant teams within Herefordshire Council. This was mainly due to the breadth of the UKSPF programme which covered three priority interventions and required a co-ordinated approach. In the past, individual teams and services delivered programmes specific to their areas e.g. community schemes through Delegated Grants and Talk Communities, business support programmes through Economic Development and Herefordshire Growth Hub and people and skills programmes through Post 16 Learning and Skills.
7. Guidelines for the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) caused significant confusion among local authorities, delivery partners, and suppliers as confirmed by national and local evaluations. The guidance was too broad and vague in scope which made it difficult to design and roll out local programmes. There was also confusion around the outputs and outcomes which were ambiguous and confusing and were subject to mid-programme changes.
8. UKSPF was, however, less prescriptive and bureaucratic than the EU funding and stripped away a lot of the constraints associated with EU structural funds, however, UKSPF funding had annual deadlines within the three-year programme, leaving short delivery windows and truncated project deadlines; this has also been fed back by grant recipients who would have benefitted from longer delivery windows. Herefordshire Council exercised the flexibility of the UKSPF programme to provide greater levels of grant funding, up to 75% for business related projects and most community projects were fully funded to 100% rather than the previous 15-50% grant caps on EU funding.
9. The national evaluation highlights the different delivery models local authorities and councils adopted to spend UKSPF funding. This varied from open calls, using established

frameworks and mixed procurement routes, as well as delivering grant schemes. Herefordshire Council has a dedicated grants team, and the nearly all grant schemes and contracts were managed in house. A number of the People and Skills contracts were awarded through open grant calls and were contract managed by the Senior Advisor for Post 16 Learning and Skills.

10. The Economic Development Team and Cultural Lead led a number of different contracts, via procurement, including the 1-2-1 business support programmes and start up schemes, feasibility studies, cultural schemes and tourism contract. This caused staffing and resource issues which were further compounded when three of the Delegated Grants Team left under the MERs scheme.
11. A direct comparison with neighbouring authority, Shropshire Council, shows different approaches to delivery. Shropshire Council delivered programmes both directly and awarded through open call. Shropshire also appointed a UKSPF lead and three technical officers. Herefordshire Council appointed one UKSPF lead and was supported part time by a project officer. The national evaluation shows that outcomes were strongest where places funded dedicated UKSPF management teams.
12. Below is the comparative table on council delivery vs external or commissioned delivery in Shropshire:

Dimension	Council-led	External/commissioned
Strategic alignment	Strong	Strong
Local accountability	Very strong	Strong, through contracts
Specialist expertise	Variable	Generally strong
Speed of mobilisation	Variable	Generally stronger
Access to existing networks	Variable	Strong
Procurement/planning risk	Higher for capital	Generally lower
Ability to tailor locally	Strong	Strong where provider is local
Scale/reach	Variable	Generally strong
Administrative efficiency	More demanding	Generally stronger
Evidence of additionality	Strong in some cases	Strong

13. Whilst the evaluation does not provide cost-per-outcome or impact-per-pound figures separately for internal vs external delivery, it appears that external delivery is operationally more effective where specialist capability, established networks or quick mobilisation were required.

Successes and achievements of the Herefordshire UKSPF/REPF Programmes

14. The full breakdown of projects funded can be found in Appendix 1 and 2.
15. Despite staffing and resource challenges, short annual delivery windows, and ambiguity and confusion around the initial guidance produced by MHCLG, Herefordshire Council fully spent its UKSPF and REPF allocation, delivering over 30 projects during its lifetime across all three intervention priorities. The co-ordination of the programme across different directorates, teams and services was a large undertaking and it should be recognised that internal teams delivered the programme on top of existing workloads.
16. The programme delivered a broad range of economic, social and environmental outputs, combining direct financial support with practical advice, skills development and community investment.

Summary of outputs and wider economic and community benefits

Area of Investment	Key Outputs Delivered	Wider Economic and Community Benefits
Business Support	• 214 businesses received tailored support through intensive 1-2-1 advice programmes. • 69 entrepreneurs and pre-start businesses received 20+ hours of support. • 35 businesses received intensive R&D support. • 102 grants awarded across business, innovation, tourism, energy and enterprise schemes. • 23 innovation grants awarded. • 20 businesses adopted new technologies or processes. • 29 new or improved products and services developed. • 8 businesses reported productivity improvements. • 49 businesses received non-financial support. • 78 energy audits completed for businesses and towns. • 66 jobs created across tourism, rural enterprise and business growth programmes. • 114 jobs safeguarded through business support interventions. • 879 tonnes of CO₂ savings identified through business and community decarbonisation activity. • 1 Destination Management Plan developed and launched. • 430,117 people reached through tourism promotion and destination marketing activity. • 11 feasibility studies completed to develop future investment opportunities.	The programme strengthened business resilience, innovation and productivity across Herefordshire. Businesses benefited from specialist advice, grants and investment to support expansion, diversification and decarbonisation. Tourism interventions increased visitor numbers and spending, while feasibility studies provided a good baseline for future economic growth and investment opportunities.

Community and Place	• 37 community facilities supported through Community Capacity Building funding. • 11 additional community facilities/infrastructure projects supported through REPF investment. • Approximately 1,500 community events and activities delivered. • 10,977 individuals accessed community services, support, activities and opportunities. • 5,188 individuals gained new skills or knowledge through community programmes. • 2,159 individuals reported improved health outcomes. • 1,375 people accessed mental and physical health support. • 5,845 people reported reduced isolation and enhanced social connections. • 5,238 people reported stronger social support networks and belonging. • 3,732 households received support to alleviate cost-of-living pressures. • 111 households received home energy support and retrofit advice. • 55 households implemented energy-efficiency measures. • 613 volunteering opportunities supported through community projects. • 12 VCSE organisations received grant support. • 46 cultural development grants awarded. • 47 festivals and events supported. • 677 cultural programmes delivered (422 cultural development programmes and 255 cultural programming activities). • 95,834 visitors attended festivals and events. • 82,255 additional visitors engaged with cultural sites, attractions and activities. • 32 people participated in creative health peer-learning programmes.	Funding and support enhanced community resilience, local pride and quality of life. Cultural and heritage activities increased participation, footfall and visitor numbers while supporting local creative organisations and tourism businesses. Community grants strengthened the VCSE sector, improved access to services and facilities, and delivered significant well-being benefits through reduced isolation, improved health outcomes and stronger community cohesion. Energy efficiency and sustainable transport initiatives also contributed to environmental objectives and reduced household costs.
---------------------	--	---

	• 131,443 cycle-share journeys completed, avoiding an estimated 81,495 vehicle journeys annually. • 2,613 volunteers engaged across cultural, sporting and community programmes. • 7,964 beneficiaries supported through the Sparks programme. • 56 community groups awarded small sparks grants.	
People and Skills	• 337 young people aged 16 to 24 were supported by the Youth Employment Hub. • 397 people aged 25+ received support to progress towards and into employment. • 467 people reported increased employability through development of interpersonal skills. • 97 people progressed into employment, including self-employment, following support. • 156 people gained basic skills in digital and ESOL (English to Speakers of Other Languages). • 1946 people in employment gained a qualification or completed a course.	The People and Skills interventions improved employability, confidence and progression opportunities for residents. Support was targeted at young people, economically inactive individuals and employees seeking to upskill or retrain. Participants gained qualifications, essential skills and work-related experience, helping them move closer to employment, education and career progression. Employers also benefited from a stronger talent pipeline and a more skilled workforce aligned to local economic needs.

Lessons learned from local delivery and local schemes

17. An evaluation of the feedback from the community and cultural programmes is generally positive, especially around support provided by council staff and grant funding increasing the capacity within community organisations. Smaller charities and volunteer led organisations raised issues around the application process being time consuming and resource intensive, especially around reporting requirements and providing supporting evidence for claims. Conversely cultural organisations mentioned that the guidance was clear, flexibility was shown when projects needed to adapt and smaller organisations appreciated a dedicated named officer.
18. Funding arrangements and reclaiming expenditure after project delivery was a significant challenge for organisations without sufficient reserves and this was also the case across business support programmes. Some had difficulty covering upfront costs.
19. While grant recipients recognised the need for appropriate financial controls and accountability, they felt some procedures could be clearer, more proportionate and easier to navigate.
20. Future grant programmes should retain the strong emphasis on personal support and communication while seeking to simplify administration, improve the timeliness of decisions, clarify reporting requirements and introduce more accessible payment arrangements where funding rules allow. These improvements could reduce barriers to participation and enable a wider range of community organisations to benefit from future funding opportunities.

Recommendations from lessons learned

21. Suggested learning for future programmes:

- Provide dedicated, named officers for projects.
- Consider advanced payment for grant schemes to help with cashflow.
- Allow longer delivery periods, where possible.
- Maintain flexibility around project changes.
- Hold workshops and webinars to promote grant schemes and answer queries, ahead of launching to support potential applicants.
- Provide additional support especially for first-time applicants.
- Provide more consistency with applications and guidance across all schemes.
- Appoint a dedicated management team to deliver larger programmes.
- Consider different delivery models, including more open calls and outsourcing to support delivery of funding and outcomes and reduce the burden on internal staff resource.

Leverage and match funding

22. Overall, the programme leveraged £4.7m match funding. The programme generated £3.5m private sector leverage from the capital and revenue grant programmes. The Our Place Project, part funded by UKSPF, secured an additional £596,000 from the Arts Council. The Marches Energy Grant (delivered by Worcestershire Council across Herefordshire) secured £525,000 Marches Local Enterprise Partnership funding. DWP also provided £98,000 match funding for the Employment Hub, during 2022/25. The evaluation also highlighted that a number of projects are pursuing funding from different funding bodies on the back of the UKSPF investment.

Post UKSPF Funding

23. There is no direct replacement for UKSPF. The Local Growth Fund (LGF) is targeted at the 11 Mayoral Strategic Authorities to invest in infrastructure, business support and skills development. There was no ringfenced grant funding for Herefordshire following the Spending Review.
24. Across the three funding priority areas; current funding opportunities are as follows:

Communities and Place

Hereford Southwest area was awarded £20m Pride in Place, however, this is limited to the South Wye area only, to address long term deprivation.

Herefordshire Council has allocated £90,000 to a Community Innovation Grant Programme. This will enable voluntary, community and social enterprise (VCSE) organisations to develop and test new approaches to improving financial resilience and preventing crisis.

Talk Communities has developed a Community Funding Tool, to help charities and community organisations identify the right grants for their projects. There is a free webinar to help businesses navigate the funding tool. This is constantly evolving to include new grant/funding programmes that come online [Community Funding Tool](#).

Talk Communities works closely with the VCSE sector to host bi-monthly funding forums and twice yearly, 'meet the funders' for charities and community organisation. These are well attended, with approximately 120 organisations in attendance.

Supporting Local Business

There are two grant programmes including Future Skills Grants and the Research and Development Grant, as well as a tourism project funded via the Hereford Enterprise Zone retained rates programme, however, this is unlikely to continue beyond March 2027.

Herefordshire Growth Hub continues to provide support to local businesses and signposting to relevant funding streams such as Made Smarter and Innovate UK funding opportunities and hosts a number of workshops and events to help businesses build business capacity, knowledge and resilience, and support growth.

People and Skills

The Youth Employment Hub (YEH) is funded through a Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) grant, which must be applied for and approved on an annual basis, creating uncertainty beyond each funding year. The grant supports 18 to 24-year-olds claiming Universal Credit into employment. DWP requires the YEH grant to be match funded, and this has previously been provided through the UK Shared Prosperity Fund enabling the service to support all young people aged 16 to 24 who are Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET).

From September 2026, match funding for 2026/27 is being provided through Hereford Enterprise Zone retained business rates, in addition to Herefordshire Council staffing resources and accommodation, ensuring continued support for vulnerable young people across the county.

Herefordshire Council has been allocated up to an indicative £2,221,448 by DWP via Shropshire Council as the accountable body for the delivery of the Connect to Work programme. The programme will support up to 605 eligible residents with disabilities, health conditions and complex barriers to employment through a voluntary supported employment model. The investment will improve employment outcomes, reduce economic inactivity and contribute to a more inclusive local labour market.

Herefordshire Council is developing a local delivery plan for submission to the Department for Work and Pensions for £1.5 million of Skills Bootcamps funding for the 2027/28 financial year. Skills Bootcamps are short, intensive, employer-led training programmes of up to 16 weeks that help adults aged 19 and over develop sector-specific skills in priority industries.

Consultees

25. None.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – UKSPF Budget Totals 2022/25

Appendix 2 – UKSPF Budget Totals 2025/26

Background papers and resources

Background Paper to UKSPF – To spend and accept UKSPF Cabinet Report dated 15 December 2022 [Spend and Accept UKSPF 15 December 2022](#)

Appendix 1 – UKSPF Totals 2022/2025

UKSPF 22/25		
Cost Centre/Project code name	Total	Total Match
UKSPF 22/25	Revenue	
Management & Admin	£189,379.58	
UKSPF - E1-Improvements to town centres & high streets	£239,678.00	
UKSPF - E4 - Enhancing existing cultural, historic & heritage institutes	£507,234.00	
UKSPF - E6 - Local arts, cultural, heritage & creative activities	£715,124.00	£596,000.00
UKSPF - E11 -Capacity building & infrastructure support local groups	£467,421.00	
UKSPF - E13 - Community measures to reduce cost of living	£120,000.00	
UKSPF - E14 - Relevant feasibility studies	£297,997.00	
UKSPF - E17 - Development & promotion of visitor economy	£225,901.00	
UKSPF - E19 - Investment in research & development at local level	£338,668.00	£52,516.83
UKSPF - E24 - Training hubs, business support offers, incubators & accelerators	£822,133.00	£148,966.62
UKSPF - E29 - Supporting decarbonisation & improving natural environment	£275,392.00	£525,000.00
UKSPF - E33 - Employment support for economically inactive people	£413,871.00	£98,000.00
UKSPF - E34 - Courses inc basis, life & career skills	£41,183.00	
UKSPF - E35 - Enrichment & volunteering activities	£142,805.42	
UKSPF - E37 - Tailored support for the employed to access courses	£710,423.00	
UKSPF - Capital (Business Enterprise Fund - Grants)	£1,134,977.00	£973,510.63
Total UKSPF Spend	£6,642,187.00	
	22-25 UKSPF Match	£2,393,994.08
Cost Centre/Project code name	Total	REPF Match
REPF Grants	£1,705,669.00	£ 1,478,259.55
	Total 22-25 Match	£ 3,872,253.63

Interventions	Total
Communities & Places	£2,049,457.00
Supporting Local Businesses	£3,095,068.00
People & Skills	£1,308,282.42
Management & Admin	£189,379.58
	£6,642,187.00

Appendix 2 – UKSPF Totals 2025/26

UKSPF 25/26						
Cost Centre/Project code name	Total Expenditure	Total Match		Interventions	Total Expenditure	
UKSPF 25/26				Communities & Places	£363,877.95	
Management & Admin	£86,907.00			Supporting Local Businesses	£757,270.18	
Sports Club grant scheme	£56,593.88			People & Skills	£964,910.87	
Community Transport	£33,736.26			Management & Admin	£86,907.00	
Cultural Programming Grant Scheme	£193,548.89				£2,172,966.00	
Community foundation	£55,000.00					
Elevate Cultural Business Support	£24,998.92					
R&D Grants Supporting Innovative Product and Service Development	£215,865.75	69,976.49				
Business Support - Business start up	£24,998.97					
Business Support	£115,207.46					
Employment Support for Economically Inactive People	£244,894.85					
Support for Young People (Not in Education, Employment or Training, or risk of being NEET)	£166,037.01					
Courses including basic, life and career skills	£38,586.04					
Tailored Support for Employed to Access Courses - Skill Boost	£99,112.97					
Tailored Support for Employed to Access Courses - workforce skills grant	£416,280.00					
Business Support Measures to Drive Employment Growth	£401,198.00	513,047.89				
Total UKSPF Spend	£2,172,966.00					
	25-26 UKSPF Match	£ 583,024.38				
Cost Centre/Project code name	Total Expenditure	REPF Match				
REPF Grants	£511,610.00	£ 241,733.48				
	Total 25-26 Match	£ 824,757.86				



Title: Work Programme 2026-27

Meeting: Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee

Meeting date: Friday 23 October 2026

Report by: Statutory Scrutiny Officer

Classification

Open

Report purpose

The report:

- Provides the committee with a draft work programme for the committee, for approval.
- Provides the committee with a copy of the council's forward plan of key decisions to assist the committee in deciding its programme of work.
- Lists the recommendations made by the committee since January 2025, and any responses to these recommendations.

Background

1. A fundamental part of good scrutiny is planning and agreeing a programme of work for the committee to undertake. A well-considered work programme:
 - a. identifies priorities for the committee's work that align with corporate and partnership priorities, as well as reflecting community concern;
 - b. ensures that each identified topic has clear objectives that focus the committee's work;
 - c. creates a timetable for the committee's programme of work so that the committee carry out its work at the optimal time; and
 - d. provides officers and partners with requirements for evidence that will support the committee in providing evidence-based scrutiny.

Meeting objectives

2. To agree the committee's work programme.
3. To note the work programmes of Herefordshire Council's other scrutiny committees.

Report information

4. The most recent work programme was published October 2026 and is attached as Appendix 1.
5. Attached as Appendix 2 to this report is the council's most recently published forward plan of key decisions.

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
 Danial Webb, Statutory Scrutiny Officer, email: danial.webb@herefordshire.gov.uk

6. Appendix 3 is a list of all recommendations made by the committee in 2025 and 2026.

Consultees

7. To prepare this work programme, the committee chairs have met with officers of the council to identify potential priority areas of work for the committee. These priority areas have been scheduled within the work programme to ensure the committee considers topics when it is most useful to do so. A draft of this work programme has then been circulated to the council's corporate leadership team and other key senior directors, alongside committee chairs, for further comment and refinement.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Scrutiny Work Programme October 2026

Appendix 2 – Herefordshire Council Forward Plan 9 October 2026

Appendix 3 – Recommendations made by Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee in 2025 and 2026

Background papers and resources

None



SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

October 2026 – March 2027

Below are the work programmes of Herefordshire Council’s five scrutiny committees and their six task and finish groups.

Work programmes are subject to change, with revised programmes agreed at the end of formal committee meetings.

Please note that no meetings will be scheduled after March 2027 until after the 2027 Council elections have concluded.

Table of Contents

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee 2

Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee..... 4

Environment and Sustainability Scrutiny Committee..... 5

Health, Care and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee 7

Scrutiny Management Board..... 8

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

Committee work programme

Committee Meeting

6 October 2026 **report deadline 28 September 2026** pre meeting lines of enquiry planning 2 October 2026

Topic and Objectives	Evidence required	Attendees*
Alternative provision - Review of capital programme relating to alternative provision. - Overview of existing provision.	Officer report	Liz Farr - Louise Tanner, Head of Learning and Achievement - Hilary Jones, Head of Additional Needs - Jane Morse - Commissioning
Children and Young People NEET - Impact of data updates on NEET average figures. - Overview of focussed service action plan with milestones.	Officer report	Liz Farr - Alexia Heath - Louise Tanner, Head of Learning and Achievement
Work programme Review work programme	Draft work programme	Statutory Scrutiny Officer

10 December 2026 **report deadline 2 December 2026** pre meeting lines of enquiry planning TBC December 2026

Topic and Objectives	Evidence required	Attendees*
Youth Strategy	Draft strategy	Tina Russell Hereford Rural Media Will Lindsey HVOSS Lindsay McHardy

11 March 2027 **report deadline 3 March 2027** pre meeting lines of enquiry planning TBC March 2027

Topic and Objectives	Evidence required	Attendees*
Fostering Objectives to be agreed	To be agreed	Tori Lynch - Natasha Newton
Participation strategy Objectives to be agreed	To be agreed	Suzanne Sims - Andrea Busk

Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee

Committee work programme

Committee Meeting

23 October 2026 **report deadline 15 October 2026** **pre meeting lines of enquiry planning 19 October 2026**

Topic and Objectives	Evidence required	Attendees*
UK Shared Prosperity Fund - Review of projects funded - Examine future funding opportunities	Overview of funded projects	- Service Director, Economy and Growth Economic Development Manager
Public participation in planning task and finish group - Review final report - Agree report recommendations	Final report	Statutory Scrutiny Officer
Work programme Review work programme	Draft work programme	Statutory Scrutiny Officer

Committee Meeting

27 January 2027 **report deadline 19 January 2027** **pre meeting lines of enquiry planning TBC**

Topic and Objectives	Evidence required	Attendees*
Year of delivery – capital projects End of year review of capital projects taking place in 2026.	- Council capital programme - Individual programme progress reports	To be determined

*The Corporate Director, Economy and Environment, Cabinet Member, Economy and Growth, Cabinet Member, Community Services and Assets, Cabinet Member, Roads and Regulatory Services, and Cabinet Member, Transport and Infrastructure, all have a standing invitation to the meeting.

Environment and Sustainability Scrutiny Committee

Committee work programme

Committee Meeting

2 December 2026 **report deadline 24 November 2026** pre meeting lines of enquiry planning 27 November 2026

Topic and Objectives	Evidence required	Attendees*
Carbon Management in Herefordshire - Identify progress in achieving carbon neutrality within: - The council and - Herefordshire more widely. - Scrutinise evidence, resident and business experiences, and project feedback to highlight - resident and business issues - evidence gaps, and - project progress. - Review the cost of carbon management programmes within the council and across the county. - Outline aims and objectives of Herefordshire Environment Board.	- Fourth Carbon Management Plan - Climate adaptation pilot feedback - Resident or business feedback and case studies - Best practice elsewhere, including the use of biochar	Richard Vaughan - Daniel Lenain - Mary Burton - Gareth Ellis - Outside representatives to be determined.
Rail Strategy - To test the ambition of the rail strategy - To establish progress to restore the Hereford-Ross-Gloucester rail link. - To seek assurance that the policy supports the objectives of the Local Transport Plan 5. - To establish how the strategy supports potential coordination of bus and rail services.	- Rail strategy - Buses task and finish group report (any West Midlands rail strategy)	- John Hobbs Ffion Horton - David Land

Flooding spotlight review – terms of reference To agree the terms of reference for a proposed spotlight review to scrutinise flood risk management and flood emergency responses.	Spotlight review terms of reference	Statutory Scrutiny Officer
--	---	---

Prospective spotlight review
February/March 2027

Topic and Objectives	Evidence required	Attendees*
Flooding and flood risk management Terms of reference to be agreed.	Evidence to be agreed	- John Hobbs - Other TBC

*The Corporate Director, Economy and Environment and Cabinet Member, Environment, both have a standing invitation to the meeting.

Health Care and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee

Committee work programme

Committee Meeting

8 December 2026 (TBC)** **report deadline 30 November 2026** pre meeting lines of enquiry planning December 2026

Topic and Objectives	Evidence required	Attendees*
Right Care Right Person Deferred update on work to deliver acute community mental health support in Herefordshire.	West Mercia Police Situation Report	Iain Richmond, Head of Adult Social Care Operations Nigel Webster, West Mercia Police Jake Wright, West Mercia Police Paul Abernethie, Herefordshire and Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust
Shaping neighbourhood health - Analyse how the health partnership identifies health needs in communities. - Scrutinise provision of current and future neighbourhood health services.	2Neighbourhood health bid - Taurus Out of Hours GP service - Worcestershire Council papers	Zoe Clifford, Director of Public Health Sarah Shingler, Managing Director Wye Valley NHS Trust Nigel Fraser, Herefordshire and Worcestershire ICB Alan Dawson, Wye Valle NHS Trust Lauren Parry, Taurus Healthcare
Adult Social Care budget outturn Scrutinise financial outturn against budget savings plans	Quarterly budget outturn and performance monitoring	Hilary Hall, Corporate Director, Community Wellbeing
Work programme Review work programme	Draft work programme	Statutory Scrutiny Officer

*The Corporate Director, Community Wellbeing and Cabinet Member Adults, Health and Wellbeing, both have a standing invitation to the meeting.

**As of 28 September, we plan to move this committee meeting date from 14 December to 8 December 2026. This will be confirmed shortly.

Scrutiny Management Board

Committee work programme

Committee Meeting

12 October 2026 **report deadline 02 October 2026** pre meeting lines of enquiry planning TBC

Topic and objective	Evidence required	Attendees
Temporary accommodation - Provide assurance that the council understands and is actively managing the growing demand and financial pressures associated with temporary accommodation, - Examine whether temporary accommodation services are meeting the needs of homeless households - Assess the effectiveness of prevention and support activity. - Identify the wider causes of homelessness and prolonged stays in temporary accommodation, including housing supply, demand trends and policy influences.	- Demand trends, causes of homelessness, turnover and household profiles. - Temporary accommodation costs, funding sources, capital investment and future financial pressures. - Resident experiences, prevention outcomes, housing supply constraints and options for reducing demand and length of stay.	Head of Supported Housing
Commercialisation task and finish group final report Agree final report	Final report	Statutory Scrutiny Officer
Annual review of effectiveness Agree final report	Scrutiny annual review	Statutory Scrutiny Officer
Hoople spotlight review terms of reference Agree terms of reference	Terms of reference	Statutory Scrutiny Officer

Topic and objective	Evidence required	Attendees
Work programme Review work programme	Draft work programme	Statutory Scrutiny Officer

Committee Meeting

1 December 2026 **report deadline 23 November 2026** member briefing 24 November 2026 pre meeting lines of enquiry planning 27 November 2026

Topic and objective	Evidence required	Attendees
Hoople spotlight review report* Agree findings and recommendations of the Hoople spotlight review.	Terms of reference	Statutory Scrutiny Officer
Inequalities task and finish group final report Agree final report	Final report	Statutory Scrutiny Officer
The voluntary and community sector Objectives to be agreed.		
Work programme Review work programme.	Draft work programme	Statutory Scrutiny Officer

*this report is dependent on the date the spotlight review takes place.

Committee Meeting**18 January 2027 (date TBC) report deadline 8 January 2027 pre meeting lines of enquiry planning TBC January 2027**

Topic and objective	Evidence required	Attendees
Budget 2027/2028 - To understand the executive's proposed revenue and capital budgets and its medium-term financial strategy. - To make recommendations for the executive to consider before proposing the budget to Council.	2027/2028 revenue budget report 2027/2028 capital budget report 2027-28-2030/31 medium-term financial strategy report - Supplementary information as requested by the committee.	Cabinet members Directors

HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL FORWARD PLAN



This document, known as the Forward Plan, sets out the decisions which are expected to be taken during the period covered by the Plan by either Cabinet as a whole, or by individual Cabinet Members. The Plan is updated regularly and is available on the Herefordshire Council website (www.herefordshire.gov.uk) and from Council Offices. This edition supersedes all previous editions.

The council must give at least 28 days' notice of key decisions to be taken. A key decision is one which results in the council incurring expenditure or making savings of £500,000 or more, and/or is likely to be significant in terms of the strategic nature of the decision or its impact, for better or worse, on the amenity of the community or quality of service provided by the council to a significant number of people living or working in the locality affected.

Current cabinet members are listed below. For more information and links papers for Cabinet meetings please visit <https://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=251>

Councillor Jonathan Lester	Corporate Strategy and Budget (Leader of the Council)
Councillor Elissa Swinglehurst	Culture and Environment (Deputy Leader of the Council)
Councillor Carole Gandy	Adults, Health and Wellbeing
Councillor Ivan Powell	Children and Young People
Councillor Harry Bramer	Community Services and Assets
Councillor Graham Biggs	Economy and Growth
Councillor Pete Stoddart	Finance and Corporate Services
Councillor Barry Durkin	Roads and Regulatory Services
Councillor Philip Price	Transport and Infrastructure
Councillor Dan Hurcomb	Local Engagement & Community Resilience

Documents submitted in relation to each decision will be a formal report, which may include one or more appendices. Reports will usually be made available on the council website at least 5 clear working days before the date of the decision. Occasionally it will be necessary to exempt part or all of a decision report from publication due to the nature of the decision, for example if it relates to the commercial or business affairs of the council. Other documents may be submitted in advance of the decision being taken and will also be published on the website unless exempt.

To request a copy of a decision report or related documents please contact governancesupportteam@herefordshire.gov.uk or telephone 01432 261699.

Report title and purpose	Decision Maker and Due date	Lead officer and lead cabinet member	Directorate	Notice of decision first published / ID	Issue Type and exemptions
--------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	-------------	---	---------------------------------

FORWARD PLAN FOR 9 October 2026 ONWARDS

The following information is provided for each entry in the Forward Plan:

Heading	Contains
Report title and purpose	A summary of the proposal
Decision Maker and Due date	Who will take the decision and the date the decision is expected to be made
Lead cabinet member and officer contact(s)	The cabinet member with responsibility for this decision and the officers producing the decision report.
Directorate	The directorate of the council responsible for the decision.
Date uploaded onto plan	The date the decision was first uploaded and the notice period started for key decisions.
Decision type, exemptions and urgency	Whether the decision is a Key or Non-Key decision, if the report is expected to be fully open, partly exempt or fully exempt and if urgency procedures are being followed.

Decisions to be taken by Cabinet at a formal meeting are listed first, ordered by date, and include both Key and Non-Key decisions. Decisions to be taken by individual Cabinet Members are then listed, grouped by portfolio area and sorted by date. These include Key and Non-Key decisions.

Report title and purpose	Decision Maker and Due date	Lead cabinet member and officer contact(s)	Directorate	Date uploaded onto plan	Decision Type, exemptions and urgency
--------------------------	-----------------------------	--	-------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------------

Cabinet decisions by date (Key and Non-key listed)

Early Help Task and Finish Group - final report To provide Cabinet with the final report of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee's Early Help task and group, looking at the provision of early help in Herefordshire.	Cabinet 22 October 2026	Cabinet member children and young people Danial Webb, Statutory Scrutiny Officer Danial.Webb@herefordshire.gov.uk Tel: 01432 260659	Children and Young People	2 October 2026	Non Key Open
Travel Plan Strategy The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet approval for an updated Travel Plan process for Herefordshire. The updated approach sets out a clearer, more consistent and outcome-focused process for the development, implementation and monitoring of travel plans across new developments, existing organisations and key trip-generating sites.	Cabinet 22 October 2026	Cabinet member transport and infrastructure Ffion Horton, Transport Planning Services Manager ffion.horton@herefordshire.gov.uk	Economy and Environment	2 October 2026	KEY Open

Report title and purpose	Decision Maker and Due date	Lead cabinet member and officer contact(s)	Directorate	Date uploaded onto plan	Decision Type, exemptions and urgency
Q2 2026/27 Budget Report To report the forecast position for 2026/27 at Quarter 2 (September 2026), including explanation and analysis of the drivers for the material budget variances, and to outline current and planned recovery activity to reduce the forecast overspend. To provide assurance that progress has been made towards delivery of the agreed revenue budget and service delivery targets, and that the reasons for major variances are understood and are being addressed to the cabinet's satisfaction.	Cabinet 26 November 2026	Cabinet member finance and corporate services Stacey Carter, Head of Strategic Finance (Deputy S151), Rachael Sanders, Director of Finance stacey.carter@herefordshire.gov.uk, Rachael.sanders@herefordshire.gov.uk Tel: 01432 383095, Tel: 01432 383775	Corporate Support Centre	2 October 2026	Non Key Open
Q2 Performance Report 2026-27 To review performance for Quarter 2 (Q2) 2026/27 and to report the performance position across all Directorates for this period.	Cabinet 26 November 2026	Cabinet member finance and corporate services Jessica Karia-Fitzgerald, Head of Corporate Performance and Intelligence j.karia-fitzgerald@herefordshire.gov.uk Tel: 01432 260976	Corporate Support Centre	2 October 2026	Non Key Open

Report title and purpose	Decision Maker and Due date	Lead cabinet member and officer contact(s)	Directorate	Date uploaded onto plan	Decision Type, exemptions and urgency
Risk Management Update Q2 2026/27 To provide an update on the status of corporate risks at the end of Quarter 2 2026/27 (September 2026) and provide assurance that risks are being managed effectively across the council.	Cabinet 26 November 2026	Cabinet member finance and corporate services Stacey Carter, Head of Strategic Finance (Deputy S151), Rachael Sanders, Director of Finance stacey.carter@herefordshire.gov.uk, Rachael.sanders@herefordshire.gov.uk Tel: 01432 383095, Tel: 01432 383775	Corporate Support Centre	2 October 2026	Non Key Open
Update on the Phase 2 Phosphate Mitigation Schemes To provide Cabinet with an update regarding the Phosphate Mitigation Wetland schemes	Cabinet 26 November 2026	Cabinet member culture and Environment Gemma Dando, Chief Operating Officer, Richard Vaughan, Sustainability and Climate Change Manager gemma.dando@herefordshire.gov.uk, Richard.Vaughan@herefordshire.gov.uk Tel: 01432 260192	Economy and Environment	2 October 2026	Non Key Open

Report title and purpose	Decision Maker and Due date	Lead cabinet member and officer contact(s)	Directorate	Date uploaded onto plan	Decision Type, exemptions and urgency
Building a Strategic Partnership between Herefordshire and Zhytomyr Oblast, Ukraine To agree the outcomes for the proposed Memorandum of Understanding, the implementation plan and resource requirements to support the long-term Herefordshire-Zhytomyr Strategic Partnership	Cabinet 17 December 2026	Leader of the Council (Section 9E) Hilary Hall, Corporate Director Community Wellbeing Hilary.Hall@herefordshire.gov.uk	Community Wellbeing	NEW ITEM	Non Key Open
Recommissioning of Drugs & Alcohol Recovery Services To obtain approval to recommission drug and alcohol recovery services in Herefordshire for an initial five-year period (2028–2033), with the option to extend the contract by a further two years. (2033–2035).	Cabinet 17 December 2026	Cabinet member adults, health and wellbeing Natalie Johnson-Stanley, Public Health Lead - Substance Misuse / Tobacco Natalie.Johnson-Stanley@herefordshire.gov.uk Tel: 01432 383230	Community Wellbeing	2 October 2026	KEY Open
Cabinet Member Decisions (Key and Non Key decisions)					
Portfolio: adults, health and wellbeing					

Report title and purpose	Decision Maker and Due date	Lead cabinet member and officer contact(s)	Directorate	Date uploaded onto plan	Decision Type, exemptions and urgency
To re-commission the home care framework in Herefordshire To approve the re-commissioning of the council's home care framework, called Services In Your Home (SIYH), in Herefordshire. The new SIYH framework needs to be operational by 1 May 2027.	Cabinet member adults, health and wellbeing 21 October 2026	Cabinet member adults, health and wellbeing Sharon Amery, Senior Commissioning Officer sharon.amery2@herefordshire.gov.uk Tel: 01432 383734	Community Wellbeing	2 October 2026	KEY Open
Herefordshire Adult Social Care Prevention Strategy The purpose of the report is to approve the 2026-2036 Herefordshire Adult Social Care Prevention Strategy	Cabinet member adults, health and wellbeing 30 November 2026	Cabinet member adults, health and wellbeing David Collyer, Acting Consultant in Public Health: General Practitioner david.collyer2@herefordshire.gov.uk	Community Wellbeing	2 October 2026	KEY Open
To re-commission the Technology Enabled Care Service in Herefordshire The existing contract for the Technology Enabled Care Service (TECS), including call monitoring, ends on 31 March 2027. Therefore, any new service arrangements will need to commence from 1 April 2027.	Cabinet member adults, health and wellbeing 3 December 2026	Cabinet member adults, health and wellbeing Sharon Amery, Senior Commissioning Officer sharon.amery2@herefordshire.gov.uk Tel: 01432 383734	Community Wellbeing	2 October 2026	KEY Open

Report title and purpose	Decision Maker and Due date	Lead cabinet member and officer contact(s)	Directorate	Date uploaded onto plan	Decision Type, exemptions and urgency
Empty Property Strategy 2026-2029 To approve the Empty Property Strategy 2026-2029 and associated Grant Scheme Overview. To delegate authority for Grant Scheme approvals and operational decisions to the Head of Housing Services.	Cabinet member adults, health and wellbeing 31 January 2027	Cabinet member adults, health and wellbeing Michelle Powell, Project Manager, Adults and Communities Michelle.Powell@herefordshire.gov.uk Tel: 01432 260728	Community Wellbeing	NEW ITEM	Non Key Open
Portfolio: children and young people					
Schools, Central School Services and Early Years Budget 2027/28 To approve School Forum's recommended budget proposals for school budgets, central school services and early years within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2027/28.	Cabinet member children and young people 27 January 2027	Cabinet member children and young people Stacey Carter, Head of Strategic Finance (Deputy S151) stacey.carter@herefordshire.gov.uk Tel: 01432 383095	Corporate Support Centre	2 October 2026	KEY Open

Report title and purpose	Decision Maker and Due date	Lead cabinet member and officer contact(s)	Directorate	Date uploaded onto plan	Decision Type, exemptions and urgency
High Needs Budget 2027/28 To propose the High Needs Budget for 2027/28 to the Cabinet Member Children and Young People.	Cabinet member children and young people 29 March 2027	Cabinet member children and young people Stacey Carter, Head of Strategic Finance (Deputy S151) stacey.carter@herefordshire.gov.uk Tel: 01432 383095	Corporate Support Centre	2 October 2026	KEY Open
Portfolio: community services and assets					
Establish a new Alternative Provision Centre capital spend To approve the spend of the capital allocation to establish a new Alternative Provision Centre	Cabinet member community services and assets 21 October 2026	Cabinet member community services and assets Quentin Mee, Head of Educational Development Quentin.Mee@herefordshire.gov.uk	Children and Young People	2 October 2026	KEY Open

Report title and purpose	Decision Maker and Due date	Lead cabinet member and officer contact(s)	Directorate	Date uploaded onto plan	Decision Type, exemptions and urgency
Relocation of Herefordshire Pupil Referral Units Capital Spend To approve the spend of the capital allocation to relocate Herefordshire Pupil Referral Units onto a single site.	Cabinet member community services and assets 21 October 2026	Cabinet member community services and assets Quentin Mee, Head of Educational Development Quentin.Mee@herefordshire.gov.uk	Children and Young People	2 October 2026	KEY Open
South Bank Close and Ivy Close Lease Arrangements To approve Midland Hearts request to rescind their lease of South Bank Close and Ivy Close. To approve the procurement of a new lease holder for these properties.	Cabinet member community services and assets Before 30 October 2026	Cabinet member community services and assets Hannah McSherry, Housing Strategy Officer Hannah.McSherry2@herefordshire.gov.uk Tel: 01432 383061	Economy and Environment	2 October 2026	KEY Open
Portfolio: economy and growth					

Report title and purpose	Decision Maker and Due date	Lead cabinet member and officer contact(s)	Directorate	Date uploaded onto plan	Decision Type, exemptions and urgency
Connect to Work Programme To approve the procurement of the Connect to Work Individual Placement and Support (IPS) Programme in Herefordshire using the Open Procedure in accordance with the Procurement Act 2023. The programme is fully funded through a grant provided by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP). To approve the award of a contract to the bidder achieving the highest overall score against the published evaluation criteria for a period of up to three years and six months, commencing in October 2026, with a total contract value of up to £1.22 million. To delegate operational responsibility for the delivery of the Connect to Work programme in Herefordshire to the Service Directors for Economy and Growth and Education, Skills and Learning, acting in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Economy and Growth.	Cabinet member economy and growth 23 October 2026	Cabinet member economy and growth Alexia Heath, Post 16 Senior Advisor aheath1@herefordshire.gov.uk Tel: 01432383416	Economy and Environment	2 October 2026	KEY Open

Report title and purpose	Decision Maker and Due date	Lead cabinet member and officer contact(s)	Directorate	Date uploaded onto plan	Decision Type, exemptions and urgency
Skills Bootcamps Herefordshire 2027/2028 Financial Year To approve the submission of a delivery plan to the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) for Skills Bootcamps funding of £1.5 million for the 2027/28 financial year. To agree that Herefordshire Council will act as the accountable body for the management, administration and commissioning of the funding, once approved by DWP, including any subsequent Skills Bootcamps allocations awarded to the council. To delegate to the Service Director for Economy and Growth and Service Director for Education, Skills and Learning, all operational decisions necessary to implement and deliver the programme, including the appointment of training provider(s) and the management of associated funding and contractual arrangements.	Cabinet member economy and growth 23 October 2026	Cabinet member economy and growth Alexia Heath, Post 16 Senior Advisor aheath1@herefordshire.gov.uk Tel: 01432383416	Economy and Environment	2 October 2026	KEY Open
Portfolio: environment					
Portfolio: finance and corporate services					

Report title and purpose	Decision Maker and Due date	Lead cabinet member and officer contact(s)	Directorate	Date uploaded onto plan	Decision Type, exemptions and urgency
Public Notices To approve a contract via a direct award process for the placing of public notices in newspapers circulating within Herefordshire.	Cabinet member finance and corporate services 30 October 2026	Cabinet member finance and corporate services Ed Bradford, Major Contracts Programme Director Edward.Bradford@herefordshire.gov.uk Tel: 01432 260786	Economy and Environment	2 October 2026	KEY Open
Portfolio: local engagement and community resilience					
Portfolio: roads and regulatory services					
Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Policy and Strategy To seek approval from the Cabinet Member (Roads and Regulatory Services) for the proposed revision of the Policy and Strategy for the delivery of Highway Infrastructure Asset Management. These documents establish the framework for the principles which are applied to the maintenance of our highway network.	Cabinet member roads and regulatory services 30 October 2026	Cabinet member roads and regulatory services Mark Lewis, Group Manager – Highway Asset Management mark.lewis2@herefordshire.gov.uk	Economy and Environment	2 October 2026	KEY Open

Report title and purpose	Decision Maker and Due date	Lead cabinet member and officer contact(s)	Directorate	Date uploaded onto plan	Decision Type, exemptions and urgency
Parking Enforcement Policy 2026 To approve the implementation of a revised Parking Enforcement Policy to include the policies relating to the implementation of virtual permits.	Cabinet member roads and regulatory services 30 October 2026	Cabinet member roads and regulatory services Michael Barnes, Parking Services Manager michael.barnes@herefordshire.gov.uk	Economy and Environment	2 October 2026	KEY Open
Procurement of Parking and Virtual Permitting Software To approve the procurement of Parking Enforcement and Virtual Permitting Software contract for a maximum of 5 years with an estimated value in excess of £500k .	Cabinet member roads and regulatory services 30 October 2026	Cabinet member roads and regulatory services Michael Barnes, Parking Services Manager michael.barnes@herefordshire.gov.uk	Economy and Environment	2 October 2026	KEY Open
Portfolio: transport and infrastructure					



APPENDIX 3

Recommendations made By Connected Communities Scrutiny Committee in 2025 and 2026

15 January 2025			
Local Transport Plan			
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.	Accepted	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 • Reduce the amount of traffic travelling through the city centre. • Transition to less polluting types of propulsion through - o Providing more Electric Vehicle charging points. - o Roll out zero emission buses in Hereford city. • Support transition of freight to sustainable modes in the city centre. 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 – • 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. Decarbonising maintenance Production of a Low Carbon Procurement Strategy Decarbonising maintenance Develop an approach to considering carbon in scheme design Decarbonising maintenance Reduce carbon emissions from street lighting Decarbonising maintenance Upgrade and enhance traffic signals Transition to lower emission fuels Increased provision of public Electric Vehicle chargers Transition to lower emission fuels Promote the use of peer-to-peer charging networks Transition to lower emission fuels Regular update of Electric Vehicle Charging Strategy Digital Access Promote online services and digital accessibility Transition to lower emission fuels Promotion of peer-to-peer charging networks Transition to lower emission fuels Delivery of LEVI funded on street charge points in all market towns Transition to lower emission fuels Delivery of EV charge points in council car parks
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 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.	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

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

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			
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.	Rejected	Rather than draft a protocol, the scrutiny team have instead focussed on supporting officers to draft recommendations. There are currently no overdue responses to recommendations.

3 June 2025			
Cultural Strategy 2019-29			
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.	Accepted	Agreed, with clarification. Cabinet Member / Cabinet recognises the Cultural Strategy 2025–2029 and the 5th Sector report as externally led, sector-produced documents, developed through extensive engagement with cultural partners. In this context, endorsement means formal Council recognition of the strategy and report as valuable frameworks that can guide collaborative working, influence internal policy, and support external funding bids. Endorsement does not imply a commitment to deliver or fund every recommendation but

			confirms the Council's willingness to support and align with the shared vision set out.
2	Herefordshire Council to support Herefordshire Cultural Partnership to produce an implementation plan to deliver the renewed Cultural Strategy 2025-29.	Accepted	Agreed, with clarification. Cabinet Member / Cabinet supports the development of an implementation plan to take forward the Cultural Strategy and recognises the importance of clear next steps and shared accountability. However, the Cultural Strategy is an Herefordshire Cultural Partnership-led (HCP) document, and it is appropriate that responsibility for the implementation plan also sits with the Cultural Partnership. The Council is willing to engage in the development of the plan, offer officer input, and help ensure alignment with council policy and delivery where appropriate.
3	Herefordshire Council ensures there is a dedicated officer to work with the partnership to produce and deliver the strategy's implementation plan.	Accepted	Partly agreed. Cabinet Member / Cabinet recognises the importance of officer capacity to support delivery of the Cultural Strategy and remains committed to contributing to its success. However, decisions regarding staffing and resource allocation are operational matters and sit outside the remit of Scrutiny Committee recommendations. Cabinet Member / Cabinet will review current capacity as part of wider workforce planning, including consideration of how best to support partnership working and strategy implementation across culture.
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.	Accepted	Agreed in principle. Cabinet Member / Cabinet recognises the value of embedding cultural priorities across wider council activity and will encourage further alignment where appropriate. Officers will explore opportunities to reflect the Cultural Strategy within

			relevant service areas, including Economic Development, Public Health, and Talk Community. Recognising that integration will be dependent on respective service plans, capacity, and strategic fit.
5	Herefordshire Council highlight the Cultural Strategy 2025-29 to town and parish councils and encourage engagement and support for local initiatives.	Accepted	Agreed in principle. The Council recognises the importance of local engagement and welcomes opportunities for town and parish councils to support cultural activity. A targeted communication campaign could help raise awareness of the strategy and encourage participation at a community level. The Cabinet Member may wish to lead this as part of their engagement role.
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.	Accepted	Agreed in principle The Cabinet Member / Cabinet supports the principle of co-working and creative hubs as valuable enablers of growth within the cultural and creative sectors. While the Council is not positioned to lead or fund such development directly, it is committed to working alongside the Economic Development team and external partners to identify opportunities, share information, and advocate for creative workspace provision where appropriate. This includes aligning with regeneration plans and the wider ambitions of the cultural and economic strategies.
Local Transport Plan			
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	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	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.	Rejected	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 required by legislation nor is it a formal recommendation by government. 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.
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.	Accepted	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	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.	Partly agreed	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. However, as the new Local Plan is developed existing highway issues will be identified and recognised where any new development is recommended.
7	The Local Transport Plan should include targets for the implementation of active travel measures.	Agreed	Agreed

8	The Local Transport Plan recognises the inability of the power grid network to meet the needs of fast EV charging point.	Rejected	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. Additionally, the LTP is a 16-year plan meaning such statement may quickly become outdated and inaccurate.
---	--	----------	--

8 July 2025

Gully Cleansing

No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	To provide the committee with an update on the current mapping operation and to provide a date by which the mapping will be completed.	Accepted	Asset data was collected by Town and Parish Councils through the 2024/25 drainage grant, which has now concluded. Mapping of drainage assets continues on a day-to-day basis through the existing arrangement with Balfour Beatty Living Places and will carry on through the new Public Realm Contract, via Herefordshire Council officers and also the new provider from June 2026. It is not possible at this time to provide a date for when all mapping will be completed.
2	To consider early adoption of the upgraded mapping software before the new contract comes into force in June 2026.	Accepted	A basic interim solution is in use on our website at www.herefordshire.gov.uk/flooding-2/flood-management/3#gulliesmap . The upgraded mapping software has been included in the requirements for the new contract, which we expect to be mobilised from late January/February 2026. Once the mapping software is in place we will begin the process of adding known assets based on existing knowledge and data collected by Town and Parish Councils through the 2024/25 drainage grant.

3	To provide an update on the new maintenance schedule that anticipates heavier rainfall across the county with an expected publication date.	Accepted	Balfour Beatty Living Places is expanding its drainage service to include a more comprehensive programmed cleanse of all gullies on A, B, and C roads. This represents the pre-emptive element of our drainage works and complements the existing reactive gully cleaning service, which responds to issues identified through inspections or defect reporting. It also sits alongside our network rehabilitation service, which addresses gullies and drainage systems requiring more substantial intervention following inspections or reactive works. The new Public Realm Contract will see the creation of an annual cleansing programme become the responsibility of Herefordshire Council, which will then be issued to the new provider to complete. The service will also move to a risk-based approach, ensuring that those areas identified as being at risk from existing datasets or previous events are subject to more frequent cleansing.
4	To provide an update on the £2 million flood resilience grant.	Accepted	A PGC meeting is scheduled for 4 September to consider how the additional £2,055,000 investment in flood risk mitigation is proposed to be allocated. We intend to distribute the funding in line with the principles outlined in Herefordshire's Local Flood Risk Management Strategy, focusing on scheme delivery, scheme development, community support, and the use of technology.

9 September 2025

Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan

No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	Ensure that the performance indicators monitoring the success of the Local Transport Plan include indicators showing reduced collisions, reduced emissions, and greater take up of walking and cycling as a mode of transport.	Accepted	Agreed – officers will review the current LTP KPI's that relate to the LCWIP and include additional measures as indicated above

2	Ensure that any targets in the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan are Specific, Measurable, Agreed (or Achievable), Realistic, and Time Bound.	Accepted	Agreed – officer will review the document and ensure that the targets are given measures as prescribed above
3	Publish the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan implementation plan, prioritisation list and programme of work by the end of 2025.	Accepted	Agreed – the current stage of work for the project is prioritising the list of projects that have been identified pre and post consultation. Once this has been completed and once the external funding provided to us has been announced this autumn the programme of work will be completed and will be returned to Scrutiny Committee for review.

17 February 2026**Tourism in Herefordshire**

No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	Herefordshire Council recognises the considerable positive impact the Herefordshire Destination Business Improvement District (DBID) has had on development of the tourism offer and should ensure council departments support the Destination Management Plan through planning, regulatory services, transport, and highways.	Accepted	Herefordshire council already recognises the positive impact of the Herefordshire BID, the relevant council departments fed into the development of the Destination Management Plan. We will ensure that the Destination Management Plan is considered when all new relevant council policies are developed and services delivered.
2	Welcomes the council leader's view that Herefordshire Council will support the DBID ballot and recommends that the council supports the ballot publicly when it takes place, and that Herefordshire Council continues to engage politically during the DBID ballot process.	Accepted	Agreed - Herefordshire council already recognises the positive impact of the Herefordshire BID, the relevant council departments fed into the development of the Destination Management Plan. We will ensure that the Destination Management Plan is considered when all new relevant council policies are developed and services delivered.
3	Herefordshire Council develops a contingency plan should the DBID ballot not be successful.	Accepted	The next Herefordshire BID ballot is due to take place in October 2026. The council is already working with BID officers to prepare for the next ballot. An in public

			governance decision (in accordance with the council's constitution) will be taken by Cabinet Member for Economy and Growth prior to ballot to confirm the council's support for, and intention to vote in favour of, the BID.
4	Herefordshire Council lobbies Government to support business development, including tourism, outside of metropolitan areas.	Partially Accepted	Should the Herefordshire BID be unsuccessful, future support for the tourism and independent retail sector will be considered alongside all other support for priority local sectors. Business support services are already provided through the Herefordshire Growth Hub. Any further support will be dependent on the availability of government or other funding support available in future years, and the council should therefore look to outsource this work.

15 April 2026

Herefordshire Parking Strategy 2026-2041

No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	Include a section explaining why Herefordshire Council charges for parking.	Accepted	The draft strategy will be updated to add a section on why the council charge for parking
2	Engage specifically with enforcement officers as part of the strategy development.	Accepted	The draft strategy has been developed through an officers' working group that included Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO's), management and operational staff.
3	Engage as soon as possible with town and parish councils to help shape the local approach.	Accepted	As part of the formal consultation on the strategy town and parish councils will be engaged so they can help shape the policy
4	Provide evidence of the modal shift arising from the strategy.	Partly Accepted	As part of the cabinet paper there will be clear KPI's identified to monitor the success of the scheme; it may not be possible for the modal shift to be directly attributable to this strategy however, if possible, this will be monitored and recorded
5	Ensure the strategy makes clear that the option to pay for parking using cash will remain for all council-provided parking.	Accepted	Draft policy currently states that cash payments are not being removed

15 April 2026 (continued)**Tourism in Herefordshire**

No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	Move from pass/fail assessments to scored or graded assessments, to ensure more granularity in traffic outcomes, safety outcomes, land acquisition, carbon reduction, woodland mitigation, biodiversity net gain, construction price, social value, affordability, and value for money.	Accepted	This recommendation has been accepted resulting in the criteria being redrafted for the final cabinet report. The criteria have now been organised against the Five Case Models as set out by the Department for Transport. The criteria have been expended from 21 to 41 and now include more qualitative and quantitative criteria as well as requirements that need to be in place before moving to the construction phase.
2	Widen the criteria for measuring social value to include the distribution of impacts on people in Herefordshire.	Accepted	The recommendation has been accepted resulting in an additional qualitative criteria covering a summary of the overall social benefits the scheme will deliver. This will be reported in a benefits distribution table and has been included in the revised Cabinet paper.
3	Ensure clearer reporting of project risks, assumptions and uncertainty.	Accepted	This recommendation has been accepted resulting in changes to the criteria so that they now include more about the key risks including the financial risks.
4	Ensure the report to Cabinet incorporates high/medium/low growth risk scenarios.	Accepted	This recommendation has been accepted resulting in changes to the Full Business Case that will be published in June so that it includes modelling information showing low, medium and high growth scenarios.

7 July 2026**Year of Delivery - Capital Projects**

No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	That the executive reviews the council's current arrangements for developing cost estimates for major capital projects before projects proceed to approval stages.		*No response received. Response was due on 9 September 2026*
2	That the council explores the provision of a marshal to manage bus manoeuvres in the transport hub.		*No response received. Response was due on 9 September 2026*
3	That the council consider an incubation hub as part of the development of phase 2 of Ross Business Park.		*No response received. Response was due on 9 September 2026*
4	That the council provide more regular public updates on the progress on the revised redevelopments of Shire Hall and the Hereford Museum and Art Gallery.		*No response received. Response was due on 9 September 2026*

20 July 2026**Hereford Bypass Phase One - full business case**

No.	Recommendation	Accepted/Rejected	Response
1	The Full Business Case Appendix I include the alternative options considered that could have achieved the strategic case for the scheme and reasons presented for discounting these options.		*No response received. Response was due on 22 September 2026*
2	The Full Business case makes the strategic case for Hereford Bypass Phase One, based on SMART objectives that align with LTP5.		*No response received. Response was due on 22 September 2026*
3	The Executive include in the full business case further details of the non monetised costs and benefits to the environment. This information should be pulled through from the Environmental		*No response received. Response was due on 22 September 2026*

	Impact Assessment and other environmental appraisals and assessments undertaken, in line with the DfT Green Book requirements.		
4	Alongside the assessment criteria, a document highlighting keys risks, mitigations, associated costs, drawn from appendices D, G and N, and to do so in Plain English.		*No response received. Response was due on 22 September 2026*
5	The Full Business Case provides greater detail to support the optimism bias contained in 2.2.4 Appendix F at 11.8%, rather than the standard 20% as outlined in 5.2.4 of Appendix J.		*No response received. Response was due on 22 September 2026*
6	That collision data includes: • Current safety outcomes; • Forecast safety outcomes; • Factors influencing those forecasts; and • Any mitigating measures available.		*No response received. Response was due on 22 September 2026*
7	The full business case should include information on the following criteria: • Physical activity; • Journey time and quality; • Security; • Townscape/visual character of towns and villages near to the route. • Severance; • Vehicle operating costs, including changes in fuel consumption and vehicle costs • Biodiversity; • Water environment; • Historic environment; and • Uncertainty and mitigation.		*No response received. Response was due on 22 September 2026*

8	The assessment criteria includes a section on traffic distribution effects, taking into account: • Localised impacts; • Communities experiencing benefits; and • Communities experiencing adverse effects.		*No response received. Response was due on 22 September 2026*
9	The assessment criteria include additional context regarding • Biodiversity; • Environmental mitigation measures.		*No response received. Response was due on 22 September 2026*

