

AGENDA

General Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Date: **Tuesday 3 September 2013**

Time: **5.00 pm**

Place: **The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road,
Hereford**

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

For any further information please contact:

Ben Baugh, Governance Services

Tel: 01432 261882

Email: bbaugh@herefordshire.gov.uk

If you would like help to understand this document, or would like it in another format, please call Ben Baugh, Governance Services on 01432 261882 or e-mail bbaugh@herefordshire.gov.uk in advance of the meeting.

Agenda for the Meeting of the General Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Membership

Chairman **Councillor A Seldon**
Vice-Chairman **Councillor EPJ Harvey**

Councillor EMK Chave
Councillor BA Durkin
Councillor DW Greenow
Councillor JW Hope MBE
Councillor RC Hunt
Councillor TM James
Councillor Brig P Jones CBE
Councillor RL Mayo
Councillor R Preece
Councillor GR Swinford
Councillor DB Wilcox

Voting Co-optees* **Mr P Burbidge**
 Miss E Lowenstein
(*on education matters) **Mr T Plumer**
 Mr P Sell

Roman Catholic Church
Secondary School Governor
Primary School Parent Governors
Church of England

AGENDA

	Pages
1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
To receive apologies for absence.	
2. NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY)	
To receive details of Members nominated to attend the meeting in place of a Member of the Committee.	
3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
To receive any declarations of interest by Members in respect of items on the agenda.	
4. MINUTES	9 - 22
To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2013.	
5. SUGGESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ON ISSUES FOR FUTURE SCRUTINY	
To consider suggestions from members of the public on issues the Committee could scrutinise in the future.	
<i>(There will be no discussion of the issue at the time when the matter is raised. Consideration will be given to whether it should form part of the Committee's work programme when compared with other competing priorities.)</i>	
6. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC	
To note questions received from the public and the items to which they relate.	
<i>(Questions are welcomed for consideration at a Scrutiny Committee meeting so long as the question is directly related to an item listed on the agenda. If you have a question you would like to ask then please submit it no later than two working days before the meeting to the officer named on the cover of this agenda).</i>	
7. WASTE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT	23 - 26
To outline the current position with regard to the negotiations over the variation to the Integrated Waste Management Contract and the processes that will be followed to enable Cabinet to make a decision on the 4 October 2013.	
8. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME	27 - 38
To consider the Committee work programme.	

PUBLIC INFORMATION

Public Involvement at Scrutiny Committee Meetings

You can contact Councillors and Officers at any time about Scrutiny Committee matters and issues which you would like the Scrutiny Committee to investigate.

There are also two other ways in which you can directly contribute at Herefordshire Council's Scrutiny Committee meetings.

1. Identifying Areas for Scrutiny

At the meeting the Chairman will ask the members of the public present if they have any issues which they would like the Scrutiny Committee to investigate, however, there will be no discussion of the issue at the time when the matter is raised. Councillors will research the issue and consider whether it should form part of the Committee's work programme when compared with other competing priorities.

2. Questions from Members of the Public for Consideration at Scrutiny Committee Meetings and Participation at Meetings

You can submit a question for consideration at a Scrutiny Committee meeting so long as the question you are asking is directly related to an item listed on the agenda. If you have a question you would like to ask then please submit it **no later than two working days before the meeting** to the Committee Officer. This will help to ensure that an answer can be provided at the meeting. Contact details for the Committee Officer can be found on the front page of this agenda.

Generally, members of the public will also be able to contribute to the discussion at the meeting. This will be at the Chairman's discretion.

(Please note that the Scrutiny Committee is not able to discuss questions relating to personal or confidential issues.)

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.
- 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.
- Have a reasonable number of copies of agenda and reports (relating to items to be considered in public) made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees.
- 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.
- Copy any of the documents mentioned above to which you have a right of access, subject to a reasonable charge (20p per sheet subject to a maximum of £5.00 per agenda plus a nominal fee of £1.50 for postage).
- 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 and copy documents.

Public Transport Links

- Public transport access can be gained to Brockington via the bus service that runs from the bus station at the Tesco store in Bewell Street (next to the roundabout junction of Blueschool Street / Victoria Street / Edgar Street).
- The nearest bus stop to Brockington is located in Old Eign Hill near to its junction with Hafod Road. The return journey can be made from the same bus stop.

FIRE AND EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

In the event of a fire or emergency the alarm bell will ring continuously.

You should vacate the building in an orderly manner through the nearest available fire exit.

You should then proceed to Assembly Point A which is located in the circular car park at the front of the building. A check will be undertaken to ensure that those recorded as present have vacated the building following which further instructions will be given.

Please do not allow any items of clothing, etc. to obstruct any of the exits.

Do not delay your vacation of the building by stopping or returning to collect coats or other personal belongings.

HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of General Overview & Scrutiny Committee held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Tuesday 16 July 2013 at 2.00 pm

Present: Councillor A Seldon (Chairman)
Councillor EPJ Harvey (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors: EMK Chave, BA Durkin, Brig P Jones CBE, R Preece, GR Swinford and DB Wilcox

In attendance: Councillors CNH Attwood, PL Bettington, WLS Bowen, RB Hamilton, J Hardwick, AJ Hempton-Smith, MAF Hubbard and MD Lloyd-Hayes

Officers: A Ashcroft (Assistant Director - Assistant Director Economic, Environment & Cultural Services), B Baugh (Democratic Services Officer), Y Coleman (Planning Obligations Manager), G Dean (Scrutiny Officer), G Hughes (Director for Economy, Communities and Corporate), and J Jones (Head of Governance)

11. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors JW Hope MBE, TM James and RL Mayo.

12. NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY)

There were no named substitutes.

13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

14. MINUTES

The minutes of the last meeting were received. It was noted that a document containing supplementary questions from the public at the last meeting and responses from officers had been circulated as a supplement.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2013 be approved as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

15. SUGGESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ON ISSUES FOR FUTURE SCRUTINY

No suggestions were received for this meeting.

16. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No questions were received for this meeting.

17. TASK AND FINISH GROUP REPORT - COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

The Vice-Chairman, as Chairman of the Task and Finish Group on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), introduced the report with the following remarks:

1. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had commissioned the Task and Finish Group to undertake policy shaping scrutiny work, alongside policy development activity, on the implementation of CIL in Herefordshire. An interim report was presented to the General Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 10 December 2012 (minute 15 refers), with the Executive response reported to the Committee on 4 March 2013 (minute 54 refers). The Group reconvened in February 2013 and a further interim report was now presented to the Committee on the Group's findings to date.
2. Officers and Members of the Group were thanked for their time and engagement on the subject. It was noted that it was a difficult piece of work, particularly as the timetable mirrored policy development and public consultations on both CIL and the Core Strategy. Shortly after the consultation was completed on CIL, the government had published further guidance and had also initiated a national consultation on revisions to the existing legislation relating to CIL.
3. As reported at the last Committee meeting (minute 7 refers), it was understood that the development of CIL would, temporarily, follow behind work on the Local Development Framework and the revised timetable for the implementation of CIL was Autumn 2014.
4. It was anticipated that the Group would reconvene in September 2013 to review the responses to the CIL consultation, once they had been analysed, and to undertake further work in preparation for recommending revised rates to Cabinet in October / November 2013. However, a detailed timetable had not yet come forward.

The Vice-Chairman explained that the structure of the report followed the themes of the Group's investigations since February 2013 and had been informed by the guidance and best practice report to the Department for Communities and Local Government by the Local Housing Delivery Group, entitled 'Viability Testing Local Plans - advice for planning practitioners'. An overview was provided of the report, the principal points and related recommendations are detailed below.

The Economic Viability Assessment 2013 (EVA-2013)

- a. The EVA-2013 had been made available to the Group shortly before the public consultation in March 2013. The Group had identified that there were a differences in the approach taken to viability work for EVA-2013 compared that used for EVA-2011; only a portion of the full infrastructure costs had been taken into account, contrary to guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Viability Testing Local Plans document.

Recommendation 1: That

- a. modelling of the cumulative effect of plan policies, to include full costs of all infrastructure mentioned in the Core Strategy policies, be undertaken as a matter of urgency; and
 - b. the results from this modelling be used to inform the setting of draft CIL rates throughout Herefordshire and to assess the viability of the Core Strategy/Local Plan ahead of examination in public.
- b. In terms of sustainable development and realistic economic viability, it was reported that the Group had concerns about some of the CIL rates that were being proposed for the County, in particular:

- There appeared to be discrepancies between the house and land values used in the modelling and those currently representative of prices being paid on the ground, so further investigation was recommended.
- It was considered that the Zone 4 housing market sub area, with the highest CIL rate of £140m/2, was too large to represent a homogeneous market.
- The December 2012 report recommended variations within geographic areas to account for housing market differences between towns, villages and rural areas. The Group had been advised that there were insufficient differences within the housing market areas to warrant that level of discrimination. However, this meant that there were some very sharp CIL rate differences at the boundaries and it was considered that the precise positioning of these boundaries needed to be reviewed, especially where developer activity might reasonably be expected.

Recommendation 2: That 1-2-1 meetings with stakeholders, or stakeholder group meetings within Localities, are held to gather further information about house/benchmark land values to inform revisions to rates, areas and boundaries.

- c. It had been identified that not all of the strategic housing sites had been modelled with appropriate assumed land values; a site in Ledbury had been given an agricultural land use value but the land had already been designated as employment land under the current policies.

Recommendation 3: That the benchmark land values ascribed to strategic sites are checked for correctness and new modelling take place for any strategic housing development which has been inappropriately classified according to its land type.

- d. It was noted that there were some differences in the modelling assumptions in the current EVA-2013 compared to EVA-2011 which had not been explained clearly in the documentation. In particular, there had been a change in the method for handling Section 106/developer funded infrastructure.

Recommendation 4: That all modelling assumptions should be discussed collaboratively with stakeholders; cross referenced with documents in the Core Strategy/Local Plan evidence base for consistency; and clearly stated/explained in EVA-2013 with respect to wider benchmarks, guidance, previous studies and best practice.

- e. It was recognised that geographical variation of house and land prices had been taken into account, albeit without further zoning as recommended in the December 2012 report, but EVA-2013 had not modelled viability across time which would be of assistance in planning the approach to utilising CIL revenue in the broader financial management framework of the Council as a whole.

- f. The Vice-Chairman welcomed the statement, in the answers to supplementary questions from the public at the last meeting, that *'In response to the consultation, Councillor RB Hamilton has invited his Cabinet colleagues to a future review of the IDP to include the prioritisation of identified infrastructure, projected timescales for delivery and potential funding mechanisms. The outcome of this review will be fed into the IDP for the independent examination.'*

Recommendation 5: That, ahead of examination in public:

- a. the fully costed infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan are phased to match with the development delivery trajectory in the core strategy; and
- b. time-based viability modelling of the whole plan be undertaken.

- g. It was reported that there had been a discussion with the Chief Officer: Finance and Commercial about the capabilities of the existing finance system to manage CIL monies. It was also noted that the final EVA-2013 had not been made available to the Group ahead of the preliminary draft charging schedule being released to public consultation, although some of the Group's suggestions had been incorporated into the schedule.

Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

- h. In view of the issues raised about modelling assumptions, it was suggested that it might be necessary to revisit the question of payment phasing to ensure that development came forward and would be viable.

Recommendation 6: That:

- a. the reasons for the revised modelling assumptions for net developable area and opening-up costs compared to EVA-2011 are clearly explained; and
- b. assurance be provided that there is no detrimental impact on the viability and deliverability of all aspects of developments by the recommendation that the phasing of CIL payments is not now necessary.
- i. The Group had made some suggestions regarding changes to the gradation of the proposed phasing criteria, due to concerns that the installment schedule for CIL payment was too narrow to take into account the range of development sizes that might come forward. Although these suggestions had not been incorporated into the CIL consultation document, it was noted that government had recently consulted on changes to guidance and the potential impact of this was still being evaluated by officers.

Recommendation 7: That the gradation of the payment phasing criteria should be reviewed to provide flexibility when tested for large, small and staged developments.

- j. The Group had been disappointed that the CIL consultation did not include special rates for self-build and high energy efficient build projects as recommended in the December 2012 report. However, it was reported that the latest national consultation on CIL did recommend such allowances and it was expected that this would feature in the draft rates in autumn 2013.
- k. In view of the 'Understanding Herefordshire 2013' report, that indicated that a significant proportion of households already suffered from fuel poverty and given below national average wage levels, the Group made a further recommendation that consideration be given to a negative CIL rate for high energy efficiency developments; it was noted that this would not preclude Section 106 agreements.

Recommendation 8: That the Executive consider setting a £Negative CIL rate for developments delivered to PassivHaus standards to recognise their contribution towards reducing the strain on strategic infrastructure.

CIL Public Consultation

- l. It was reported that the Group was broadly content with the consultation process itself but made observations and recommendations in respect of the CIL rate for the 'superstore' category and had sought clarification about the definition and treatment of 'large' stores.

Recommendation 9: That

- a. a 'Superstore' rate of CIL be proposed for the next round of consultation; and

- b. question 9 of the CIL consultation be reviewed for correctness.

New Guidance

- m. The report contained hyperlinks to recent government guidance. It was noted that officers were assessing the implications of the new guidance at present but it was clear to the Group that a number of the policy changes would involve additional work for the Council in administering CIL. In particular, the potential for large developments to be divided into smaller schemes or many phases could result in additional workload and costs for the authority which might not be reflected in the management charge for CIL. The Group made the following recommendations arising from government guidance.

Recommendation 10: That following submission of the Core Strategy/Local Plan to full Council in July 2013, priority is given to bringing the CIL and Core Strategy back in alignment (in line with guidance) and that this be achieved ahead of the Core Strategy being submitted to examination in public.

Recommendation 11: That officers assess the impact of CIL capping for councils holding a parish plan and provide guidance to all parishes by the end of August 2013.

Future Work Programme

- n. It was commented that the revised timetable for the implementation of CIL was dependent on the publication of the outcomes of the latest government reforms. The report set out further work that would need to be undertaken.
- o. It was noted that CIL was a new levy on development, that there would need to be a period of adjustment, and economic conditions had slowed the rate of development in the County. Consequently, the Group considered that CIL should not be implemented in such a way that would further inhibit development and recommended that a transition plan be devised, along with monitoring indicators to enable market conditions and behaviour to be reviewed post-implementation.

Recommendation 12: That

- a. a set of transition CIL rates be initially introduced which are significantly lower than those modelled as viable, to assist with immediate market land price adjustment and to encourage development to come forward following the introduction of CIL; and
 - b. consultants provide advice on monitoring indicators and trigger thresholds for future rate review.
- p. The Vice-Chairman said that, as identified in the December 2012 report, it was crucial that appropriate CIL rates were set an appropriate level at the outset, as CIL would be non-negotiable once implemented. It was noted that affordable housing and local infrastructure would be negotiable elements. Therefore, to achieve the best outcomes for communities, the Group considered it essential that negotiations with developers were sufficiently robust and sought assurance about the approach to be taken.

Recommendation 13: That

- a. the Executive provides information and assurance to the reconvened Task & Finish Group to demonstrate that the District Valuation Office approach comprises detailed and continually updated market and economic information on whole development costs sufficient to ensure the robust defence of local infrastructure and affordable housing targets; and
- b. this is demonstrated to the Group's satisfaction ahead of the Core Strategy being submitted to examination in public.

The Chairman thanked the Vice-Chairman and the Task and Finish Group for this significant piece of work; Committee Members also congratulated the Group for the thoroughness of the report. The Chairman noted that some of the pilot areas for CIL had encountered difficulties and the government seemed to be making changes as the situation evolved. In response, the Assistant Director - Economic, Environment & Cultural Services (hereafter 'Assistant Director' in these minutes) acknowledged that there had been a steep learning curve but said that, informed by experiences in the pilot areas, government advice was clarifying outstanding issues. He added that this consolidated the view that CIL should follow behind work on the Core Strategy, thereby enabling the authority to proceed with confidence in view of the most up to date guidance and findings.

A Committee Member raised a number of issues, including:

- It was questioned whether the work on economic viability applied only to CIL or whether it also applied to the Core Strategy.
- Clarification was sought about the reasons for the delay in the analysis of the CIL consultation responses.
- Referring to recommendation 8, it was commented that self-build and high energy efficiency developments should be given priority, adding that on-site sewage disposal systems also reduced the burden on local infrastructure.

The Assistant Director said that it was a mandatory duty for a council to prepare a Local Development Framework and Herefordshire Council had been working on this kind of plan since 2007. It was a matter of discretion whether the authority chose to bring forward CIL and it had decided to do so. Therefore, the issues were linked but had to be treated on their own merits and in the context of the legislation. The Planning Obligations Manager outlined the EVA modelling approach and advised that, as identified in the reports to Cabinet and Council, work on viability would continue to be refined, particularly for strategic sites; it was noted that helpful discussions had taken place with Ward Members for all the market towns.

The Planning Obligations Manager commented that self-build developments had not been included in previous CIL work but this element had now been identified in the latest government consultation.

The Assistant Director advised that analysis of the CIL consultation responses had not yet been undertaken because of the time and scope available within the team.

Another Committee Member sought clarification about paragraph 3.3.1 of the report which read '*The Group was not permitted to engage with stakeholder parish councils during the period of the public consultation on CIL*'. The Vice-Chairman said that the Group had been advised that it could be confusing for parish councils if they were engaged in scrutiny work on CIL at the same time as the consultation on the preliminary draft charging schedule. The Cabinet Member Environment, Housing and Planning (hereafter 'Cabinet Member' in these minutes) said that he was comfortable with his decision on this matter, as the public consultation was a statutory process and it would not have been appropriate to complicate the process.

Clarification was also sought about recommendation 8. The Vice-Chairman acknowledged that the recommendation was innovative and said that it sought to encourage energy efficient housing, as this form of development did not create as much loading on County infrastructure and reduced lifetime running costs. The Chairman noted that some Councillors had been campaigning for a number of years to get building

regulations to the highest possible standard, so that as many properties as possible were zero emission.

The Assistant Director commented that: good, modern housing of this type was supported, this was reflected in the Core Strategy; CIL was perhaps a blunt tool to encourage energy efficient development to come forward; the legislation encouraged the setting of zero CIL rates where appropriate, but it might not be possible to set a negative CIL rate; and it might not be appropriate to pay developers to build particular types of houses given current financial conditions. The Cabinet Member supported the comments of the Assistant Director and said that sustainability should be integral to all forms of development. He added that the authority could take a sophisticated look at the range of options to incentivise the highest standards of sustainability.

A Committee Member proposed that, rather than setting 'a £Negative CIL rate', recommendation 8 be amended to refer to 'a significant reduction in the CIL rate'; perhaps with a sliding scale to recognise that any development would require some infrastructure to some extent. The amendment was not seconded, therefore no vote could be taken.

Attention was drawn to paragraph 4.1.4 ii) of the report which read '*We question whether the definition of a 'large' store in Herefordshire should start at 280m²*'. A Committee Member suggested that, for consistency, the determination of 'large' store should follow the same legal definition as used for trading purposes for Sunday restrictions. This amendment was agreed by the Committee; the Vice-Chairman abstained, noting that the purpose of the paragraph was to seek clarification about question 9 of the CIL consultation prior to the next round of modelling.

In response to a question about recommendation 12, the Vice-Chairman said that the authority would need to identify some key indicators in order to monitor what was happening with CIL and with the development situation in the County, adding that CIL rates would need to be reviewed several times during the lifetime of the Core Strategy. It was the view of the Group that a set of transition CIL rates were needed initially, at a level at which the market could cope with given current conditions. The Assistant Director said that legislation provided some flexibility but, given the potential for developments to come forward once the Council had reached a decision on the Core Strategy, the authority needed to be cautious about setting CIL rates lower than levels indicated as being viable from the evidence.

Referring to a response given at the last meeting (see Questions from the Public, 18 June 2013, Answer 1 b), appended to the minutes of the last Committee meeting), the Vice-Chairman queried the use of the phrase that CIL would 'be used to bridge a funding gap'. The Assistant Director said that CIL in itself would not be paying for all infrastructure in the County but would add value to what was available to the authority, either through public and/or private funding. It was acknowledged that a number of Members wished for a more detailed plan but, as a living document, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan would inevitably change during the 20 year period and the authority could not speculate on future government policies and funding.

In response to a question from a Committee Member, the Assistant Director advised that it was intended that the analysis of the CIL consultation responses would be brought back to Cabinet in autumn 2013.

The Cabinet Member thanked the Vice-Chairman and the other Members of the Task and Finish Group for the work that had been undertaken to date and acknowledged the effort that had gone into the report.

RESOLVED: That

- (a) The report of the Task and Finish Group - Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) be received and, subject to the amendment identified in respect of paragraph 4.1.4, the Committee agree its findings for submission to the Executive; and
- (b) The Executive be invited to provide a response to the review, including an action plan, to be reported to the first available meeting of the Committee after the Executive has approved its response.

18. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

The Chairman advised that the Herefordshire Plan - Core Strategy 2011-2031 (draft) was to be considered by Council on 19 July 2013. He made the following points:

1. As Chairman of the Committee, he would have the opportunity to speak for five minutes at Council.
2. It was acknowledged that the officers had worked extremely hard but there was a perception that the Council was pressing ahead without fully considering the views of local communities.
3. Reference was made to the allocation of land in Bromyard for residential development in the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007. It was commented that mistakes were made, with too much reliance given to the views of the Ward Members at the time, and this situation should not be repeated.

The Chairman invited views from attendees on the general policies.

General Policies

A Councillor in attendance, referring to the Place Shaping Policies, advised that 'minimum' had been replaced with 'target' in respect of affordable housing on strategic sites. He considered this to be a significant weakening of the policy commitment to deliver affordable housing and the policy should revert to the original wording. A Committee Member said that the position would depend on the economic situation and inward investment, therefore he considered a target percentage to be pragmatic. The Councillor in attendance commented that there was a risk that affordable housing would be negotiated away, particularly as the Community Infrastructure Levy would be a non-negotiable charge. The Assistant Director commented that the consolidated version of the plan would be presented to Council. The Chairman suggested that this question be put to Council.

The Councillor in attendance said that there had been a change to the rural housing policies since consultation, with minimum housing numbers required in growth villages, the reason for the change and who requested it were questioned. The Cabinet Member said that this was a question for Council; he subsequently added that changes had resulted from responses received and the analysis that had been undertaken.

The following points were made about the purpose of the agenda item:

- a. The Cabinet Member said that: he had come to listen; the ultimate scrutiny on this item would be at Council; in addition to the Chairman of the Committee being given time to speak, all Councillors would have an opportunity to speak; and this was not a pre-meeting of Council.

- b. The Chairman questioned the capacity to answer detailed questions at Council and said that areas of concern needed to be identified.
- c. The Vice-Chairman said that this Committee had the Local Development Framework before it for discussion and points could be cleared up ahead of the Council meeting.
- d. The Head of Governance said that it was the role of the Committee to scrutinise the proposal being put forward to Council but also noted the limited time available to the Committee. He added that Council would get some comfort from knowing that the matter had been through the scrutiny process.
- e. The Cabinet Member said that Council would undertake a piece of major business in a public forum on 19 July 2013 and all Councillors would have the opportunity to contribute to the debate, would benefit from hearing the answers to any questions asked, and would ultimately make a decision.
- f. A Committee Member said that the purpose of the item was for Committee Members to provide comments to the Chairman on the Local Development Framework, prior to its consideration at Council, and that it was appropriate to narrow the discussion accordingly.
- g. Another Committee Member suggested that the Chairman's comments could include the fact that responses had not been provided to the questions posed at the Committee.

A Committee Member commented that there was reference within the Core Strategy to 'Understanding Herefordshire 2012' but the 'Understanding Herefordshire 2013' document was now available; in particular, reference was made to demographics in the 18-34 age group. In view of this, it was questioned what account had been taken of the new information and whether some of the evidence within the Core Strategy was as up-to-date as it needed to be.

A Committee Member made the following comments:

- i. Concern was expressed about the over reliance on the opinions of Ward Members in certain areas, coupled with negative attitudes towards the views of town councils and Hereford City Council, which represented over 50% of the total population.
- ii. Four out of five of the town councils and the City Council had agreed to contribute to a fund to challenge the Core Strategy in its present form.
- iii. Bromyard was being asked to provide 500 new houses but it did not have employment land to accompany the new housing, as required in the policy.
- iv. The Cabinet Member and the officers were urged to use the next few months to engage directly, actively and constructively with all town councils and the City Council.

The Vice-Chairman said that she had a number of questions and comments on the revisions to the Core Strategy, these included:

- 1. Page 29: In respect of assessing the document against the sustainability criteria, why had the phrase "to find the 'best fit'" been removed? In view of this, how could assurance be provided about the performance of the current proposals compared to other alternatives?

2. Which evidence base documents had been added to or changed since the consultation?
3. Page 49: It was stated that the '*Core Strategy does not identify specific development sites*' but this was considered misleading as a number of strategic housing sites could be identified easily. The Vice-Chairman added that this limited the scope to negotiate with other landowners and achieve viable land prices and maximum levels of community gain.
4. Page 53: The total number of houses for major residential developments came to 5300, not 5200, therefore the Hereford Area Plan needed to allocate a residual requirement of around 2250 houses, not 2350 as stated.
5. Page 64: What is the causal relationship between the building of the relief road and the delivery of sustainable transport measures? How does the design of the road both avoid and mitigate adverse impacts?
6. Page 180: With reference to the new requirement for a Natural Resources Development Plan document, what are the shortcomings with regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 13 and Technical Guidance does this plan intend to address?
7. Page 198: Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP):
 - Why has the authority chosen not to provide provisional costings for the local infrastructure projects assumed to be delivered through developer funding in the IDP?
 - What are the positive and negative effects on the Core Strategy of only modelling a proportion of the total infrastructure costs at this time?
 - Although recognising the difficulties of modelling over a twenty year period, there was an expectation in guidance that total cumulative costs should be modelled based on the best available current information.
 - How are we to be assured that the financial viability and the material deliverability of the plan is as stated?
 - It was stated in a response to supplementary questions from the public from the last meeting that there would be '*future review of the IDP to include the prioritization of identified infrastructure, projected timescales for delivery and potential funding mechanisms*'. How can we be assured that the plan, as it stands, is viable, deliverable and sustainable?

The Chairman said that sustainability, viability and deliverability were key themes that applied to the whole document and would feature in his comments to Council.

Specific Policies for Market Towns and Hereford City

Hereford City

- a. In response to a question from a Committee Member about the Hereford Area Plan, the Cabinet Member advised that this reference reflected discussions with Ward Members about the need to develop such a plan. The Committee Member commented on the confusion caused by changing titles. The Assistant Director made the following points:

- It was acknowledged that the wording used needed to be consistent.
 - The Hereford Local Plan would add detail to the Core Strategy, with some parallels with Neighbourhood Planning activities.
 - It was recognised that certain parcels of land would be identifiable in the Core Strategy but it would be at the Neighbourhood Planning or area plan stage that definitive lines would be drawn.
 - The Local Development Framework was composed of a series of plans. The Core Strategy was a strategic level document and, following Council, the focus would be on the details going forward. Neighbourhood Planning groups were already doing some of this and some of the work had directly informed the Core Strategy.
- b. A Committee Member said that, despite being strategic, the Core Strategy clearly identified locations for housing growth and was concerned that local representatives were not being given the opportunity to consider whether these were the right sites. The Chairman said that similar concerns had been expressed in other areas.

Ledbury

- c. The Vice-Chairman questioned whether the amount of infrastructure required to support development in Ledbury was achievable and said that the viability modelling needed to look very carefully at what was being proposed.

Bromyard

- d. The Chairman invited Councillor Roger Page from Bromyard and Winslow Town Council, who was present in the public gallery, to address the Committee. The key points included: the town council had put forward alternative development proposals; a five hectare site had been identified for employment land previously but this was now considered undeliverable by Herefordshire Council and it would not be carried forward in the Core Strategy; the town council had been invited to find another site through the Neighbourhood Plan but this would not be in place for another 24 to 30 months; the housing could not be progressed without the employment land, placing Bromyard in a unique and difficult position; and he questioned whether the situation would be considered acceptable by the Inspector at examination.

Kington, Leominster and Ross-on-Wye

- e. No specific comments were made about these market towns by those in attendance.

Recommendation for Council

- f. A Committee Member said that the fact that four of the five market towns and the City Council were working together to challenge the Core Strategy suggested that there were significant issues to address. In view of this, it was proposed that it be recommended to Council that there be a deferment of consideration of the Core Strategy (the full wording is given in the resolution below). Another Committee Member supported this proposal and noted that a revised timetable would enable the Nutrient Management Plan, that was to be delivered by the end of September 2013, to be incorporated into the evidence base.

- g. In response to the recommendation, the Assistant Director noted that it was a matter for Members but provided the following advice about potential risks:
 - i. It was possible that new issues would come forward or government advice would change in the intervening period.
 - ii. Although there might be refinements, the principal nature of the issues and judgements were likely to remain the same.
 - iii. From a development industry perspective, a delay would produce further uncertainty; the authority had adhered to its timetable so far and some developers were waiting for the Council to form a view on the Core Strategy before bringing forward proposals for some of the strategic sites.
 - iv. The position with the lack of five year housing land supply could worsen, with the potential for the Council to lose control over which sites came forward for development.
 - v. A delay could have a further impact on inward investment for the county.
- h. The Chairman noted that a deferment of only three-months was proposed. It was acknowledged that significant work had been undertaken already but he felt that there should be an opportunity to engage with communities to try to resolve their outstanding concerns. Some Members endorsed this view and commented on the need for careful and thorough analysis.
- i. The Cabinet Member commented on the substantial work that had been undertaken since 2007 and questioned what could be meaningfully achieved during three months, particularly as this would coincide with the summer holiday period.
- j. A Committee Member noted the Assistant Director's comments and cautioned against any delays which might weaken the Council's ability to control development. He added that it was not pragmatic to delay consideration of the Core Strategy but every attempt should be made to work through the issues as document moved forward.

There being an equal number of votes for and against the recommendation, the Chairman used his casting vote to support the recommendation.

The Chairman said that he would convey the recommendation to Council and thanked the Cabinet Member, Assistant Director and Planning Obligations Manager for the substantial work that they had done.

RESOLVED:

That it be recommended to Council that there be a deferment of consideration of the Core Strategy until late October / early November to enable:

- (a) Direct and constructive engagement to take place between Herefordshire Council and all the Market Town Councils and the City Council;**
- (b) A thorough locality-based analysis of the Core Strategy consultation responses to be presented to Members; and**
- (c) Further consideration of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the revised Economic Viability Assessment to take place.**

19. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee considered the draft work programme, the following points were made:

- It was noted that an update on the Waste Contract was expected at the 3 September 2013 meeting and the Chairman suggested that representatives of the Herefordshire and Worcestershire Action Group be invited to attend. In response to a question from the Vice-Chairman, the Scrutiny Officer said that the relevant officer would be asked to expedite a briefing paper for Members on Waste Contract performance; it was understood that the paper was awaiting confirmation with Worcestershire County Council. The Chairman expressed concern about the level of scrutiny on this topic at Worcestershire County Council.
- A Committee Member, referring to the Reviews Identified for Feasibility Study, suggested that the proposed review on Financial Support to the Arts should be widened to include the support given to arts in remote / rural areas. The Chairman said that, in view of the financial situation, the review had been put on hold for the time being but would remain on the work programme. The Scrutiny Officer added that the Cabinet Member Enterprise and Culture had recently suggested that the Committee look at issues relating to libraries and museums.
- The Vice-Chairman suggested combining work on the Council's IT Strategy and Systems with work on the Digital Strategy; expressions of interest would be sought from Councillors shortly.
- The Chairman advised that a piece of work on Proactis and Frameworki would be progressed in the autumn.

20. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting was Tuesday 3 September 2013 at 5.00 pm.

The meeting ended at 4.20 pm

CHAIRMAN

MEETING:	GENERAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
MEETING DATE:	3 SEPTEMBER 2013
TITLE OF REPORT:	WASTE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT
REPORT BY:	HEAD OF SPECIAL PROJECTS

1. Classification

Open.

2. Key Decision

This is not an executive decision.

3. Wards Affected

County-wide.

4. Purpose

To outline the current position with regard to the negotiations over the variation to the Integrated Waste Management Contract and the processes that will be followed to enable Cabinet to make a decision on the 4th October 2013.

5. Recommendation(s)

THAT:

- (a) The Committee notes the report

6. Alternative Options

- 6.1 The work on verifying the options is not complete.

7. Reasons for Recommendations

- 7.1 The work to complete the options is extensive and it will be necessary to take a report to Cabinet that provides a comprehensive explanation of any recommended option. The work to finalise that is not yet complete which is why the Cabinet decision has moved back to October.

8. Key Considerations

- 8.1 The Cabinets of Herefordshire Council and Worcestershire County Council (WCC) are due to consider the Variation to the Integrated Waste Management Contract on the 4th October 2013, as outlined in the Cabinet Report of the 13th December 2012. Both Cabinets will be asked to confirm a preferred option and costings within which a Variation can be concluded. This preferred option will be required to meet the parameters identified in the Cabinet Reports of the 13th December 2012 and the 16th February 2012.
- 8.2 The Contract was signed between Herefordshire and Worcestershire Councils and Mercia Waste Management in December 1998. MWM's Planning Application for the Energy from Waste plant in Kidderminster was refused by WCC. MWM duly appealed that decision and lost that appeal in 2002. The loss of a facility to divert waste from landfill meant the landfill site at Hill and Moor was filling considerably more quickly than anticipated and meant that some means of diverting waste from landfill needed to be developed.
- 8.3 The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Herefordshire and Worcestershire 2004-2034 (JMWMS) identified autoclaving a new process for treating residual waste as the preferred technology alongside the facilities developed by MWM and the Comingled Materials Recycling Facility at Worcester. Despite securing planning permissions in Worcestershire and Herefordshire it became evident that the subcontractor would be unable to deliver a process that would adequately divert waste from landfill. Having failed to deliver a new approach to treating residual waste the Councils reviewed the JMWMS which contained a revised Residual Waste Options Appraisal.
- 8.4 In response to the revised JMWMS, MWM submitted a Planning Application in 2010 to build an Energy from Waste Facility at Hartlebury. In 2012 MWM were granted Planning Permission. MWM went out to competitive tender to secure an engineering, procurement and construction (EPC) contract for the EfW plant. MWM have identified their preferred contractor but as of yet the EPC Contract has not been signed.
- 8.5 Following the Cabinet meeting of the 13th December 2012 which noted the progress in negotiations on the contract variation to deliver the EfW it was agreed that the Councils would develop an option for alternative methods of financing for the EfW.
- 8.6 Work continues to identify the costs associated within the options as at the time of writing this report; negotiations with the Contractor are continuing and the finalised options will be available for Cabinet's meeting on the 4th October 2013. Several options will be presented to Cabinet and will include the termination of the current contract, "doing nothing" as well as a number of different approaches to financing the EfW. In accordance with the Cabinet decision of the 13th December 2013, the Councils have been in discussion with DEFRA who have considered the options proposed by the Council and have asked for a further option to be developed this work is currently being undertaken.
- 8.7 These options will be presented to Cabinet on the 4th October and will be costed.
- 8.8 The Councils are being advised as a partnership by Deloitte on the financial aspects of the proposal, Eversheds on the legal aspects of the proposal and AMEC on the technical elements of the proposal. These advisors will be present at a joint presentation to the Cabinets on the 4th October 2013.
- 8.9 Herefordshire Council has sought independent advice through KPMG to advise on Value for Money of the options for Herefordshire alone. As the options have not been fully

completed this work will not be finished by the 3rd September 2013. KPMG will provide advice at the Cabinet meeting on the 4th October 2013.

- 8.10 In addition further advice will be presented to Cabinet on the issue of procurement, as outlined in the “parameters” paper presented to Cabinet on the 13th December 2012 as well as other legal advice in relation to the options presented to Cabinet. As this advice will only be available once the detail of the Options is finalised.

9. Community Impact

- 9.1 The report to Cabinet on the 4th October 2013 will identify if any community impact needs to be assessed.

10. Equality and Human Rights

- 10.1 The report to Cabinet on the 4th October 2013 will identify if any equality and human rights issues needs to be assessed.

11. Financial Implications

- 11.1 At this stage because the full costings of the options to be presented to the two Cabinets has not been completed it is not yet possible to provide definitive view of the financial implications.

12. Legal Implications

- 12.1 At this stage there are a number of outstanding legal issues to be resolved before the options are presented to the two Cabinets and it is not yet possible to provide definitive view of the legal implications.

13. Risk Management

- 13.1 The risks associated with the variation will be assessed and reported on to Cabinet on the 4th October 2013. As the full financial and legal implications are yet to be finalised it is not possible to provide a detailed assessment of the risks until that work is complete.

14. Consultees

- 14.1 None.

15. Appendices

- 15.1 None.

16. Background Papers

- 16.1 None identified.

MEETING:	GENERAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
DATE:	3 SEPTEMBER 2013
TITLE OF REPORT:	COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME
REPORT BY:	HEAD OF GOVERNANCE & MONITORING OFFICER

1. Classification

Open.

2. Key Decision

This is not a key decision.

3. Wards Affected

County-wide.

4. Purpose

To consider the Committee's work programme.

5. Recommendation

THAT the work programme be noted, subject to any comments the Committee wishes to make.

6. Key Points Summary

- 6.1 The Committee is asked to note its work programme and to note progress on current work.
- 6.2 Should Committee Members become aware of issues please discuss the matter with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and the Scrutiny Officer.

7. Alternative Options

- 7.1 It is for the Committee to determine its work programme as it sees fit to reflect the priorities facing Herefordshire. The Committee needs to be selective and ensure that the work programme is focused, realistic and deliverable within the existing resources available.

8. Reasons for Recommendations

- 8.1 The Committee needs to develop a manageable work programme to ensure that scrutiny is focused, effective and produces clear outcomes.

9. Introduction and Background

- 9.1 An outline work programme is appended for this meeting. This is because the programme is under continuous review.

10. Key Considerations

- 10.1 The work programme needs to focus on the key issues of concern and be manageable allowing for urgent items or matters that have been called-in.

11. Community Impact

- 11.1 The topics selected for scrutiny should have regard to what matters to residents.

12. Equality and Human Rights

- 12.1 The topics selected need to have regard for equality and human rights issues.

13. Financial Implications

- 13.1 The cost of the work of the Scrutiny Committee will have to be met within existing resources. It should be noted the costs of running scrutiny will be subject to an assessment to support appropriate processes.

14. Legal Implications

- 14.1 The Council is required to deliver an Overview and Scrutiny function.

15. Risk Management

- 15.1 There is a reputational risk to the Council if the Overview and Scrutiny function does not operate effectively. The arrangements for the development of the work programme should help mitigate this risk.

16. Consultees

- 16.1 The Chairman and Vice-Chairman meet on a regular basis to consider the programme.

17. Appendices

- 17.1 Appendix A: Draft Work Programme

Appendix B: Task and Finish Reviews - Progress Report

Appendix C: Executive Rolling Programme (as at the time of going to print).

18. Background Papers

- 18.1 None identified.

GENERAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME

Monday 7 October 2013 at 10.00am	
Root and Branch Reviews - Update	To receive an update and consider progress as it relates to this Committee.
Task & Finish – Income & Charging - Projected additional Income	O&SC 19 March 2012 added to the T&F Report that a report be made in Oct 2013 setting out how much of the projected additional income had been achieved and reviewing the intended and unintended consequences of new/additional charges.
Monday 11 November 2013 at 10.00am	
Monday 9 December 2013 at 10.00am	
School Examination Performance	To consider the examination performance in Herefordshire Schools.

The following issues have been identified for consideration but not scheduled:

Corporate Delivery Plan & Performance Monitoring
Performance Report on Hoople
Performance Report on Waste Management
Broadband
Document control and information including the website;
CIL
Financial Inclusion Strategy
Budget Monitoring
Response to the Francis enquiry (joint committee with Health scrutiny)

REVIEWS IDENTIFIED FOR FEASIBILITY STUDY	
Proposed Review	Status
Free Schools	The Chairman has requested information concerning free schools and will decide whether a review is required. The Chairman continues to monitor the situation.
Legal Services	Feasibility Study complete. Scoping to be confirmed. 25.3.13 Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Cllr Brig P Jones CBE met with Corporate Statutory Services Manager and officers to discuss possible issues for a review. Having discussed concerns and heard how the Legal Service is now on a more business footing and that measures are now in place to monitor budgets and cases it has been decided not to undertake a Task & Finish Review. The Committee on 8 April requested that a similar follow up meeting be held in 3 months to ensure that progress was being made.
Governance & Management of Joint Ventures/Partnering Arrangements –	Feasibility Study complete. Scoping to be confirmed The Scrutiny Officer is in discussion with relevant officers regarding a future substantial item for Committee regarding the commissioning of services. 13 May 2013 - the Chairman reported that he was considering a possible all member seminar on the issue.
Accommodation Strategy	Feasibility Study complete. Scoping to be confirmed.
Financial Support to the Arts	The Chairman suggested this review at the Committee on 10 December 2012. Scoping of the review is at very early stages. The Chairman and Cllr Swinford are considering the scope for a possible review prior to seeking information from the Cultural Services Manager. The Scrutiny Officer is working up a scoping statement for consideration.
Review the Council's Communication Policy	This review was suggested at the Committee on 10 December 2012. 13 May 2013 - The Chairman is considering a number of potential themes for including in a possible review of the policy.

Monitoring the Council's 'Public Services Vision'	This review was suggested at the Committee on 10 December 2012. This relates to the vision contained in the Corporate Plan 2013/15 reported to Council 23 November 2012.
Council Procurement Policy and Local Business and Local Employment (Further Review)	<p>The Committee on 10 December decided to undertake a further short review to investigate a number of concerns arising from the update.</p> <p>The Chairman of the Committee has sought further information on the Proactis system which was identified at the December meeting as being of concern and he will then decide whether the concerns are still warranted or whether to reform the T&F Group.</p> <p>14 February 2013 - The Chairman together with Cllr Atkinson and Cllr GA Powell met with the Head of Commercial Services on 14 February. While they were disappointed that the recommendations arising from the review had not been progressed they appreciated the current problems in attracting staff to key posts in the Commercial Services Team. Having been appraised of the position concerning Proactis System the current concerns were allayed. Members will receive a further update in 3 months' time.</p> <p>Arising out of the meeting the Chairman has requested background information on how the Council is attracting personnel to key posts needed to drive forward the Council's savings and improvements across the Council.</p>
Council's IT Strategy and Systems / Digital Strategy	Item identified at 1 February 2013. Initial feasibility work underway.

REVIEWS IN PROGRESS	
Review	Comment
Community Infrastructure Levy - draft policy for Herefordshire (Part 2)	<p>The report of the T&F Group was considered by the Committee on 10 December 2012 and forwarded to the Executive for consideration. Arising from that review it was acknowledged that further work was needed.</p> <p>A report detailing the findings of the T&F Group since February 2013 was considered and approved by the General Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 16 July 2013. The Executive has been invited to respond to the report.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the T&F Group will reconvene in September 2013.</p>

Executive Rolling Programme: August 2013

Final Decision Maker	Meeting / Decision Date	Issue Type:	Report Title	Purpose	Directorate and Lead Officer
Officer Decision – Interim Director Adults Wellbeing	28/8/13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KEY • Budget & Policy Framework Item (B&PF) • Non-Key Non-Key	Grant Offer for transforming usage of direct payments in Herefordshire	To approve a one off, time limited grant offer Services for Independent Living (SIL) to enable the development of a strong and robust Direct Payments provision within Herefordshire.	Adults Wellbeing / Donna Eiherton
Cabinet Members CS&F & MP	29/8/13	Non-Key	Halo Prudential Borrowing for Development of Outdoor Café Area of Hereford Leisure Pool	To approve the allocation of Capital Expenditure funded by prudential borrowing for the development of the outdoor café area of Hereford Leisure Pool	Economies, Communities & Corporate / Mick Ligema

Executive Rolling Programme: September 2013

Final Decision Maker	Meeting / Decision Date	Issue Type:	Report Title	Purpose	Directorate and Lead Officer
Audit & Governance Committee	6/9/13	N/A	Counter-fraud and Corruption Policies – Biennial Review		Economies, Communities & Corporate / David Powell
Audit & Governance Committee	6/9/13	N/A	Whistle Blowing Policy – Biennial Review		Economies, Communities & Corporate / David Powell
Cabinet Member – Portfolio MC	11/9/13	Non Key	Countryside Services Review	To consider opportunities to generate income and deliver efficiency savings to ensure the future sustainability of countryside services.	Economies, Communities & Corporate / Steve Burgess
Officer Decision - Economies, Communities & Corporate	11/9/13	Non Key	Replacement of annual bedding plants with sustainable perennial planting within Council controlled beds	To agree to changes to the regime for formal planning to achieve year on year savings whilst maintaining amenity for local communities	Economies, Communities & Corporate / Steve Burgess
Cabinet Member – Portfolio H&T	12/9/13	Non Key	Resident Parking Scheme Review	To seek approval for the introduction of a revised resident parking scheme policy and approval for the new charges for permits	Economies, Communities & Corporate / Richard Gabb / David Hepworth
Cabinet Member – Portfolio HWB	16/9/13	KEY	Home and Community Support	To seek approval for the extension of the current contracts until 31 st March 2014 and terminate all contracts from 1 st April 2014 In addition, to set out the procurement methodology, timescales, including the proposed methodology of engagement with the Providers, service users & carers	Adults Wellbeing / Helen Coombes
Cabinet Member – EH&P	16/9/13	KEY	Public Conveniences – Next Stage	To approve the countywide roll out of the Community Toilet Scheme as an element of the council's overall approach to the future provision of public conveniences, ensuring high quality accessible toilets in Herefordshire that meets local and visitor needs. To approve the continuation of work with local City, Town, Parish Councils and community groups to examine alternative approaches to the delivery of public conveniences locally and further reduce the number operated by Herefordshire Council. To approve the exploration of income generation opportunities for facilities. To approve the provision of additional support to businesses to encourage greater use of their premises as a part of the Community Toilet Scheme To deliver further savings by reducing public subsidy into public conveniences.	Economies, Communities & Corporate / Richard Ball / Paul Nicholas
Cabinet Member – EH&P & Cabinet Member – CS&F	To be confirmed	Non key	Revised Option Appraisal For The Madley Traveller Transit Site	To amend a non-key decision dated 11th April 2013 in respect of an option appraisal for the Madley Traveller Transit Site	Economy, Communities & Corporate Directorate / Mike Pigrem
CABINET Portfolio – H&WB	19/09/13	KEY	Open Book Review of Residential and Nursing Home Fees for Older People	To advise Cabinet on the outcome of the consultation with homes providers and the consideration of the Open Book Review and options for setting the usual price for residential and nursing home places	Adults Wellbeing / Helen Coombes

Final Decision Maker	Meeting / Decision Date	Issue Type: • KEY • Budget & Policy Framework Item (B&PF) • Non Key	Report Title	Purpose	Directorate and Lead Officer
CABINET Portfolio – CS&F	19/09/13	Non Key	Budget Monitoring Report	To report the financial position for both Revenue and Capital.	Economies, Communities & Corporate / David Powell
CABINET Portfolio - CS	19/09/13	KEY	Post 16 Learners with Learning Difficulties & Disabilities (LLDD) Review	To decide the future approach to supporting children and young people with Learning Difficulties and Disabilities following review.	People's Services
CABINET Portfolios – C&A	19/09/13	KEY	Buttermarket Refurbishment	To establish if and how the Council wishes to fund the refurbishment of the Buttermarket and to clearly set out the options available in managing the delivery of the project should it progress.	Economies, Communities & Corporate / Chris Jenner
CABINET – Portfolio E&C	19/09/13	KEY	Cultural, Libraries and Customer Services Savings	To determine the package of measures required to achieve proposed in –year savings.	Economies, Communities & Corporate / Natalia Silver
CABINET - Portfolio	19/09/13	KEY	Devolved Services	To outline options for devolved services to local councils for approval by Cabinet	Economies, Communities & Corporate / Natalia Silver
CABINET – Portfolio	19/09/13	Non Key	Six Month Review Report for Department for Education	To inform Cabinet on the progress of improvement planning in children's safeguarding resulting from the self-evaluation undertaken and reported to the DIE in July 2013 in relation to the Herefordshire Safeguarding and Protecting Children Improvement Plan	Children's Wellbeing / Julie Rzezniczek
CABINET - Portfolio	19/09/13	Non Key	HSCB and HSAB Business Plans and Annual Report	To inform Cabinet of the 2013-14 development priorities of Herefordshire Safeguarding Children Board and Herefordshire Safeguarding Adults Board and present the Boards' assessment of their work in 2012-13 and the current context of multi-agency safeguarding in Herefordshire.	Children's Wellbeing/ Interim Adults' Wellbeing / Andy Churcher
CABINET – Portfolio CS	19/09/13	KEY	West Mercia Adoption Business Case	To endorse the proposals to explore further and consult on the feasibility of a single West Mercia Adoption Service	People's Services / Kathy O'Mahony
Officer Decision -Economies, Communities & Corporate	22/09/13	Non Key	Car Park, Station Approach, Hereford (225)	To seek the approval of the Director, Economies, Communities & Corporate to commission the necessary groundworks and initiate the necessary processes (statutory advertising) to provide a charged for car park at Station Approach, Hereford (the site of the old Rockfield DIY store)	Economies, Communities & Corporate
Officer Decision – Adults Wellbeing	23/09/13	Non Key	Herefordshire Empty Property Strategy 2013 – 2016	To agree publication of the strategy which sets out how the Council will reduce the number of empty properties in Herefordshire to assist in meeting identified housing needs.	Adults Wellbeing / Richard Gabb
COUNCIL	27/09/13		Leader's Report	To receive the Leader's report, which provides an overview of the Executive's activity since the last COUNCIL meeting.	Economies, Communities & Corporate / John Jones
COUNCIL	27/09/13		Monitoring Officer's Annual Report		Economies, Communities & Corporate / John Jones
COUNCIL	27/09/13		Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority Report		
COUNCIL	27/09/13	B&PF *decision of Council – September requires 28 day notice	Youth Justice Plan	To approve the Youth Justice Plan as attached as an Appendix be endorsed for approval by Council.	People's/Jo Davidson
COUNCIL	27/09/13	Non Key	Appointment of s151 Officer		Economies, Communities & Corporate
Cabinet Member – EH&P	30/09/13	Non key	Planning Services Cost Reductions (Conservation & Archaeology)	To agree a package of measures to reduce costs in the regulatory services/conservation/archaeology function.	Economies, Communities & Corporate – Andrew Ashcroft

GENERAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ITEMS – SEPTEMBER 2013

MEETING/ BRIEFNG DATE	ITEM	PURPOSE	O&S PRE-DECISION PRIOR TO:	
			A&G Committee Cabinet Council	Meeting Date
3 September 2013	Waste Contract update	To receive an update on the Waste Contract prior to consideration by Cabinet		

HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ITEMS – SEPTEMBER 2013

MEETING/ BRIEFING DATE	ITEM	PURPOSE	O&SC PRE-DECISION PRIOR TO: A&G Committee Cabinet Council	Meeting Date
12 September 2013	Recovery Plan for Children Safeguarding	To receive a progress report on the Action Plan.		
12 September 2013	Work Programme	To consider the Committees Work Programme		

Executive Rolling Programme: October 2013

Final Decision Maker	Meeting / Decision Date	Issue Type: • KEY • Budget & Policy Framework Item (B&PF) • Non Key	Report Title	Purpose	Directorate and Lead Officer
Cabinet Member – CS&F & MC	1/10/13	KEY	Halo Leisure Prudential Borrowing Programme	To support Halo Prudential Borrowing for investment programme at Hereford Leisure Centre, Hereford Leisure Pool, Leominster Leisure Centre, Ledbury Swimming Pool, Ross-on-Wye Swimming Pool and Photo-voltaic investment. To approve in principle the allocation of capital expenditure funded by prudential borrowing for a capital investment and improvement programme at leisure facilities managed by Halo Leisure.	Economies, Communities & Corporate / Mick Ligema
CABINET Portfolio – MC	4/10/13	KEY	Waste Contract		Economies, Communities & Corporate / Andy Tector
Audit & Governance Committee	15/10/13	N/A			
CABINET Portfolio – CS&F	17/10/13	Non Key	Budget Monitoring Report	To report the financial position for both Revenue and Capital.	Economies, Communities & Corporate / David Powell
CABINET Portfolio – H&WB	17/10/13	Non Key	Local Account	To approve the Local Account relating to Adult Social Care Performance.	People's Services / Peter Sowerby
Cabinet Member – Portfolio H & T	30/10/13	KEY – Impact on several wards	Increasing Income from Parking – On Street Charging In Hereford	To agree to the introduction of on street parking charges in Hereford central area	Economies, Communities & Corporate / Steve Burgess

GENERAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ITEMS – OCTOBER 2013

MEETING/ BRIEFING DATE	ITEM	PURPOSE	O&SC PRE-DECISION PRIOR TO: A&G Committee Cabinet Council	Meeting Date
7 October 2013	Root and Branch Reviews - Update	To receive an update and consider progress as it relates to this Committee.		
7 October 2013	Task and Finish Group – Income and Charging - Projected additional income	Overview and Scrutiny Committee 19 March 2012 added to the Task and Finish Report that a report be made in October 2013 setting out how much of the projected additional income had been achieved and reviewing the intended and unintended consequences of new/additional charges.		

HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ITEMS – OCTOBER 2013

MEETING/ BRIEFING DATE	ITEM	PURPOSE	O&SC PRE-DECISION PRIOR TO: A&G Committee Cabinet Council	Meeting Date
11 October 2013	Recovery Plan for Children Safeguarding	To receive a progress report on the Action Plan.		
11 October 2013	Strategic Plan for Delivering Adult Services	To consider a quarterly report containing a schedule of performance reports outlining the savings that are being achieved through the Strategic Plan. (July12)		
11 October 2013	Work Programme	To consider the Committees Work Programme		

Executive Rolling Programme: November 2013

Final Decision Maker	Meeting / Decision Date	Issue Type: • KEY • Budget & Policy Framework Item (B&PF) • Non Key	Report Title	Purpose	Directorate and Lead Officer
Audit & Governance Committee	26/11/13				
CABINET	21/11/13	KEY – Budget – seeking to secure savings target of c£.1M.	Transport and Travel Review – Preferred Network Option	To agree a preferred arrangement for public transport and education transport service integration.	Economies, Communities & Corporate. Steve Burgess
CABINET Portfolio – CM FM	21/11/13	Non Key	Budget Monitoring Report	To report the financial position for both Revenue and Capital.	Economies, Communities & Corporate / David Powell
CABINET Portfolio – CM CS	21/11/13	Non Key	Integrated Corporate Performance Report Q2		Economies, Communities & Corporate / David Powell

GENERAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ITEMS – NOVEMBER 2013

MEETING/ BRIEFING DATE	ITEM	PURPOSE	O&SC PRE-DECISION PRIOR TO: A&G Committee Cabinet Council	Meeting Date
11 November 2013				

HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ITEMS – NOVEMBER 2013

MEETING/ BRIEFING DATE	ITEM	PURPOSE	O&SC PRE-DECISION PRIOR TO: A&G Committee Cabinet Council	Meeting Date
7 November 2013	Recovery Plan for Children Safeguarding Work Programme	To receive a progress report on the Action Plan. To consider the Committees Work Programme		

36

Executive Rolling Programme: December 2013

Final Decision Maker	Meeting / Decision Date	Issue Type: • KEY • Budget & Policy Framework Item (B&PF) • Non Key	Report Title	Purpose	Directorate and Lead Officer
COUNCIL	13/12/13	N/A	Annual Report – Corporate Plan		Economies, Communities & Corporate
COUNCIL	13/12/13	N/A	Leader's Report		Economies, Communities & Corporate
COUNCIL	13/12/13	B&PF	Review of Gambling Act Policy	Consider implementing new Policy	Economy, Communities and Corporate Directorate – Claire Corfield
COUNCIL	13/12/13	N/A	Review of Licensing Act Policy	Consider implementing new Policy	Economy, Communities and Corporate Directorate – Claire Corfield
COUNCIL	13/12/13	N/A	Introduction of a Sex Establishment Policy	Consider implementing new Policy	Economy, Communities and Corporate Directorate – Claire Corfield
COUNCIL	13/12/13	N/A	Review of Gypsy and Traveller Policy	Consider implementing new Policy	Economy, Communities and Corporate Directorate – Claire Corfield
COUNCIL	13/12/13	N/A	Waste Contract		Economies, Communities & Corporate / Andy Tector
CABINET Portfolio – CM FM	19/12/13	Non Key	Budget Monitoring Report	To report the financial position for both Revenue and Capital.	Economies, Communities & Corporate / David Powell

GENERAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ITEMS – DECEMBER 2013			
MEETING/ BRIEFNG DATE	ITEM	PURPOSE	O&SC PRE-DECISION PRIOR TO: A&G Committee Cabinet Council
9 December 2013			Meeting Date

HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ITEMS – DECEMBER 2013			
MEETING/ BRIEFNG DATE	ITEM	PURPOSE	O&SC PRE-DECISION PRIOR TO: A&G Committee Cabinet Council
6 December 2013	Recovery Plan for Children Safeguarding Work Programme	To receive a progress report on the Action Plan. To consider the Committees Work Programme	Meeting Date

