

Agenda

General scrutiny committee

Date: **Wednesday 18 July 2018**

Time: **10.00 am**

Place: **Council Chamber, The Shire Hall, St Peter's Square,
Hereford, HR1 2HX**

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

For any further information please contact:

Tim Brown, Governance Services

Tel: 01432 260239

Email: tbrown@herefordshire.gov.uk

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

Agenda for the meeting of the General scrutiny committee

Membership

Chairman **Councillor WLS Bowen**
Vice-Chairman **Councillor BA Baker**

Councillor SP Anderson
Councillor BA Baker
Councillor JM Bartlett
Councillor AW Johnson
Councillor A Warmington
Councillor SD Williams

Agenda

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive apologies for absence.

2. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

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.

4. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

To receive any written questions from members of the public.

Details of the scheme and related guidance are available here:

https://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/info/200148/your_council/61/get_involved

Please submit questions to councillorservices@herefordshire.gov.uk

The deadline for the receipt of questions is Thursday 12 July 2018 at 5.00 pm.

Accepted questions will be published as a supplement prior to the meeting.

5. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

To receive any written questions from members of the council.

Deadline for receipt of questions is 5.00 pm on Thursday 12 July 2018.

Accepted questions will be published as a supplement prior to the meeting.

Please submit questions to councillorservices@herefordshire.gov.uk

6. HEREFORD TRANSPORT PACKAGE (HTP)

To undertake pre-decision call in scrutiny of the Cabinet's proposed decision to select a preferred route for Hereford bypass as part of the Hereford Transport package.

Note: Please note that the appendices to the Cabinet report as listed below have been published individually as supplements. They include some very large files that may take some time to download. The screen may appear blank for a time during this process:

Appendix 1 - Hereford Transport Package Phase 2 Consultation report

Appendix 2 - Hereford Transport Package Stage 2 Scheme Assessment

Report

Appendix 3 - Hereford Transport Package Stage 2 Environmental Assessment Report

Appendix 4 - Hereford Transport Package Route Selection Report

Appendix 5 - Hereford Transport Package Preferred Route Report

Appendix 6 - Hereford Transport Package Active Travel Measures Report

Appendix 7 - Hereford Transport Package Equality Impact Assessment

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting is 10 September 2018.

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

The Shire Hall is a few minutes walking distance from both bus stations located in the town centre of Hereford.

Recording of this meeting

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 services team know before the meeting starts so that anyone who intends filming or photographing the meeting can be made aware.

The council makes official audio recordings of meetings. These Recordings are available via the council's website.

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

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 and make your way to the Fire Assembly Point in the Shire Hall car park.

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.

The Chairperson or an attendee at the meeting must take the signing in sheet so it can be checked when everyone is at the assembly point.

Guide to General 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 three scrutiny committees. The Committees reflect the balance of political groups on the council.

The General Scrutiny Committee consists of 7 Councillors.

Councillor WLS Bowen (Chairperson)	Herefordshire Independents
Councillor SP Anderson	Conservative
Councillor BA Baker (Vice-Chairperson)	Conservative
Councillor JM Bartlett	Green
Councillor AW Johnson	Conservative
Councillor A Warmington	It's Our County
Councillor SD Williams	Conservative

The committees have the power:

- (a) to review 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.

The specific remit of the general scrutiny committee includes:

- Services within the economy, communities and corporate directorate
- Corporate performance
- Budget and policy framework matters
- Statutory flood risk management scrutiny powers
- Statutory community safety and policing scrutiny powers

Who attends general scrutiny committee meetings?

Coloured nameplates are used which indicate the role of those attending the committee:

Pale pink	Members of the committee, including the chairman and vice chairman.
Pale Blue	Cabinet Members – They are not members of the committee but attend principally to answer any questions the Committee may have and inform the debate.
Orange	Officers of the council – attend to present reports and give technical advice to the committee
Green	People external to the Council invited to provide information to the committee.
White	Other councillors may also attend as observers but are only entitled to speak at the discretion of the chairman.



Meeting:	General Scrutiny Committee
Meeting date:	Wednesday 18 July 2018
Title of report:	Hereford Transport Package
Report by:	Democratic Services Manager

Classification

Open

Decision type

This is not an executive decision

Wards affected

All wards (with potential particular impact on Belmont Rural; Credenhill; Holmer; Kings Acre; Queenswood; Stoney Street; Whitecross and Wormside wards).

Purpose and summary

To undertake pre-decision call in scrutiny of the Cabinet's proposed decision to select a preferred route for Hereford bypass as part of Hereford Transport Package.

The draft Cabinet report is appended to this report and sets out the feedback to the HTP Phase 2 consultation, assessment of the shortlist of possible bypass route corridor, the recommended preferred bypass route corridor, the proposed development of associated walking, cycling, bus and public realm (active travel) improvements, together with the scope of the Phase 3 consultation.

Recommendation(s)

That: the committee determine any recommendations it wishes to make to the executive to consider

Alternative options

1. Having reviewed the documents and sought clarification of any issues from the Cabinet member and supporting officers the committee may, having regard to the principles of good decision making either:
 - Determine to support the proposed recommendation to Cabinet; or
 - Determine recommendations to the executive to consider specific additional information or actions to inform their decision making.

Key considerations

2. The General Scrutiny Committee has identified that the Hereford Transport Package – Phase 2 as a forthcoming decision on the forward plan, is relevant to the remit of its committee. The committee decided at its meeting on 2 July to exercise its right to call in this cabinet decision in advance of it being taken, given the significant (county-wide) community interest in the matter.
3. The draft report proposed for consideration to Cabinet on 27 July is appended, enabling the committee to consider exactly the same evidence base and recommended route to that being considered by the Cabinet on 27 July. The only additional information that will be published (on 19 July) with the cabinet papers will be any executive response to recommendations made by the scrutiny committee at their 18 July meeting.
4. In undertaking the pre-decision call in, the committee will wish to be assured that the decision the Cabinet propose to take is being taken in accordance with the principles of good decision-making, namely that:

When the council takes a decision it will:

- a. be clear about what the council wants to happen, how it will be achieved, who is accountable for the decision and who is accountable for implementing it and monitoring implementation;
- b. consult properly and have regard to the professional advice from its officers;
- c. have regard to the public sector equality duty and respect for natural justice and human rights;
- d. make the decision public unless there are good reasons for it not to be;
- e. give due weight to all material considerations, only take relevant matters into account, and make sure the action is proportionate to what the council wants to happen;
- f. explain what options were considered and give the reasons for the decision; and
- g. follow proper procedures.

Community impact

5. In accordance with our code of corporate governance, Herefordshire Council achieves its intended outcomes by providing a mixture of legal, regulatory and practical interventions. Determining the right mix of these is an important strategic choice to make to ensure intended outcomes are achieved. The council needs robust decision-making mechanisms to ensure our outcomes can be achieved in a way that provides the best use of resources while still enable efficient and effective operations. The council is committed to promoting a positive working culture that accepts, and encourages constructive challenge, and recognises that a culture and structure for scrutiny are key elements for accountable decision making, policy development, and review.

Equality duty

Under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the ‘general duty’ on public authorities is set out as follows:

A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to -

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
John Coleman, Tel: 01432 260382, email: John.Coleman@herefordshire.gov.uk

- a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
6. The public sector equality duty (specific duty) requires us to consider how we can positively contribute to the advancement of equality and good relations, and demonstrate that we are paying 'due regard' in our decision making in the design of policies and in the delivery of services. The committee may make recommendations to the executive to strengthen demonstration of our duties.

Resource implications

7. None associated with any recommendations scrutiny which to make however if there are any resource implications associated with the recommendations determined by this committee the executive will have to respond to this.

Legal implications

8. Overview and scrutiny committees were established by the Local Government Act 2000 ("The Act"). As set out in the council's constitution reflecting section 9F 2 (b) of the Act the scrutiny committee has the power to make recommendations to the executive with respect to the discharge of any functions which are the responsibility of the executive. All decisions on the HTP (bar adoption of the core strategy) are executive functions.
9. Making recommendations on a forthcoming key decision under the constitution is set out in the scrutiny rules and described as pre decision call in. It provides the committee with the power to examine the issues around the decision to be taken.
10. The effect of undertaking this function are as follows;
- A. the committee may require members of the executive, other members or other persons and officers of the council, to attend before it to answer questions.
 - B. The executive are under duty to consider and respond to any recommendations and provide a written response.
 - C. The decision cannot be called in again after the decision has been taken, however the decision cannot be implemented any sooner than it would have been had the scrutiny committee not called it in.

Risk management

11. None in relation to this report; scrutiny is a key element of accountable decision making and may make recommendations to the executive with a view to strengthening mitigation of any risks associated with the proposed decision.

Consultees

12. None in relation to this report

Appendices

- Draft report to cabinet – 27 July 2018
- **Appendix 1:** Hereford Transport Package Phase 2 – Consultation Report
- **Appendix 2:** Hereford Transport Package Stage 2 – Scheme Assessment Report
- **Appendix 3:** Hereford Transport Package Stage 2 – Environmental Assessment Report
- **Appendix 4:** Hereford Transport Package Route Selection Report
- **Appendix 5:** Hereford Transport Package Preferred Route Report
- **Appendix 6:** Hereford Transport Package Active Travel Measures Report
- **Appendix 7:** Hereford Transport Package Equality Impact Assessment

Background papers

None identified.

Meeting:	Cabinet
Meeting date:	27 July 2018
Title of report:	HEREFORD TRANSPORT PACKAGE (HTP)
Report by:	Cabinet member infrastructure

Classification

Open

Decision type

Key

This is a key decision because it is likely to result in the council incurring expenditure which is significant having regard to the council's budget for the service and because it is likely to be significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising one or more wards in the county.

Wards affected

Countywide

(with potential particular impact on Wormside, Stoney Street, Belmont Rural, Credenhill, Whitecross, Kings Acre, Queenswood and Holmer wards)

Purpose and summary

To consider: feedback to the HTP Phase 2 consultation, assessment of the shortlist of possible bypass route corridor options, the recommended preferred bypass route corridor, the development of associated walking, cycling, bus and public realm (active travel) improvements and to confirm the scope of the Phase 3 consultation.

On 18 January 2018, Cabinet approved a shortlist of seven bypass route corridors for the Hereford bypass and authorised that a phase 2 consultation be carried out on the approved shortlist of seven possible bypass route corridors and possible active travel measures to gather feedback to inform the selection of a preferred route and to enable a preferred

package of active travel measures to be further developed.

The Hereford bypass, as part of the Hereford Transport Package, is a key infrastructure project that is necessary to drive the economic growth of Hereford and the region. It is identified as a priority within the council's Economic Vision, Local Plan Core Strategy (LPCS) and Local Transport Plan (LTP) and also within the Marches Strategic Economic Plan and Midlands Connect regional transport strategy.

The Hereford Transport Package will:

- Enable the delivery of future housing, employment and educational development by maintaining acceptable peak hour journey times across the city
- Enable the delivery of future housing, employment and educational development by providing attractive alternatives to the private car for journeys within the city
- Enable the improvement of regional connectivity by achieving acceptable peak hour journey times on the A49 through the city
- Ensure the transport network within Hereford is resilient enough to provide consistent journey times throughout the day
- Encourage healthy lifestyles by encouraging more people to walk and cycle
- Reduce the impacts of transport on air quality and noise within the city
- Protect the quality of the urban realm to enhance pedestrian connectivity in the city
- Improve road safety within the city.

The phase 2 consultation on the Hereford Transport Package took place in February & March 2018 and the outcome of this consultation is summarised in this report and a detailed public consultation report (P2CR) is included in Appendix 1. Over 4300 responses were received during the consultation and the results show a majority support for the objectives identified for the Hereford Transport Package and also for the inclusion of a bypass. Not all respondents expressed a preference for a particular route for the bypass and hence the results do not show a clear overall preference for any of the seven route options. In addition, the results show strong support for the inclusion of active travel measures as part of the package.

It is recognised that proposals for a bypass have the potential to have a significant impact upon local residents and land owners directly affected by proposals. The consultation process sought to ensure those residents and landowners that were affected by the seven route corridors were fully informed of the process and potential implications. As the development of the scheme progresses, the Council will continue to engage with those who may be most affected to ensure they are treated fairly and have all the information they need.

Consultation feedback has been scrutinised in detail alongside a comprehensive technical assessment of the shortlist of possible bypass route corridors. The assessment work is summarised in this cabinet report. In addition, detailed technical reports are appended which set out the work undertaken and the conclusions. The Preferred Route Report (Appendix 5) draws together all the technical work undertaken and concludes with the recommendation that the Red Route be considered for selection as the preferred route for the bypass.

In addition to considering the route for a bypass, the technical work has also considered the development of the active travel measures which would be delivered with the bypass to form the Hereford Transport Package. This is detailed in the Active Travel Measures Report

which is also appended to this cabinet report in Appendix 6.

Cabinet is asked to consider these reports and approve the further development of the bypass and active travel improvements. It is recommended that the Red Route be selected for further development and be subject to further consultation later this year. This Phase 3 consultation will enable stakeholders to comment on the detail of a bypass scheme based on the Red Route corridor and complementary active travel measures which would make up the package. The results of this consultation would then inform a future cabinet decision to confirm the bypass scheme and associated package measures and to authorise submission of a planning application for the scheme.

Recommendation(s)

That:

- (a) having regard to the feedback to the HTP Phase 2 consultation report, the Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Report, the Stage 2 Environmental Assessment Report, the Route Selection Report and the Preferred Route Report, the red route (as identified in Appendix 5) be approved as the preferred route for further scheme development for the Hereford bypass;**
- (b) subject to approval of recommendation (a) above, a further round (phase 3) of consultation on the detailed proposals for a scheme based on the red route corridor and complementary active travel measures be undertaken to gather stakeholder feedback to assist with informing a future decision by Cabinet to confirm the route for the bypass and recommended active travel measures which will together form the Hereford Transport Package, prior to submission for planning and other necessary permissions;**
- (c) the director for economy, communities and corporate be authorised to take all necessary steps to progress detailed design and, consultation including commissioning external professional advisers as required to inform future decisions on the Hereford Transport Package to a maximum cost of £2.45m**

Alternative options

1. One option would be to select one of the other route corridors as the basis for developing the bypass scheme. This is not recommended because to do so would not be supported by the technical evidence presented in the appended reports and could therefore be subject to challenge.
2. A second option would be to not select a route corridor at this stage and seek further assessment of the options or a sub set of the options. This is not recommended as the assessment carried out to date is considered robust to inform the selection of a single route corridor for scheme development. Deferring a decision on the preferred corridor for further assessment would add significant delay to the programme for taking forward the scheme, prolong the uncertainty for residents and landowners affected by the short list of routes and incur significant additional costs.
3. An option for proceeding with the Hereford growth proposals without the provision of a bypass was considered and discounted during the Core Strategy process. Not progressing this work will mean the HTP objectives and core strategy growth targets

cannot be achieved.

Key considerations

4. The Hereford bypass, as part of the Hereford Transport Package is a key infrastructure project that is necessary to drive the economic growth of Hereford and the region. It is identified as a priority within the council's approved corporate plan, Economic Vision, Local Plan Core Strategy (LPCS) and Local Transport Plan (LTP) and also within the Marches Strategic Economic Plan and Midlands Connect regional transport strategy.
5. The Hereford Transport Package will
 - Enable the delivery of future housing, employment and educational development by maintaining acceptable peak hour journey times across the city
 - Enable the delivery of future housing, employment and educational development by providing attractive alternatives to the private car for journeys within the city
 - Enable the improvement of regional connectivity by achieving acceptable peak hour journey times on the A49 through the city
 - Ensure the transport network within Hereford is resilient enough to provide consistent journey times throughout the day
 - Encourage healthy lifestyles by encouraging more people to walk and cycle
 - Reduce the impacts of transport on air and noise within the city
 - Protect the quality of the urban realm to enhance pedestrian connectivity in the city
 - Improve road safety within the city.
6. On 18 January 2018 Cabinet approved a shortlist of seven possible bypass route corridors for the Hereford bypass and authorised that phase 2 consultation on the approved shortlist of possible bypass route corridors and active travel measures be undertaken. The consultation was to gather feedback to inform the selection of a preferred bypass route corridor and to enable the preferred package of active travel measures to be further developed.

Phase 2 Consultation Report (P2CR) – Appendix 1

7. Appendix 1 contains full details of the Phase 2 consultation. Feedback, analysis and demographics are summarised below. Where appropriate, cross-references to specific sections and figures is included. This report and the Route Selection Report (RSR – Appendix 4) between them inform the Preferred Route Report (PRR – Appendix 5).
8. The Phase 2 consultation period was a six-week period, from 6 February 2018 to 20 March 2018.
9. During the consultation period exhibitions were held at a number of venues across the city. A total of 1317 people were recorded as having attended the events in the first week of the consultation with a significant number of people also visiting

subsequent public events. Staffed consultation events gave attendees the opportunity to discuss the project with council staff and staff from BBLP and their consultants WSP. Following these events the exhibition was available from 16 February 2018 until the end of the consultation on 20 March 2018 and staff were available each day to answer questions and collect feedback. All consultation information and materials were available on the following website throughout the consultation period. At the invitation of parish councils the project team also attended public meetings at Breinton and Belmont.

10. The main channel for feedback was the consultation survey. The questionnaire included 18 questions, 9 of them related to the seven proposed bypass routes and the walking, cycling and public realm improvements. The remaining questions related to the consultation and attendees.
11. A total of 4,351 questionnaires were either fully or partially completed during this period – 3,354 questionnaires were completed online and 997 printed copies of the questionnaire were returned of which 30 were Easy Read versions of the questionnaire.
12. Following the end of the consultation period all feedback was saved and coded to enable analysis of all responses received including analysis of the demographics of respondents.
13. The following is a summary of the responses to the questions about the bypass and active travel measures.
14. **Question 1: Do you agree with the Hereford Transport Package (HTP) objectives to address transport problems in Hereford and enable growth?**
4202 respondents (97%) responded to this question. 2872 of these respondents (68%) said they agreed with the HTP objectives of addressing Hereford's transport problems and enabling growth. (Appendix 1, Figure 17)
15. **Question 2: Do you agree that a bypass should form part of the package?**
3033 respondents (70%) responded to this question. 1789 of these respondents (59%) said they agreed that a bypass should form part of the package. (Appendix 1, Figure 20)
16. **Question 3: Which bypass route would you prefer?**
In this question, survey respondents were asked to rank their preferred routes from 1 – 7. Only 1747 respondents (40%) responded to this question. 1747 respondents (40%) chose at least one route. A total of 876 (20%) chose to rank all routes and 416 (10%) only ranked one route. 2604 respondents (60%) did not indicate a preferred route.

The total score for all routes when scores from 7 (preferred route) to 1 (least preferred route) are applied to each route when a preference is stated can be seen in Appendix 1, Figure 24 and the frequency of each route being chosen as a respondents first choice when a preference is indicated can be seen in Appendix 1, Figure 25..

17. **Question 4: Do you agree that a package should include possible walking, cycling, bus and public realm measures described in the consultation materials?**

2799 respondents (64%) responded to this question. 2427 of these respondents (87%) said yes they agree that that a package should include possible walking, cycling, bus and public realm measures. (*Appendix 1, Figure 27*).
18. **Question 5: Are there other walking, cycling, bus and public realm improvements or locations that you think we should be considering?**


1407 respondents (32%) responded to this question. Common themes from the responses provided include requests for bus and cycling improvements (other than those shown in the consultation materials), park and ride improvements, other pedestrian improvements and school travel improvements. (*Appendix 1, Figure 28*).
19. **Question 6: Do you have any other comment about the current proposals included in the Hereford Transport Package?**

1407 respondents (32%) responded to this question. Common themes from the responses provided relate to traffic flows, bypass location (east or west), housing developments / growth and associated traffic impacts, bypass build process and need for the scheme. (*Appendix 1, Figure 30*).
20. Questions 8, 9 and 10 allowed respondents to tell us how often they travelled around Hereford, how they most commonly travelled and their most common reason for travelling. Analysis of responses to these questions indicate that the highest percentage of respondents (72%) to question 8 travel around Hereford daily; the highest percentage of respondents (85%) to question 9 travel by car and the most common reason for travel (67%) was for shopping by car. Further analysis of the response to this question can be seen in the consultation report in Appendix 1.
21. Written responses from 22 individuals were received during the consultation period and the details of the issues raised can be seen in the consultation report in Appendix 1. Personal details have been omitted to comply with data protection legislation.
22. 109 organisations responded to the HTP consultation using the consultation questionnaire and their feedback forms part of the feedback analysis in paragraph 10 to paragraph 17. A further 27 written responses were received from organisations in response to the consultation. Copies of these responses are included in full in the consultation report in Appendix 1.
23. This consultation reached a wide range of landowners, businesses and community members with 4351 responses. 1317 members of the public attended the first week of the consultation events with many more attending later events and attending the library exhibition right through the consultation period. The consultation website had 4474 unique visits at this time. Postcode mapping confirms that responses have been received from across the city. 1062 questionnaire respondents attended a public exhibition whilst others chose to view exhibition materials on line. The number of disabled respondents or respondents with limited mobility is in line with data for Hereford from the 2011 census.
24. In summary, the majority of respondents support the HTP objectives, the inclusion of a bypass and that a package should include walking, cycling, bus and public realm measures. Not all respondents expressed a preference for a particular route for the

bypass and hence the results do not show a clear overall preference for any of the seven route options.

Bypass Route Selection:

25. The bypass route selection process is informed by a number of reports. The scheme assessment report (SAR) documents the factors to be taken into account in choosing between options and the environmental, engineering, economic and traffic advantages, disadvantages and constraints associated with individual bypass route corridors. Along with the Environmental Assessment Report (EAR), Route Selection Report (RSR) and the Phase 2 Consultation Report (P2CR) the findings of this report will inform the Preferred Route Report (PRR) which sets out the route recommended for selection as the preferred route for the bypass for further scheme development. The suite of documents is summarised below:



Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) – Appendix 2

26. The SAR documents the factors to be taken into account in the technical selection of a preferred route from the shortlist of possible bypass corridors approved by cabinet. It sets out the environmental, engineering, economic and traffic impacts and constraints associated with each possible bypass route.
27. The SAR has been prepared in accordance with national standards Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) TD37/93 and incorporates the principles of the Web Transport Analysis Guidance (WebTAG). The report follows TD37/93 advice with full engineering content.

28. For the purposes of route corridor comparison, a similar design standard has been assumed for each. This is appropriate for the purpose of comparing possible bypass route corridors to select a preferred route. The design standard of the selected preferred route will be confirmed when further modelling work is completed and will be set out in Phase 3 consultation. The report summarises the differing issues associated with each bypass route corridor and all seven have been considered feasible for further assessment.


Stage 2 Environmental Assessment Report (EAR) – Appendix 3

29. The EAR (included in Appendix 3 of this cabinet report) presents the findings of an environmental review and assessment of the potential environmental impacts and effects of the shortlist of seven possible bypass route corridors. The EAR has been completed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, for all environmental factors set out in the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017. The Stage 2 EAR has been prepared to enable a preferred route for the bypass to be selected which will be subject to a more detailed assessment including a statutory Environmental Impact Assessment and subsequent Environmental Statement. The EAR and the Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) - Appendix 2 inform the Route Selection Report (RSR) - Appendix 4.
30. The assessments in this report are based on the design work that has been undertaken to refine the seven shortlisted options identified in the Corridor Assessment Framework report, as well as further qualitative and quantitative environmental assessments that have been undertaken, including modelling and surveys.
31. The environmental assessment methodology used for this assessment is in accordance with DMRB Volume 11: Environmental Assessment and Interim Advice Note 125/15: Supplementary guidance for users of DMRB Volume 11 'Environmental Assessment' and confirms that as the DMRB is intended for the assessment of trunk roads, and motorways, it is the most relevant and applicable set of guidance for the assessment of this highway project. Environmental factors assessed include:
- Air Quality;
 - Noise and Vibration;
 - Landscape;
 - Cultural Heritage;
 - Ecology
 - Water and Drainage;
 - Geology and Soils;
 - Materials
 - People and Communities;
 - Climate Change; and
 - Combined effects and Cumulative Effects of this scheme with other schemes.
32. The potential impact of each possible bypass route during construction and operational phases have been considered. This information is used to inform the route selection process presented in the Route Selection Report (RSR).
33. As detailed design of the selected route progresses, by incorporating mitigation into the final design of the preferred route, any significant effects caused by the scheme are anticipated to decline in significance over time. There are a number of further

assessments which will be carried out within and in support of the Stage 3 Environmental Statement (ES), included in the EAR, with the aim of reducing significant adverse effects. Furthermore as the design proceeds, the aim is to maximise beneficial environmental effects, in particular those which are expected to arise from the provision and future management of the scheme. The scheme is being designed to deliver overall a biodiversity net gain in accordance with good practice.

Route Selection Report (RSR) – Appendix 4

34. The purpose of the Route Selection Report (RSR) is to document and provide an understanding of the technical assessment process and methodology used in determining the best performing of the seven shortlisted bypass route corridors under consideration. (For the purposes of clarity, these are simply referred to as “corridors” in paragraphs 35 to 0 below). The RSR with the Phase 2 Consultation Report – Appendix 1 informs the Preferred Route Report - Appendix 5
35. The RSR describes the structured comparison assessment process undertaken for each of the shortlisted corridors. Each of the seven corridors has been divided into elements and sub-elements that provide a detailed comparison within the specific conditions relating to the sub-element area . The results were combined to establish the overall best performing route using information from the SAR and EAR.
36. The methodology for considering the Preferred Route is informed by national guidance ‘Choice between Options for Trunk Road Schemes (TA 30/82)’, in particular the ‘pair-wise’ comparison method. .This process is appropriate as there are a number of possible bypass corridors and using the pairwise comparison involves cutting the problem down to a more manageable size by comparing the options, two at a time, eliminating the least favoured in turn. The advantage of this method is that the problem is sub-divided into a discrete number of smaller problems. It enables the reasons for decisions to be traced without ambiguity.
37. In accordance with this prescribed process, seven bypass route corridors have been split into three Elements (or sections) which allow the impacts to be carefully scrutinised and assessed.
38. The three elements (see below and Appendix 4, Figure 3) are as follows:
 - Element 1 - A465 to Hill Road (Upper Breinton Road – U73022)
 - Element 2 – Hill Road (Upper Breinton Road – U73022) to Canon Pyon Road
 - Element 3 – Canon Pyon Road to existing A49



39. The RSR provides a detailed description of each element and a description of the possible bypass corridors in each element. The issues that need to be considered when choosing between possible route corridors are presented and the relevant policy framework which is relevant to the considerations is explained.
40. Each element is split where appropriate into smaller section to make the comparison of corridors more manageable. The report provides a detailed summary of the pairwise comparison for element and the result of this comparison process within each section is confirmed.

41. The Pair wise comparison process has been used in a structured manner, and entirely in accordance with guidance to assess elements of each of the seven possible bypass corridors in the Core Strategy corridor.
42. The comparison identified a preferred route within each element as follows:
 - Element 1 – Red / Black
 - Element 2 – Red / Olive
 - Element 3 – All
43. Across all elements therefore Red is the best performing route and therefore the RSR recommends that the Red Route is taken forward as the preferred route for the bypass.

Preferred Route Report (PRR) – Appendix 5

44. The Preferred Route Report (PRR) presents consideration of the findings of the HTP technical and environment assessment work as well as the HTP Phase 2 Public Consultation (P2CR) feedback.
45. The PRR details the process for the selection of the preferred route for the bypass and has considered the following;
 - Policy background and requirements
 - Assessment process including:
 - Technical
 - Engineering
 - Environmental
 - Route Selection Process
 - Public consultation
 - Preferred Route Assessment and Recommendation
46. The PRR confirms that on the basis of this combined analysis the Red Route bypass corridor should be taken forward as the Preferred Route for the Hereford Bypass and cabinet is asked to consider and approve this preferred route for further development and consultation.
47. The process to identify a preferred route was undertaken in accordance with national guidance and design standards, planning policy and legislation. It was undertaken by experienced technical, environmental and planning teams within WSP and BBLP.

48. The map below shows the recommended preferred route:



Preferred Route (Appendix 5, Figure 2)

Active Travel Measures: Walking, cycling, bus and public realm improvements - Appendix 6

49. The public consultation results demonstrate strong support for the inclusion of active travel measures within the HTP. As such, the active travel measures (walking, cycling, bus and public realm improvements) which, with the bypass, will form the Hereford Transport Package, have been developed alongside the route selection assessment work.
50. The Active Travel Measures Report (ATMR) in - Appendix 6 outlines the work done to date in developing these walking, cycling, bus and public space improvements. It also sets out the next steps for further developing and refining the active travel projects.
51. A range of possible active travel measure improvements have been considered in the ATMR and are summarised below:

Active travel improvement options

Improvement themes	Improvements to be considered
Better use of public space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Shared use walking and cycling paths ■ New bus lanes or on-road cycle lanes ■ Wider footways ■ Improved street environment (e.g. tree lined boulevards and removal of street clutter) ■ Wider cycle lanes ■ Improvements to bus stops (e.g. real time information)
Junction improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and bus users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Safe crossings at all junction arms (e.g. wider waiting areas) ■ New / upgraded crossings for pedestrians and cyclists (e.g. signalling crossings and single stage crossings) ■ More cycle friendly junction designs (e.g. advanced stop lines, advanced traffic signals or right turn lanes) ■ Bus priority improvements at junctions
Crossing improvements along and across main roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Walking and/or cycling priority over side streets (e.g. raised footway to reduce vehicle speeds) ■ New/upgraded crossings for pedestrians and cyclists (e.g. signalling crossings, bigger waiting areas and removing guard rails)
Improved existing traffic free paths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Better lighting, surfacing and signage ■ Wider paths ■ Improved ramps and path accesses ■ New and improved connections to the city's main roads
New traffic free paths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ New green corridors for walking and cycling ■ Connections with Holmer West and Three Elms urban expansion areas ■ "Park and Choose" sites

(Appendix 6, Table 2).

52. To further develop the active travel improvements key movement corridors have been identified.
53. The report also sets out (Appendix 6, Table 3) the development of traffic management improvements as follows;

Development of traffic management improvements.

Traffic management option	Purpose	Key risks/opportunities
HGV restrictions within central Hereford	To reduce HGV traffic through the city centre, particularly through the AQMA	Maintaining local deliveries and supporting businesses Enforcement capabilities
20mph speed limit on all streets north of the River Wye	To reduce traffic speeds to improve pedestrian/cycle comfort and safety.	Enforcement capabilities
Intelligent Transport Systems	To manage traffic demand through Hereford through intelligent transport systems Technology advancements	

- 54. These proposals will be developed with further consultation to confirm the preferred package of measures.
- 55. The report also sets out that walking and cycling provision will be delivered alongside the bypass route. The provision may include dedicated walking and cycling facilities within the limits of the bypass or in areas outside/parallel to the bypass alignment. It will also consider and provide for where the bypass interacts with the existing highway and Public Right of Way network.
- 56. These proposals will be developed with further consultation to confirm the preferred package of measures.

Conclusion and Next Steps

- 57. The Phase 2 Consultation Report – Appendix 1, describes the results and analysis of the consultations on the Hereford Transport Package (HTP) to date. The Scheme Assessment Report – Appendix 2, and Environmental Assessment Report – Appendix 3, set out the impacts of the proposed Hereford bypass scheme. The Route Selection Report – Appendix 4 sets out all the appropriate technical factors to consider in the assessment of possible route corridors for the bypass scheme. The Preferred Route Report - Appendix 5 confirms that on the basis of this combined analysis the Red Route bypass corridor should be taken forward as the Preferred Route for the Hereford Bypass and the Active Travel Measures Report - Appendix 6, describes how active travel measures will be identified as part of the HTP. The cabinet is recommended to consider these reports and approve this preferred route corridor and associated active travel measures for further development and consultation.
- 58. This further development and consultation work will include further detailed design, environmental surveys and traffic modelling to support the development of a scheme design for Phase 3 consultation and business case development to support funding applications. Following consideration of phase 3 consultation feedback a further cabinet decision will confirm next steps to secure permissions and consents for the project.
- 59. The scheme is identified within the Capital Programme and funding is available to take forward this development and consultation. Work will continue with Government departments and agencies to secure funding contributions towards this development work and the future construction of the scheme. Failure to confirm early government funding will impact on funding requirement from the council and could impact on programme.

Community impact

60. The bypass is a significant transport infrastructure element of the Hereford transport strategy, linked to the promotion of social progress (by supporting housing needs), economic prosperity (by supporting new jobs, area regeneration, and business), and environmental quality (lessening the harmful impacts of traffic growth, providing an alternative route for the movement of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs), and freeing up space for buses, pedestrians and cyclists). The delivery as part of a Hereford Transport Package will enable active travel measures to be implemented to deliver benefits to communities within the city.
61. The bypass will enable the delivery of new homes and communities. The development of these housing areas will include associated community sustainable transport infrastructure.
62. The re-routing of traffic, particularly HGVs, from the Hereford city centre, will benefit those living and working near the A49. However, there will be adverse effects on residents living near the proposed route. Given that the land within the bypass corridor is largely rural and suburban, there are likely to be adverse noise impacts and increases in the level of air pollution. The technical work will develop options to mitigate adverse impacts on residential amenity in line with Core Strategy policy (HD3 Hereford Movement).
63. It is recognised that proposals for a bypass have the potential to have a significant impact upon local residents and land owners directly affected by proposals. The consultation process sought to ensure those residents, businesses and landowners that were affected by the seven route corridors were fully informed of the process and potential implications. As the development of the scheme progresses, the Council will continue to engage with those who will be most affected to ensure they are treated fairly and have all the information they need.

Equality duty

64. Under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the 'general duty' on public authorities is set out as follows:

A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to

 - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
65. As part of the consultation processes, an equality impact assessment screening has been undertaken to better understand the needs of those who may be impacted by the HTP proposals. This has identified that key elements of the Scheme which could disproportionately affect vulnerable groups are as follows:

Scheme development and design considerations:

- Amendments to public transport facilities, such as bus stops;
- Impacts on physical accessibility to rural and community facilities, due to increases in PRow length and permanent closure of certain routes as well as potential changes to footpath gradients; and
- Impact on the Hereford Community Farm. Disruption caused by proximity to the Bypass or direct land take may affect its current capacity to offer therapeutic services and also its viability as a business.

Construction considerations:

- Pedestrian or community severance due to construction activities;
 - Temporary changes and diversions to the road or footpath;
 - Temporary changes to public transport facilities;
 - Noise, dust, light and environmental impacts associated with the scheme route options have the potential to impact on health and wellbeing of the local populations; and
 - The area has several trip attractions/local services that are likely to be impacted by the Scheme. Access to these attractions and local services could be affected during construction.
66. Based on the potential impacts that have been outlined above, the Screening has identified that a full Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) should be carried out as part of the ongoing assessment of the preferred route focussing specifically on gender, age; disability, and pregnancy & maternity. This will help in gathering further evidence to enable sound equality decision making. All other groups with protected characteristics have been screened out of an EqIA as they are not considered to experience differential impacts at this stage.
67. There is potential for benefits for groups with protected characteristics in the development of the Hereford Bypass including improved traffic flow and journey times and increased safety and security. It is important that these benefits continue to be developed and promoted with these most vulnerable users in mind so as to ensure and advance equality of opportunity.
68. As part of Phase 2, a need was identified to produce literature and information in an 'Easy Read' format. This was done as quickly as possible, and additional time allowed for those using these documents to respond.
69. 246 questionnaire respondents stated that they considered themselves to have a disability. This would include those who responded by Easy Read.
70. 121 respondents (54% of those who provided an answer to this question) agreed that the HTP objectives would address the transport problems in Hereford and enable growth. This is compared to the 68% of all respondents, and therefore indicates a lower level of agreement. Comments provided alongside responses to this question suggested negativity about the ability to meet the HTP's objectives as well as the route options being consulted upon.
71. 125 respondents (53% of those who provided an answer to this question) agreed that a bypass should form part of the HTP. This is slightly lower than the 59% across all respondents who were in support of the proposal. Comments suggested that respondents felt that the bypass would not help in meeting objectives while there was

also concern regarding the environmental impact. There was also negativity regarding the route options. Another common theme identified was that the bypass would be effective in meeting the objectives.

72. Orange was the most popular route option in this case, followed by Olive and Black 1. Black 2, despite being ranked second in the overall analysis, was selected as first choice by the fewest respondents in this case.
73. 195 respondents (90% of those who provided an answer to this question) agreed that walking, cycling, bus and public realm measures should form part of the HTP. This is at similar level to the 87% who were in support overall
74. In order to identify and engage with hard to reach groups, HC continues to engage its Corporate Information, Customer and Equality Manager and follow its Equality Policy (2017-2019) which can be found on HC's website. All consultation materials and events will continue to be fully accessible, and consultation documents can be made available in different formats and languages upon request. This will be made explicit in brochures and leaflets.
75. 'About You' demographic questions will continue to be included in Phase three of this consultation, enabling the Council to monitor the effectiveness of consulting with the whole community.
76. In taking forward the route options for the bypass and the associated package of measures and in consultation with local communities, the council will pay due regard to the public sector equality duty under the Equality Act 2010.

Legal Implications

77. This is an executive function under the Council's Constitution Part 3 Section 3 and it is a key decision being one which is likely to be significant having regard to the strategic nature of the decision and/or whether the outcome will have an impact for better or worse, on the amenity of the community or quality of service provided by the authority to a significant number of people living or working in the locality (two or more wards in Herefordshire) affected.
78. As referred to in the previous cabinet report (18 January 2018) the policy context for delivery of this scheme is through the Core Strategy and Local Transport Plan, and the Council as the highways authority can promote and deliver the scheme.
79. Any consultation on preferred route/s are to be completed in accordance with the statutory pre-application procedure provisions in the Planning Act 2008 and should be "robust", in order to ensure that the council is acting reasonably. To date the Council have undertaken a robust appraisal on the routes, following guidance and the national standard on both Phase 1 and Phase 2 consultations.
80. Phase 3 consultation on the preferred route will also follow the statutory regime and the choice of route is based on a systematic selection method of considering the outcome of the Phase 2 consultation, and having followed guidance and the national standard as demonstrated in the appended reports. The results of the next stage of scheme development and Phase 3 consultation will enable the Council to review the assumptions made at Stage 2 and assess carefully to determine if they are feasible

and will meet the aims of the scheme as originally set, prior to confirming the scheme to be taken forward.

81. In consideration of any decision to be made, Cabinet need to have due regard to the European Convention on Human Rights more particularly Article 8 which stipulates the need to take into account the right to respect for family and private life. The likely interference with human rights should therefore be weighed up in the balance of factors leading to the decision to select a route.

Resource implications

82. Estimated costs for a bypass have been developed on a consistent basis across all route corridors. This is to ensure a fair comparison for route selection purposes based on an assumed standard for the road at this stage of development. Once a route is chosen work will be done to confirm the design and standard for the scheme prior to confirming the cost estimate for the scheme to be delivered. At this point a further independent review of cost estimates will be undertaken prior to a decision to proceed.
83. The current estimated cost of each of the possible bypass route corridors is summarised in the SAR contained in Appendix 2 of this cabinet report. Costs are presented in Section 4.9 of that report for each bypass route corridor in Table 3 of the report. Estimates comprise bypass construction costs, land acquisition and compensation payments, statutory undertaker's costs and professional fees. These costs are based on current year prices with an appropriate amount of optimism bias applied to reflect that the estimates are produced based on a preliminary design for each route. When a route is selected, detailed design of the route will progress and cost estimates will be updated. Inflation and optimism allowances will be updated in accordance with government guidance as the business case for the scheme is developed for funding application purposes.

Corridor	Estimated Total Cost (£) – Current year Prices (2018)
Corridor 1 – Orange	151m
Corridor 2 - -Cyan	153m
Corridor 3 – Yellow	150m
Corridor 4 – Red	153m
Corridor 5 – Olive	149m
Corridor 6 – Black 1	160m
Corridor 7 - Black 2	166m

84. Each cost estimate is based on a detailed spreadsheet of quantities taken from the current level of design model. These cost estimates have been built up using rates

appropriate to the size and nature of the scheme from national price book SPONS Civil Engineering and Highway Price Book 2018. Estimates also include overhead and profit, preliminaries, statutory undertakers estimated costs land costs and professional fee costs. An allowance of optimism Bias of 32% is included in the costs presented given the preliminary stage of design in accordance with WebTAG guidance. This allowance within the estimate is in accordance with government guidance and ensures that preliminary cost estimates include possible future cost uplifts based on similar project experience.

85. The cost estimates presented in the SAR and summarised above are an update on the previous estimated costs presented in the Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) for the project. These SOBC costs were undertaken prior to any route assessment work and were consistent with the level of project detail at that time. They were estimated at the time of production of the SOBC in 2014 prices. The current estimated costs for the bypass have been estimated at current year (2018) prices. Taking inflation into account since 2014 the estimated cost of the bypass remain broadly comparable with those identified in the SOBC. The recommended red route as the preferred route for the bypass is at the lower end of estimated route costs.

Package Element	Estimated Total Cost (£) – Current year Prices (2014)	Estimated Total Cost (£) – Current year Prices (2018)
Western Relief Road (excluding Southern Link & with Risk adjusted)	£136,270,000	£153,000,000 (subject to selection of red route as preferred bypass route)
Public realm, active mode and traffic management scheme for existing route of A49	£10,000,000	To be updated as active travel measures are further developed
Public realm, active mode and traffic management scheme for radial A routes within urban area	£10,000,000	To be updated as active travel measures are further developed
Urban traffic control system including local management centre	£5,000,000	To be updated as active travel measures are further developed
20 mph schemes for residential areas	£2,000,000	To be updated as active travel measures are further developed
City wide active travel mode projects	£2,000,000	To be updated as active travel measures are further developed

86. Estimated costs for the active travel projects that would form the HTP with the bypass were estimated within the SOBC as £29m based on some assumed

improvements detailed within the report and summarised in the table above.

87. Since then we have developed proposals for ATMs and consulted on a range of possible improvements. The detail of this is set out the ATM report which is contained within Appendix 6 of this cabinet report. Further assessment and consultation will enable a package of measures to be selected that would form the HTP with the bypass. The package of measures will be different from those included in the SOBC so costs will differ. This would be the subject of a further report to cabinet and cost estimates will be presented within that report to confirm overall cost and value for money of the HTP project and would be considered by cabinet at that time.
88. As of 31 May 2018 spend from 2015 totals £4.037m. £3.992m has been spend on professional fees associated with the work to develop a long list of possible bypass route corridors, assessment work to select a shortlist from this and the work (which is the subject of this report) to assess the shortlist to recommend a preferred route corridor including the consultations undertaken to inform this process. The remaining £45K is cost associated with various payments ranging from land compensation payments associated with survey work and consultation consumables costs.
89. There is an approved capital programme allocation of £2.960m in 2018 / 2019 for the detailed design and consultation of the preferred route and package. Following selection of a preferred route, these funds will be drawn down to undertake detailed design, phase 3 consultation and development of reports required to support the planning process.
90. Funding to progress the scheme further in 2019/20 and beyond will be the subject of applications for funding and will need to be considered in the annual review of the capital programme. The budget for further stages of this project development will be the subject of a further reports.
91. Funding for the construction costs of the HTP will be subject to ongoing bids to appropriate Government funding streams. As reported in January 2018, contributions to the development of the scheme have already been received from Highways England and Midlands Connect. The Council was also recently been accepted into the Housing Infrastructure Fund forward funding programme which will support the development of the detailed business case and subject to acceptance of the business case could make a significant contribution to the cost of delivering the scheme. Failure to confirm early government funding will impact on funding requirement from the council and could impact on programme. Should the scheme not be constructed the development costs would need to be funded from revenue sources.

Risk management

92. If the council does not carry out a robust appraisal process of the alignment alternatives, the route recommended for selection as the preferred route for the bypass may not be the correct choice. To ensure that the best performing route corridor is recommended this risk will be managed through the commissioning of engineering, transport planning, and environmental professional services challenged and reviewed by an adequately resourced project team within the council and its delivery partner Balfour Beatty Living Places with appropriate reviews during the delivery of the project. The route appraisal will be carried out and documented in accordance with DfT Transport Analysis Guidance (WebTAG). Compliance with this

guidance will be monitored at key stages in the project.

93. The need for significant investment in transport infrastructure is recognised by the council, the LEP, and Highways England. It is possible that the current economic climate and the reliance on various funding sources to deliver the road may affect the timing and deliverability of the bypass. The risks associated with uncertainty of funding will be managed through applications for government funding, consideration of phased delivery of the road, the development of a robust business case, and ongoing regional partnership work through both the LEP and Midland Connect to secure funds from central government.

Consultees

94. Detail of Phase 2 consultation is set out in this cabinet report above and in greater detail in the consultation report in Appendix 1. Local members and parish councils were briefed both about the shortlist of possible bypass route corridors in advance of Phase 2 consultation and to explain the process for the selection of a preferred route and local members were also briefed in advance of the consideration of this cabinet report.
95. The Hereford BID, Chamber of Commerce and Business Board expressed support for the HTP and cited the economic benefits that it would bring to the city of Hereford and how it would help unlock growth in the local economy and the ambitions of the city. NMITE, Weston's and Stagecoach provided a response to the consultation setting out their support as in their view the bypass would improve regional connectivity and provide a suitable alternative route which will relieve congestion for by reducing traffic through town, resulting in improved journey times and significant improvements in air quality.
96. CPRE Herefordshire, Hereford Green Party, Historic England and the National Trust set out concerns that the proposed bypass could have environmental and heritage impacts and would not deliver the benefits claimed. These comments will be considered further as the project is progressed. The Church Commissioners noted in their response to the consultation that there is an opportunity for the bypass to contribute to reducing flows along Yazor Brook.
97. The Herefordshire Tertiary Education Trust responded to express their support for the bypass in the context of it facilitating the construction of new homes.
98. There was a significant level of support for Walking, Cycling, Bus and Public Realm Improvements and the benefits the new connections could bring. Ensuring existing public rights of way were not severed by the new road and junctions was also highlighted. The need to 'maximise benefits to public transport and non-motorised users within the city was also praised. Other organisations were keen to see more emphasis on walking, cycling, bus and public realm improvements.
99. Further consultations will take place as the project progresses. Phase 3 consultation will take place late 2018 on the preferred alignment and package of measures subject to cabinet decision. There will be ongoing consultation with people directly affected by the scheme, local communities and groups, parish councils and local members.
100. There is ongoing engagement with statutory consultees. This includes: consultation with Highways England on transport modelling, developing the business case and establishing the required design standards; consultation with Historic England

discussing options to avoid adverse impacts on heritage assets, including the setting of listed buildings; consultation with Natural England to agree the approach to the Habitats Regulation Screening Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment; and the Environment Agency to discuss matters in relation to watercourses and flood risk, particularly design requirements for the River Wye.

101. All political groups and local members were consulted about this report. There has been no direct feedback from local members or political groups to officers.

Appendices

Appendix 1: HTP Phase 2 Consultation Report

Appendix 2: HTP Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Report

Appendix 3: HTP Stage 2 Environmental Assessment Report

Appendix 4: HTP Route Selection Report

Appendix 5: HTP Preferred Route Report

Appendix 6: HTP Active Travel Measures Report

Appendix 7: HTP Equality Impact Assessment

Background papers

None