

**Corporate Support Centre**  
Alistair Neill – Chief Executive Officer

**To: All members of the Council**

our ref: Council - 6 March 2020  
contact: Matthew Evans, Democratic Services  
telephone: 01432 383690  
email: matthew.evans@herefordshire.gov.uk

27 February 2020

Dear Councillor,

**You are hereby summoned** to attend the meeting of the Herefordshire Council to be held on **Friday 6 March 2020** at the Council Chamber, The Shire Hall, St Peter's Square, Hereford, HR1 2HX at **10.00 am** at which the business set out in the attached agenda is proposed to be transacted.

Yours sincerely

*C Ward*

**Claire Ward**

**Solicitor to the council**



# AGENDA

## Council

Date: **Friday 6 March 2020**

---

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:

**Matthew Evans, Democratic Services**

Tel: 01432 383690

Email: [matthew.evans@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:matthew.evans@herefordshire.gov.uk)

---

If you would like help to understand this document, or would like it in another format or language, please call Matthew Evans, Democratic Services on 01432 383690 or e-mail [matthew.evans@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:matthew.evans@herefordshire.gov.uk) in advance of the meeting.

# Agenda for the Meeting of the Council

## Membership

**Chairman**

**Vice-Chairman**

**Councillor Sebastian Bowen**

**Councillor Kema Guthrie**

Councillor Graham Andrews

Councillor Polly Andrews

Councillor Chris Bartrum

Councillor Dave Boulter

Councillor Ellie Chowns

Councillor Gemma Davies

Councillor Toni Fagan

Councillor Carole Gandy

Councillor John Harrington

Councillor Jennie Hewitt

Councillor David Hitchiner

Councillor Bernard Hunt

Councillor Terry James

Councillor Tony Johnson

Councillor Mike Jones

Councillor Jonathan Lester

Councillor Bob Matthews

Councillor Jeremy Milln

Councillor Roger Phillips

Councillor Paul Rone

Councillor Nigel Shaw

Councillor John Stone

Councillor Elissa Swinglehurst

Councillor Kevin Tillet

Councillor Ange Tyler

Councillor William Wilding

Councillor Paul Andrews

Councillor Jenny Bartlett

Councillor Christy Bolderson

Councillor Tracy Bowes

Councillor Pauline Crockett

Councillor Barry Durkin

Councillor Elizabeth Foxton

Councillor John Hardwick

Councillor Liz Harvey

Councillor Kath Hey

Councillor Phillip Howells

Councillor Helen l'Anson

Councillor Peter Jinman

Councillor Graham Jones

Councillor Jim Kenyon

Councillor Trish Marsh

Councillor Mark Millmore

Councillor Felicity Norman

Councillor Tim Price

Councillor Alan Seldon

Councillor Louis Stark

Councillor David Summers

Councillor Paul Symonds

Councillor Diana Toynbee

Councillor Yolande Watson

## Agenda

### Pages

*(The meeting will be preceded by thought for the day.)*

- |            |   |         |
|------------|---|---------|
| <b>1.</b>  | <b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>  |         |
|            | To receive apologies for absence.   |         |
| <b>2.</b>  | <b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>   |         |
|            | To receive declarations of interest in respect of Schedule 1, Schedule 2 or Other Interests from members of the Council in respect of items on the agenda.  |         |
| <b>3.</b>  | <b>MINUTES</b>  | 9 - 40  |
|            | To approve and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 February 2020.  |         |
| <b>4.</b>  | <b>CHAIRMAN AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</b>   | 41 - 46 |
|            | To receive the Chairman and Chief Executive's announcements.  |         |
| <b>5.</b>  | <b>QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC</b>   |         |
|            | To receive questions from members of the public.<br><i>Deadline for receipt of questions is 5:00pm on Monday 2 March.<br/>Accepted questions and answers will be published as a supplement prior to the meeting.</i>              |         |
| <b>6.</b>  | <b>QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL</b>  |         |
|            | To receive any written questions from members of the Council.<br><i>Deadline for receipt of questions is 5:00pm on Monday 2 March.<br/>Accepted questions and answers will be published as a supplement prior to the meeting.</i> |         |
| <b>7.</b>  | <b>COUNCIL TAX SETTING</b>  | 47 - 66 |
|            | To approve the council tax amounts for each category of dwelling in Herefordshire, including precepts from West Mercia Police, Hereford and Worcester Fire Authority and Herefordshire parishes for the financial year 2020/21.   |         |
| <b>8.</b>  | <b>LEADER'S REPORT</b>  | 67 - 82 |
|            | To receive a report from the leader on the activities of the executive (cabinet) since the meeting of Council on 11 October 2019.   |         |
| <b>9.</b>  | <b>NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDERS</b>  | 83 - 90 |
|            | To consider Notices of Motion.  |         |
| <b>10.</b> | <b>FULL COUNCIL MEETING DATES 2020/21</b>   |         |
|            | The next meeting is the annual meeting of Council on 22 May 2020.   |         |
|            | Council is asked to approve the schedule of full Council meeting dates in 2020/21 as below:   |         |
|            | 17 July 2020  |         |
|            | 9 October 2020  |         |
|            | 12 February 2021 – Budget meeting   |         |
|            | 5 March 2021  |         |
|            | 21 May 2021 – Annual meeting  |         |



## **The Public's Rights to Information and Attendance at Meetings**

### **YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO: -**

- Attend all Council, Cabinet, Committee and Sub-Committee meetings unless the business to be transacted would disclose 'confidential' or 'exempt' information.
- Inspect agenda and public reports at least five clear days before the date of the meeting.
- 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 meetings**

- Anyone is welcome to record public meetings of the council using whatever, non-disruptive, methods you think are suitable. Please note that the meeting chairman has the discretion to halt any recording for a number of reasons including disruption caused by the recording, or the nature of the business being conducted. Recording should end when the meeting ends, if the meeting is adjourned, or if the public and press are excluded in accordance with lawful requirements.
- Anyone filming a meeting is asked to focus only on those actively participating.
- If, as a member of the public, you do not wish to be filmed please make a member of the governance team aware.

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



**Minutes of the meeting of Council held at Council Chamber, The Shire Hall, St Peter's Square, Hereford, HR1 2HX on Friday 14 February 2020 at 10.00 am**

**Present:** Councillor Sebastian Bowen (chairperson)  
Councillor Kema Guthrie (vice-chairperson)

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

**Officers:** Alistair Neill, Chief Executive; Chris Baird, Director Children and Families; Richard Ball, Director for Economy and Place; Andrew Lovegrove, Chief Finance Officer; Paul Smith, Assistant Director All Ages Commissioning; Claire Ward, Solicitor to the Council; Kate Charlton; Interim Head of Legal Services; John Coleman, Democratic Services Manager

**34. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Graham Andrews.

**35. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Roger Phillips declared an other interest as the vice chairman of the national joint council (NJC) for local government services.

**36. MINUTES**

The Chairman outlined two changes to the accuracy of the minutes of the previous meeting as outlined below:

Minute 32, bullet point 2 the wording 'the risk was currently being assessed' to be replaced with the wording 'the correspondence provided assurance that that it was unlikely that the £850k would be called upon'.

Minute 32, bullet point 15 (the last bullet point) the wording 'his election material explained that he did not support road schemes' to be replaced with the wording ' a number of members of the administration had been elected on the basis that they did not support the planned road schemes'.

**RESOLVED: That, subject to the changes outlined above, the minutes of the meeting 11 October 2019 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.**

**37. CHAIRMAN AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Council noted the Chairman's announcements as printed in the agenda papers.

The Chairman introduced his announcements and informed Council of a suggestion to rename the cycle bridge at the outfall works and the path from Rotherwas to the bridge Canary Bridge and Canary Way respectively.

The chief executive introduced his announcements and provided an update from Public Health England regarding coronavirus.

It was requested that a briefing note was provided by the end of the day to provide an update on the phosphate levels in the river Lugg catchment.

**38. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

A copy of the public questions and written answers, together with supplementary questions asked at the meeting and their answers, is attached to the Minutes at Appendix 1.

**39. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

A copy of the Member questions and written answers, together with supplementary questions asked at the meeting and their answers, is attached to the Minutes at Appendix 2.

**40. CORPORATE PLAN - THE COUNTY PLAN 2020/24**

Council considered a report by the Leader which set out the proposed corporate plan. The Leader moved the report and proposed the corporate plan, now to be referred to as the county plan 2020/2024, for approval. The Leader outlined the priorities contained in the plan, consisting of environment, community and economy and explained that the plan set the direction of the council for the next four years.

The deputy leader seconded the report and outlined the consultation that had taken place in the development of the Plan and the importance of highlighting the work undertaken with partners and the involvement of young people.

In discussion the following principal points were raised:

- It was important that connectivity for small, rural communities was acknowledged. It was hoped that villages without services and infrastructure would not be required to accept housing targets in the review of the core strategy;
- The Talk Community initiative was raised and good practice around adults' social care.
- A comment was made that the delivery of the priorities and objectives in the Plan was key, not merely their presentation.
- The Plan should contain details of depressed wages locally and relatively expensive housing and travel costs. Average earnings were below levels in the local region.
- It was felt that there should be greater reference to key partners in the Plan.
- Some members felt that they could not support the Plan without the western bypass to drive growth. The loss of funding resulting from the discontinuation of

the scheme would impact on growth and undermine the delivery of the priorities in the Plan.

- The Plan represented a shift of emphasis that placed residents and the community at the heart of decisions that affected them.
- The western bypass would not relieve the congestion caused by the local residents travelling in the City which accounted for 85% of journeys.
- Local businesses should be supported by the Plan to drive jobs and growth.
- The promotion of tourism was important.
- The Plan ensured that the environment and response to the climate emergency were at the heart of the council's work.

The County Plan 2020/2024 was put to the vote and carried by a simple majority.

**RESOLVED: That the County Plan 2020/2024, as set out in appendix A to the report, is approved.**

#### **41. 2020/21 COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME**

Council considered a report by the Leader to agree the council tax reduction scheme for 2020/21.

The Leader moved the report and proposed the current council tax reduction scheme for approval. The scheme proposed for approval had been originally adopted in 2015 and it was considered the scheme continued to provide an appropriate level of reduction.

The cabinet member finance and corporate services seconded the report and explained that the retention of the current scheme was supported by responses to the budget consultation. The scheme provided support to vulnerable residents and those suffering hardship. In effect the scheme resulted in a reduction in council tax to the council of £10.9 million. Over 80% of council tax billed to claimants of the reduction scheme was collected; a rate which had remained consistent across the period of the current reduction scheme.

The principal points below were raised during the debate:

- The provision of relief of up to three months to local residents forced to leave their homes following flooding was raised and what further relief could be provided after three months.
- There was concern at those local residents who did not meet the threshold to claim the reduction but who were just about managing.
- The number of claimants for a reduction highlighted the high number of people in the county on low incomes.

A named vote was held to agree the council tax reduction scheme set out in the report. The scheme was approved unanimously.

FOR (52): Councillors Paul Andrews, Polly Andrews, Bartlett, Bartrum, Bolderson, Boulter, Bowen, Bowes, Chowns, Crockett, Davies, Durkin, Fagan, Foxton, Gandy, Guthrie, Hardwick, Harrington, Harvey, Hewitt, Hey, Hitchiner, Howells, Hunt, l'Anson, James, Jinman, Johnson, Graham Jones, Mike Jones, Kenyon, Lester, Marsh, Matthews, Millmore, Milln, Norman, Phillips, Price, Rone, Seldon, Shaw, Stark, Stone, Summers, Swinglehurst, Symonds, Tillett, Toynbee, Tyler, Watson and Wilding.

Against (0)

Abstentions (0)

**RESOLVED: that the council tax reduction scheme for 2020/21, attached at appendix 1, is approved with the same parameters as the existing scheme.**

#### **42. CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2020/21 ONWARDS AND CAPITAL STRATEGY**

Council considered a report by the Leader to approve the capital investment budget and capital strategy 2020/21 onwards.

The cabinet member finance and corporate services moved the report and proposed the recommendations. She explained that the capital programme of the previous administration had been largely retained with additions including: school improvement; the Talk Community initiative; care home facilities; employment facilities; and infrastructure investment. Environmental improvements were also proposed through the programme including waste reduction initiatives. The majority of investment proposed through the capital programme was from grant funding with a small amount from borrowing.

The Leader seconded the report and explained that the capital plan reflected the county plan and proposed investment across market towns and rural areas.

In discussion the following points were raised in the debate concerning the Cabinet's capital budget:

- The impact of the loss of grant funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership was raised and where new grant funding would be identified in its place. Support was expressed for a capital strategy that proposed a bypass but it was noted that funding for such an initiative had been withdrawn.
- A shortfall in social and affordable housing was raised and the need for investment in this area.
- The importance of a review of the processes around the capital programme and risk management of capital schemes was raised.
- Support was expressed for the investment in schools and superhubs.
- Welcome was expressed for climate specific projects in the capital programme including electric buses. The programme proposed integrated action on environment and economy and the future carbon management strategy would set out how the capital programme could contribute to initiatives to reduce carbon emissions.
- Support was expressed for projects to construct care homes.
- There was requirement for investment in the road network, in particular drainage issues.

**Amendment 1 – Proposed by Councillor Bob Matthews, seconded by Councillor Bernard Hunt. To allocate £2.2m of the capital receipts monies to rural verges management and any remaining funding from New Homes Bonus, not used for phosphate issue or climate change, will also be allocated. The funding will be used to commence work to provide adequate passing bays on the county's minor road network to help prevent the destruction of the grass verges alongside these B and C class Highways which contain a wide range of valuable and rare flora and fauna, and would be a means of protecting the rural environment generally.**

Councillor Bob Matthews proposed the amendment and explained that recent public surveys had established that highway improvements were a priority for the public. The amendment proposed the use of capital receipts from the smallholdings sale to improve minor roads. Passing places along minor roads formed naturally over time; the amendment would formalise these passing places which would help protect rural roads and reduce the incidence of potholes.

Councillor Bernard Hunt seconded the amendment and explained that the amendment represented additional investment for rural roads which were in need of improvement.

In discussion the following points were raised in the debate concerning amendment 1:

- It was explained that the creation of passing places would help to protect verges on rural roads which could be considered by Balfour Beatty Living Places (BBLP) during the forthcoming year.
- There was concern that the amendment would re-commit funding that would be allocated to address phosphate levels in the Lugg catchment.
- It was noted that the proposal had not undergone scrutiny; it was suggested that the consideration of amendments at scrutiny prior to the budget meeting could be considered by the governance working group.
- It was commented that this was the type of work or road improvement which could be undertaken by parish councils through lengthsman schemes or by raising parish precepts.
- Verges often encroached on rural roads restricting width; clearance work was necessary to address this problem.
- Clarity was sought from the section 151 officer concerning the capital receipts identified in support of the proposal in the amendment. There was concern that the use of capital receipts for the proposal in the amendment would undermine the use of such investment to secure a return. *The section 151 officer explained that the funding identified in the amendment came, in part, from unallocated capital receipts.*
- There was some concern that the proposal in the amendment could be considered revenue spending.

Councillor Liz Harvey, as proposer of the original motion, responded to the amendment and explained that the amendment was not supported as there was confusion regarding changes to the amendment and the source of the funding, between capital receipts and the New Homes Bonus. Capital reserves existed but were for use in times of emergency or to be allocated to priorities following detailed proposals and consultation. Engagement with the cabinet member for infrastructure and transport was encouraged to investigate if the proposal in the amendment could be brought forward.

The budget amendment was put to the recorded vote and was lost by a simple majority.

FOR (7): Councillors Boulter, Foxton, Hunt, Graham Jones, Mike Jones, Matthews and Price.

Against (41): Councillors Paul Andrews, Polly Andrews, Bartlett, Bartrum, Bolderson, Bowes, Chowns, Crockett, Davies, Durkin, Fagan, Gandy, Guthrie, Hardwick, Harrington, Harvey, Hewitt, Hey, Hitchiner, Howells, l'Anson, Jinman, Johnson, Kenyon, Lester, Marsh, Millmore, Milln, Norman, Phillips, Rone, Seldon, Shaw, Stone, Summers, Swinglehurst, Tillett, Toynbee, Tyler, Watson and Wilding

Abstentions (4): Councillors Bowen, James, Stark and Symonds.

**Amendment 2 – Proposed by Councillor Paul Symonds, seconded by Councillor Chris Bartrum.**

**a)That a new ring fenced capital allocation be included in the capital programme to provide an additional £1m per year to be invested through the Public Realm annual plan for market towns public realm improvement in 2020/21, 2021/22 and 2022/23 and that this be funded from capital receipts.**

**b) That additional capital funding of £300,000 be allocated to the client team budget for the Public Realm contract to provide 2 additional inspectors during 2020/21, 2021/22 and 2022/23, increasing supervision and checking of capital works carried out by BBLP and to enable a review during 2020/21 of the benefit in transferring the Locality Steward service from BBLP to Herefordshire Council, Hoople or another contractor. This funding to be provided from capital receipts.**

Councillor Paul Symonds proposed the amendment and explained that amendment (a) concerned how investment in the public realm of the market towns was allocated through the capital programme. The amendment had no impact on council tax and was drawn from a pot of unallocated monies. Amendment (b) concerned the effectiveness of the investment in the public realm and would complement and help drive the proposed review of the BBLP contract and monitoring arrangements. It was confirmed that the two proposals were intended as separate amendments.

Councillor Chris Bartrum seconded the amendment and explained the reduction in funding for local authorities from central government. In order to make improvements to the public realm in market towns alternative funding needed to be identified to support projects such as the resurfacing of roads that were disintegrating. Local residents supported such proposals which would improve the safety of road users.

In discussion the following points were raised in the debate concerning amendment 2:

- There was concern that the proposed amendment (a) allocated money from reserves to a small number of towns in the county. There was a possibility that this could be divisive between the City of Hereford and the market towns.
- Roads were assessed for resurfacing and improvement work based on a risk/safety matrix. The assessment was a robust process to prioritise roads from across the county and undertake improvements on the basis of public safety. Separate allocations for market towns in amendment (a) would not complement this process.
- It was queried whether the addition of inspectors to supervise and check works in amendment (b) was a duplication of the work undertaken by locality stewards.
- There was concern that amendment (a) proposed taking money out of the capital budget to pay for recurring costs which represented revenue expenditure.
- The county plan contained a proposal to work with the market towns and parish councils.
- Amendment (a) was intended to support infrastructure across the market towns and was consistent with the priorities of local residents to make improvements to the maintenance of roads and public spaces. The proposal was supported by local residents and the town council in Ross-on Wye.
- It was understood that processes existed to address long standing problems with highways that were not prioritised for safety repairs. The Cabinet should consider the best way to address such issues.
- Some members supported the enhanced supervision of works undertaken by BBLP as proposed in amendment (b).
- There was concern that the use of capital receipts to support the proposals in the budget amendments reduced their value. It was stated that the capital receipts from the sale of the smallholdings were intended to raise revenue.
- Clarification was sought regarding the period of time proposed in amendment (a). *The section 151 officer confirmed that the amendment sought a change to the capital programme over the next three years.*
- Lobbying of central government should be co-ordinated across the political groups to request funding to provide a safe road network.
- The proposal in amendment (b) would be looked at during the review of the BBLP contract.

- It was explained that the proposals in the budget amendment had been presented to scrutiny.

Councillor Liz Harvey, as proposer of the original motion, responded to the amendment and explained that the amendment to the capital programme was not supported; such proposals would require work before inclusion in the capital programme. It was important to ensure the prioritisation process for repairs and works was fair across the county. The new county plan included a priority to re-balance investment in market towns. Leominster had secured grant funding with matched capital money and other market towns were encouraged to apply for similar funding. Market towns had worked with BBLP to identify priorities for inclusion in the infrastructure plan. The review proposed by the cabinet member procurement and assets relating to contract and project management was the right way to address concerns with oversight of the BBLP contract.

Budget amendment **(a)** and **(b)** was put to the recorded vote and was lost by a simple majority.

**(a)**

For (22): Councillors Polly Andrews, Bartrum, Bolderson, Durkin, Gandy, Guthrie, Hunt, l'Anson, James, Johnson, Mike Jones, Lester, Matthews, Millmore, Price, Rone, Shaw, Stark, Stone, Swinglehurst, Symonds and Tillett.

Against (27): Councillors Paul Andrews, Bartlett, Boulter, Bowes, Chowns, Crockett, Davies, Fagan, Hardwick, Harrington, Harvey, Hewitt, Hey, Hitchiner, Jinman, Graham Jones, Kenyon, Marsh, Milln, Norman, Phillips, Seldon, Summers, Toynbee, Tyler, Watson and Wilding.

Abstain (2): Councillors Bowen and Howells

**(b)**

For (13): Councillors Polly Andrews, Bartrum, Howells, Hunt, James, Graham Jones, Matthews, Phillips, Price, Stark, Summers, Symonds and Tillett.

Against (36): Councillors Paul Andrews, Bartlett, Bolderson, Boulter, Bowes, Chowns, Crockett, Davies, Durkin, Fagan, Gandy, Guthrie, Hardwick, Harrington, Harvey, Hewitt, Hey, Hitchiner, l'Anson, Jinman, Johnson, Mike Jones, Kenyon, Lester, Marsh, Millmore, Milln, Norman, Rone, Seldon, Stone, Swinglehurst, Toynbee, Tyler, Watson and Wilding.

Abstain (2): Councillors Bowen and Shaw

**Amendment 3 – Proposed by Councillor Nigel Shaw and seconded by Councillor Carole Gandy – This amendment reduces the capital allocated to the Hereford Transport Plan (HTP) from £3.6m to £1.6m and provides the released £2m to be used to repair and maintain our U and C roads.**

Councillor Nigel Shaw proposed the amendment and explained that the use of the road safety matrix alone resulted in some minor roads never receiving investment or repairs. The proposal involved the adjustment of the HTP to allow more roads to be repaired and drainage issues addressed.

Councillor Carole Gandy seconded the amendment and explained that there was some disappointment that the capital programme proposed investment in road infrastructure close to Hereford and roads in rural areas had been marginalised. The deterioration of rural roads affected tourism, particularly associated with the cycle routes through the

county. The parish drainage scheme contained unspent funding and new projects needed to be brought forward.

In discussion the following points were raised in the debate concerning amendment 3:

- Reduced funding had affected the minor road network and although £2million was not a large sum of money it would help with maintenance and repair.
- It was commented that the amendment proposed that money was removed from a budget for the HTP project that was currently under review. There was concern that the amendment pre-empted the outcome of the review. If the outcome resulted in money becoming available its reallocation could be considered. There was concern that the amendment raised legal problems concerned with the pre-determination of the outcomes of the review. *The monitoring officer explained that there were no concerns regarding pre-determination; Council was a separate decision-making body to Cabinet. Cabinet would be responsible for determining how the outcomes of the review would be put into effect.*
- It was acknowledged that the road network was in a bad condition which had resulted from reduced funding from government. There was a need to lobby local MPs and central government for the provision of greater funding in the local road network.
- Repair and maintenance of the road network was a priority for local communities. The amendment sought to provide more money to address the poor condition of the highways.
- There was concern that the amendment proposed the use of capital funding on recurring revenue costs and that the amount proposed would be of little effect.
- The amendment would help provide for those roads that were not considered a priority on the road safety matrix but were in a poor condition.
- The condition of the minor road network impacted upon rural tourism and local businesses.
- The lack of investment since 2014/15 in the minor road network was attributed to the priorities and decision-making of the previous administration.
- There was concern that the amendment had not been considered at scrutiny or Cabinet before presentation to full Council.
- The loss of funding from the LEP would impact upon the council's ability to access funding in the future.

Councillor Liz Harvey, as proposer of the original motion, responded to the amendment and explained that it was not supported as there was concern that money would be removed from the HAP budget before the conclusion of the review. The review would take account of alternative transport options which the government was now prioritising for grant funding. The entire £28million had not necessarily been lost but the new administration were not in a position, upon assumption of office, to award a contract for the work contained in the south wye transport package.

The amendment was put to the recorded vote and was carried by a simple majority.

For (26): Councillors Polly Andrews, Bartrum, Bolderson, Bowen, Durkin, Gandy, Guthrie, Howells, Hunt, l'Anson, James, Johnson, Graham Jones, Mike Jones, Lester, Matthews, Millmore, Phillips, Price, Rone, Shaw, Stark, Stone, Swinglehurst, Symonds and Tillett.

Against (25): Councillors Paul Andrews, Bartlett, Boulter, Bowes, Chowns, Crockett, Davies, Fagan, Hardwick, Harrington, Harvey, Hewitt, Hey, Hitchiner, Jinman, Kenyon, Marsh, Milln, Norman, Seldon, Summers, Toynbee, Tyler, Watson and Wilding.

Abstain (0)



**RESOLVED: That:**

**This amendment reduces the capital allocated to the Hereford Transport Plan from £3.6m to £1.6m and provides the released £2m to be used to repair and maintain our U and C roads.**

**The bulk of the Hereford Transport Plan capital funding was predicated on the need to purchase early properties that might be blighted by the route of the Hereford Bypass. With the scheme now under review and any funding application for the scheme, should it go ahead, further delayed, it makes no sense to keep this capital allocation at the current level. The Conservative Group would ask others to consider the plight of the U and C roads in our most rural communities. In the unlikely event that additional capital above the £1.6m is suddenly needed for the HTP, then the general reserve and the financial resilience reserve (standing at £13.6m) are available.**

**Although A and B roads in Herefordshire are the fastest roads and carry the most vehicles, the C and U roads are the capillaries that feed these roads and, in the more remote places, the arteries for local transport too. Since the one off spending of £20m in 2014/5 there has been minimal investment in the U and C road infrastructure and drainage and the results are visible for all to see.**

**This additional £2m will not fix all of the issues, but is seen as a responsible step by this Council to address the concerns of the rural third of this county's population.**

The capital programme 2020/21 onwards and capital strategy, as amended by amendment 3 above was put to the recorded vote and carried by a simple majority.

FOR (49): Councillors Paul Andrews, Polly Andrews, Bartlett, Bartrum, Bolderson, Boulter, Bowen, Bowes, Chowns, Crockett, Davies, Durkin, Fagan, Gandy, Guthrie, Hardwick, Harrington, Harvey, Hewitt, Hey, Hitchiner, Howells, Hunt, l'Anson, James, Jinman, Johnson, Graham Jones, Mike Jones, Kenyon, Lester, Marsh, Matthews, Millmore, Milln, Norman, Phillips, Price, Rone, Seldon, Shaw, Stone, Summers, Swinglehurst, Tillett, Toynbee, Tyler, Watson and Wilding.

Against (0)

Abstentions (2): Councillors Stark and Symonds

**RESOLVED: That:**

**(a) the proposed capital programme for 2020/21 attached at appendix 3, as amended by amendment 3 above, be approved; and**

**(b) the capital strategy document at appendix 4 be approved.**

There was an adjournment at 1.50 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 2.25 p.m.

#### **43. SETTING THE 2020/21 BUDGET AND UPDATING THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY AND TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

Council considered a report from the Leader to set the 2020/21 budget and update the medium term financial strategy and treasury management strategy.

The cabinet member finance and corporate services introduced and moved the budget and explained that the administration had inherited a sound financial position and it was possible to set a balanced budget. The council tax precept increase was at a lower rate than it had been in the previous two years and the budget supported the priorities contained in the new county plan. The budget contained support for local business and education, including NMiTE, and incorporated plans to address challenges including the rising cost of services. The budget contained investment in social care for children and adults and the Talk Community initiative. The budget had been shaped by the public with extensive consultation and had been presented to each of the scrutiny committees twice.

The Leader seconded the budget and explained that the precept increase was prudent to enlarge the council tax base but it was regrettable that it was at a rate higher than inflation. There was a pressure on the budget from the increasing cost of looked after children. Headroom existed in the budget to support projects such as the superhubs and to address the climate emergency. The new homes bonus was being utilised to address the phosphate levels and support house building.

Councillor Jonathan Lester expressed support for the provision in the budget for key services and in particular the investment in legal and children's services to enhance safeguarding. He expressed concern at the precept level. The strong financial position of the council undermined the proposal for a precept above the level of inflation.

Councillor John Hardwick explained that there had been full and thorough consultation on the budget. The proposals in the budget demonstrated the effective working arrangements that had been established by the alliance and reflected the priorities expressed by the electorate.

Councillor Alan Seldon explained that the budget was the culmination of significant work by the executive and reflected the manifesto commitments of It's Our County. The proposals in the budget responded to the climate emergency and contained modern day thinking to address issues such as congestion in Hereford.

Councillor Polly Andrews explained that the comments of her political group would be outlined during the debate.

Councillor Ellie Chowns explained that the budget was set in the context of: a lack of central government funding; the pressure on adult social care services caused by the demography of Herefordshire; and the increased need of children's services caused by a lack of funding. Long term investment in services was proposed in the budget and the council tax precept was how the public collectively funded local services to protect vulnerable residents.

Councillor Bernard Hunt explained that in considering the proposed precept increase the demands on the resources of the council needed to be considered.

In discussion the following principal points were raised on the Cabinet's budget:

- The lobbying of central government was raised and the need to work with government to gain commitments and access funding.
- The level of reserves was raised and the potential utilisation of reserves to remedy road defects.
- The level of reserves was inherited from the previous administration of the council.
- There was sympathy with local residents with respect to the precept increase but it was necessary to avoid a reduction in the level of services. The council tax reduction scheme would help those vulnerable local residents to manage the

precept increase. If the council tax reduction scheme required a change to provide assistance to a wider range of local residents this could be considered.

- The level of the precept was high and Herefordshire residents had been required to pay increased precepts over a number of years. Some residents would struggle to pay the precept even with the council tax reduction scheme in place.

**Amendment 1 – Proposed by Councillor Nigel Shaw and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lester - The proposed increase in council tax is reduced by 1% to 2.9%. The annual cost of this will be approximately £1m, the new homes bonus allocated in the government settlement of £2m will fund the reduction for the next two years.**

Councillor Shaw proposed the budget amendment and explained that the proposed reduction in the precept did not reduce services. The shortfall created by the reduction would be met from the new homes bonus. There was concern at the effect the tax increase would have upon local residents and the amendment was intended to reduce the burden on council taxpayers. The money allocated to the phosphate issue could be allocated from an alternative source.

In discussion the following principal points were raised on amendment 1:

- It was important that there was a budget to ensure that resources were in place to address the phosphate issue.
- The previous administration had consistently increased the council tax precept.
- Some members felt that any amendment which withdrew the money allocated to the phosphate issue could not be supported. It was recognised that the phosphate issue was significant and urgent.
- It was noted that even with the support provided by the council tax reduction scheme some local residents would struggle to pay the precept increase. Some members felt that the amendment offered the opportunity to reduce the financial burden of the precept on those local residents least able to afford it without affecting the overall budget.
- The allocation of funding to address the phosphate issue had only occurred at the end of January.
- A change to the council tax reduction scheme could be considered to change the thresholds.
- There was disappointment that the 3.9% increase was the only model considered in the budget.
- There was concern that the reduced precept would reduce the funding available to adult social care.

Councillor Lester seconded the amendment and explained that the proposal increased the precept but not to the level in the Cabinet's budget. The 3.9% placed an excessive burden on council taxpayers to provide for services; the amendment did not alter the budget or withdraw money from services but reduced the burden on the tax payer.

Councillor Harvey, as the mover of the original motion, responded to the amendment and explained that it was not supported as the allocation of the new homes bonus to the phosphate issue sought to address an existential threat which put development in the county at risk and increased the potential for predatory development if housing targets were not met. The amendment could not be supported as it was essential that work was undertaken with partners to address the issue which the allocation from the new homes bonus supported.

The amendment was put to the recorded vote and was lost by a simple majority.

For (18): Councillors Polly Andrews, Bartrum, Bolderson, Durkin, Gandy, Guthrie, , l'Anson, Johnson, Graham Jones, Lester, Millmore, Phillips, Rone, Shaw, Stark, Stone, Symonds and Tillett.

Against (29): Councillors Paul Andrews, Bartlett, Boulter, Bowes, Chowns, Crockett, Davies, Fagan, Foxton, Hardwick, Harrington, Harvey, Hewitt, Hey, Hitchiner, Hunt, Jinman, Mike Jones, Kenyon, Marsh, Milln, Norman, Price, Seldon, Summers, Toynbee, Tyler, Watson and Wilding.

Abstain (3): Bowen, Howells and Swinglehurst.

Councillor Shaw withdrew his second proposed budget amendment.

The budget and updated medium term financial strategy and treasury management strategy was put to the recorded vote and was approved by a simple majority.

For (31): Councillors Paul Andrews, Bartlett, Boulter, Bowen, Bowes, Chowns, Crockett, Davies, Fagan, Foxton, Hardwick, Harrington, Harvey, Hewitt, Hey, Hitchiner, Hunt, Jinman, Graham Jones, Mike Jones, Kenyon, Marsh, Milln, Norman, Price, Seldon, Summers, Toynbee, Tyler, Watson and Wilding.

Against (9): Councillors Bolderson, Durkin, Guthrie, Johnson, Lester, Millmore, Rone, Shaw and Tillett.

Abstain (10): Councillors Polly Andrews, Bartrum, Gandy, Howells, l'Anson, Phillips, Stark, Stone, Swinglehurst and Symonds.

#### **RESOLVED:**

**That:**

**(a) Council approves;**

- a. the council tax base of 69,756.19 Band D equivalents in 2020/21**
- b. an increase in core council tax in 2020/21 of 1.9%**
- c. an additional precept in respect of adult social care costs of 2% applied to council tax in 2020/21 resulting in a total council tax increase of 3.9%; increasing the band D charge from £1,514.70 to £1,573.77 for Herefordshire Council in 2020/21;**
- d. the balanced 2020/21 revenue budget proposal totalling £157.1m, subject to any amendments approved at the meeting, specifically the net spending limits for each directorate as at appendix 3**
- e. delegates to the section 151 officer the power to make necessary changes to the budget arising from any variations in central government funding allocations via general reserves;**
- f. the medium term financial strategy (MTFS) 2020-24 at appendix 1 be approved; and**
- g. the treasury management strategy at appendix 4.**

As an amendment was made by Council to the capital programme the Leader was asked whether he, on behalf of the Cabinet, accepted the amendment.

The Leader requested an adjournment to consult with his Cabinet.

The meeting adjourned at 3.48 p.m. and reconvened at 4.01 p.m.

The Leader indicated on behalf of the Cabinet that he accepted the amendment to the budget.

#### **44. PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2020**

Council considered a report by the chairperson of the employment panel to approve the pay policy statement for 2020.

The report and recommendation was moved by the Leader (as chairperson of the employment panel) and seconded by the cabinet member for finance and corporate services.

During the discussion it was requested that in future the report should include detail of the gender pay gap at the council.

The pay policy statement was put to the vote and approved unanimously.

**RESOLVED: That:**

**(a) the pay policy statement at appendix A is approved**

#### **45. PROCEDURE FOR QUESTIONS AT SCRUTINY COMMITTEES AND CABINET**

Council considered a report by the solicitor to the council regarding the procedure for public and member questions at scrutiny committees and Cabinet. The correction supplement was noted.

Councillor Shaw proposed and Councillor Bolderson seconded the recommendation in the report.

**Amendment – Proposed by Councillor Bob Matthews and seconded by Councillor Bernard Hunt – That the constitution at section 4.4.11 (part c) in the cabinet rules – is amended to include group leaders being able to ask questions of the relevant cabinet member(s) at cabinet meetings.**

Councillor Hunt proposed the amendment and explained that it was democratic and essential that group leaders were able to ask questions of cabinet members at meetings of the cabinet.

In the debate concerning the amendment it was acknowledged that if it was approved it could lead to a lot of questions being raised at cabinet however it was considered that it would be more democratic and accountable.

Councillor Jim Kenyon seconded the amendment and explained that good chairmanship would ensure democracy and transparency.

Councillor Shaw replied to the debate on the amendment and explained that he had sympathy with the amendment but such proposals should be considered at the audit and governance committee before determination at full Council.

The amendment was put to the vote and was carried by a simple majority.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the constitution at section 4.4.11 (part c) in the cabinet rules – is amended to include group leaders being able to ask questions of the relevant cabinet member(s) at cabinet meetings.**

The substantive motion, as amended above was put to the vote and carried by a simple majority.

**RESOLVED: That:**

- (a) the council approve the process for public and member questions at scrutiny and the deadline for cabinet questions with implementation with effect from the council meeting on 14 February 2020, including the amendment agreed above; and**
- (b) authority be delegated to the solicitor to the council to make technical amendments (grammatical, formatting, and consistency) necessary to finalise the revised constitution.**

**46. COUNCILLORS' ALLOWANCE SCHEME AND LINK TO THE NATIONAL JOINT COUNCIL (NJC) INDEX**

Council considered a report by the solicitor to the council concerning the index linking of the increase to councillors' allowances to the National Joint Council rates.

The monitoring officer introduced the report and explained that following a request from the Chairman a dispensation had been provided to all members to be present and vote on the report.

The recommendation in the report was proposed by the Leader and seconded by Councillor Nigel Shaw.

The recommendation in the report was put to the vote and approved by a simple majority.

**RESOLVED: That:**

- (a) The National Joint Council (NJC) pay award applying to the basic allowance and the special responsibility allowances received by councillors in 2020 and 2021 be approved.**

**47. ADDITIONAL ITEM - URGENT NOTICE OF MOTION**

Council considered an urgent motion regarding the appeal against the rejection of the Ledbury viaduct planning application by the planning committee.

In moving the motion Councillor Liz Harvey made the following points:

- The motion was intended to provide an opportunity for members of the planning committee and local ward members to express a view on the appeal of the Ledbury viaduct planning application and the monitoring officer's decision as to whether the council would contest the appeal.
- The planning committee had rejected the application, in part because it felt that a single access for the proposed site was inadequate. The developer had been asked to consider a second access under the viaduct but such a proposal had not been included in the report submitted to the planning committee in December.

- In reaching its decision the planning committee had taken the views of the local community into account.
- An appeal would be taking place and legal advice provided to the council from counsel stated that the appeal should not be contested. The legal advice considered that there were insufficient grounds to defend the decision of the planning committee and by not contesting the appeal the potential financial risk to the council would be reduced.
- The legal advice of counsel undermined the decision of the planning committee. The motion was intended to collate the thoughts of members to assist the monitoring officer to decide whether to defend the appeal.

Councillor Tony Johnson seconded the motion.

The following principal points were raised during the debate:

- Developments of the size proposed at Ledbury viaduct generally had more than one access.
- Ledbury Town Council would make representations at the inquiry that considered the appeal.
- There was substantial evidence concerning the application that needed to be considered at inquiry including contradictory highways assessments.
- The local community of Ledbury opposed development on the site where there was only a single access.
- To contest the appeal could result in significant costs against the council.
- Without the development of the viaduct site the council's three and five year housing land supply targets were threatened.
- The prospect of success in the appeal was queried. *The monitoring officer explained that counsel advice indicated that there was not a good chance of success.*
- If the decision of the planning committee was consistent with planning policy the appeal should be defended.
- It was noted that if the council defended the appeal it might become liable for the legal costs of the appellant.
- It was confirmed that there was strong feeling against the application among the members of the planning committee however the single access had been considered adequate by officers.
- It was acknowledged that the monitoring officer would need to assess the legal advice received in deciding whether to defend the appeal.

In closing the debate Councillor Harvey explained that it was a point of principle to defend the decision of the planning committee. To not defend the decision would run counter to localism and democracy.

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

**RESOLVED: That this Council:**

**notes that the solicitor to the council is considering making an urgent decision regarding whether or not the Council is to actively defend the appeal commenced by Bloor Homes against the Planning Committee's refusal of Bloor's planning application at the strategic housing site adjacent to the viaduct in Ledbury;**

**recognises this sensitive decision is the responsibility of the solicitor to the council to make; and**

**requests that the solicitor to the council gives very careful consideration to the views expressed by its Planning Committee on 11 December 2019, and in this urgent debate, in arriving at her decision.**

The meeting ended at 4.55 pm

**Chairman**



**Appendix 1 - Questions from members of the public**

Question Number	Questioner	Question	Question to
PQ 1	Mr Roger, Hereford	To raise more Council revenue with regard to Council Tax based on resident's house value bandings is it now time to re-value everyone's' property to update the real value of residences in today's house market?	Cabinet member finance and corporate services
<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>Every property in England is in one of eight council tax bands, depending on value. These were last set in 1993 and are based on valuations from 1991. What band a house falls into is determined by inspectors from the government's Valuation Office Agency (VOA). To date, central government has ruled out any recalculation of the English council tax bands.</p>			
PQ 2	Ms Ward, Tarrington	Since the last administration scrapped the annual publication of the generic bus timetable, it has made life difficult for people who plan changes of bus when travelling in the county. There are so many different bus companies to change between. The consequence is that fewer people are inclined to use the bus services. Does the proposed budget for 2020-21 include funding to reinstate, print and sell the bus timetable booklet, at cost, to help and encourage people to use buses and to improve communication between public transport?	Cabinet member infrastructure and transport
<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>With an increasing move towards providing information digitally, there are no immediate plans to reintroduce printed copies of bus timetables for general sale. All timetable information is provided online including journey planning facilities.</p> <p>In addition, the council continues to provide a countywide bus routes map which provides visibility of the entire bus network such that residents can see what services they might use should they wish to travel by bus. This is available free of charge from the Hereford Library and Hereford Tourist Information Centre. Bus timetables and journey planners are extensively available online including at <a href="http://www.Traveline.info">www.Traveline.info</a>. Information on buses is also available on the council's website <a href="http://www.Herefordshire.Gov.uk">www.Herefordshire.Gov.uk</a>, this includes details of how to access real time live bus arrival and departure information. Online journey planners have an advantage over hard copy timetables in that they allow passengers to easily plan journeys that involve multiple buses, multiple operators, or different modes of travel such as bus and train.</p> <p>That all said and done I know some users will struggle with online access and where an individual cannot access information this way officers will provide hard copy service timetables for any residents on demand – libraries or Council offices being places these may be requested from.</p>			
PQ 3	Ms Simpson, Hereford	Would the councillors let us know please what provision exists in the budget for 2020/21 in relation to the introduction in the immediate future of electric buses to replace non-electric ones, including buses which could	Cabinet member

		operate as part of a 'Park & Ride' scheme for Hereford, since that scheme would greatly improve air quality in the city by reducing the number of vehicles to and from the city centre?	infrastructure and transport
<b>Response:</b>			
<p>The draft capital programme 2020/21 includes details of capital cost to replace the Hereford and wider county bus fleets with electric buses. Funding for this will need to be secured from external grants such as the recently announced 'all electric bus town' scheme announced by government. The total cost of replacing the fleet is estimated at £35M which would provide around 80 new electric buses.</p> <p>This Council is determined to develop a co-ordinated and focussed bus strategy, good public transport is an essential in providing choice for people to move around the County and City and will help tackle congestion. Park and rides will be considered as part of that strategy.</p>			
PQ 4	Mrs Wegg Prosser, Breinton	The Council has launched an innovative and user friendly Travel Survey, as part of its Transport Review. Regarding the City Centre Transport Package, would the Cabinet member responsible for Infrastructure agree to make provision in the budget to arrange for a new assessment of the proposals for the rail station transport hub and public realm improvements to include analysis of responses to this Travel Survey, thus becoming more contemporary, and delivering better value for money?	Cabinet member infrastructure and transport
<b>Response:</b>			
<p>The draft capital programme already includes funding for the development of the transport hub and public realm schemes and this will take into account stakeholder and user feedback. I am due to take a decision shortly to enable consultation with key stakeholders about the proposals and a public consultation will follow when people will be able to tell us their priorities for both the hub and public realm improvements and this will include consideration of the feedback people are currently giving in the current travel survey.</p>			
PQ 5	Dr Geeson, Hereford	The Capital Programme shows that the Hereford City Centre transport package (that includes the City Link Road), has about £7million left to spend on the new station transport hub. With the City Link Road costing a lot more than originally expected, has sufficient budget been left after the road construction to complete such an important transport interchange for the people of Hereford and the wider County, along with the pedestrian/cycle improvements along Commercial Rd?	Cabinet member infrastructure and transport
<b>Response:</b>			
<p>The total approved budget for the HCCTP project was £40.651m. Of this the budget for the City Link Road (CLR) was £34.160m and the remaining £6.491m was allocated for transport hub and public realm improvements. Spend to date on the CLR has not exceeded the budget of £34.160m and the budget allocated for the transport hub and public realm scheme is available to deliver the planned improvements.</p>			
PQ 6	Ms O'Neill, Richards Castle	Is there any provision in the proposed budget to stimulate large-scale tree planting across the county, including the use of the council's own estate for the planting of trees, as a way of helping meet the commitments in the Council's climate change declaration of March 2019?	Cabinet member environment,

			economy and skills
<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>Whilst there is not a dedicated budget for tree planting in this year's budget, we are however exploring a number of different options for local carbon offsetting which will form an important part of delivering carbon neutrality. We are actively discussing a substantial increase in the county's tree cover with environmental partners who would also be in a position to play an active role.</p> <p>For example, as part of a recent funding application to the Department for Transport we have included the proposal for a local tree planting and carbon offsetting scheme so that we can locally offset the carbon emissions from this project. Our approach to this project will form a case study in the pursuit of carbon neutral highway maintenance.</p> <p>In addition, the Council continues to make effective use of the planning system where we have been successfully requiring the additional planting of new trees and hedge rows on new developments across the county.</p> <p>We will also continue to work in partnership with organisations such as the Herefordshire Wildlife Trust, so that we can not only promote additional tree planting, but to also help to make sure that the right type of trees are planting in the right places so that we can also enhance and protect local the wildlife</p>			
PQ 7	Mrs Morris, Hereford	Nottingham Council introduced a workplace parking levy to help fund public transport improvements. With many private car parks located within the centre of Hereford, what likely income could be generated by such a policy in the City?	Cabinet member finance and corporate services
<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>I understand that the Nottingham workplace parking levy has generated £61M since introduced in 2012, this equates to approximately £8.7M income per annum. Nottingham is a large city with an urban population of 768,000 and is part of the larger east midlands conurbation. As a smaller city, the likely income from such a charge in Hereford would be significantly less. However, the transport review for Hereford will be considering a wide range of alternative options including demand management measures, such as this, to help inform the future transport strategy for the city. I have asked that the review includes an assessment of the potential costs, benefits and income which could be generated from such scheme in Hereford which would relate to the number of parking spaces affected and the level of charge.</p> <p>Clearly, the introduction of any such scheme would need to be coordinated with the implementation of a range of alternative travel options for people who work in the city centre, as has been the case in Nottingham.</p>			
PQ 8	Mr Geeson, Hereford	My question relates to agenda item 9 the Capital programme and in particular the Hereford Transport Package/Active Travel Measures within the programme.  Making the railway bridge on the Roman Road two lane is long overdue and I welcome the fact that this will now be considered. As part of improving connectivity through the Hereford Transport Package and making walking and cycling more attractive and safer options for short journeys through Active Travel Measures; can	Cabinet member infrastructure and transport

		the Cabinet member confirm that consideration will also be given to improving other railway bridges such as those on College Road, Old School Lane and the Northern end of Barrs Court Road?.	
--	--	---	--

**Response:**

I can confirm that I have authorised the delivery of active travel schemes in Hereford alongside the transport review which commenced further to my decision last month. You may recall we consulted on a range of possible active travel schemes last year (January – March) and we presented key routes in Hereford city where improvements could be delivered for pedestrians and cyclists. These early proposals recognised that improvements to these bridges would enable better walking and cycling provision along these roads into the city. Further detailed design, which will take into account feedback received through our current Transport review, is planned as I am committed to delivering improvements such as these whilst the wider transport review takes place.

**Supplementary Question:**

In 2010 consulting engineers Mouchel produced a report for Advantage West Midlands on Delivering a Sustainable Transport System (DaSTS). This considered Hereford's role as a designated Growth Point for future economic development. It aimed to tackle immediate problems and shape the transport system to meet future growth. The study considered low-cost, specific and innovative sustainable transport interventions.

There are 17 pages of tables for Hereford alone. Every possibility is ranked for ease of implementation, many are rated green.

Will the Cabinet member draw this exhaustive list to the attention of those working on the Hereford Transport Package, suggest it is updated and consider the possibilities for inclusion in future capital programmes?

**Cabinet Member Response:**

Consideration of the information will be included in the current Transport review.

PQ 9

N Fletcher,  
Hereford

Cycling is the most efficient and sustainable method of urban travel whatever the time of day, Hereford is a wonderful compact city, but the cycle network is meagre and disjointed. I note that the capital programme contains a scheme for super cycle highways, please expand on what plans you have to extend the network and promote this form of travel?

Cabinet member infrastructure and transport

**Response:**

I agree with the questioner that cycling is an ideal mode of transport for Hereford. The super cycle highways project is ambitious and will take time but it aims to deliver a comprehensive network of active travel routes across the city, market towns and key long distance rural links between them. The project will bring together and extend the active travel components of current transport projects to form a county wide coherent network of active travel schemes. This will not only continue the development of the existing cycle routes already identified in transport packages, but it also includes other schemes identified in both our emerging Local Cycling and Walking Investment Plan and Sustainable Modes of Travel to School strategy.

I am also pleased to confirm that the Council was also successful in securing £500,000 from the Department for Transport's 'Access Fund' competition. This will support the continuation of our successful Choose How You Move campaign which includes a wide range of walking and cycling projects such as Beryl Bikes, Business Travel grants and our active travel in school project. We also expect shortly to hear confirmation of a significant capital award via Highways England for cycle routes along the central corridor of Hereford City.

PQ 10	Ms Sharp, Hereford	The work on the South Wye Transport Package and Hereford Transport package has been previously treated as just an extension of Balfour Beatty's existing Public Realm contract without ever going out to tender. In view of the poor quality, but expensive transport schemes and a lack of any Full Business Case for the SWTP by March 2019, will the current administration confirm that in accordance with the Council's own Constitution, future capital transport projects will go out to tender to ensure value for money for the local taxpayer?	Cabinet member Commissioning procurement and assets
<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>Thank you for your question on this important area of my portfolio that has received much public interest. The engagement of BBLP to provide the professional and technical resource to deliver the SWTP and HTP projects was done through the use of the public realm contract as these design and technical services are within the scope of that contract. The public realm contract was itself procured following an open competitive tender OJEU procurement in 2013. The delivery of the Southern Link Road construction works was not intended through the BBLP contract and an OJEU procurement was selected at that time. A full review of the Council's procurement and project management of transport projects has been undertaken whereby a clear structure and process is documented. The route to market for all future capital projects will be in accordance with the Council's Constitution and appropriate procurement options will be selected and approved at the appropriate stage of each project.</p> <p>Ensuring that we can demonstrate value for money and effective, documented and accountable procurement processes is key to the administration as are our external auditors, Grant Thornton.</p>			
PQ 11	Ms Dean, Bishops Frome	I note that the county plan 2020-2024 contains an objective to 'Identify climate change action in all aspects of council operation'. What provision has been made to inform the public of the truth of the dire climatic and environmental position that we are in and of the strategies that you propose to adopt to meet this looming disaster.	Cabinet member environment, economy and skills
<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>Building on our public declaration of a Climate Emergency in March last year, the council has undertaken significant action to address climate change in all aspects of our operations. This will be set out in our own new carbon management plan, which will be published in March, as well as our plan to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030.</p> <p>We are also working closely with a number of partners and stakeholders to develop a new countywide carbon reduction strategy. This emerging strategy will build on the excellent progress, local action and growing momentum across the county. This collaborative approach seeks to bring together residents, groups, businesses and organisations as we jointly work to meet the current and future challenges, and opportunities, on our journey to become net carbon neutral by 2030.</p> <p>We will be gearing up both our web presence and our communications to make more information on our county carbon reduction initiatives easy to access and I am pleased to welcome Cllr Ellie Chowns as the new cabinet support member who will be supporting me in this area and will be actively working to further raise the profile of this important issue.</p>			

PQ 12	Mr Hardy, Hereford	In view of the widely perceived problem of traffic congestion in the city and the belief in some quarters that this would be significantly relieved by the construction of a bypass some time in the future, what alternative measures for congestion relief does the proposed budget provide for that could be completed within the next three years?"	Cabinet member infrastructure and transport
<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>I am keen to understand Hereford City's congestion issues as quickly as possible and it is right there is risk that road schemes will take considerable time to be built and may/may not then provide a reduction in congestion. It is essential therefore to have more than one plan and to have some plans that can be implemented and assessed more quickly. The budget includes funding for transport improvements to be delivered whilst a review of the two major road schemes is progressed over coming months. This review gives us the opportunity to consider options for Hereford's congestion relief including the possibility of an eastern link road and river crossing, removal of traffic lights on key routes, emergency response arrangements to remove breakdowns on the A49, an electric bus fleet for the urban bus network and improvements that provide safer routes to school. While the review is under way, I want to continue to deliver improvements for cyclists and pedestrians across the city to encourage people who currently use the car for short distance trips which contributes to congestion to travel by more sustainable modes.</p>			
<p><b>Supplementary Question:</b></p> <p>Will the council apply for the £50 million grant to implement electric buses across the county?</p>			
<p><b>Cabinet Member Response:</b></p> <p>The council will apply and the introduction of electric buses was a priority.</p>			
PQ 13	Mr Sherwood, Hereford	Pursuant to its 2019 commitment to take measures locally in response to the Climate Emergency, and in view of the all-important UN international conference on Climate this November in Glasgow (COP26), will Herefordshire Council commit appropriate officer time and financial resources in the budget for next year, so as to promptly support emergent voluntary-sector plans aimed at establishing a public-access Centre for Climate Action in Hereford city centre, with the intention of increasing a) public understanding of the expected impacts of climate change on Herefordshire and elsewhere, b) awareness of all the possibilities for action by local individuals and organisations to mitigate and to adapt, and c) support for local activities and actions related to the Climate Emergency?	Cabinet member environment, economy and skills
<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>I welcome the commitment of the voluntary sector to this agenda and whilst I am not aware of the specific proposal to develop a centre for climate action in Hereford City, I am very interested to hear more. As such I have requested that our newly appointed Head of Environment, Climate Emergency and Waste liaises with you directly to see how best we can support this initiative.</p> <p>I can confirm that Herefordshire Council has allocated substantial officer time and financial resource as part of our commitment to tackle the Climate Emergency. We will be publishing our new Carbon Management Plan in March, which will set out our approach to reducing the Council's carbon footprint and our commitment to achieve net carbon neutrality by 2030.</p>			

In addition, as part of our commitment to achieve countywide carbon neutrality, we are also working closely with a range of partners to develop a new countywide carbon reduction strategy. I would also like to welcome the opening of the Queenswood sustainable futures centre next month which is an initiative by New Leaf and I wish this every success.

PQ 14	Mrs Protherough, Clehonger	In the context of the current Pause and Review of Transport Policy how do the budget proposals ensure that the Council is giving consideration to the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and the 2018 report "The Inclusive Transport Strategy: achieving equal access for disabled people to ensure that the needs of people with a wide range of disabilities have adequate choice of safe, accessible and independent means of getting around Hereford.	Cabinet member infrastructure and transport
-------	----------------------------	---	---

**Response:**

The transport review will enable a wide range of transport options to be considered and assessed. I can assure you that this assessment will consider the needs of all those travelling into and around Hereford to ensure equal access for disabled people getting around in Hereford. New electric bus fleets will address accessibility issues that we have with older vehicles which are still in operation by some providers, when new service contracts are awarded.

**Supplementary Question:**

Has the council a designated Access Officer tasked with ensuring an inclusive approach to planning the physical environment, including transport, and will proactive consultation be undertaken with organisations of and for disabled people in the course of the review?

**Cabinet Member response:**

There is not a designated officer at the council but a member of staff was tasked with extending inclusive access. It was confirmed that there would be proactive engagement with those organisations referred to in the question.

PQ 15	Ms Setterfield, Hereford	The Corporate Plan states on page 20 "Our schools enable our young people to achieve and excel intellectually, physically and socially, and prepare them to do well once they move on to college, training or work. What is this council doing to promote more sustainable practices in schools?"	Cabinet member environment, economy and skills
-------	--------------------------	---	--

**Response:**

Schools are required to follow the National Curriculum which allows for some flexibility in what is taught. As a result all schools help their pupils understand and engage in activities which are designed to build a deeper understanding of sustainable activities in a variety of ways. Academies have wider freedoms to choose the content of their curriculum. Recent guidance from both The Department for Education and Ofsted require a deeper and richer curriculum model than was the case in previous years. Many schools undertake such activity in science or other lessons and report high levels of interest by pupils and staff. There is however no prescribed content beyond good intent. Resources to develop this are emerging around the world and we are aware of the

national initiative produced in New Zealand where the government there has produced more detailed published content. We are seeking to access some of this to encourage schools to engage.

In addition to internal taught elements, our schools undertake a wide variety of activity beyond lessons. This includes eco clubs, forest school initiatives, green travel plans to get to school, awards and badges for engaging in sustainable activity. This is widespread and well developed and is well reported by Ofsted.

In order to support schools to become more sustainable, and to help deliver our commitment to become carbon neutral by 2030, we are currently supporting the development of new Zero Carbon Schools conference planned for July. As part of this we are also developing a new sustainability and carbon reduction resource pack to support our schools as they seek to improve their environmental performance and to reduce their carbon footprint.

In addition, the Council also offers free Bikeability training to all schools and has recently secured additional funding to continue supporting Hereford schools with our active travel in school programme in partnership with Sustrans.

It remains the case however that there is always the opportunity to do more. Schools are in general receptive to this. We are also looking again at the transition from school to work, for all groups of students with a view to ensuring all school leavers have access to high quality training, employment or education. In the local context we are happy to work closely with our HE and FE colleges, both of whom offer courses and training specifically to address concerns about sustainable futures. This, together with the work already being encouraged in our schools forms a strong basis for future development. We are also seeking ways of ensuring our capital projects, including new school premises, have a strong sustainability strand.



## Appendix 2 - Questions from members of the council

Question Number	Questioner	Question	Question to
MQ 1	Councillor Roger Phillips, Arrow	Cllr Sebastian Bowen and myself have been working with officers from the Council, Balfour Beatty and West Mercia police for a considerable time on improving the safety of the Lawton`s cross junction between the A4110 and C1035 ( the previous A44). Working in consultation with our Parish councils and communities we have identified a roundabout solution giving way priority to the left on all approaches. Can the Cabinet member reassure us and our communities that this remains a priority for the administration and in the emerging capital programme for 2020/21?	Cabinet member infrastructure and transport
<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The design of the scheme to improve safety at Lawton`s Cross junction remains a priority for delivery. We are concluding the detailed design and costing of the scheme which will be complete in the 2019/20 programme, delivery is included in the annual plan for early 2020/21.</p> <p>There is a section of hedge to be removed to improve visibility, this has been commissioned and will be carried out early in 2020 to avoid the impact to nesting birds and infringement of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.</p> <p>Balfour Beatty Living Places are currently awaiting the return of the tenders for the scheme, there will be the tender evaluation and mobilisation, it is anticipated the scheme will commence on site April / May 2020.</p> <p>The scheme traffic management plan and construction programme will be developed with the successful contractor, this will be communicated with the local members, parish councils and communities once agreed.</p>			
<p><b>Supplementary Question:</b></p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member join with local members to monitor the length and cost of the scheme?</p>			
<p><b>Cabinet Member response:</b></p> <p>Yes – the member could be assured this would happen.</p>			

MQ 2	Councillor Shaw, Bromyard Bringsty	In reply to my question at GSC on Jan 20 <sup>th</sup> the cabinet member responsible for the phosphate emergency in the Lugg suggested that the new homes bonus would, if necessary, be able to assist in bringing forward “appropriate measures”. I note that neither revenue nor capital proposals to address this issue have yet been specifically included in the budget. Councils in Hampshire, Wiltshire and Portsmouth have already designed and implemented measures following the warning letter from Natural England and are able to continue with their economic development. Given that this emergency is now seriously endangering the viability of local construction companies and their workforces and is stymying growth of all kind across North Herefordshire can this Council now stop dragging their feet and give firm dates for when this issue will be addressed and the ban lifted?	Cabinet member infrastructure and transport
<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The Nutrient Management Board met on 29 January, chaired by Cllr Swinglehurst, to whom I am exceptionally grateful to for all the hard work and expertise she is bringing to our efforts to address this issue as quickly as possible. This Board considered the report given by its Technical Advisory Group and agreed to a number of its proposals as to how phosphate levels in the Lugg catchment could either be reduced or offset. The budget proposals to be considered by Council today include funding to enable suitable proposals to be delivered– see para 13 p281 and again at para 1a on p359 of the meeting agenda pack.</p> <p>Subject to the budget proposals being approved today, I can assure you that the officers are and will continue to be working with the utmost speed and continue to work closely with partner agencies to overcome this moratorium as soon as possible. I can also assure you that the Herefordshire Construction Industry Lobby Group are being kept fully informed throughout the process, as I am conscious of the impact that this moratorium is having on local companies. This underlying issue of pollution is a historic issue and we are doing more to tackle that now and address the core causes than has ever been done before.</p>			
<p><b>Supplementary Question:</b></p> <p>Responsibility for the phosphate issue needed to be clarified with partner agencies including Welsh Water and the Environmental Agency. If the issue caused the council’s housing land supply to decrease to below three years what would the cabinet member say to parish councils and citizens when all neighbourhood development plans and our core strategy were rendered out of date, effectively voided, which could lead to predatory development in the south of the county?</p>			
<p><b>Cabinet Member response:</b></p>			

The performance of the previous administration to address problems recorded by the nutrient management plan were questioned. The environmental agency (EA) was the responsible body. A group had been established to oversee the issue and correspondence had been sent to the EA recently to request detail of a timeline for the resolution of the issue. Integrated wetlands were being implemented and a briefing note would be shared with all members shortly.

MQ 3	Councillor Matthews, Credenhill	<p>Recently I chaired a public meeting at Marden regarding the possibility of the general use of 5G technology within the county. The Council Leader, Cabinet member commissioning, procurement and assets attended and a number of elected members. Evidence-based issues were raised about the impact of 5G usage on public health, because many leading scientists have expressed safety doubts. The Cabinet Member undertook to look into the matters raised, and report back; this was later confirmed by the leader.</p> <p>As of today, no response has been received, so can the Cabinet Member inform us of the outcome of her investigations, confirming the view of this administration with regard to the use of 5G within the county particularly in light of the ambition in the corporate plan to 'Strengthen communities to ensure that everyone lives well and safely together'.</p>	Cabinet member commissioning procurement and assets
------	---------------------------------	---	---

**Response:**

Thank you for question on this matter and your continued efforts to ensure that this remains a priority for the administration.

I apologise for the delay in providing back a report regarding this matter. As you are aware there is a wealth of evidence and information, including working with colleagues across the country, that we have to go through before coming to a point where a report is ready. In the meantime I am working with other members of the administration to look at other technological solutions that do not require 5g.

I attach the latest briefing from public health for your information:

Public Health England's (PHE's) Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazards (CRCE) takes the lead on public health matters associated with radiofrequency electromagnetic fields, or radio waves, used in telecommunications, including 5G. They have issued guidance which is based on published evidence.

Mobile telecommunications technology has developed through several generations and there are now many 2G, 4G base stations installed throughout the environment providing services to users of mobile phones and other devices. Over the decades since the networks were first introduced there has been a general trend towards increasing numbers of smaller transmitters that individually provide services to smaller geographical areas and which have reducing radiated powers.

Against this background, many measurements have been made and these continue to show that exposures of the general public to radio waves are well within the international health-related guideline levels that are used in the UK. These guidelines are from the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) and underpin health protection policies at UK and European levels.

In relation to the implementation of 5G user devices and networks, this technology is at an early stage and reflects the latest evolution in mobile communications technology. Current technical standards that draw on the ICNIRP guidelines will apply to the products that are developed and the UK network operators are already committed to complying with the ICNIRP guidelines. With the increase in the volume of information being transferred, more spectrum is being made available and the highest frequencies being discussed for future use by 5G are around ten times higher than those used by current network technologies, up to a few tens of GHz. Their use is not new, and they have been used for point-to-point microwave links and some other types of transmitters that have been present in the environment for many years. ICNIRP guidelines apply up to 300 GHz, well beyond the maximum (few tens of GHz) frequencies under discussion for 5G.

Exposure to radio waves is not new and health-related research has been conducted on this topic over several decades. In particular, a large amount of new scientific evidence has emerged over the past few years through dedicated national and international research programmes that have addressed concerns about rapidly proliferating wireless technologies.

The main focus of recent research studies has been on exposure to the types of radio signals used by current communications technologies and at the frequencies they use, up to a few GHz. Fewer studies have been carried out at higher frequencies but the biophysical mechanisms that govern the interaction between radio waves and body tissues are well understood at higher frequencies and are the basis of the present ICNIRP restrictions. The main change in using higher frequencies is that there is less penetration of radio waves into body tissues and absorption of the radio energy, and any consequent heating, becomes more confined to the body surface. It is possible that there may be a small increase in overall exposure to radio waves when 5G is added to an existing network or in a new area; however, the overall exposure is expected to remain low relative to guidelines and as such there should be no consequences for public health.

A summary of PHE advice on radio waves can be accessed in the following link: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/electromagnetic-fields#radio-waves>

PHE advice on Base Stations including 5G can be found at:  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/mobile-phone-base-stations-radio-waves-and-health>

PHE is committed to monitoring the evidence applicable to this and other radio technologies, and to revising its advice, should that be necessary.

Public Health will post reliable sources of information for the public on the council website.

**Supplementary Question:**

It was asked that the council continue to closely monitor the issue.

**Cabinet Member response:**

This was agreed.

MQ 4	Councillor Symonds, Ross East	In light of the fact that Balfour Beatty set and monitor their own performance measures within their Public Realm contract for Herefordshire, what assurance is the Cabinet Member able to offer residents that the BBLP contract represents good value for money?	Cabinet member commissioning procurement and assets
------	----------------------------------	--	---

**Response:**

Thank you for your question Cllr Symonds, it raises some really important points that the administration are currently dealing with. Achieving value for money in our contracts is essential not only for us to keep control of our budget but more importantly, reassuring the residents of Herefordshire that we are getting the very best for every penny that they pay into the council.

For clarification, BBLP do not set and monitor their own performance measures. Performance measures in the form of Operational and Strategic performance indicators are set by the Council to achieve our required outcomes. Performance against these is then monitored by the Council's own Public Realm contract management team on a monthly basis. The Cabinet member for Infrastructure and Transport and myself attend fortnightly meetings with the BBLP management and the council's contract team and we have just started attending the performance meetings.

In addition, the contract is "open book" which means that expenditure can be reviewed and scrutinised throughout the supply chain. All applications for payment are scrutinised in detail by the Contract Management team to assure value and correct spend against outputs. The team undertake regular service reviews to ensure that services being delivered are effective, equitable, economic and efficient.

As part of our initiatives to ensure that we are able to demonstrate Value for Money, we shall be reviewing our approach to the management of all contracts and specifically the BBLP contract. We shall ensure that scrutiny has an important part in that process.

**Supplementary Question:**

It was requested that the cabinet member commit to a timeline to commence the BBLP review.

**Cabinet member response:**

Six months would be a reasonable timeline to commence the review and a start date in September was seen as reasonable.

MQ 5	Councillor Milln, Central	Might I ask that ahead of expiry in May 2021 of any NJC-related award in respect of members allowances that an IRP (Independent Review Panel) examine also the system of expenses in view of the fact some are assumed to be covered by the allowance and some are separately claimable, a system which may be viewed as unfair to members with large rural wards and which does nothing to promote greener travel in line with our climate emergency declaration.	Leader
------	------------------------------	--	--------

**Response:**

An independent remuneration panel will be convened following a decision by Council in October 2020 on the future governance model. As part of the IRP's consideration, they will be asked to look at the basic allowance which all councillors receive and the special responsibility allowances. As part of the work on the basic allowance, the panel will be asked to consider what the basic allowance does and does not cover.

Council in May 2021 will need to take into account the views of the IRP and make a decision on the councillor allowance scheme to be adopted as from May 2021.

**Supplementary Question:**

How might the members' allowance scheme be amended to encourage members to make the shift to sustainable forms of transport and set the example?

**Response** (*monitoring officer*):

The Independent Remuneration Panel would consider feedback from members and conduct focus groups to consider the members' allowance scheme when it was next convened.





**Chairman's Announcements – Council Meeting – 6<sup>th</sup> March 2020**  
**Events attended by the Chairman since the last**  
**Council meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2020**

- 16<sup>th</sup> February – Shropshire Civic Service, St Magdalene's Church
- 21<sup>st</sup> February – Martin Lown's British Empire Medal presentation, Shire Hall, Hereford
- 21<sup>st</sup> February – Herefordshire Federation of Young Farmers' Club Drama Festival, Hereford
- 1<sup>st</sup> March – Worcestershire Civic Service, Worcester Cathedral
- 5<sup>th</sup> March – Lord-Lieutenant's Cadet Awards Ceremony, Shire Hall, Hereford
- \*5<sup>th</sup> March – Herefordshire Community Foundation's, High Sheriff Awards, Eastnor Castle

\*Attended by the Vice-Chairwoman, Councillor Kema Guthrie



## **Chief Executive's Announcements – Full Council – 6 March 2020**

Communities across Herefordshire were heavily impacted by Storm Dennis, with a month's worth of rain falling in two days over the weekend of Saturday 15 and Sunday 16 February 2020. The sheer volume of water caused generalised flooding in many areas severely affecting properties and roads, and the rivers Wye and Lugg both rose to their highest ever recorded peaks bursting their banks. What this means is that these levels were the highest in over 200 years. At one point around 700 tonnes of water per second were flowing under the Old Bridge in Hereford. With widespread disruption experienced by residents and businesses, a major incident was declared on Sunday 16 February 2020 at 11.20am.

### **Major incident response**

A Tactical Control Group (TCG) was convened working out of Plough Lane, chaired by Sue Thomas, Superintendent Herefordshire, West Mercia Police. This brought together a number of key agencies including Herefordshire Council, Public Health, the Environment Agency, West Mercia Police, Hereford & Worcester Fire and Rescue Service, West Midlands Ambulance Service, our health partners and utility services. Through the TCG, services were coordinated to protect and provide assistance to Herefordshire residents and businesses, focusing our early efforts on the most vulnerable members of the community.

Travel and transport across the county was extremely difficult with around 80 major and minor roads impassable at peak flood. Road and bridge closures were put in place where they were flooded or where their condition had become unsafe. Whilst a priority was to keep Herefordshire moving, the top priority has been to keep people safe.

Some areas experienced power cuts, however these were generally short term.

More than 300 residential properties experienced devastating flooding. Recovery and rest centres were opened in Ross, Leominster and Holmer Leisure Centres and at Point4 for people whose homes were flooded, providing shelter and refreshment.

In Whitchurch, 24 residents were evacuated from a privately-run care home and moved safely to alternative accommodation. The eldest of the residents was 97. In Hampton Bishop a care home became inaccessible to normal vehicles, so staff were transported to and from the home by military and fire and rescue services, and the basement was continuously pumped so that residents could remain in their home.

In total, 204 people were rescued across the county by fire and rescue services from either properties or vehicles.

Due to its proximity to both the rivers Wye and Lugg, much of Hampton Bishop remained inaccessible by road for many days. The delivery of essential food and medicine supplies was arranged, with council staff visiting the local ASDA supermarket, who kindly provided the food free of charge, on behalf of stranded residents.

During this time information was provided to residents across the county through a dedicated page on the Council website and via the Council's social media channels - which were viewed more than 6.5million times in the last 11 days - with the latest situation updates and general advice on what to do if affected by the flooding. Information was also shared through local newspaper, radio and community social media sites, and interviews on regional TV. With national and international media interest, the online news reach (that is number of people who have read about the flooding) is 1.18billion to date.

In addition, video messages were sent to residents in Whitchurch and Hampton Bishop providing information specific to those communities. These were circulated through Whatsapp, the local parish council and local residents through electronic messaging.

On Tuesday 18 February 2020, under emergency provisions, the decision was taken to allocate £1million of council reserves to support local residents and businesses impacted by flooding. Since this decision, the Government (Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government) has announced community and business flood recovery grants, which the council will assist people to access, with £500 available to residents and £2500 for businesses. Payment of grants started on Monday 24 February 2020 to the 322 residents and 64 businesses who have applied to date. In addition council tax and business rate relief is available for three months for flooded properties. At the this time we await word from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) as to whether local farmers affected can access its Farming Recovery Fund.

## **Recovery**

With the impact of further rainfall and possible raised river levels, the formal position of emergency response was maintained until Tuesday 25 February 2020 when we formally moved to a 'recovery' position. However recovery for many communities started sooner than this.

The council provides recovery support and signposting to assist affected communities during recovery so that they can work towards restoring local services and facilities and returning to normal.

Additional resources have been deployed across the county to expedite road cleaning and inspection and assessment of the condition of roads and bridges. Surveys using specialist equipment are being carried out. Of the 71 roads inspected so far 51 require extensive work to remedy the damage caused which is expected to cost upwards of £1.6million. Whilst work to repair damage has commenced, several roads and bridges will require longer term attention and investment to fully address flood damage and secure their resilience. As such I expect the final repair bill to multiply.

We are extremely mindful of the experiences of people who live and work in the communities affected by current road and bridge closures, however it will take weeks before many are safe to reopen. As of 27<sup>th</sup> February, there remain 28 road closures in place, with restricted access particularly problematic around Fownhope/ Holme Lacy and Walford/ Leintwardine. We ask people to continue to adhere to these road closures and bear with us while this work takes place. We will be looking for Government funding under the Bellwin scheme for the repair of roads and other infrastructure. Clearly, travel through the county will continue to be impacted and additional bus services have been established in those areas that are impacted by prolonged road closure. School transport services have also been supplemented.

Communities across the county are facing the unenviable task of cleaning-up their homes and businesses. Herefordshire Council are providing a free service to collect flood-damaged household items from outside residents' houses, and commercial vehicles won't need permits at household recycling centres in Herefordshire until Sunday 1 March, for the disposal of flood damaged items. Lost wheelie bins are being replaced.

Helping with the clean-up effort, Herefordshire Council staff joined with others from local response services to deliver cleaning supplies and assistance to a number of communities affected by flooding. The Talk Community Big Herefordshire clean-up has involved hundreds of staff who volunteered to visit residents and businesses in prioritised areas to distribute information about flood recovery, provide help with completing grant forms and deliver cleaning essentials to designated community hubs. These door-to-door visits by our staff have been very gratefully received by residents and businesses. Among the other volunteers were retired firefighters who had driven from Kent, east London and north Yorkshire to support our efforts by clearing out flooded properties. In total more than 400 volunteers have now visited 42 different sites. Those volunteers were not only from the council, but also from:

- Police

- Fire and Rescue
- Herefordshire Council
- British Red Cross
- Tunnels to Towers provided support to lift and move heavy furniture and equipment out of homes ready for waste collection.

With many local play areas affected by the flooding, the council funded sessions in local leisure centres offering a safe place for children to play during the half term. And as pupils returned to school, the Council's school transport service put alternative services in place for those communities still impacted by flooding and road closures.

Information has been sent to local businesses and representative groups about how to access short-term desk or office space to aid with business continuity, and recovery grants. Our farming and agricultural businesses will be impacted beyond a single season.

Over the coming weeks we will be working with residents and businesses to access flood resilience grants, once details on this have been received from Government.

### **Future considerations**

Although the recent high river levels and extent of flooding across the county was unprecedented, climate changes mean that it is sensible to assume that they will become a more regular occurrence. If unprecedented is the new normal, we need to think and plan differently. It must be a priority for us to work to build community resilience to flooding across the county and work with partner agencies to consider and plan flood defence and prevention measures.

We will be looking to Central Government to provide special funding to support this and repairs to our road network, bridges and other infrastructure to a standard that will be able to better withstand extreme weather conditions, and are writing to government departments and MPs in this regard.

In the longer-term, the council will need to give careful consideration to planning issues, where we build and how we manage our environment appropriately, and again we will be looking to Government to support this through policy and action.

I am mindful that whilst Herefordshire is well into recovery mode, our West Mercia neighbours in Shropshire, Worcestershire and Telford and Wrekin in particular remain in emergency response, with once again, unprecedented flooding. We continue to liaise across West Mercia through the Strategic Control Group, where Herefordshire Council will chair the region's communications as all areas move into recovery.

I would like to round-off by recognising and thanking people from across the county during this time of extraordinary disruption. The impact of this flooding has been substantial and significant, and we do not underestimate how upsetting and disruptive it has been for many. It may take several months before the county can return to 'business as normal'. However, residents have responded with resilience and a wonderful sense of community.

27<sup>th</sup> February 2020





<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Council</b>
<b>Meeting date:</b>	<b>Friday 6 March 2020</b>
<b>Title of report:</b>	<b>Council tax setting</b>
<b>Report by:</b>	<b>Cabinet member finance and corporate services</b>

## Classification

Open

## Decision type

This is not an executive decision

## Wards affected

(All Wards);

## Purpose and summary

To set the council tax and precepts for 2020/21.

At its meeting on 14 February Herefordshire Council approved the net budget requirement for 2020/21 at £157.1m and an associated council tax requirement of £109.8m on a tax base of 69,756.19 band D equivalents.

As the billing authority this report seeks approval for the council tax amounts for each category of dwelling in Herefordshire including precepts from West Mercia Police, Hereford and Worcester Fire Authority and Herefordshire town and parish councils for the financial year 2020/21. Appendices 1, 2 and 5 will be updated and shared as a supplementary paper following the confirmation of the Walford parish precept requirement.

## Recommendation(s)

That:

- (a) The precepting authority details incorporated in appendices 1 to 5, relating to town and parishes, West Mercia Police and Hereford and Worcester Fire Authority be approved in accordance with sections 30(2), 34(3), 36(1) and section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended) and that the following amounts be approved for the year 2020/21 in accordance with sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, regulation 6 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011):**

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
 Josie Rushgrove, Tel: 01432 261867, email: jrushgrove@herefordshire.gov.uk

- a. **TBC** being the estimated aggregate expenditure of the council in accordance with section 31A (2) of the act, including all precepts issued to it by parish councils;
- b. **£222,682,000** being the estimated aggregate income of the council for the items set out in section 31A (3) of the act (including revenue support grant);
- c. **TBC** being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (b) calculated by the council in accordance with section 31A(4) of the act, as its council tax requirement for the year (including parish precepts); [Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act]
- d. **TBC** being the amount at (c) above divided by the amount of the council tax base calculated by the council, in accordance with section 31B of the act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year (including parish precepts);
- e. **TBC** being the aggregate amount of all special items (parish precepts) referred to in section 34(1) of the act;
- f. **£1,573.77** being the amount at (d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (e) above by the amount of the council tax base calculated by the council, in accordance with section 34(2) of the act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no parish precept relates (Herefordshire Council band D council tax, excluding parishes)

**(b) it is agreed that the net tax base of 69,756.19 band D equivalent properties (being the gross tax base adjusted for an assumed collection rate) used for setting the budget requirement for 2020/21;**

- a. **is allocated to band D equivalent dwellings per precept area as shown in appendix 1; and**
- b. **the individual council tax allocations per valuation band of dwelling by parish (including fire and police precepts) as set out in appendix 5.**



## Alternative options

1. There are no alternative options to setting a council tax. As the billing authority, the council is required to set the overall council tax for the following financial year and Council approved the net tax base on which the precept is in part based at its meeting on 14 February; the remaining precept elements are set by other authorities and the council acts as the collecting agent for those precepted sums.
2. Local government legislation requires the council to set council tax each financial year. It also requires that certain categories of income and expenditure and other financial information are provided in accordance with Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011).

## Key considerations

3. The Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) sets out the specific amounts to be calculated and approved. This report enables the council to meet its legislative duty and set the council tax for each category of dwellings, including the council tax requirement of the council.
4. Herefordshire Council approved a council tax increase of 3.9% (inclusive of 2% adult care precept) above the rate of council tax for 2019/20 at its meeting on 14 February. The council's band D council tax for 2020/21 becomes set at £1,573.77.
5. The parish precepts for 2020/21 is attached at appendix 1. Walford Parish Council will be confirming its precept requirement for 2020/21 on the 28<sup>th</sup> February, following confirmation of this a supplementary paper will be published confirming the total precept and average band D council tax charge.
6. The precepts for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for West Mercia, an increase of 3.9%, and Hereford and Worcester Fire Authority, an increase of 2.0%, are shown in appendices 3 and 4.

### Council tax calculations

7. The calculation of council tax involves several stages and the Local Government Finance Act 1992 requires figures to be calculated including and excluding parish precepts. The following table will be updated in a supplementary paper to be issued following the confirmation of the Walford parish precept requirement:

	<b>Herefordshire Council £</b>	<b>Parish precepts £</b>	<b>Herefordshire incl. parishes (average) £</b>
Estimated gross expenditure	379,799,000	TBC	TBC
LESS estimated income	222,682,000	Not applicable	222,682,000
<b>Net budget requirement</b>	<b>157,117,000</b>	<b>TBC</b>	<b>TBC</b>

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Josie Rushgrove, Tel: 01432 261867, email: jrushgrove@herefordshire.gov.uk

LESS retained business rates	36,726,000	Not applicable	36,726,000
LESS revenue support grant	635,000	Not applicable	635,000
LESS rural sparsity delivery grant	5,101,000	Not applicable	5,101,000
LESS adult social care grant	4,875,000	Not applicable	4,875,000
<b>Council tax requirement</b>	<b>109,780,000</b>	<b>TBC</b>	<b>TBC</b>
Divided by council net tax base (band D equivalent)	69,756.19	69,756.19	69,756.19
<b>Council tax at band D</b>	<b>£1,573.77</b>	<b>TBC</b>	<b>TBC</b>

### Council tax amounts

8. Appendices 1 to 5 to this report contain the individual council tax amounts for each category of dwelling as required by the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and associated regulations. Appendices 1, 2 and 5 will be updated and shared as a supplementary paper following the confirmation of the Walford parish precept requirement.
9. Herefordshire Council's band D council tax for 2020/21 is £1,573.77, which is an increase of £59.07 (3.9%) compared to 2019/20.
10. As part of the process we are required to include precepts from other bodies that will be included on council tax bills.
11. The parish precepts is set out in detail in appendix 1 providing the parish precept requirement and the band D council tax charge for each parish. This will be updated and published as a supplementary paper following the confirmation of the Walford parish precept requirement.
12. The charge by each property band, inclusive of the Herefordshire Council charge, is set out in appendix 2. This will be updated and published as a supplementary paper following the confirmation of the Walford parish precept requirement.
13. The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for West Mercia precept is set out in appendix 3 (£225.20 at band D).
14. The Hereford and Worcester Fire Authority precept is set out in appendix 4 (£85.99 at band D).
15. Appendix 5 provides the impact of all precepts on the council tax bill by detailing the total amount of council tax payable in each parish by property band. This will be updated and published as a supplementary paper following the confirmation of the Walford parish precept requirement.

## Community impact

16. The council tax is levied to enable the council to resource service delivery in accordance with the corporate plan priorities established by full Council. The proposed increase could result in increasing individuals financial difficulties; this is mitigated by providing payment options, relevant discounts and reliefs including the council tax reduction scheme and financial hardship policy.

## Equality duty

17. 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.
18. The public sector equality duty (specific duty) requires us to consider how we can positively contribute to the advancement of equality and good relations, and demonstrate that we are paying 'due regard' in our decision making in the design of policies and in the delivery of services. As this is a decision on back office functions, we do not believe that it will have an impact on our equality duty.
  19. The council tax charges may not directly impact on the equality duty because charges are levied in relation to property values and not individuals however where it may have an impact on households there are a variety of schemes in place to mitigate against a negative impact, including single person discount and council tax reduction.

## Resource implications

20. The resources required for billing purposes are contained within existing budgets. Customers are encouraged to register online to receive their bill electronically. As in prior years, information relating to council tax, including how the money is spent, will be available online and a weblink will be included on issued bills.

## Legal implications

21. S30 of the Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on this council, as a billing authority, to set an amount of council tax for the different categories of dwellings, according to the band in which the dwelling falls before 11 March.
22. A notice of the amount set must be published in at least one newspaper circulating in the authority's area within 21 days of the decision.

23. Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 precludes a councillor from voting on this decision as a relevant matter, if he or she has an outstanding council tax debt of over two months. If a councillor is present at this meeting he or she must disclose that section 106 applies and may not vote. Failure to comply is a criminal offence.

## **Risk management**

24. That an incorrect precept is applied, this would result in differences between the amount collected and the amount required. Every effort is made to ensure the correct data is gathered and applied to minimise this risk.

## **Consultees**

25. The council consulted with the public on the proposed budget for 2020/21. There were a total of 269 responses to the consultation; 52% of respondents thought that a council tax increase of 4% is about right or too little. The council tax charge is determined by the budget requirement as agreed by full Council on 14 February following a review of the outcome of the budget consultation.
26. The council has undertaken no consultation on the precepts of other authorities, this is not a matter that the council can undertake.

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1 - Herefordshire Council requirement by parish, including band D equivalent.

Appendix 2 - Council tax for each valuation band, by parish, without the police and fire precepts.

Appendix 3 – The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for West Mercia precept requirement for each valuation band.

Appendix 4 - Hereford and Worcester Fire Authority precept requirement for each valuation band.

Appendix 5 - Council tax for each valuation band by parish, including the police and fire precepts.

## **Background papers**

None identified

Herefordshire Council requirement by Parish, including Band D equivalent						
Parish	Parish Precept	Tax Base (Band D)	2020/21 Parish Precept Basic Tax Rate (Band D)	2019/20 Parish Precept Basic Tax Rate (Band D)	% change from 2019/20 to 2020/21	Band D Charge (Parish and Herefordshire Council's Basic Rate - £1,573.77)
	£		£	£	%	£
Abbeystre & Bacton Group Parish Council	9,200.00	164.16	56.04	57.05	(1.8%)	1,629.81
Aconbury Parish Meeting	150.00	36.86	4.07	4.00	1.7%	1,577.84
Acton Beauchamp Group Parish Council	6,500.00	183.39	35.44	42.66	(20.4%)	1,609.21
Allensmore Parish Council	6,250.00	264.70	23.61	23.71	(0.4%)	1,597.38
Almeley Parish Council	15,850.00	263.65	60.12	54.75	8.9%	1,633.89
Ashperton Parish Council	9,000.00	119.94	75.04	75.65	(0.8%)	1,648.81
Aston Ingham Parish Council	7,400.00	208.90	35.42	34.92	1.4%	1,609.19
Avenbury Parish Council	4,740.00	114.23	41.50	31.73	23.5%	1,615.27
Aymestrey Parish Council	10,883.00	163.92	66.39	67.34	(1.4%)	1,640.16
Ballingham, Bolstone & Hentland Group	13,250.00	298.92	44.33	41.49	6.4%	1,618.10
Bartestree & Lugwardine Group Parish Council	50,500.00	921.98	54.77	46.24	15.6%	1,628.54
Belmont Rural Parish Council	60,000.00	1,331.32	45.07	45.24	(0.4%)	1,618.84
Birley with Upper Hill Parish Council	3,000.00	139.89	21.45	22.31	(4.0%)	1,595.22
Bishop's Frome Parish Council	25,000.00	346.34	72.18	72.63	(0.6%)	1,645.95
Bishopstone Group Parish Council	8,100.00	198.78	40.75	40.24	1.3%	1,614.52
Bodenham Parish Council	15,000.00	494.28	30.35	30.65	(1.0%)	1,604.12
Border Group Parish Council	9,250.00	298.00	31.04	28.19	9.2%	1,604.81
Bosbury and Coddington Parish Council	20,500.00	365.75	56.05	61.55	(9.8%)	1,629.82
Brampton Abbots & Foy Group Parish Council	13,552.00	222.41	60.93	49.65	18.5%	1,634.70
Bredonbury & District Group Parish Council	8,560.00	160.13	53.46	53.98	(1.0%)	1,627.23
Breinton Parish Council	13,165.00	405.26	32.49	32.68	(0.6%)	1,606.26
Bridstow Parish Council	8,000.00	401.91	19.90	19.97	(0.4%)	1,593.67
Brilley Parish Council	11,500.00	118.21	97.28	96.74	0.6%	1,671.05
Brimfield and Little Hereford Group Parish Council	12,500.00	513.20	24.36	24.55	(0.8%)	1,598.13
Brockhampton with Much Fawley Parish Council	3,900.00	100.85	38.67	35.07	9.3%	1,612.44
Brockhampton Group Parish Council	9,500.00	333.16	28.51	25.43	10.8%	1,602.28
Bromyard & Winslow Town Council	240,815.00	1,449.93	166.09	171.05	(3.0%)	1,739.86
Burghill Parish Council	20,962.00	713.86	29.36	29.75	(1.3%)	1,603.13
Callow & Haywood Group Parish Council	7,500.00	223.43	33.57	32.17	4.2%	1,607.34
Cleghonger Parish Council	22,800.00	506.30	45.03	46.98	(4.3%)	1,618.80
Clifford Parish Council	5,500.00	259.21	21.22	21.47	(1.2%)	1,594.99
Colwall Parish Council	86,800.00	1,195.64	72.60	71.48	1.5%	1,646.37
Malvern Hills Trust (Colwall Parish Council)	44,800.00		37.47	36.41	2.8%	37.47
Cradley Parish Council	45,000.00	816.07	55.14	55.87	(1.3%)	1,628.91
Credenhill Parish Council	43,951.00	652.28	67.38	48.34	28.3%	1,641.15
Cusop Parish Council	8,500.00	188.79	45.02	47.77	(6.1%)	1,618.79
Dilwyn Parish Council	25,000.00	310.26	80.58	81.56	(1.2%)	1,654.35
Dinedor Parish Council	9,500.00	132.50	71.70	69.50	3.1%	1,645.47
Dinmore Parish Meeting	-	9.65	-	-	-	1,573.77
Dormington & Mordiford Group Parish Council	22,445.00	314.97	71.26	70.64	0.9%	1,645.03
Dorstone Parish Council	6,500.00	183.06	35.51	35.59	(0.2%)	1,609.28
Eardisland Parish Council	25,408.00	232.79	109.15	107.93	1.1%	1,682.92
Eardisley Group Parish Council	17,000.00	522.14	32.56	23.35	28.3%	1,606.33
Eastnor & Donnington Parish Council	5,250.00	144.24	36.40	35.33	2.9%	1,610.17
Eaton Bishop Parish Council	13,250.00	192.95	68.67	68.66	0.0%	1,642.44
Ewyas Harold Group Parish Council	46,854.00	439.40	106.63	108.01	(1.3%)	1,680.40
Fownhope Parish Council	30,000.00	432.38	69.38	69.43	(0.1%)	1,643.15
Foxley Group Parish Council	2,500.00	160.43	15.58	19.93	(27.9%)	1,589.35
Garway Parish Council	17,160.00	174.25	98.48	99.50	(1.0%)	1,672.25
Goodrich & Welsh Bicknor Group Parish Council	8,979.00	269.55	33.31	33.91	(1.8%)	1,607.08
Hampton Bishop Parish Council	17,500.00	316.21	55.34	54.10	2.2%	1,629.11
Hampton Charles Parish Meeting	-	20.74	-	-	-	1,573.77
Hatfield and District Group Parish Council	6,000.00	204.39	29.36	36.42	(24.0%)	1,603.13
Hereford City Council	897,500.00	16,417.61	54.67	53.34	2.4%	1,628.44
Holme Lacy Parish Council	19,500.00	197.00	98.98	93.06	6.0%	1,672.75
Holmer & Shelwick Parish Council	18,000.00	963.58	18.68	19.91	(6.6%)	1,592.45
Hope Mansell Parish Council	2,000.00	130.27	15.35	18.96	(23.5%)	1,589.12
Hope under Dinmore Group Parish Council	11,750.00	158.49	74.14	74.08	0.1%	1,647.91

**Herefordshire Council requirement by Parish, including Band D equivalent**

Parish	Parish Precept	Tax Base (Band D)	2020/21 Parish Precept Basic Tax Rate (Band D)	2019/20 Parish Precept Basic Tax Rate (Band D)	% change from 2019/20 to 2020/21	Band D Charge (Parish and Herefordshire Council's Basic Rate - £1,573.77)
	£		£	£	%	£
How Caple, Sollershope & Yatton Group Parish Council	8,405.00	157.76	53.28	53.08	0.4%	1,627.05
Humber, Stoke Prior & Ford Group Parish Council	12,289.00	294.63	41.71	42.92	(2.9%)	1,615.48
Huntington Parish Council	750.00	48.92	15.33	15.08	1.6%	1,589.10
Kentchurch Parish Council	8,500.00	103.15	82.40	73.58	10.7%	1,656.17
Kilpeck Group Parish Council	17,600.00	199.63	88.16	89.05	(1.0%)	1,661.93
Kimbolton Parish Council	9,551.50	203.81	46.86	42.05	10.3%	1,620.63
Kings Caple Parish Council	8,000.00	145.96	54.81	45.94	16.2%	1,628.58
Kingsland Parish Council	16,000.00	499.66	32.02	30.58	4.5%	1,605.79
Kingstone & Thrupton Group Parish Council	12,000.00	445.66	26.93	27.55	(2.3%)	1,600.70
Kington Rural and Lower Harpton Group Parish Council	7,000.00	235.48	29.73	27.02	9.1%	1,603.50
Kington Town Council	109,000.00	906.99	120.18	115.72	3.7%	1,693.95
Kinnersley and District Group Parish Council	6,500.00	250.43	25.96	26.09	(0.5%)	1,599.73
Lea Parish Council	16,000.00	282.02	56.73	58.62	(3.3%)	1,630.50
Ledbury Town Council	531,978.00	3,422.84	155.42	139.44	10.3%	1,729.19
Leintwardine Group Parish Council	25,043.00	455.12	55.03	55.79	(1.4%)	1,628.80
Leominster Town Council	557,574.00	3,678.52	151.58	139.95	7.7%	1,725.35
Linton Parish Council	12,000.00	479.92	25.00	25.50	(2.0%)	1,598.77
Little Birch Parish Council	5,700.00	101.74	56.03	55.54	0.9%	1,629.80
Little Dewchurch Parish Council	10,369.00	181.23	57.21	56.99	0.4%	1,630.98
Llangarron Parish Council	27,500.00	512.01	53.71	46.11	14.2%	1,627.48
Llanwarne & District Group Parish Council	9,500.00	281.47	33.75	35.20	(4.3%)	1,607.52
Longtown Group Parish Council	17,165.00	419.34	40.93	40.91	0.0%	1,614.70
Lower Bullingham Parish Council	13,000.00	601.75	21.60	20.04	7.2%	1,595.37
Luston Group Parish Council	16,000.00	388.36	41.20	41.92	(1.7%)	1,614.97
Lyonshall Parish Council	20,000.00	292.38	68.40	68.65	(0.4%)	1,642.17
Madley Parish Council	23,200.00	420.60	55.16	55.03	0.2%	1,628.93
Marden Parish Council	51,500.00	554.70	92.84	95.37	(2.7%)	1,666.61
Marstow Parish Council	9,000.00	167.65	53.68	51.01	5.0%	1,627.45
Mathon Parish Council	7,998.00	161.10	49.65	47.94	3.4%	1,623.42
Malvern Hills Trust (Mathon)	5,950.00		36.93	36.17	2.1%	36.93
Middleton-on-the-Hill and Leysters Group Parish Council	4,223.00	190.19	22.20	23.12	(4.1%)	1,595.97
Monkland and Stretford Parish Council	9,450.00	81.99	115.26	120.11	(4.2%)	1,689.03
Moreton on Lugg Parish Council	20,000.00	297.01	67.34	66.15	1.8%	1,641.11
Much Birch Parish Council	6,750.00	412.43	16.37	16.45	(0.5%)	1,590.14
Much Cowarne Group Parish Council	3,708.00	212.26	17.47	17.08	2.2%	1,591.24
Much Dewchurch Parish Council	8,500.00	265.52	32.01	32.09	(0.2%)	1,605.78
Much Marcle Parish Council	8,830.00	304.63	28.99	24.46	15.6%	1,602.76
North Bromyard Group Parish Council	10,000.00	349.21	28.64	30.05	(4.9%)	1,602.41
Ocle Pychard Parish Council	17,500.00	264.14	66.25	64.35	2.9%	1,640.02
Orcop Parish Council	9,200.00	170.91	53.83	53.51	0.6%	1,627.60
Orleton Parish Council	25,500.00	366.94	69.49	68.28	1.7%	1,643.26
Pembridge Parish Council	34,000.00	479.01	70.98	52.28	26.3%	1,644.75
Pencombe Group Parish Council	13,750.00	196.08	70.12	64.68	7.8%	1,643.89
Peterchurch Parish Council	21,660.00	387.64	55.88	56.97	(2.0%)	1,629.65
Peterstow Parish Council	9,160.25	194.39	47.12	42.99	8.8%	1,620.89
Pipe and Lyde Parish Council	3,780.00	146.46	25.81	22.33	13.5%	1,599.58
Pixley & District Parish Council	8,580.00	230.73	37.19	37.63	(1.2%)	1,610.96
Putley Parish Council	9,000.00	106.69	84.36	86.69	(2.8%)	1,658.13
Pyons Group Parish Council	13,500.00	400.88	33.68	33.81	(0.4%)	1,607.45
Richard's Castle (Herefordshire) Parish Council	8,500.00	131.95	64.42	53.60	16.8%	1,638.19
Ross-on-Wye Parish Council	515,328.00	3,926.51	131.24	128.67	2.0%	1,705.01
Sellack Parish Council	8,000.00	126.32	63.33	56.11	11.4%	1,637.10
Shobdon Parish Council	25,000.00	335.87	74.43	68.81	7.6%	1,648.20
St. Weonards Parish Council	6,900.00	156.39	44.12	44.54	(1.0%)	1,617.89
Stapleton Group Parish Council	9,400.00	145.38	64.66	65.43	(1.2%)	1,638.43
Staunton-on-Wye and District Group Parish Council	3,600.00	200.92	17.92	17.32	3.3%	1,591.69

**Herefordshire Council requirement by Parish, including Band D equivalent**

Parish	Parish Precept	Tax Base (Band D)	2020/21 Parish Precept Basic Tax Rate (Band D)	2019/20 Parish Precept Basic Tax Rate (Band D)	% change from 2019/20 to 2020/21	Band D Charge (Parish and Herefordshire Council's Basic Rate - £1,573.77)
	£		£	£	%	£
Stoke Edith Parish Meeting (Chairman)	-	44.20	-	-	-	1,573.77
Stoke Lacy Parish Council	9,000.00	154.16	58.38	56.48	3.3%	1,632.15
Stretton Grandison Group Parish Council	14,000.00	228.70	61.22	39.12	36.1%	1,634.99
Stretton Sugwas Parish Council	7,500.00	147.64	50.80	52.03	(2.4%)	1,624.57
Sutton Parish Council	28,577.00	403.57	70.81	72.17	(1.9%)	1,644.58
Tarrington Parish Council	16,350.00	225.97	72.35	93.48	(29.2%)	1,646.12
Thornbury Group Parish Council	4,750.00	185.99	25.54	25.12	1.6%	1,599.31
Titley and District Group Parish Council	10,500.00	231.51	45.35	46.91	(3.4%)	1,619.12
Upton Bishop Parish Council	17,728.00	269.05	65.89	32.91	50.1%	1,639.66
Vowchurch & District Group Parish Council	12,336.50	316.91	38.93	35.53	8.7%	1,612.70
Walford Parish Council	TBC	654.70	TBC	40.75	TBC	TBC
Wellington Parish Council	22,500.00	461.00	48.81	49.11	(0.6%)	1,622.58
Wellington Heath Parish Council	9,500.00	241.51	39.34	40.28	(2.4%)	1,613.11
Welsh Newton & Llanrothal Group Parish Council	13,900.00	149.38	93.05	89.85	3.4%	1,666.82
Weobley Parish Council	28,465.00	468.65	60.74	58.49	3.7%	1,634.51
Weston Beggard Parish Council	4,000.00	87.31	45.81	35.61	22.3%	1,619.58
Weston-under-Penyard Parish Council	7,500.00	483.77	15.50	26.16	(68.8%)	1,589.27
Whitbourne Parish Council	12,000.00	346.16	34.67	34.77	(0.3%)	1,608.44
Whitchurch & Ganarew Group Parish Council	50,000.00	512.62	97.54	96.68	0.9%	1,671.31
Wigmore Group Parish Council	23,800.00	365.83	65.06	49.03	24.6%	1,638.83
Withington Group Parish Council	22,000.00	691.33	31.82	32.57	(2.4%)	1,605.59
Woolhope Parish Council	12,500.00	217.01	57.60	53.47	7.2%	1,631.37
Wyeside Group Parish Council	9,720.00	301.21	32.27	32.68	(1.3%)	1,606.04
Yarkhill Parish Council	8,085.00	139.31	58.04	57.17	1.5%	1,631.81
Yarpole Group Parish Council	24,000.00	352.99	67.99	63.70	6.3%	1,641.76
<b>Total/Average</b>	<b>TBC</b>	<b>69,756.27</b>	<b>TBC</b>	<b>67.16</b>	<b>TBC</b>	<b>TBC</b>





Council Tax for each valuation band, by Parish, without the Police & Fire precepts								
PARISH	VALUATION BANDS							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Abbeystre & Bacton Group Parish Council	1,086.54	1,267.63	1,448.72	1,629.81	1,991.99	2,354.17	2,716.35	3,259.62
Aconbury Parish Meeting	1,051.89	1,227.21	1,402.53	1,577.84	1,928.47	2,279.10	2,629.73	3,155.68
Acton Beauchamp Group Parish Council	1,072.81	1,251.60	1,430.41	1,609.21	1,966.82	2,324.41	2,682.02	3,218.42
Allensmore Parish Council	1,064.92	1,242.40	1,419.90	1,597.38	1,952.36	2,307.32	2,662.30	3,194.76
Almeley Parish Council	1,089.26	1,270.80	1,452.35	1,633.89	1,996.98	2,360.06	2,723.15	3,267.78
Ashperton Parish Council	1,099.21	1,282.40	1,465.61	1,648.81	2,015.22	2,381.61	2,748.02	3,297.62
Aston Ingham Parish Council	1,072.79	1,251.59	1,430.39	1,609.19	1,966.79	2,324.38	2,681.98	3,218.38
Avenbury Parish Council	1,076.85	1,256.32	1,435.80	1,615.27	1,974.22	2,333.16	2,692.12	3,230.54
Aymestrey Parish Council	1,093.44	1,275.68	1,457.92	1,640.16	2,004.64	2,369.12	2,733.60	3,280.32
Ballingham, Bolstone & Hentland Group	1,078.73	1,258.52	1,438.31	1,618.10	1,977.68	2,337.25	2,696.83	3,236.20
Bartestree & Lugwardine Group Parish Council	1,085.69	1,266.64	1,447.59	1,628.54	1,990.44	2,352.33	2,714.23	3,257.08
Belmont Rural Parish Council	1,079.23	1,259.09	1,438.97	1,618.84	1,978.59	2,338.32	2,698.07	3,237.68
Birley with Upper Hill Parish Council	1,063.48	1,240.72	1,417.98	1,595.22	1,949.72	2,304.20	2,658.70	3,190.44
Bishop's Frome Parish Council	1,097.30	1,280.18	1,463.07	1,645.95	2,011.72	2,377.48	2,743.25	3,291.90
Bishopstone & District Group Parish Council	1,076.35	1,255.73	1,435.13	1,614.52	1,973.31	2,332.08	2,690.87	3,229.04
Bodenham Parish Council	1,069.41	1,247.65	1,425.89	1,604.12	1,960.59	2,317.06	2,673.53	3,208.24
Border Group Parish Council	1,069.87	1,248.18	1,426.50	1,604.81	1,961.44	2,318.06	2,674.68	3,209.62
Bosbury and Coddington Parish Council	1,086.55	1,267.63	1,448.73	1,629.82	1,992.01	2,354.18	2,716.37	3,259.64
Brampton Abbots & Foy Group Parish Council	1,089.80	1,271.43	1,453.07	1,634.70	1,997.97	2,361.23	2,724.50	3,269.40
Bredenbury & District Group Parish Council	1,084.82	1,265.62	1,446.43	1,627.23	1,988.84	2,350.44	2,712.05	3,254.46
Breinton Parish Council	1,070.84	1,249.31	1,427.79	1,606.26	1,963.21	2,320.15	2,677.10	3,212.52
Bridstow Parish Council	1,062.45	1,239.52	1,416.60	1,593.67	1,947.82	2,301.96	2,656.12	3,187.34
Brilley Parish Council	1,114.03	1,299.70	1,485.38	1,671.05	2,042.40	2,413.74	2,785.08	3,342.10
Brimfield and Little Hereford Group Parish Council	1,065.42	1,242.99	1,420.56	1,598.13	1,953.27	2,308.41	2,663.55	3,196.26
Brockhampton with Much Fawley Parish Council	1,074.96	1,254.12	1,433.28	1,612.44	1,970.76	2,329.08	2,687.40	3,224.88
Brockhampton Group Parish Council	1,068.19	1,246.21	1,424.25	1,602.28	1,958.35	2,314.40	2,670.47	3,204.56
Bromyard & Winslow Town Council	1,159.91	1,353.22	1,546.55	1,739.86	2,126.50	2,513.13	2,899.77	3,479.72
Burghill Parish Council	1,068.75	1,246.88	1,425.01	1,603.13	1,959.38	2,315.63	2,671.88	3,206.26
Callow & Haywood Group Parish Council	1,071.56	1,250.15	1,428.75	1,607.34	1,964.53	2,321.71	2,678.90	3,214.68
Cleghonger Parish Council	1,079.20	1,259.06	1,438.94	1,618.80	1,978.54	2,338.26	2,698.00	3,237.60
Clifford Parish Council	1,063.33	1,240.54	1,417.77	1,594.99	1,949.44	2,303.87	2,658.32	3,189.98
Colwall Parish Council (inc Malvern Hills Trust)	1,122.56	1,309.65	1,496.75	1,683.84	2,058.03	2,432.21	2,806.40	3,367.68
Cradley Parish Council	1,085.94	1,266.93	1,447.92	1,628.91	1,990.89	2,352.87	2,714.85	3,257.82
Credehill Parish Council	1,094.10	1,276.45	1,458.80	1,641.15	2,005.85	2,370.55	2,735.25	3,282.30
Cusop Parish Council	1,079.19	1,259.06	1,438.93	1,618.79	1,978.52	2,338.25	2,697.98	3,237.58
Dilwyn Parish Council	1,102.90	1,286.71	1,470.54	1,654.35	2,021.99	2,389.61	2,757.25	3,308.70
Dinedor Parish Council	1,096.98	1,279.81	1,462.64	1,645.47	2,011.13	2,376.79	2,742.45	3,290.94
Dinmore Parish Meeting	1,049.18	1,224.04	1,398.91	1,573.77	1,923.50	2,273.22	2,622.95	3,147.54
Dormington & Mordiford Group Parish Council	1,096.69	1,279.46	1,462.25	1,645.03	2,010.60	2,376.15	2,741.72	3,290.06
Dorstone Parish Council	1,072.85	1,251.66	1,430.47	1,609.28	1,966.90	2,324.51	2,682.13	3,218.56
Eardisland Parish Council	1,121.95	1,308.93	1,495.93	1,682.92	2,056.91	2,430.88	2,804.87	3,365.84
Eardisley Group Parish Council	1,070.89	1,249.36	1,427.85	1,606.33	1,963.30	2,320.25	2,677.22	3,212.66
Eastnor & Donnington Parish Council	1,073.45	1,252.35	1,431.27	1,610.17	1,967.99	2,325.80	2,683.62	3,220.34
Eaton Bishop Parish Council	1,094.96	1,277.45	1,459.95	1,642.44	2,007.43	2,372.41	2,737.40	3,284.88
Ewyas Harold Group Parish Council	1,120.27	1,306.97	1,493.69	1,680.40	2,053.83	2,427.24	2,800.67	3,360.80
Fownhope Parish Council	1,095.43	1,278.00	1,460.58	1,643.15	2,008.30	2,373.44	2,738.58	3,286.30
Foxley Group Parish Council	1,059.57	1,236.16	1,412.76	1,589.35	1,942.54	2,295.72	2,648.92	3,178.70
Garway Parish Council	1,114.83	1,300.64	1,486.45	1,672.25	2,043.86	2,415.47	2,787.08	3,344.50
Goodrich & Welsh Bicknor Group Parish Council	1,071.39	1,249.95	1,428.52	1,607.08	1,964.21	2,321.33	2,678.47	3,214.16
Hampton Bishop Parish Council	1,086.07	1,267.08	1,448.10	1,629.11	1,991.14	2,353.16	2,715.18	3,258.22
Hampton Charles Parish Meeting	1,049.18	1,224.04	1,398.91	1,573.77	1,923.50	2,273.22	2,622.95	3,147.54
Hatfield and District Group Parish Council	1,068.75	1,246.88	1,425.01	1,603.13	1,959.38	2,315.63	2,671.88	3,206.26
Hereford City Council	1,085.63	1,266.56	1,447.51	1,628.44	1,990.32	2,352.19	2,714.07	3,256.88
Holme Lacy Parish Council	1,115.17	1,301.02	1,486.89	1,672.75	2,044.48	2,416.19	2,787.92	3,345.50
Holmer & Shelwick Parish Council	1,061.63	1,238.57	1,415.51	1,592.45	1,946.33	2,300.20	2,654.08	3,184.90
Hope Mansell Parish Council	1,059.41	1,235.98	1,412.55	1,589.12	1,942.26	2,295.39	2,648.53	3,178.24
Hope under Dinmore Group Parish Council	1,098.61	1,281.70	1,464.81	1,647.91	2,014.12	2,380.31	2,746.52	3,295.82
How Caple, Sollershope & Yatton Group Parish Council	1,084.70	1,265.48	1,446.27	1,627.05	1,988.62	2,350.18	2,711.75	3,254.10
Humber, Stoke Prior & Ford Group Parish Council	1,076.99	1,256.48	1,435.99	1,615.48	1,974.48	2,333.47	2,692.47	3,230.96
Huntington Parish Council	1,059.40	1,235.96	1,412.54	1,589.10	1,942.24	2,295.36	2,648.50	3,178.20
Kentchurch Parish Council	1,104.11	1,288.13	1,472.15	1,656.17	2,024.21	2,392.24	2,760.28	3,312.34
Kilpeck Group Parish Council	1,107.95	1,292.61	1,477.27	1,661.93	2,031.25	2,400.56	2,769.88	3,323.86
Kimbolton Parish Council	1,080.42	1,260.49	1,440.56	1,620.63	1,980.77	2,340.91	2,701.05	3,241.26
Kings Caple Parish Council	1,085.72	1,266.67	1,447.63	1,628.58	1,990.49	2,352.39	2,714.30	3,257.16
Kingsland Parish Council	1,070.53	1,248.94	1,427.37	1,605.79	1,962.64	2,319.47	2,676.32	3,211.58
Kingstone & Thrupton Group Parish Council	1,067.13	1,244.99	1,422.85	1,600.70	1,956.41	2,312.12	2,667.83	3,201.40
Kington Rural and Lower Harpton Group Parish Council	1,069.00	1,247.16	1,425.34	1,603.50	1,959.84	2,316.16	2,672.50	3,207.00
Kington Town Council	1,129.30	1,317.51	1,505.74	1,693.95	2,070.39	2,446.81	2,823.25	3,387.90
Kinnersley and District Group Parish Council	1,066.49	1,244.23	1,421.99	1,599.73	1,955.23	2,310.72	2,666.22	3,199.46

<b>Council Tax for each valuation band, by Parish, without the Police &amp; Fire precepts</b>								
PARISH	VALUATION BANDS							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Lea Parish Council	1,087.00	1,268.16	1,449.34	1,630.50	1,992.84	2,355.16	2,717.50	3,261.00
Ledbury Town Council	1,152.79	1,344.92	1,537.06	1,729.19	2,113.46	2,497.72	2,881.98	3,458.38
Leintwardine Group Parish Council	1,085.87	1,266.84	1,447.83	1,628.80	1,990.76	2,352.71	2,714.67	3,257.60
Leominster Town Council	1,150.23	1,341.94	1,533.65	1,725.35	2,108.76	2,492.17	2,875.58	3,450.70
Linton Parish Council	1,065.85	1,243.48	1,421.13	1,598.77	1,954.06	2,309.33	2,664.62	3,197.54
Little Birch Parish Council	1,086.53	1,267.62	1,448.71	1,629.80	1,991.98	2,354.15	2,716.33	3,259.60
Little Dewchurch Parish Council	1,087.32	1,268.54	1,449.76	1,630.98	1,993.42	2,355.86	2,718.30	3,261.96
Llangarron Parish Council	1,084.99	1,265.81	1,446.65	1,627.48	1,989.15	2,350.80	2,712.47	3,254.96
Llanwarne & District Group Parish Council	1,071.68	1,250.29	1,428.91	1,607.52	1,964.75	2,321.97	2,679.20	3,215.04
Longtown Group Parish Council	1,076.47	1,255.87	1,435.29	1,614.70	1,973.53	2,332.34	2,691.17	3,229.40
Lower Bullingham Parish Council	1,063.58	1,240.84	1,418.11	1,595.37	1,949.90	2,304.42	2,658.95	3,190.74
Luston Group Parish Council	1,076.65	1,256.08	1,435.53	1,614.97	1,973.86	2,332.73	2,691.62	3,229.94
Lyonshall Parish Council	1,094.78	1,277.24	1,459.71	1,642.17	2,007.10	2,372.02	2,736.95	3,284.34
Madley Parish Council	1,085.95	1,266.94	1,447.94	1,628.93	1,990.92	2,352.90	2,714.88	3,257.86
Marden Parish Council	1,111.07	1,296.25	1,481.43	1,666.61	2,036.97	2,407.32	2,777.68	3,333.22
Marstow Parish Council	1,084.97	1,265.79	1,446.63	1,627.45	1,989.11	2,350.76	2,712.42	3,254.90
Mathon Parish Council (inc Malvern Hills Trust)	1,106.90	1,291.38	1,475.87	1,660.35	2,029.32	2,398.28	2,767.25	3,320.70
Middleton-on-the-Hill and Leysters Group Parish Council	1,063.98	1,241.31	1,418.64	1,595.97	1,950.63	2,305.29	2,659.95	3,191.94
Monkland and Stretford Parish Council	1,126.02	1,313.69	1,501.36	1,689.03	2,064.37	2,439.71	2,815.05	3,378.06
Moreton on Lugg Parish Council	1,094.07	1,276.42	1,458.77	1,641.11	2,005.80	2,370.49	2,735.18	3,282.22
Much Birch Parish Council	1,060.09	1,236.77	1,413.46	1,590.14	1,943.51	2,296.87	2,650.23	3,180.28
Much Cowarne Group Parish Council	1,060.83	1,237.63	1,414.44	1,591.24	1,944.85	2,298.45	2,652.07	3,182.48
Much Dewchurch Parish Council	1,070.52	1,248.94	1,427.36	1,605.78	1,962.62	2,319.46	2,676.30	3,211.56
Much Marcle Parish Council	1,068.51	1,246.59	1,424.68	1,602.76	1,958.93	2,315.09	2,671.27	3,205.52
North Bromyard Group Parish Council	1,068.27	1,246.32	1,424.37	1,602.41	1,958.50	2,314.59	2,670.68	3,204.82
Ocle Pychard Parish Council	1,093.35	1,275.57	1,457.80	1,640.02	2,004.47	2,368.91	2,733.37	3,280.04
Orcop Parish Council	1,085.07	1,265.91	1,446.76	1,627.60	1,989.29	2,350.97	2,712.67	3,255.20
Orleton Parish Council	1,095.51	1,278.09	1,460.68	1,643.26	2,008.43	2,373.59	2,738.77	3,286.52
Pembridge Parish Council	1,096.50	1,279.25	1,462.00	1,644.75	2,010.25	2,375.75	2,741.25	3,289.50
Pencombe Group Parish Council	1,095.93	1,278.58	1,461.24	1,643.89	2,009.20	2,374.50	2,739.82	3,287.78
Peterchurch Parish Council	1,086.43	1,267.50	1,448.58	1,629.65	1,991.80	2,353.94	2,716.08	3,259.30
Peterstow Parish Council	1,080.59	1,260.69	1,440.79	1,620.89	1,981.09	2,341.28	2,701.48	3,241.78
Pipe and Lyde Parish Council	1,066.39	1,244.11	1,421.85	1,599.58	1,955.05	2,310.50	2,665.97	3,199.16
Pixley & District Parish Council	1,073.97	1,252.97	1,431.97	1,610.96	1,968.95	2,326.94	2,684.93	3,221.92
Putley Parish Council	1,105.42	1,289.65	1,473.90	1,658.13	2,026.61	2,395.07	2,763.55	3,316.26
Pyons Group Parish Council	1,071.63	1,250.24	1,428.85	1,607.45	1,964.66	2,321.87	2,679.08	3,214.90
Richard's Castle (Herefordshire) Parish Council	1,092.13	1,274.14	1,456.17	1,638.19	2,002.24	2,366.27	2,730.32	3,276.38
Ross-on-Wye Parish Council	1,136.67	1,326.12	1,515.57	1,705.01	2,083.90	2,462.79	2,841.68	3,410.02
Sellack Parish Council	1,091.40	1,273.30	1,455.20	1,637.10	2,000.90	2,364.70	2,728.50	3,274.20
Shobdon Parish Council	1,098.80	1,281.93	1,465.07	1,648.20	2,014.47	2,380.73	2,747.00	3,296.40
St. Weonards Parish Council	1,078.59	1,258.36	1,438.13	1,617.89	1,977.42	2,336.95	2,696.48	3,235.78
Stapleton Group Parish Council	1,092.29	1,274.33	1,456.39	1,638.43	2,002.53	2,366.62	2,730.72	3,276.86
Staunton-on-Wye and District Group Parish Council	1,061.13	1,237.98	1,414.84	1,591.69	1,945.40	2,299.10	2,652.82	3,183.38
Stoke Edith Parish Meeting	1,049.18	1,224.04	1,398.91	1,573.77	1,923.50	2,273.22	2,622.95	3,147.54
Stoke Lacy Parish Council	1,088.10	1,269.45	1,450.80	1,632.15	1,994.85	2,357.55	2,720.25	3,264.30
Stretton Grandison Group Parish Council	1,089.99	1,271.66	1,453.33	1,634.99	1,998.32	2,361.65	2,724.98	3,269.98
Stretton Sugwas Parish Council	1,083.05	1,263.55	1,444.07	1,624.57	1,985.59	2,346.60	2,707.62	3,249.14
Sutton Parish Council	1,096.39	1,279.11	1,461.85	1,644.58	2,010.05	2,375.50	2,740.97	3,289.16
Tarrington Parish Council	1,097.41	1,280.31	1,463.22	1,646.12	2,011.93	2,377.73	2,743.53	3,292.24
Thornbury Group Parish Council	1,066.21	1,243.90	1,421.61	1,599.31	1,954.72	2,310.11	2,665.52	3,198.62
Titley and District Group Parish Council	1,079.41	1,259.31	1,439.22	1,619.12	1,978.93	2,338.73	2,698.53	3,238.24
Upton Bishop Parish Council	1,093.11	1,275.29	1,457.48	1,639.66	2,004.03	2,368.39	2,732.77	3,279.32
Vowchurch & District Group Parish Council	1,075.13	1,254.32	1,433.51	1,612.70	1,971.08	2,329.45	2,687.83	3,225.40
Walford Parish Council	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC
Wellington Parish Council	1,081.72	1,262.00	1,442.30	1,622.58	1,983.16	2,343.72	2,704.30	3,245.16
Wellington Heath Parish Council	1,075.41	1,254.64	1,433.88	1,613.11	1,971.58	2,330.04	2,688.52	3,226.22
Welsh Newton & Llanrothal Group Parish Council	1,111.21	1,296.41	1,481.62	1,666.82	2,037.23	2,407.63	2,778.03	3,333.64
Weobley Parish Council	1,089.67	1,271.28	1,452.90	1,634.51	1,997.74	2,360.96	2,724.18	3,269.02
Weston Beggard Parish Council	1,079.72	1,259.67	1,439.63	1,619.58	1,979.49	2,339.39	2,699.30	3,239.16
Weston-under-Penyard Parish Council	1,059.51	1,236.10	1,412.69	1,589.27	1,942.44	2,295.61	2,648.78	3,178.54
Whitbourne Parish Council	1,072.29	1,251.01	1,429.73	1,608.44	1,965.87	2,323.30	2,680.73	3,216.88
Whitchurch & Ganarew Group Parish Council	1,114.21	1,299.90	1,485.61	1,671.31	2,042.72	2,414.11	2,785.52	3,342.62
Wigmore Group Parish Council	1,092.55	1,274.64	1,456.74	1,638.83	2,003.02	2,367.20	2,731.38	3,277.66
Withington Group Parish Council	1,070.39	1,248.79	1,427.19	1,605.59	1,962.39	2,319.18	2,675.98	3,211.18
Woolhope Parish Council	1,087.58	1,268.84	1,450.11	1,631.37	1,993.90	2,356.42	2,718.95	3,262.74
Wyeside Group Parish Council	1,070.69	1,249.14	1,427.59	1,606.04	1,962.94	2,319.83	2,676.73	3,212.08
Yarkhill Parish Council	1,087.87	1,269.18	1,450.50	1,631.81	1,994.44	2,357.06	2,719.68	3,263.62
Yarpole Group Parish Council	1,094.51	1,276.92	1,459.35	1,641.76	2,006.60	2,371.43	2,736.27	3,283.52

**The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for West Mercia**  
**precept requirement for each valuation band**

	VALUATION BANDS							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
<b>Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for West Mercia</b>	150.13	175.15	200.17	225.20	275.24	325.28	375.33	450.39

A total 2020/21 precept from Herefordshire Council of £15,708,861 (2019/20 £14,911,762)

The band D council tax charge amounts to £225.20 an increase of £8.54 or 3.9% over the previous year.



**Hereford & Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority**  
**precept requirement for each valuation band**

	VALUATION BANDS							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
<b>Hereford &amp; Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority</b>	57.33	66.88	76.44	85.99	105.10	124.21	143.32	171.98

A 2020/21 total precept from Herefordshire Council of £5,998,340 (2019/20 £5,804,784)

The band D council tax charge for Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority amounts to £85.99, an increase of £1.65 or 2.0% over the previous year.



<b>Council Tax for each valuation band, by Parish, including the Police &amp; Fire precepts</b>								
PARISH	VALUATION BANDS							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Abbeydore & Bacton Group Parish Council	1,294.00	1,509.66	1,725.33	1,941.00	2,372.33	2,803.66	3,235.00	3,881.99
Aconbury Parish Meeting	1,259.35	1,469.24	1,679.14	1,889.03	2,308.81	2,728.59	3,148.38	3,778.05
Acton Beauchamp Group Parish Council	1,280.27	1,493.63	1,707.02	1,920.40	2,347.16	2,773.90	3,200.67	3,840.79
Allensmore Parish Council	1,272.38	1,484.43	1,696.51	1,908.57	2,332.70	2,756.81	3,180.95	3,817.13
Almeley Parish Council	1,296.72	1,512.83	1,728.96	1,945.08	2,377.32	2,809.55	3,241.80	3,890.15
Ashperton Parish Council	1,306.67	1,524.43	1,742.22	1,960.00	2,395.56	2,831.10	3,266.67	3,919.99
Aston Ingham Parish Council	1,280.25	1,493.62	1,707.00	1,920.38	2,347.13	2,773.87	3,200.63	3,840.75
Avenbury Parish Council	1,284.31	1,498.35	1,712.41	1,926.46	2,354.56	2,782.65	3,210.77	3,852.91
Aymestrey Parish Council	1,300.90	1,517.71	1,734.53	1,951.35	2,384.98	2,818.61	3,252.25	3,902.69
Ballingham, Bolstone & Hentland Group	1,286.19	1,500.55	1,714.92	1,929.29	2,358.02	2,786.74	3,215.48	3,858.57
Bartestree & Lugwardine Group Parish Council	1,293.15	1,508.67	1,724.20	1,939.73	2,370.78	2,801.82	3,232.88	3,879.45
Belmont Rural Parish Council	1,286.69	1,501.12	1,715.58	1,930.03	2,358.93	2,787.81	3,216.72	3,860.05
Birley with Upper Hill Parish Council	1,270.94	1,482.75	1,694.59	1,906.41	2,330.06	2,753.69	3,177.35	3,812.81
Bishop's Frome Parish Council	1,304.76	1,522.21	1,739.68	1,957.14	2,392.06	2,826.97	3,261.90	3,914.27
Bishopstone Group Parish Council	1,283.81	1,497.76	1,711.74	1,925.71	2,353.65	2,781.57	3,209.52	3,851.41
Bodenham Parish Council	1,276.87	1,489.68	1,702.50	1,915.31	2,340.93	2,766.55	3,192.18	3,830.61
Border Group Parish Council	1,277.33	1,490.21	1,703.11	1,916.00	2,341.78	2,767.55	3,193.33	3,831.99
Bosbury and Coddington Parish Council	1,294.01	1,509.66	1,725.34	1,941.01	2,372.35	2,803.67	3,235.02	3,882.01
Brampton Abbots & Foy Group Parish Council	1,297.26	1,513.46	1,729.68	1,945.89	2,378.31	2,810.72	3,243.15	3,891.77
Bredenbury & District Group Parish Council	1,292.28	1,507.65	1,723.04	1,938.42	2,369.18	2,799.93	3,230.70	3,876.83
Breinton Parish Council	1,278.30	1,491.34	1,704.40	1,917.45	2,343.55	2,769.64	3,195.75	3,834.89
Bridstow Parish Council	1,269.91	1,481.55	1,693.21	1,904.86	2,328.16	2,751.45	3,174.77	3,809.71
Brilley Parish Council	1,321.49	1,541.73	1,761.99	1,982.24	2,422.74	2,863.23	3,303.73	3,964.47
Brimfield and Little Hereford Group Parish Council	1,272.88	1,485.02	1,697.17	1,909.32	2,333.61	2,757.90	3,182.20	3,818.63
Brockhampton with Much Fawley Parish Council	1,282.42	1,496.15	1,709.89	1,923.63	2,351.10	2,778.57	3,206.05	3,847.25
Brockhampton Group Parish Council	1,275.65	1,488.24	1,700.86	1,913.47	2,338.69	2,763.89	3,189.12	3,826.93
Bromyard & Winslow Town Council	1,367.37	1,595.25	1,823.16	2,051.05	2,506.84	2,962.62	3,418.42	4,102.09
Burghill Parish Council	1,276.21	1,488.91	1,701.62	1,914.32	2,339.72	2,765.12	3,190.53	3,828.63
Callow & Haywood Group Parish Council	1,279.02	1,492.18	1,705.36	1,918.53	2,344.87	2,771.20	3,197.55	3,837.05
Clehonger Parish Council	1,286.66	1,501.09	1,715.55	1,929.99	2,358.88	2,787.75	3,216.65	3,859.97
Clifford Parish Council	1,270.79	1,482.57	1,694.38	1,906.18	2,329.78	2,753.36	3,176.97	3,812.35
Colwall Parish Council (including Malvern Hills Trust (C	1,330.02	1,551.68	1,773.36	1,995.03	2,438.37	2,881.70	3,325.05	3,990.05
Cradley Parish Council	1,293.40	1,508.96	1,724.53	1,940.10	2,371.23	2,802.36	3,233.50	3,880.19
Credenhill Parish Council	1,301.56	1,518.48	1,735.41	1,952.34	2,386.19	2,820.04	3,253.90	3,904.67
Cusop Parish Council	1,286.65	1,501.09	1,715.54	1,929.98	2,358.86	2,787.74	3,216.63	3,859.95
Dilwyn Parish Council	1,310.36	1,528.74	1,747.15	1,965.54	2,402.33	2,839.10	3,275.90	3,931.07
Dinedor Parish Council	1,304.44	1,521.84	1,739.25	1,956.66	2,391.47	2,826.28	3,261.10	3,913.31
Dinmore Parish Meeting	1,256.64	1,466.07	1,675.52	1,884.96	2,303.84	2,722.71	3,141.60	3,769.91
Dormington & Mordiford Group Parish Council	1,304.15	1,521.49	1,738.86	1,956.22	2,390.94	2,825.64	3,260.37	3,912.43
Dorstone Parish Council	1,280.31	1,493.69	1,707.08	1,920.47	2,347.24	2,774.00	3,200.78	3,840.93
Eardisland Parish Council	1,329.41	1,550.96	1,772.54	1,994.11	2,437.25	2,880.37	3,323.52	3,988.21
Eardisley Group Parish Council	1,278.35	1,491.39	1,704.46	1,917.52	2,343.64	2,769.74	3,195.87	3,835.03
Eastnor & Donnington Parish Council	1,280.91	1,494.38	1,707.88	1,921.36	2,348.33	2,775.29	3,202.27	3,842.71
Eaton Bishop Parish Council	1,302.42	1,519.48	1,736.56	1,953.63	2,387.77	2,821.90	3,256.05	3,907.25
Ewyas Harold Group Parish Council	1,327.73	1,549.00	1,770.30	1,991.59	2,434.17	2,876.73	3,319.32	3,983.17
Fownhope Parish Council	1,302.89	1,520.03	1,737.19	1,954.34	2,388.64	2,822.93	3,257.23	3,908.67
Foxley Group Parish Council	1,267.03	1,478.19	1,689.37	1,900.54	2,322.88	2,745.21	3,167.57	3,801.07
Garway Parish Council	1,322.29	1,542.67	1,763.06	1,983.44	2,424.20	2,864.96	3,305.73	3,966.87
Goodrich & Welsh Bicknor Group Parish Council	1,278.85	1,491.98	1,705.13	1,918.27	2,344.55	2,770.82	3,197.12	3,836.53

<b>Council Tax for each valuation band, by Parish, including the Police &amp; Fire precepts</b>								
<b>PARISH</b>	<b>VALUATION BANDS</b>							
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>H</b>
	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
Hampton Bishop Parish Council	1,293.53	1,509.11	1,724.71	1,940.30	2,371.48	2,802.65	3,233.83	3,880.59
Hampton Charles Parish Meeting	1,256.64	1,466.07	1,675.52	1,884.96	2,303.84	2,722.71	3,141.60	3,769.91
Hatfield and District Group Parish Council	1,276.21	1,488.91	1,701.62	1,914.32	2,339.72	2,765.12	3,190.53	3,828.63
Hereford City Council	1,293.09	1,508.59	1,724.12	1,939.63	2,370.66	2,801.68	3,232.72	3,879.25
Holme Lacy Parish Council	1,322.63	1,543.05	1,763.50	1,983.94	2,424.82	2,865.68	3,306.57	3,967.87
Holmer & Shelwick Parish Council	1,269.09	1,480.60	1,692.12	1,903.64	2,326.67	2,749.69	3,172.73	3,807.27
Hope Mansell Parish Council	1,266.87	1,478.01	1,689.16	1,900.31	2,322.60	2,744.88	3,167.18	3,800.61
Hope under Dinmore Group Parish Council	1,306.07	1,523.73	1,741.42	1,959.10	2,394.46	2,829.80	3,265.17	3,918.19
How Caple, Sollershope & Yatton Group Parish Council	1,292.16	1,507.51	1,722.88	1,938.24	2,368.96	2,799.67	3,230.40	3,876.47
Humber, Stoke Prior & Ford Group Parish Council	1,284.45	1,498.51	1,712.60	1,926.67	2,354.82	2,782.96	3,211.12	3,853.33
Huntington Parish Council	1,266.86	1,477.99	1,689.15	1,900.29	2,322.58	2,744.85	3,167.15	3,800.57
Kentchurch Parish Council	1,311.57	1,530.16	1,748.76	1,967.36	2,404.55	2,841.73	3,278.93	3,934.71
Kilpeck Group Parish Council	1,315.41	1,534.64	1,753.88	1,973.12	2,411.59	2,850.05	3,288.53	3,946.23
Kimbolton Parish Council	1,287.88	1,502.52	1,717.17	1,931.82	2,361.11	2,790.40	3,219.70	3,863.63
Kings Caple Parish Council	1,293.18	1,508.70	1,724.24	1,939.77	2,370.83	2,801.88	3,232.95	3,879.53
Kingsland Parish Council	1,277.99	1,490.97	1,703.98	1,916.98	2,342.98	2,768.96	3,194.97	3,833.95
Kingstone & Thruxton Group Parish Council	1,274.59	1,487.02	1,699.46	1,911.89	2,336.75	2,761.61	3,186.48	3,823.77
Kington Rural and Lower Harpton Group Parish Council	1,276.46	1,489.19	1,701.95	1,914.69	2,340.18	2,765.65	3,191.15	3,829.37
Kington Town Council	1,336.76	1,559.54	1,782.35	2,005.14	2,450.73	2,896.30	3,341.90	4,010.27
Kinnersley and District Group Parish Council	1,273.95	1,486.26	1,698.60	1,910.92	2,335.57	2,760.21	3,184.87	3,821.83
Lea Parish Council	1,294.46	1,510.19	1,725.95	1,941.69	2,373.18	2,804.65	3,236.15	3,883.37
Ledbury Town Council	1,360.25	1,586.95	1,813.67	2,040.38	2,493.80	2,947.21	3,400.63	4,080.75
Leintwardine Group Parish Council	1,293.33	1,508.87	1,724.44	1,939.99	2,371.10	2,802.20	3,233.32	3,879.97
Leominster Town Council	1,357.69	1,583.97	1,810.26	2,036.54	2,489.10	2,941.66	3,394.23	4,073.07
Linton Parish Council	1,273.31	1,485.51	1,697.74	1,909.96	2,334.40	2,758.82	3,183.27	3,819.91
Little Birch Parish Council	1,293.99	1,509.65	1,725.32	1,940.99	2,372.32	2,803.64	3,234.98	3,881.97
Little Dewchurch Parish Council	1,294.78	1,510.57	1,726.37	1,942.17	2,373.76	2,805.35	3,236.95	3,884.33
Llangarron Parish Council	1,292.45	1,507.84	1,723.26	1,938.67	2,369.49	2,800.29	3,231.12	3,877.33
Llanwarne & District Group Parish Council	1,279.14	1,492.32	1,705.52	1,918.71	2,345.09	2,771.46	3,197.85	3,837.41
Longtown Group Parish Council	1,283.93	1,497.90	1,711.90	1,925.89	2,353.87	2,781.83	3,209.82	3,851.77
Lower Bullingham Parish Council	1,271.04	1,482.87	1,694.72	1,906.56	2,330.24	2,753.91	3,177.60	3,813.11
Luston Group Parish Council	1,284.11	1,498.11	1,712.14	1,926.16	2,354.20	2,782.22	3,210.27	3,852.31
Lyonshall Parish Council	1,302.24	1,519.27	1,736.32	1,953.36	2,387.44	2,821.51	3,255.60	3,906.71
Madley Parish Council	1,293.41	1,508.97	1,724.55	1,940.12	2,371.26	2,802.39	3,233.53	3,880.23
Marden Parish Council	1,318.53	1,538.28	1,758.04	1,977.80	2,417.31	2,856.81	3,296.33	3,955.59
Marstow Parish Council	1,292.43	1,507.82	1,723.24	1,938.64	2,369.45	2,800.25	3,231.07	3,877.27
Mathon Parish Council (includes Malvern Hills Trust (M	1,314.36	1,533.41	1,752.48	1,971.54	2,409.66	2,847.77	3,285.90	3,943.07
Middleton-on-the-Hill and Leysters Group Parish Council	1,271.44	1,483.34	1,695.25	1,907.16	2,330.97	2,754.78	3,178.60	3,814.31
Monkland and Stretford Parish Council	1,333.48	1,555.72	1,777.97	2,000.22	2,444.71	2,889.20	3,333.70	4,000.43
Moreton on Lugg Parish Council	1,301.53	1,518.45	1,735.38	1,952.30	2,386.14	2,819.98	3,253.83	3,904.59
Much Birch Parish Council	1,267.55	1,478.80	1,690.07	1,901.33	2,323.85	2,746.36	3,168.88	3,802.65
Much Cowarne Group Parish Council	1,268.29	1,479.66	1,691.05	1,902.43	2,325.19	2,747.94	3,170.72	3,804.85
Much Dewchurch Parish Council	1,277.98	1,490.97	1,703.97	1,916.97	2,342.96	2,768.95	3,194.95	3,833.93
Much Marcle Parish Council	1,275.97	1,488.62	1,701.29	1,913.95	2,339.27	2,764.58	3,189.92	3,827.89
North Bromyard Group Parish Council	1,275.73	1,488.35	1,700.98	1,913.60	2,338.84	2,764.08	3,189.33	3,827.19
Ocle Pychard Parish Council	1,300.81	1,517.60	1,734.41	1,951.21	2,384.81	2,818.40	3,252.02	3,902.41
Orcop Parish Council	1,292.53	1,507.94	1,723.37	1,938.79	2,369.63	2,800.46	3,231.32	3,877.57
Orleton Parish Council	1,302.97	1,520.12	1,737.29	1,954.45	2,388.77	2,823.08	3,257.42	3,908.89
Pembridge Parish Council	1,303.96	1,521.28	1,738.61	1,955.94	2,390.59	2,825.24	3,259.90	3,911.87
Pencombe Group Parish Council	1,303.39	1,520.61	1,737.85	1,955.08	2,389.54	2,823.99	3,258.47	3,910.15



<b>Council Tax for each valuation band, by Parish, including the Police &amp; Fire precepts</b>								
<b>PARISH</b>	<b>VALUATION BANDS</b>							
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>H</b>
	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
Peterchurch Parish Council	1,293.89	1,509.53	1,725.19	1,940.84	2,372.14	2,803.43	3,234.73	3,881.67
Peterstow Parish council	1,288.05	1,502.72	1,717.40	1,932.08	2,361.43	2,790.77	3,220.13	3,864.15
Pipe and Lyde Parish Council	1,273.85	1,486.14	1,698.46	1,910.77	2,335.39	2,759.99	3,184.62	3,821.53
Pixley & District Parish Council	1,281.43	1,495.00	1,708.58	1,922.15	2,349.29	2,776.43	3,203.58	3,844.29
Putley Parish Council	1,312.88	1,531.68	1,750.51	1,969.32	2,406.95	2,844.56	3,282.20	3,938.63
Pyons Group Parish Council	1,279.09	1,492.27	1,705.46	1,918.64	2,345.00	2,771.36	3,197.73	3,837.27
Richard's Castle (Herefordshire) Parish Council	1,299.59	1,516.17	1,732.78	1,949.38	2,382.58	2,815.76	3,248.97	3,898.75
Ross-on-Wye Parish Council	1,344.13	1,568.15	1,792.18	2,016.20	2,464.24	2,912.28	3,360.33	4,032.39
Sellack Parish Council	1,298.86	1,515.33	1,731.81	1,948.29	2,381.24	2,814.19	3,247.15	3,896.57
Shobdon Parish Council	1,306.26	1,523.96	1,741.68	1,959.39	2,394.81	2,830.22	3,265.65	3,918.77
St. Weonards Parish Council	1,286.05	1,500.39	1,714.74	1,929.08	2,357.76	2,786.44	3,215.13	3,858.15
Stapleton Group Parish Council	1,299.75	1,516.36	1,733.00	1,949.62	2,382.87	2,816.11	3,249.37	3,899.23
Staunton-on-Wye and District Group Parish Council	1,268.59	1,480.01	1,691.45	1,902.88	2,325.74	2,748.59	3,171.47	3,805.75
Stoke Edith Parish Meeting (Chairman)	1,256.64	1,466.07	1,675.52	1,884.96	2,303.84	2,722.71	3,141.60	3,769.91
Stoke Lacy Parish Council	1,295.56	1,511.48	1,727.41	1,943.34	2,375.19	2,807.04	3,238.90	3,886.67
Stretton Grandison Group Parish Council	1,297.45	1,513.69	1,729.94	1,946.18	2,378.66	2,811.14	3,243.63	3,892.35
Stretton Sugwas Parish Council	1,290.51	1,505.58	1,720.68	1,935.76	2,365.93	2,796.09	3,226.27	3,871.51
Sutton Parish Council	1,303.85	1,521.14	1,738.46	1,955.77	2,390.39	2,824.99	3,259.62	3,911.53
Tarrington Parish Council	1,304.87	1,522.34	1,739.83	1,957.31	2,392.27	2,827.22	3,262.18	3,914.61
Thornbury Group Parish Council	1,273.67	1,485.93	1,698.22	1,910.50	2,335.06	2,759.60	3,184.17	3,820.99
Titley and District Group Parish Council	1,286.87	1,501.34	1,715.83	1,930.31	2,359.27	2,788.22	3,217.18	3,860.61
Upton Bishop Parish Council	1,300.57	1,517.32	1,734.09	1,950.85	2,384.37	2,817.88	3,251.42	3,901.69
Vowchurch & District Group Parish Council	1,282.59	1,496.35	1,710.12	1,923.89	2,351.42	2,778.94	3,206.48	3,847.77
Walford Parish Council	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC
Wellington Parish Council	1,289.18	1,504.03	1,718.91	1,933.77	2,363.50	2,793.21	3,222.95	3,867.53
Wellington Heath Parish Council	1,282.87	1,496.67	1,710.49	1,924.30	2,351.92	2,779.53	3,207.17	3,848.59
Welsh Newton & Llanrothal Group Parish Council	1,318.67	1,538.44	1,758.23	1,978.01	2,417.57	2,857.12	3,296.68	3,956.01
Weobley Parish Council	1,297.13	1,513.31	1,729.51	1,945.70	2,378.08	2,810.45	3,242.83	3,891.39
Weston Beggard Parish Council	1,287.18	1,501.70	1,716.24	1,930.77	2,359.83	2,788.88	3,217.95	3,861.53
Weston-under-Penyard Parish Council	1,266.97	1,478.13	1,689.30	1,900.46	2,322.78	2,745.10	3,167.43	3,800.91
Whitbourne Parish Council	1,279.75	1,493.04	1,706.34	1,919.63	2,346.21	2,772.79	3,199.38	3,839.25
Whitchurch & Ganarew Group Parish Council	1,321.67	1,541.93	1,762.22	1,982.50	2,423.06	2,863.60	3,304.17	3,964.99
Wigmore Group Parish Council	1,300.01	1,516.67	1,733.35	1,950.02	2,383.36	2,816.69	3,250.03	3,900.03
Withington Group Parish Council	1,277.85	1,490.82	1,703.80	1,916.78	2,342.73	2,768.67	3,194.63	3,833.55
Woolhope Parish Council	1,295.04	1,510.87	1,726.72	1,942.56	2,374.24	2,805.91	3,237.60	3,885.11
Wyeside Group Parish Council	1,278.15	1,491.17	1,704.20	1,917.23	2,343.28	2,769.32	3,195.38	3,834.45
Yarkhill Parish Council	1,295.33	1,511.21	1,727.11	1,943.00	2,374.78	2,806.55	3,238.33	3,885.99
Yarpole Group Parish Council	1,301.97	1,518.95	1,735.96	1,952.95	2,386.94	2,820.92	3,254.92	3,905.89





<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Council</b>
<b>Meeting date:</b>	<b>Friday 6 March 2020</b>
<b>Title of report:</b>	<b>Leader's report to Council</b>
<b>Report by:</b>	<b>Leader of the Council</b>

## Classification

Open

## Decision type

This is not an executive decision

## Wards affected

(All Wards);

## Purpose

To provide an update on the work of the Cabinet since the meeting of Council held on 11 October, 2019. A brief summary of decisions taken by the executive is provided at appendix A; all decision reports and notices are available on the council's [website](#).

## Recommendation(s)

That:

- (a) the report be noted.

## Alternative options

1. There are no alternative options; the constitution requires the Leader to provide Council with reports on the activities of the executive.

## Key considerations

2. It is a constitutional requirement that the Leader of the Council provides a report to each ordinary council meeting, other than the budget meeting, on the activities of the work of the cabinet since the last meeting including a summary of those matters decided by the cabinet, cabinet member or any executive joint committee, and any decisions taken under the urgency provisions and of those subject to call in.

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
John Coleman, Tel: 01432 260605, email: [john.coleman@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:john.coleman@herefordshire.gov.uk)

3. It is customary for the decisions to be listed in an annex to this report (attached at appendix A). These decisions have been made available on the council's website as they are taken, so all councillors and members of the public have the opportunity to study these decisions as they are being made. Of the decisions taken since the last report to Council, one key decision was made under the general exception provisions (giving more than five but less than 28 days' notice) and one taken under the urgency provisions (less than five days' notice).
4. Since my last report no decisions have been called in.
5. I am also including in my report a summary of what I consider the most significant decisions supporting achievement of the current corporate delivery plan, as well as some additional subjects that I hope will be of interest.

### **Enable residents to live safe, healthy and independent lives**

6. **Major flood incident response (October/November, 2019):** Herefordshire Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) for Herefordshire has a number of duties and responsibilities in relation to managing flood risk across the county. A major and prolonged flooding event occurred in Herefordshire in late October 2019 and early November 2019. Herefordshire experienced significant surface water and river flooding, with at least 130 properties believed to have been impacted.
7. Herefordshire Council staff and contractor, Balfour Beatty Living Places (BBLP), together with the emergency services and voluntary sector organisations, dealt with a large number of road closures, flooded properties, stranded people and abandoned vehicles. BBLP drafted in significant extra resources to deal with flooded roads and affected communities by putting road closures in place, where necessary, and supporting the police and fire services with rescue and evacuation across Hereford City and the county.
8. Despite the Government announcing financial support for people and businesses in the north of England who had been affected by this flooding, this offer was not extended to Herefordshire. The cabinet member for infrastructure therefore took an urgent decision on 9<sup>th</sup> December to provide grants for the households and businesses affected by the floods in October and November 2019. The community recovery grant scheme and business recovery grant scheme were approved with a budget of up to £225k
9. **Major flood incident response (February 2020).** This incident is ongoing. An update will be provided at the Council meeting.
10. **Novel coronavirus (COVID-19).** You will have received regular updates from our Director of Public Health who is in regular contact with central government. Enquiries have been received from schools and colleges in Herefordshire, regarding their staff/pupils returning from Northern Italy and the risks associated with the novel coronavirus (COVID-19). We will be updating guidance and considering any emerging situation and response as necessary and keeping the situation under review.
11. **Renewing the priorities and membership of the Health and Wellbeing Board (HWBB):** The current HWBB membership commissioned a Local Government Association (LGA) review of the board's membership and function. The review considered the board's alignment to the evolving Herefordshire and Worcestershire health and social care systems and the Talk Community initiatives in the county. As the statutorily recognised forum bringing together political, community and health leaders the review identified where

change is required and built renewed consensus around the value of the HWBB partnership and its shared values.

12. A key focus of the board will be to strengthen collaborative partnership working to maximise resources across the county; improve quality of life through healthy ageing; identifying climate change action in all aspects of operational delivery within our health and social care sectors and improve social mobility including housing, economic opportunities and learning. Aligning the HWBB to the recently updated county plan for Herefordshire Council, the NHS long term plan and evolving integrated care strategy are key priorities. The proposed working arrangements will be recommended to the audit and governance committee, with a view to seeking full Council approval for the new board membership.

13. ***The executive's response to the general scrutiny committee review of highways maintenance – pothole repairs:*** The review was commissioned by the general scrutiny committee who appointed a task and finish group to consider the highway maintenance plan. It also sought to seek and address concerns expressed within the community about the potential mismatch between policy and practice on pothole repairs. The review made a number of recommendations. All of the recommendations directed to the executive were accepted or partially accepted and will now be implemented. This included a commitment to:

- The council should continue to take a risk-based approach to prioritising repairs as part of a proactive asset management strategy.
- BBLP should reinforce, emphasise and implement a 'cluster-based' strategy to fixing potholes i.e. to fix all defects within an appropriate length of road at the same time, unless essential emergency work needs to be done elsewhere.
- The service (Highways and Transport) consulting with Parish Councils about the proposed Rural Routes Maintenance Hierarchy, and involve them in any decisions about which roads to prioritise.
- The important contribution that the lengthsman can make should be recognised and parish councils encouraged to support lengthsman schemes, exploring scope for co-operation between parishes in doing so, and the council should review whether reinstating a financial contribution to the scheme would be prudent, for example, via match funding.
- The council should invest further in independent inspection of repair quality, including inspection of 'making-good' work done by utilities companies.
- The council should adopt a policy of making a different type of repair in certain locations where evidence shows a standard approach would not be effective in achieving the 'fix right first time approach', and adopt a performance measure of the effectiveness of this approach in reducing occasions where more than one visit is required to fix a defect.
- The full set of recommendations and executive response can be viewed [here](#)

14. ***Herefordshire and Worcestershire Living Well with Dementia Strategy, 27***

*November 2019:* Over the last five years the delivery of dementia care in Herefordshire and Worcestershire has evolved into a multi-agency approach with each county having separate strategies. As strong as our foundations are, we know that we have more to do to ensure we provide timely diagnosis and that people with dementia and their carers get the right support whatever their individual circumstances. Cabinet has agreed a strategy which it sets out a shared vision for a collaborative approach across both counties. It will build upon the successes of our local dementia partnerships delivered by a wide range of local stakeholders who are key to supporting people living with dementia, their family, friends and communities.

15. **Homelessness prevention and rough sleeping strategy, 19 December 2019:** Tackling homelessness and rough sleeping is a high priority for the council. Nationally, many housing associations have taken a risk adverse approach to rough sleepers as potential tenants and avoided letting to people on benefits. In Herefordshire the strategic housing forum has been relaunched and the council has identified the importance of outreach and navigation workers to help individuals to sustain tenancies. The council, working with Hope Scott House in Hereford, is developing provision for homeless persons and capital investment to provide an additional 5 self-contained apartments with office space alongside for use by support services, being self-contained the accommodation was available to both males and females. As part of this strategy, specific reference will be made to ensure the strategy includes provision for migrants and pets.
16. **Community seed funding grant:** On the 18 December, we approved the implementation of the Talk Community Hub seed funding. The aim of the grant is to help address local wellbeing challenges by working through community hubs and other means focusing on how people support themselves, and can be supported in their local communities. The council is working with communities to help them support people at a local level by providing access to information, advice and signposting within their own community settings. The grants will help people to connect with each other and to engage in activities in their community, through a community group/hub supporting people to help themselves and each other to remain well and independent. The purpose of the seed funding is to help communities to provide local signposting, information and activities in a local hub or community setting, promoting wellbeing and independence.

### **Keep children and young people safe and give them a great start in life**

17. **Short breaks capital grant scheme:** On October 10, we approved a decision to create a capital grant scheme to provide short breaks for children in our care. Breaks provide opportunities for disabled children and young people to have enjoyable experiences away from their primary carers, thus contributing to their social inclusion and personal and social development. They also provide the parents and carers of disabled children with a necessary and valuable break from their caring responsibilities. The grant scheme will ensure maximum benefit for children with disabilities and special educational needs across Herefordshire.
18. The aim of the scheme is to improve access to universal and targeted activities across Herefordshire to create greater opportunity for spending time with friends, and developing independence. The maximum capital funding available for this scheme is £118,000, which is non-recurrent. It is intended that all funding will be committed by the end of March 2020. If required, further bidding rounds will be scheduled during 2020 until the budget has been fully allocated.
19. **Improvement of Children's social work practice:** On 22 November, approval was given to use earmarked reserves to recruit and improve the quality of children's social work in the county. Cabinet has recognised that the council can support children's social care work further by enabling more staff to be recruited within this financial year. This is in conjunction with work that the council has already done to increase the number of social work posts, expand the early help service and family support service to work with families and business support to take some tasks off social workers. This will enable the service to potentially recruit five social work posts (including a senior practitioner post) and a manager to provide further capacity that would be located in the assessment service and carry out assessment team work.

20. **Approval of the revised business case and budget for the expansion of Marlbrook primary school within the approved capital allocation:** On 27 November cabinet took the decision to approve the business case and budget for this decision. Provision of £6.141m is included within the approved capital programme to complete the expansion of Marlbrook Primary School from 420 to 630 statutory age pupils, increasing its planned admission number from 60 to 90.
21. **Ofsted visit.** Ofsted carried out a focused visit on the 18 and 19 December, focusing on Child in Need, Child Protection, peer on peer concerns, neglect, any issues the local authority wishes to discuss. This involved a huge amount of work for our children and families directorate and in particular our safeguarding and family support services. It is reassuring to note that no child was seen to be left at significant risk and all were receiving intervention. There were no priority areas for action. Ofsted recognise the continued challenges we face in recruitment and retention and that turnover of agency staff in particular effects the quality of work. However they noted that little progress has been made since the last inspection in terms of the quality of practice in our Child Protection/Court teams and that a number of areas are still to be resolved. The Directorate will continue to work to improve in these areas.
22. Ofsted recognised the investment that is taking place, the strong understanding of the service by senior managers, informed by a growing audit programme that accurately reflects practice. There saw gaps in supervision and recording. They noted the strong work in the Children with Disabilities team, including plans focused on the child's needs, packages of support tailored to their needs, social workers having a clear understanding of the child's needs and consistent guidance and reflection from supervising managers.
23. The feedback from Ofsted will help us to continue to improve our services, despite the significant challenges that we face. There is more detailed feedback on the [Ofsted website](#), which does not come with any change to our rating.
24. **A new local 16+ years champion:** In line with Herefordshire Council's constitution, and in my capacity as leader of the council, I am able to appoint individual councillors or other individuals to champion a particular issue within the council, with its partners, in communities, across the council, regionally or nationally. I am seeking to appoint a new 16+ years champion and I am seeking interest from all local members who may wish to take on this role.

### **Support the growth of our economy**

25. **Update on Phosphate levels in the Lugg and Wye Catchment:** As members will be aware, new development that would increase Phosphate levels in the Lugg catchment remain under review following the judgment handed down in November 2018 by the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU). Natural England provided initial advice to Herefordshire Council on 22nd July 2019 and subsequent further advice that: In the light of the interpretation of the Dutch judgment where a site is failing its water quality objectives, and is therefore classed as in unfavourable condition, there is limited scope for the approval of additional damaging effects.
26. There remains potential for a positive Appropriate Assessment to enable development to proceed, on Natural England's advice, where it can be demonstrated that development is nutrient neutral where avoidance / mitigation measures included in the plan or project, counterbalance any phosphate increase from the plan or project. I and my Cabinet colleagues place great importance around reducing phosphate levels in our rivers. To that

end, we are redirecting £2m from the new homes bonus scheme to develop water catchment projects in the Lugg catchment area to help reduce phosphate levels.

27. Nutrient Management Board met on 29 January. On 14<sup>th</sup> February a note was circulated to all member providing an update.
28. ***New Model Institute for Technology and Engineering (NMITE) Phase 2 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Funding:*** NMITE, the council, the LEP, Shropshire Council, and the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government have been working together to finalise the next phase of Growth Deal funding for NMITE. The £5.6 million grant will enable NMITE to develop a Centre for Advantaged Timber Technology, and Centre for Automated Manufacturing on a site next to the council's business incubation space in a former WW1 Shell Store on the Hereford Enterprise Zone. Negotiations the grant funding will be transferred from the LEP to Herefordshire Council to oversee the delivery of the project locally. Government has confirmed that the funding being allocated would not be subject to clawback.
29. ***Herefordshire Council is committed to invest in the support and development of tourism and our valuable visitor economy.*** Over the past couple of months we have continued to work strategically across the Marches with colleagues from Shropshire and Telford and Wrekin Councils to develop closer working on tourism projects and data collection and representatives of the three local authorities are looking at different models for supporting the tourism sector. The LEP is not directly involved in tourism but has funded the development of a Visitor Economy Strategy which was launch of The Marches LEP Visitor Economy Strategy in January 2020. As a follow on some work has begun on the value of tourism in the region which will enable us to benchmark progress in future years
30. A key project for tourism is the development of the DBID and we are working with partners to support the next steps of the project which would take it, if successful, to the launch of the new BID. Local partners in Herefordshire organised a Marches Tourism Forum at the Green Dragon which was very well attended with delegates from across the Marches. As part of her sum up at the end of the event Cllr Trish Marsh confirmed the support of the council to the development of a Destination BID and Tourism Partnerships.
31. Our budget request for 2020/2021 of £160k will be used to deliver the next phases of the Herefordshire Destination Business Improvement District (DBID) and enable the continuation of the Visit Herefordshire website and tourism marketing until the Destination BID can be developed.
32. ***LEP Funding:*** On 28 February the council will submit three detailed business case proposals to the Marches LEP seeking a total of circa £12 million of funding. This will support the development of: the Shell Store business incubator; a further package of infrastructure works (including sustainable transport provision); open up employment land on the Hereford Enterprise Zone, and support the development of the Ross Enterprise Park project. The council were invited to submit business case proposals for these projects following the successful submission of Expression of Interest applications in December 2019. At the end of March the LEP are due to consider which projects will receive funding which will need to be spent by 31 March 2021.
33. ***Hereford Transport and South Wye Package review:*** On 24 January the decision was taken by the cabinet member for infrastructure and transport to commence this review. The review is essential to ensure that the council's decision making is fully informed by the latest information and best practice. We need to ensure any major scheme has a positive



impact on the county to address travel issues, such as congestion and air quality, as these schemes have a permanent impact upon the environment which last for generations to come.

34. The current Local Transport Plan (2016-2031) describes the vision: A transport network that supports growth enabling the provision of new jobs and houses, whilst providing the conditions for safe and active travel, which reduces congestion and increases accessibility by less polluting and healthier forms of transport than the private car. The Cabinet is keen to understand how alternative options address emerging local and national policy such as those resulting from the declared climate emergency, considering new solutions and approaches which have developed over the last twenty years and which are now being implemented in other urban areas.
35. It is incumbent on the council to ensure that projects are consistent with the council's declaration of a climate emergency and will contribute to reducing the carbon output of the county whilst also addressing the transport problems of the city and supporting economic growth. Whilst the review is being carried out the council will continue to deliver agreed improvements to encourage a shift of travel mode and reduce congestion.

### **Secure better services, quality of life, and value for money**

36. **Review of Governance Models:** Following the resolution passed by Council on 11 October a cross party working group has been formed, reporting to the audit and governance committee, to undertake a review of the models of governance open to the council. Council authorised the Monitoring Officer to determine membership following consultation with political group leaders. The work is likely to be reasonably intensive in order to meet Council's requirement for recommendations to be presented no later than October 2020. At the working group meetings, members will be expected to provide a communication channel between the working group and their respective political groups as well as members of the function that they represent. I urge all members to attend the rethinking local governance drop in session on 18 March to share your views and to influence the council's constitutional arrangements.
37. **Corporate peer challenge:** The Local Government Association (LGA) conducted a peer challenge in February 2018 and paid the council a return visit in October last year. This visit was to assess how the council has progressed with their original recommendations. A lot has changed between the visits so it was important to understand where there is continued room for improvement. In summary the LGA report outlines there is a sense the organisation is moving forward and would encourage us to be confident in what is achieved. Relationships between members and officer are good and though members' training has been well received, it is now timely to identify next steps. LGA considered strategic communications needs to ensure corporate priorities are promoted and to promote what Herefordshire the "place" stands for.
38. **The new County Plan:** Our County Plan seeks to shape the future of Herefordshire and aims to encourage and strengthen our vibrant communities, creating a thriving local economy and protecting and enhancing our environment to ensure Herefordshire remains a great place to live, visit, work, learn and do business. The plan will guide the work of the council through from 2020 to 2024. It also provides a platform to strengthen our relationship with individuals, families, communities and partners over the next four years. Underpinning this plan are the themes of connectivity, wellbeing and sustainability, which sit at the core of our policy making, planning and design for the future.

39. **New cabinet support members:** I have appointed two new cabinet support members since my last report. Cllr Ellie Chowns will provide cabinet support and a leading role in taking action on climate change and ecology. Cllr Jenny Bartlett will provide cabinet support and a leading role working with town and parish councils to develop a shared service partnership model and enable parishes to have an active role in delivering or managing local priorities and assets.
40. **Finance.** I am pleased to report that results for the period for Quarter 3 showed a protected outturn for the year of an overspend of £51,000 which is impressive on a gross budget of £385m. Performance measures showing an improvement or remaining the same is 70%. This is an improvement on last year. Thanks is due to everyone in the Council for this projected achievement. The recent floods will make this outcome difficult to achieve without resource to using reserves, but events like this are unprecedented. Government have initiated the Bellwin scheme to allow the council to reclaim certain costs of the recovery from central government.

## Community impact

38. The community impact of any decisions of the executive have been set out within the relevant decision report and taken into consideration at the time the decision was taken. Reporting to Council the activities of the executive demonstrates the council's commitment to the code of corporate governance principle of implementing good practices in transparency, reporting and audit to deliver effective accountability.

## Equality duty

39. 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.
40. The public sector equality duty (specific duty) requires us to consider how we can positively contribute to the advancement of equality and good relations, and demonstrate that we are paying 'due regard' in our decision making in the design of policies and in the delivery of services. As this report provides a summary of activity undertaken, we do not believe that it will have an impact on our equality duty. These considerations are set out in each of the relevant reports informing the decisions listed at appendix A, and will inform any future decision making.

## Resource implications

41. There are no resource implications arising from the recommendations of this report. The resource implications of any decisions of the executive listed at appendix A have been

set out within the relevant decision report and taken into consideration at the time the decision was taken and will inform any future decision making.

## **Legal implications**

42. The council and committee, and cabinet rules within the constitution require the Leader to provide a report to Council on the work of the cabinet since the last meeting of Council and, at the first meeting to follow the annual meeting of Council (except in a year when there are ordinary elections), on the priorities of the cabinet and progress made in meeting those priorities. This report ensures these requirements are met.
43. There are no legal implications arising from the recommendations of this report. The legal implications of any decisions of the executive listed at appendix A have been set out within the relevant decision report and taken into consideration at the time the decision was taken.

## **Risk management**

44. There are no risks arising from the recommendations of this report. The risks of any decisions of the executive listed at appendix A have been set out within the relevant decision report and taken into consideration at the time the decision was taken and will inform future decision making.

## **Consultees**

45. None

## **Appendices**

Appendix A: Summary of executive decisions made from 11 October, 2019 to 6 March, 2020.

## **Background papers**

None identified.



**Executive decisions taken between 10 October 2019 and 6 March 2020.**

	<b>Decision and purpose</b>	<b>Decision date</b>	<b>Taken by</b>
1.	<b>Short Breaks Capital Grant Scheme</b>  To approve the creation of a short breaks capital grant scheme.	10.10.19	Cabinet member children and families
2.	<b>Adoption of the Withington Group neighbourhood plan and consequential updates to the countywide policies map</b>  To make the Withington Group neighbourhood development plan as part of the statutory development plan for Herefordshire and approve the consequential updates to the countywide policies maps.	11.10.19	Cabinet member Infrastructure and transport
3.	<b>Adoption of the Weobley neighbourhood plan and consequential updates to the countywide policies map</b>  To make the Weobley neighbourhood development plan as part of the statutory development plan for Herefordshire and approve the consequential updates to the countywide policies maps.	11.10.19	Cabinet member Infrastructure and transport
4.	<b>Corporate Parenting Annual Update 2018/2019</b>  To review the progress of the corporate parenting strategy.	24.10.19	Cabinet
5.	<b>Fostering and Adoption Service Annual Reports 2018/19</b>  To review Fostering and Adoption Services performance and approve related documents.	24.10.19	Cabinet
6.	<b>Annual review of earmarked reserves</b>  To approve the annual review of earmarked reserves undertaken and to establish the continued need for reserves held for earmarked purposes.	24.10.19	Cabinet
7.	<b>Executive Response to Review of highways maintenance - pothole repairs</b>  To agree the executive response to the recommendations from the review of highways maintenance - pothole repairs.	29.10.19	Cabinet member Infrastructure and transport

	<b>Decision and purpose</b>	<b>Decision date</b>	<b>Taken by</b>
8.	<p><b>Estates capital programme - improvement works to the electrical installation at the Shire Hall</b></p> <p>To approve the early draw down of funds from the 2020/21 capital programme budget to deliver improvement works to the electrical installation at the Shire Hall, Hereford.</p>	12.11.19	Cabinet member commissioning, procurement and assets
9.	<p><b>Improvement of Children's social work practice</b></p> <p>To approve the use of earmarked reserves to provide the opportunity to recruit to improve the quality of children's social work.</p> <p>Cabinet has recognised that the council can support children's social care work further by enabling more staff to be recruited within this financial year. This is in conjunction with work that the council has already done to increase the number of social work posts, expand the early help service and family support service to work with families and business support to take some tasks off social workers.</p> <p>The proposals in this report will enable the service to potentially recruit five social work posts (including a senior practitioner post) and a manager to provide further capacity that would be located in the assessment service and carry out assessment team work. This would enable some cases to be held in the assessment teams rather than in the child protection court teams and therefore lessen the pressure on social workers, particularly in the child protection court teams where we are finding it particularly difficult to recruit agency and permanent staff, despite all the work the council has done to improve the retention and recruitment offer.</p>	22.11.19	Cabinet member children and families
10.	<p><b>To approve a revised business case and budget for the expansion of Marlbrook Primary School within the approved capital allocation</b></p> <p>To approve a revised business case and budget for the expansion of Marlbrook Primary School within the approved capital allocation to accommodate the additional pupils admitted from 2014 in response to rising numbers in South Hereford and to meet parental preference.</p>	27.11.19	Cabinet
11.	<p><b>Herefordshire's Better Care Fund (BCF) and Integration plan 2019-20 and section 75 agreement</b></p> <p>To approve the council's contribution to the Herefordshire Better Care Fund and Integration plan 2019-20 and the s.75 agreement from 1 April 2020 to 31 March</p>	27.11.19	Cabinet
12.	<p><b>Quarter 2 2019/20 corporate budget and performance report</b></p> <p>To review performance for quarter 2 2019/20 and the budget outturn.</p>	27.11.19	Cabinet

	<b>Decision and purpose</b>	<b>Decision date</b>	<b>Taken by</b>
13.	<p><b>Herefordshire and Worcestershire Living Well with Dementia Strategy</b></p> <p>To approve and support the contents of the Herefordshire and Worcestershire Living Well with Dementia Strategy (HWLWD) and approve the high level actions set out for 2019-2024.</p>	27.11.19	Cabinet
14.	<p><b>Support for residents and businesses whose homes or business premises have been flooded</b></p> <p>To seek approval for the launch of hardship schemes to residents and businesses whose homes or business premises have been flooded.</p> <p>The hardship schemes would consist of a Community Recovery Grant, equivalent to £500 per eligible household, to help families with their immediate recovery and a Business Recovery Grant, which will provide up to £2,500 per eligible small and medium-sized business.</p>	09/12/19	Cabinet member Infrastructure and transport
15.	<p><b>Passenger Service Vehicle Accessibility Regulations 2000 (PSVAR) and implications for vacant seats scheme and supported college transport</b></p> <p>To seek approval to cease charging for the spring academic term for home to school transport and post 16 transport on specific council provided services that are not be compliant with PSVAR from 1 January 2020.</p>	09/12/19	Cabinet member Infrastructure and transport
16.	<p><b>Adoption of the Whitchurch and Ganarew neighbourhood plan and consequential updates to the countywide policies map</b></p> <p>To make the Whitchurch and Ganarew neighbourhood development plan as part of the statutory development plan for Herefordshire and approve the consequential updates to the countywide policies maps.</p>	13.12.19	Cabinet member Infrastructure and transport
17.	<p><b>Recommissioning of the Integrated Community Equipment Service (ICES)</b></p> <p>Approve commissioning approach and award of contract for provision of the integrated community equipment service.</p>	19.12.19	Cabinet
18.	<p><b>Homelessness Prevention and Rough Sleeping Strategy</b></p> <p>To approve the council's strategy to prevent homelessness and rough sleeping happening and where this is not possible to prevent it happening in future.</p>	19.12.19	Cabinet

	<b>Decision and purpose</b>	<b>Decision date</b>	<b>Taken by</b>
19.	<p><b>Community Seed Funding Grant</b></p> <p>To approve the implementation of Talk Community Hub Seed Funding Grant to support communities in setting up a Talk Community Hub in their community.</p>	18.12.19	Cabinet member health and adult wellbeing
20.	<p><b>Fastershire Broadband Terms of Extension 2019</b></p> <p>To approve changes to the Council's existing broadband delivery contracts with Gigaclear to expand their scope in terms of the level of public subsidy and the number of eligible premises that would be reached with full fibre broadband.</p>	18.12.19	Cabinet member environment, economy and skills
21.	<p><b>Mobilisation of new Edge of Care approach for children and young people</b></p> <p>To approve the initial investment into a new approach for supporting children who are on the edge of being required to be looked after by the Council, either because they are at risk of becoming a looked after child, or because they could safely cease to be looked after with appropriate support.</p>	20.12.19	Cabinet member children and families
22.	<p><b>Fastershire Broadband Strategy 2019-2022</b></p> <p>To consider the latest iteration of the Fastershire Broadband Strategy which will direct the approaches of the Fastershire project that will drive the deployment of high-speed broadband infrastructure throughout Herefordshire and Gloucestershire through to 2022.</p>	27.12.19	Cabinet member environment, economy and skills
23.	<p><b>To agree the continuation of delivery of ICT services with Rutland County Council</b></p> <p>To agree that Herefordshire Council continue to accept the delegation by Rutland County Council of their enterprise system support function (an element of ICT support) and that Herefordshire Council should act as lead commissioning council for the service.</p>	13.1.20	Cabinet member finance and corporate services
24.	<p><b>Approval of continuation of annual rolling maintenance contract for Business World system</b></p> <p>To approve the continuation of the Business World maintenance contract required for the running of the Business World system on an annual rolling basis.</p>	17.1.20	Cabinet member finance and corporate services
25.	<p><b>Hereford Transport &amp; South Wye Transport Packages review</b></p> <p>This report seeks cabinet member approval to confirm the scope, outline programme and timescale for undertaking a review of Hereford and South Wye Transport packages following the decision made by cabinet 22 October 2019.</p>	24.1.20	Cabinet member Infrastructure and transport



	<b>Decision and purpose</b>	<b>Decision date</b>	<b>Taken by</b>
<b>26.</b>	<b>Schools Budget 2020/21</b> To approve final budget proposals for school, central school services and early years within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2020/21 as recommended by Schools Forum.	28.1.20	Cabinet member children and families
<b>27.</b>	<b>Building maintenance, small works and cleaning services for Herefordshire Council</b> To procure the councils building maintenance and cleaning contract through an open market tender exercise.	30.1.20	Cabinet
<b>28.</b>	<b>Use of reserve funding to support Hereford Transport and South Wye Transport Package Review</b> To approve the use of reserve funding to complete the pause and review work associated with the Hereford Transport Package and South Wye Transport Package.	30.1.20	Cabinet
<b>29.</b>	<b>Corporate plan 2020-24</b> To agree proposals for the council's corporate plan 2020-24 for recommendation to council. To agree the activities within the delivery plan 2020-21. The delivery plan has been designed to include initiatives and projects for 2020-21 which will support achievement of the council's corporate plan priorities.	30.1.20	Cabinet
<b>30.</b>	<b>Setting the 2020/21 budget and updating the medium term financial strategy and treasury management strategy.</b> To agree the draft 2020/21 budget and associated medium term financial strategy and treasury management strategy.	30.1.20	Cabinet
<b>31.</b>	<b>Property services estates capital programme 2020/21</b> To agree the property services 2020/21 estates capital works programme.	31.1.20	Cabinet member commissioning, procurement and assets





<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Council</b>
<b>Meeting date:</b>	<b>6 March 2020</b>
<b>Title of report:</b>	<b>Motions on notice</b>
<b>Report by:</b>	<b>Solicitor to the Council</b>

## Classification

Open

## Key decision

This is not an executive decision.

## Wards affected

Countywide

## Purpose

To consider motions received on notice.

## Recommendation

**THAT: the motions listed at paragraph 6 are debated and determined by Council.**

## Alternative options

- 1 There are no alternative options to the recommendation; the constitution makes provision for motions on notice to be debated and decided by Council.

## Key considerations

- 2 The constitution provides that members of Council may submit written notice of motions for debate at Council. A motion must be signed by the proposer and seconder and submitted not later than midday on the seventh working day before the date of the meeting. A member cannot propose more than one motion on notice per meeting and a maximum of three motions will be debated at meetings of full Council.
- 3 Motions must be about matters for which the council has a responsibility or which affect Herefordshire.
- 4 Motions for which notice has been given will be listed on the agenda in the order in which notice was received unless the member giving notice states, in writing, that they propose to move it to a later meeting or withdraw it.
- 5 Up to one and a half hours will be allocated to debate motions on notice but that time may be varied at the discretion of the chairman.

6 Three motions will be debated at the meeting. The motions for discussion are set out below:

**Motion – Car park passes**

(Proposed by Councillor Paul Rone, Seconded by Councillor Jeremy Milln)

**That all elected members that represent a city ward and live in the city should not have a car park pass as this only encourages use of a motor car.**

**Motion – 20 mph speed limits**

(Proposed by Councillor Felicity Norman, Seconded by Councillor Ange Tyler)

**Herefordshire Council recognises the benefits associated with a 20 miles per hour speed limit in residential areas rather than a default of 30 mph which exists in most parts of the town and County.**

**There are fewer fatalities and injuries, greater survivability in traffic collisions, improved air quality, reduced fuel use and greater willingness of the population to walk or cycle – which has associated health benefits.**

**Many councils have or are in the process of implementing area-wide 20mph speed limits on residential and urban roads without traffic calming.**

**Many bodies with a remit for public health support a reduction in speed limits to 20mph on residential streets.**

**Area-wide 20mph limits rarely need traffic calming measures. They are an affordable way to improve health equality by creating child, disability, elderly and dementia friendly streetscapes that help reduce inactivity, obesity and isolation.**

**This Council requests that the executive undertakes an investigation concerning the introduction of area-wide 20mph speed limits across Herefordshire’s towns and major villages.**

**Motion – Minor Injury Unit (MIU) Closures**

(Proposed by Councillor Paul Symonds, Seconded by Councillor Chris Bartrum)

**The repeated closure of Minor Injury Units in Herefordshire was scrutinised at this Council’s Adults & Wellbeing Committee on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2020.**

**The NHS Trust and CCG submitted a report to this meeting which was incomplete and misleading. No evidence was given that any serious consideration had been given to enhancing community services to take pressure off A&E. There appeared to be a perception that it was the communities’ fault for not using the MIUs sufficiently, as opposed to the Trust’s failure to develop and promote these facilities.**

**The reason given for not consulting stakeholders prior to closing the MIUs was that it was not a ‘significant’ decision, hiding behind the shroud of ‘urgent patient safety’. Whilst this may not be significant in terms of NHS budgets, it is significant to the 30,000**

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Matthew Evans, democratic services officer on Tel (01432) 383690

or so residents of communities served by the MIUs in Herefordshire. Government guidance cites ward closure due to viral outbreak, not closures planned months ahead, as an example of urgent patient safety.

Assurances were given by the CCG & Trust to Ross Town Council that a public consultation on the future of community health services, including MIUs, would be forthcoming in February 2020. This has not happened.

Under The National Health Service Act 2006, the only power available to Herefordshire Council if it is not satisfied with service NHS provision is to refer such decisions to the Secretary of State for Health. The alternative to this is to accept at face value the decisions, statements and lack of consultation by Wye Valley NHS Trust and CCG, letting down the residents of Herefordshire.

This Council agrees that the decision by Wye Valley NHS Trust to close Minor Injury Units in Herefordshire for the last 3 winter periods be referred to the Secretary of State for Health because Herefordshire Council has not been consulted on these changes to service and is not satisfied with the reasons given by the Trust not to consult.

7 The constitution provides that the report to Council containing notices of motion on hand will also include detail of progress of all outstanding resolutions. There are outstanding resolutions with respect to three motions considered at earlier meetings of full Council. The resolutions and updates of progress against these resolutions are provided below:

Date of meeting	Motion	Current Status
9 March 2018	Video Casting of Council Meetings	A decision to initiate a procurement process has been delegated to the level of officer decision. A procurement process will be undertaken and a further report will be produced to recommend the appointment of an approved supplier.
<p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>Recognising that, following It's Our County's proposal and after a nine month trial period, this council has recently decided to audio-cast public meetings and to adopt these recordings as audio minutes; and knowing that almost all our neighbouring authorities (Gloucestershire, Monmouthshire Powys and Worcestershire), and many others already routinely video-cat their meeting – an option originally rejected by this council on cost grounds.</p> <p>That, to align this council with best practice elsewhere, the executive is asked:</p> <p>a) to consider again the merits of 'up-grading' from audio to live on-line video streaming so that the public meetings of Herefordshire Council and its elected members would be publically open and visible to those unable to attend, and that the recordings should be archived and made available on-line.</p> <p>b) To consider a trial period for live video streaming with the opportunity during the trial for feedback from elected members and the public.</p>		

Date of meeting	Motion	Current Status
8 March 2019	Eastern City Bridge Protective Corridor	A decision to begin the review of the core strategy is expected to be taken by the end of the current financial year, and will include a response to this resolution.
RESOLVED: – that this council asks the executive to consider including in the forthcoming core strategy review a consideration of options for a route corridor for a full city ring road for Hereford to include an Eastern city bridge.		

Date of meeting	Motion	Current Status
12 July 2019	Community Infrastructure Levy	A decision to begin the review of the core strategy is expected to be taken by the end of the current financial year. A decision regarding potential future implementation of a Community Infrastructure Levy will be taken as part of the decision to begin the review of the core strategy.
RESOLVED:		
<p>Legal powers for English Planning authorities to introduce in their areas a Community Infrastructure Levy have been in place since the Planning Act 2008 (1). The CIL provides among other things, for Parish and Town Councils to receive at least 15% of all proceeds, or 25% if a Neighbourhood Development Plan is in place.</p> <p>Herefordshire Council has paused the process by which CIL can be levied in the County, thus depriving Town and Parish councils of this potential income. Most neighbouring authorities have introduced the levy including Shropshire, Cheltenham Borough, Gloucester City, Tewkesbury Borough, Malvern Hills, Worcester City and Wychavon Councils. The longer this goes on, the more income is lost to Town &amp; Parish Councils.</p> <p>This Council asks the executive to investigate the adoption of the Community Infrastructure Levy as a matter of urgency, ensuring it is implemented for Herefordshire no later than January 2021.</p>		

Date of meeting	Motion	Current Status
11 October 2019	Review of Governance Models	The re-thinking governance working group has met on 27 January and 7 February 2020 and an all members' seminar will be held on 18 March 2020. A progress report

		is due to be presented to the audit and governance committee meeting on 25 March 2020.
<p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>The Council resolves that:</p> <p>a) The Audit and Governance Committee oversee a review of governance models for a recommendation to Council no later than October 2020.</p> <p>b) The review be undertaken by a cross-party working group, reporting to the Audit and Governance Committee. To contain representation from each political group, from the executive, scrutiny and other functions. The Monitoring Officer be authorised to determine membership following consultation with political group leaders.</p> <p>c) The review should follow guidance from the Local Government Association and from the Centre for Public Scrutiny guidance; 'Rethinking Governance: Practical steps for councils considering changes to their governance arrangement, and</p> <p>d) The review be undertaken having regard to the following guiding principles;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To maximise member engagement and participation in decision making</li> <li>- Ensure decision making is informed, transparent and efficient</li> <li>- Welcome public engagement</li> <li>- Enable member and officers to perform effectively in clearly defined functions and roles</li> <li>- To assess any resource implications for any proposed changes.</li> </ul>		

Date of meeting	Motion	Current Status
11 October 2019	Mental Health Awareness Day	An executive response is being prepared.
<p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>Mental illness has a huge social and economic impact, its effects can predispose a person to a range of negative health issues which in turn leads to depression or worse suicide. It's a matter of fact that mental health can affect a family member or anyone of us at any stage of life.</p> <p>However, anyone who has been in crisis is well aware that there is still a stigma attached to it. For many of us simply having someone talk at us can increase those feelings of inadequacy and isolation. Conversely, just listening will allow a sense of being in charge.</p> <p>Thankfully there is a wealth of mental health support already available in the county. To highlight this support and promote the need to listen without prejudice the Council resolves that:</p>		

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

Date of meeting	Motion	Current Status
11 October 2019	General Permitted Development Order	Officers have discussed the matter with MHCLG and a letter is being prepared.
<p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>This Council resolves that: the executive is requested to write to government to ask them to review the policy regarding part 3 class Q (General Permitted Development Order as amended) applications under the General Permitted Development Order.</p>		

## Community impact

- 8 Herefordshire Council's adopted code of corporate governance provides the framework for maintaining high standards of corporate governance in order to achieve the council's vision of "people, organisations and businesses working together to bring sustainable prosperity and well-being for all, in the outstanding natural environment of Herefordshire."
- 9 In accordance with the code, the long-term nature of many of Herefordshire Council's responsibilities mean that we should define and plan outcomes and that these should be sustainable. Decisions should further the council's purpose, contribute to intended benefits and outcomes, and remain within the limits of authority and resources. Input from all groups of stakeholders is vital to the success of this process and in balancing competing demands when determining priorities for the finite resources available.

## Equality duty

- 10 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.
- 11 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. If any motion results in a request that the executive (cabinet) consider taking some action, the cabinet will have regard to the equality duty when determining its response to the request.



## **Resource implications**

- 12 None arising from the recommendation; if any motion results in a request that the executive (cabinet) consider taking some action the implications of such action will inform any decision by cabinet.

## **Legal implications**

- 13 None arising from the recommendation; if any motion results in a request that the executive (cabinet) consider taking some action the implications of such action will inform any decision by cabinet.

## **Risk management**

- 14 None arising from the recommendation; if any motion results in a request that the executive (cabinet) take some action the risks associated with such action will inform any decision by cabinet.

## **Consultees**

- 15 None.

## **Appendices** – none

## **Background papers** – none identified

