

**Corporate Support Centre**  
Andrew Lovegrove and Claire Ward,  
Acting Deputy Chief Executives

**To: All members of the Council**

our ref: Council - 5 March 2021  
contact: Matthew Evans, Democratic Services  
telephone: 01432 383690  
email: matthew.evans@herefordshire.gov.uk

25 February 2021

Dear Councillor,

**You are hereby summoned** to attend the meeting of the Herefordshire Council to be held on **Friday 5 March 2021** at the online meeting at **10.00 am** at which the business set out in the attached agenda is proposed to be transacted.

Yours sincerely



**Kate Charlton**

**Monitoring Officer**



# AGENDA

## Council

Date: **Friday 5 March 2021**

---

Time: **10.00 am**

---

Place: **Online meeting only**

---

Notes: Watch this meeting live by accessing the link below:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cdTdQ8ejN78&feature=youtu.be,](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cdTdQ8ejN78&feature=youtu.be)

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 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

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 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

## 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 any declarations of interest by Members in respect of items on the Agenda.   |         |
| <b>3.</b> | <b>MINUTES</b>  | 9 - 42  |
|           | To approve and sign the Minutes of the extraordinary meeting of Council held on 2 February and the budget meeting held on 12 February 2021.   |         |
| <b>4.</b> | <b>CHAIRMAN AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</b>   | 43 - 44 |
|           | To receive the Chairman and Chief Executive's announcements and the schedule of emergency decisions taken since the full meeting of Council on 11 December 2020.  |         |
| <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 1 March 2021.</i><br><i>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 1 March 2021.</i><br><i>Accepted questions and answers will be published as a supplement prior to the meeting.</i> |         |
| <b>7.</b> | <b>2021/22 COUNCIL TAX SETTING REPORT</b>   | 45 - 66 |
|           | To set the council tax and precepts for 2021/22.  |         |
| <b>8.</b> | <b>LEADER'S REPORT TO COUNCIL</b>   | 67 - 92 |
|           | To receive a report from the leader on the activities of the executive (cabinet) since the meeting of Council on 11 December 2020.  |         |
| <b>9.</b> | <b>NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDERS</b>  | 93 - 98 |
|           | To consider Notices of Motion.  |         |

## **The Seven Principles of Public Life**

### **(Nolan Principles)**

#### **1. Selflessness**

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

#### **2. Integrity**

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

#### **3. Objectivity**

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

#### **4. Accountability**

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

#### **5. Openness**

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

#### **6. Honesty**

Holders of public office should be truthful.

#### **7. Leadership**

Holders of public office should exhibit these principles in their own behaviour. They should actively promote and robustly support the principles and be willing to challenge poor behaviour wherever it occurs.

## 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. For online meetings you will be able to view the meeting live via the Council's YouTube site; <https://www.youtube.com/HerefordshireCouncil>
- 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.





## Minutes of the meeting of Council held at Virtual Meeting on Tuesday 2 February 2021 at 2.00 pm

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

**Councillors:** Graham Andrews, 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, 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 Tillett, Diana Toynbee, Ange Tyler, Yolande Watson and William Wilding

**Officers:** Director for children and families, Director for economy and place, Interim Head of Legal Services, Democratic services manager, Director for adults and communities and Solicitor to the council

### 33. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

### 34. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Tracy Bowes declared a Schedule 1 interest in agenda item number 5, Hereford Transport Strategy, as the owner of property adjacent to the proposed route of the Western Bypass. She outlined the dispensation granted by the monitoring officer to remain in the meeting to participate in the debate and vote.

Councillor Graham Andrews declared a Schedule 1 interest in agenda item number 5, Hereford Transport Strategy, as the owner of property adjacent to the proposed route of the Western Bypass. He outlined the dispensation granted by the monitoring officer to remain in the meeting to participate in the debate and vote.

Councillor Christy Bolderson declared a Schedule 1 interest in agenda item number 5, Hereford Transport Strategy, as the owner of property adjacent to the proposed route of the Southern Link Road. She outlined the dispensation granted by the monitoring officer to remain in the meeting to participate in the debate and vote.

Councillor Jeremy Milln declared a Schedule 2 interest connected to but not directly related to agenda item number 5, Hereford Transport Strategy, as a committee member of Hereford and Worcester Gardens and Parks Trust and as a member of the Hereford Transport Alliance.

Councillor Bob Matthews declared an other interest in agenda item number 5, Hereford Transport Strategy; his electoral ward was impacted by the Western Bypass proposal.

Councillor David Summers declared an other interest in agenda item number 5, Hereford Transport Strategy; his electoral ward was impacted by the Western Bypass proposal.

### **35. 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.

### **36. HEREFORD TRANSPORT STRATEGY**

Council considered a report by the cabinet member infrastructure and transport concerning the Hereford Transport Strategy.

The monitoring officer provided clarification relating to predetermination and bias.

The cabinet member environment, economy and skills apologised to the Council for comments she had made ahead of the meeting.

The cabinet member infrastructure and transport proposed the recommendations in the report and during his introduction he made the principal points below:

- The report asked Council to agree to: the discontinuation of the South Wye Transport Package (SWTP) including the Southern Link Road and the Hereford Transport Package which together comprised the western bypass; removal of the projects from the capital programme; and utilisation of reserves to cover the de-capitalisation of the schemes.
- The proposal would enable a transport strategy to focus on projects to encourage modal shift, improve methods of school travel and the introductions of better forms of public transport.
- There would be consideration of an eastern crossing of the river Wye near Rotherwas.
- The proposal was consistent with the climate emergency declaration and national targets to reduce carbon.

The cabinet member finance and corporate resources seconded the recommendations in the report and made the principal points below:

- Over the previous 15 years an excess of officer time and money had been spent on road building projects that would not provide the congestion relief necessary in Hereford.
- The schemes were undeliverable and unaffordable. Solid investment in buses bikes and bridges was necessary to deliver local solutions and improvements.
- Ear marked reserves would be utilised to meet the need to decapitalise the projects.

During the course of the debate members of the Council raised the principal points below:

- The implementation of local travel measures on the A49 and the relationship with Highways Agency.
- Planning considerations for an Eastern bypass of Hereford.
- The need to balance the requirement for economic development with ecological impact.
- The lack of evidence to support the building of a western bypass.

- Improvements to bus services and walking and cycling infrastructure would help to address congestion in Hereford.
- Concern that the construction of a western bypass would result in a significant increase in housing that would be developed before the completion of the bypass.
- The importance of undertaking measures to address air quality in Hereford.
- Active travel measures would help reduce congestion in Hereford and required effective implementation.
- Improvements to cycling safety were raised and the importance of continuing cycling infrastructure projects contained in the SWTP.
- The proposals for increased car parking charges could penalise residents from rural areas where there was not extensive public transport provision.

There was a brief adjournment at 3.32 p.m., the meeting reconvened at 3.50. The debate continued with the principal points raised below:

- The infrastructure contained in the western bypass and southern link road projects would facilitate and manage growth. It would assist in the delivery of major projects and attract business.
- The impact of cancellation of the schemes on house building targets in the county.
- The western bypass would reduce traffic in Hereford and allow for the implementation of active travel measures.
- A bypass could ensure that short journeys in Hereford were taken out of the city centre and avoid the single river crossing.
- The high cost of the schemes was raised and the relatively low value for money rating they achieved.

*Amendment - That recommendation (a) and (b) be split into amendments (a), (b) and (c) as follows:-*

*(a) Proceed with the progress of the South Wye Transport Package projects, including :-*

- 1. A southern link road route between A49 and A465.*
- 2. Pedestrian crossing improvements to Belmont road and A49 in Hereford urban area.*
- 3. Cycle and walking provision on and off road at A49 and A465*
- 4. Residential cycling schemes in Belmont and Bullingham and consider how the approved route will facilitate a second river crossing.*

*(b) Stop the progress of the western bypass scheme which is included in the adopted policy.*

*(c) Make an amendment to the capital programme such that the Hereford Transport Plan is removed from the programme.*

Councillor Jim Kenyon proposed and introduced the amendment above. He explained that the amendment was an attempt to achieve a compromise. He supported an eastern river crossing and eastern bypass route to extend as far as the Ledbury Road. A southern link road route was proposed which could deviate from the line of the road in the SWTP. The population of Hereford was expanding which required additional infrastructure including a southern link road.

Councillor Bob Matthews seconded the amendment and explained that he opposed a western bypass and favoured an eastern route and river crossing. The cancellation of

the western bypass and the southern link road in its present form was supported however a more cost effective and sustainable route should be developed which took account of elements of the existing plans. A link between the A465 and A49 was essential: for vehicles to access the enterprise zone; to facilitate a proposed eastern crossing; and to reduce vehicle emissions on the Belmont Road.

Members of the Council debated the amendment and raised the principal points below:

- Doubt was expressed regarding the proposed amendment and the route of a southern link road and how this impacted on the de-capitalisation of the current scheme.
- Traffic accessing Rotherwas was currently using residential roads through the southern side of Hereford, a southern link road would remove this traffic from such roads and support the introduction of active travel measures.
- A southern link road would assist growth and jobs and support the enterprise zone by linking to the Rotherwas access road.
- Decapitalisation costs of £11.833m would be met from the financial resilience reserve.
- The southern link road scheme was an advanced project which had secured planning permission and for which compulsory purchase orders had been issued.
- To avoid decapitalisation of the route it was understood that the existing southern link road route would need to be used.
- The procurement process for the southern link road was considered flawed and the business case had not been produced in time to access funding.
- There was concern regarding the environmental impact of the route of the southern link road which passed through ancient woodland. Further planning permission would be required for the route and network rail had raised an issue concerning the height of the proposed road.
- Increased investment, the upgrading of existing infrastructure and improved connectivity should be considered to improve travel in the South Wye area in preference to the building of a southern link road.
- There was insufficient infrastructure south of Hereford to support house building strategies which the SWTP would provide.
- The resilience reserve was being used to avoid spending additional money on the projects. £5m in revenue spending had been allocated to the projects which should have been spent on existing roads, active travel measures and improved buses. The amendment would divert money from these measures and would not relieve traffic problems in the city.
- The amendment was inconsistent with the climate and ecological emergency declared by Council.
- Confusion was expressed over the route of a southern link road proposed in the amendment.

Councillor Harrington, as the mover of the original motion, in his right of reply explained his confusion over claims that parts of the southern link road would not be decapitalised. He stated that it was a flawed scheme that would not work in isolation and agreeing to the amendment would likely delay progress to a proposed eastern river crossing. It was important that projects to achieve modal shift were taken forward swiftly to provide congestion relief that was consistent with the climate emergency.

Council voted on the amendment. The amendment was lost by a simple majority of Council.

Council voted on the original recommendations in the report. The original recommendations in the report were carried by a simple majority of Council.

**RESOLVED: That council determines to:**

- (a) Stop the progress of the southern link road and western bypass schemes which are included in the adopted policy; and**
- (b) Make amendments to the capital programme such that the Hereford Transport Package and South Wye Transport Package projects are removed from the programme.**

The meeting ended at 5:42 p.m.

**Chairman**

## Appendix 1 - Questions from members of the public

Question Number	Questioner	Question	Question to
PQ 1	Mrs Protherough, Birch Hill	I very much appreciate all the hard work and consideration which has contributed to the Transport Review and note the commitment to providing an affordable, safe and secure transport system for all sectors of society, and to follow the principles set out in the governments 'Inclusive Transport Strategy' 2018. Taking into account that older and disabled people probably make up a quarter of our population how is this going to be achieved for this sector of society in an inclusive and well informed manner?	Cabinet member Infrastructure and Transport
<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>As is referenced in the question, the review process has taken into account inclusivity and this formed an important component of the assessment framework which assisted cabinet in determining its preferred strategy and the importance of increasing investment in public transport.</p> <p>Ongoing development of the preferred strategy will be informed by government guidance including its Inclusive Transport Strategy, public and stakeholder consultation and reference to local demographic information which includes information on age and disability. We will of course seek to ensure that we capture information in our consultation and engagement which enables us to understand the specific views of people with protected characteristics and particularly those with limited transport choice at present.</p>			
PQ 2	Ms Stace, Leominster	Herefordshire Wildlife Trust (HWT) supports cessation of all work on southern link road and western bypasses but remains opposed to the concept of an eastern bypass. This would have severe detrimental consequences on the environment, including the Lugg Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), the River Lugg SSSI and Special Area of Conservation and breeding curlews, a Red Data Book bird. We are also concerned about future pressure that such development might have on land north of the A428, including Lammas meadows owned and managed as Nature Reserves by HWT and Plantlife. Given the recent declaration of Climate and Ecological Emergency, and previous rejections of this eastern route on environmental grounds, how could the Council justify investing further funding to develop such a proposal. Will the Council therefore also reject Package E on the grounds on unacceptable environmental damage?	Cabinet member Infrastructure and Transport

**Response:**

I understand the concerns raised by the questioner in respect of the important environmental assets to the east of Hereford. I can confirm that the development of an eastern link between Rotherwas and the A438 Ledbury Road will include the appropriate assessment of all potential impacts and this will inform the process of identifying, initially, a corridor and then route options followed by identification of a preferred route. This process will include consultation and engagement with all relevant stakeholders and statutory bodies. It is important to note the entire Cabinet remains opposed to an 'Eastern Bypass' but recognises the resilience driven need to fully consider an Eastern crossing, going no further than the Ledbury road.

**Supplementary Question:**

Can reassurance be provided that environmental impact and damage will be rigorously considered in the question of an eastern bypass?

**Response to supplementary question - Cabinet Member:**

If an eastern link road was shown to be a solution to improve resilience, the current administration did not intend to take an eastern link road, beyond the Ledbury road and all necessary impact assessments would be considered fully.

PQ 3	Mr Morfett, Breinton	The South Wye Transport Package is now clearly a zombie project with no prospect of funding in the remaining term of this Coalition Council. If it was never-the-less retained in the capital budget would it hamper the Council's emergency response to Climate Change introducing modern sustainable transport solutions, by adding further delays on improvements to existing roads, road/rail bridges, cycle networks and new electric bus services?	Cabinet member Infrastructure and Transport
------	----------------------	--	---

**Response:**

Removing the SWTP from capital programme does not free up any capital funds for alternative projects as the funding for this scheme has already been withdrawn following the termination of the funding agreement by the Marches LEP.

In general terms however, not progressing the southern link road and the western bypass will allow all available resources to focus on the alternative transport measures included in our preferred strategy. These were set out at the cabinet meeting of 3 December 2020 and have been summarised in the report to council at paragraphs 22 to 24.

**Supplementary Question:**

With all due respect you have not answered my question. I asked if retaining the SWTP as an unfunded 'zombie' project would hamper the Council's emergency response to Climate Change introducing modern sustainable transport solutions?

Would it not seriously hamper new designs?

For example:

Mass transit options along the Abergavenny corridor include reopening the Pontrilas rail station to reduce commuter and school traffic into Hereford on the Belmont road, supported by our MP and Welsh government.

Surely this would be far less of a priority if you retained the unfunded SWTP?

In the previous administration all sustainable transport infrastructure was planned to be implemented after road construction.

Since the SWTP project was 'dead on arrival' having its funding withdrawn by the Marches LEP even before a strategic review was completed, is there not a clear case for a clean sweep on designs to enable an urgent response to the Climate Emergency ?

**Response to supplementary question - Cabinet Member:**

The SWTP does not work and southern link road does not serve a purpose. In a sense it

<p>is a zombie project, it has no funding, requires additional planning permission and business cases to be completed. Until a river crossing is achieved or other measures achieved it will not produce congestion and pollution reduction in the south wye area. Other measures could be implemented much quicker and the active travel measures can be retained. The resource implications are large and only limited project resource exists in county therefore there is a need to focus on sound projects in the capital programme.</p>			
PQ 4	Mr Palgrave, Hereford	<p>The Hereford Transport Review's assessment framework was based on four key themes - Economy, Society, Environment and Climate Emergency - which underpinned the appraisal of an initial long-list of 18 possible interventions. Two interventions included the Southern Link Road as a component part of bigger schemes (Option 14, full Eastern bypass, and Option 18, full Western Bypass). The long-list did not include a standalone Southern Link Road nor a combination of the SLR with the proposed short Eastern Link between Rotherwas and the A438 in Tupsley. Can the Cabinet Member confirm that if Council decide to reject Cabinet's decision and vote to keep the SLR - either standalone or combined with Eastern Link - that the same comprehensive assessment using the Transport Review methodology would be required to inform a decision whether to proceed or not with the SLR?</p>	Cabinet member Infrastructure and Transport
<p><b>Response:</b> Cabinet was not bound by the 6 package combinations looked at in the final stages of the review and determined to select a blended package which identified a combination of interventions not specifically assessed as a single package in the review. As such I do not believe that we would need to undertake a re-run of the review if council determined not to support the stopping of the southern link road and/or the western bypass but as identified by Mott MacDonald in the peer assessment of the prior SLR assessment and consultation process, national policy has changed and we would, particularly in relation to ecological, environmental and climate emergency factors, as far as I understand, need to rerun those elements of the work previously done. If council does not support the stopping of the two schemes cabinet would need to consider how to proceed and take advice from the statutory officers.</p>			
<p><b>Supplementary Question:</b> Thank you for your answer, which confirms that the preparatory work done so far on the Southern Link Road is likely to need updating to reflect movement in national and local policy on climate change. Variations have been made to the design of the SLR since planning permission was granted in 2016, and I understand officers have said that further permissions will be needed for these variations before the SLR design and procurement can be taken forward. Together with the absence of funding, would you agree with me that these points illustrate the SLR is far from a shovel-ready project?</p>			
<p><b>Response to supplementary question - Cabinet Member:</b> Yes – I agree entirely.</p>			
PQ 5	Mrs Palgrave,	Would the Cabinet member for Infrastructure please confirm the position regarding the	Cabinet member



	Hereford	provisional allocation of money from the Marches LEP Local Growth Fund for the South Wye Transport Package (SWTP). The arrangement as I understand it was that release of the £27m from Marches LEP was conditional on Department for Transport review and approval of a final business case, which I believe was not completed. Has the Marches LEP Local Growth Fund allocation for the SWTP now been irrevocably withdrawn?	Infrastructure and Transport
<p><b>Response:</b>  Yes. The local growth funding agreement for the South Wye Transport Package was terminated and funding withdrawn by the Marches LEP following a majority vote of its Board at its meeting of 27 January 2020. The administration does not agree with the approach taken by the LEP and is strongly resisting the LEP's attempt to clawback the monies already provided and spent by the council on the package. A business case for this project was not completed and the procurement process for the tendering of the road building element to a contractor was not completed and was formally terminated.</p>			
PQ 6	Mr Franklin, Bromyard	The Critical Friend Review (Appendix D) highlights uncertainty introduced by Covid-19 and suggests that travel patterns may change considerably. It seems certain that local businesses have suffered with consequent losses of employment and erosion of the revenue base. We may also see erosion of public transport and greater car use with people finding employment further afield plus additional vehicles if the proposed housing developments go ahead. The Critical Friend Review suggests development of multiple scenarios in response to the uncertainties. Have alternative scenarios been developed which would enable Councillors to consider whether continuation with the SLR and Western Bypass, with consequent stimulus to development and employment, which will surely be badly needed, and avoiding the write-off of £11.8 million of reserves which may also be badly needed, should be re-examined in the light of the impact of the Covid emergency?	Cabinet member Infrastructure and Transport
<p><b>Response:</b>  Firstly, as I understand it, the reduction in the usage of public transport is widely believed to be a temporary issue and directly related to concerns around safe distancing and COVID-19 infection potential. As the country is vaccinated this risk will decrease and the belief is that a return to greater use of public transport will follow, most likely within the next 12 months. Therefore it is entirely sensible and appropriate to consider what measures locally could drive an increase in bus service provision and usage' – ideally along a Herefordshire 'Hopper' model of collaboration. The focus of provision of an improved and larger local bus network is entirely in line with the direction from Central Government and the DfT, with the minister, Grant Shapps ascertaining that, "We will use our cars less and be able to rely on a convenient, cost-effective and coherent public transport network."</p>			

The Hereford Transport Strategy Review (included at appendix 3 of the council papers) identified the potential future trends and scenarios which might impact transport strategy requirements over the longer term (pages 33 and 34) advising for the need for an agile and flexible approach. Alongside current DfT forecasts for transport the review also included an assessment of a scenario in which long term effects of covid might see a sustained reduction in commuting traffic (page 96).

With this in mind the cabinet selected a blended package which combines a range of different types of transport intervention including better walking and cycling infrastructure, behavioural change, shared mobility, mobility hubs, investment in public and school transport, demand management and some additional road building. This will provide flexibility as we move forward. Cabinet wished to consider if any new road building was required and the review allowed us to look at alternatives with and without new roads and ultimately enabled us to make a selection which we feel represents the best value for money, will improve choice and resilience and also support local growth. Whilst it will be important to maintain a focus for this strategy, which will provide a strong basis to develop clear and specific bids for external funding, we note the advice provided by the review to remain agile and flexible due to the acknowledged uncertainty of the future. We do not feel that this agility and flexibility should include ongoing uncertainty for people living in the vicinity of the western bypass and southern link road and do not see any value in maintaining these schemes as we pursue the preferred strategy.

**Supplementary Question:**

It seems to me that the short answer to my question is "NO". In my original question here and that to Cabinet on January 21, and I thank the Cabinet member for his response, I have attempted to discover whether adequate cost benefit analyses were carried out and whether these would support the change in transport policy. It would seem that these analyses do not exist and I am left with the impression that thus far the proposed policy change rests almost entirely on qualitative judgements, which are necessarily subjective. What steps have been taken to ensure that throughout the process of policy change from the initial announcement of pause and review, through the selection of consultants and the scoping of the review, the selection of options for consideration, and future implementation, that obtaining best value for money and the best outcome for the citizens of Herefordshire, as a whole, can and will be demonstrated?

**Response to supplementary question - Cabinet Member:**

In any consultation or analysis there was not perfection and the high level review undertaken by our consultant was based on quantitative and qualitative assessments. The majority were qualitative assessments by experts taking modelling into account. I am satisfied that the review was done to good enough standard; a judgement Mott Macdonald also reached.

PQ 7	Dr Geeson, Hereford	We read that the purpose of the review was to “ensure any major scheme has a positive impact on the county to address travel issues, such as congestion and air quality”. Building the Southern Link Road would mean a Traffic Regulation Order on the A465 Belmont Road to stop lorries using that, therefore adding to traffic on the A49. Even if an eastern bridge were built, there would be likely to be restrictions affecting HGVs on that route. So please can you confirm that building the Southern Link Road on its own would be likely to increase congestion and air pollution on the A49 Ross Road?	Cabinet member Infrastructure and Transport
------	---------------------	--	---

**Response:**

As per the evidence presented at the SWTP Compulsory Purchase Order Public Inquiry, autumn 2018, if the Southern Link Road was built on its own, traffic on some sections of the A49 Ross Road would increase and on other sections traffic would decrease. Most of the increases are adjacent to the SLR roundabout as traffic re-routes to use the new road. However, most of the links on the A49 corridor south of the River Wye are forecast to experience a reduction in traffic flow upon construction of the SLR. These are 'net' effects with some traffic diverting to the new route, thereby creating spare capacity on the A49, some of which has been partially filled by other traffic.

**Supplementary Question:**

Most heavy traffic approaching Hereford city from the south uses the A465 Abergavenny Road or A49 Ross Road, converging at ASDA roundabout and Greyfriars Bridge. A Southern Link Road would link these roads, completing a triangle. As I understand it, if the SLR were built, a Traffic Regulation Order would put restrictions on the types and therefore numbers of vehicles using the Belmont Road. This was to facilitate measures such as a bus lane. Imagine a lorry coming north towards Hereford from Pontrilas on the Abergavenny Road. At the junction with a new SLR, due to new restrictions it would turn right onto the SLR. If it needed to access Hereford city it would then turn left onto the A49 Ross Road at Grafton roundabout. Surely such lorries would add to traffic already using the A49 Ross Road increasing congestion and air pollution in e.g. Redhill?

I have looked at the modelling figures you mention in the reply to my first question. As you say, they show some decreases in traffic flow on parts of the A49, which seems strange in the light of the proposed Belmont Road restrictions. Please can you explain how such decreases in traffic flow could happen? Perhaps the model assumes a large volume of traffic from the SLR travelling E to Rotherwas rather than N to Hereford city, but is that likely?

**Response to supplementary question - Cabinet Member:**

The original modelling shows an increase and a reduction in the Ross Road, it shows an increase around junctions and decrease on some other parts but the assessment was undertaken without factoring in induced demand. The work on the Hereford transport strategic review most recently undertaken did factor in induced demand. Before the question was answered definitely a further understanding was required through engagement with the consultants but without another river crossing traffic would only be able to transfer between the A465 and A49.

PQ 8	Ms Sharp, Hereford	The school run increases congestion at peak times by over 50% on some key routes into Hereford. In particular the largest area of Hereford that generated the most traffic in the city, much more than any employer, is the North East quadrant of the City. By delivering on Safer Routes to School and improving school transport, how much could congestion be reduced at peak times?	Cabinet member Infrastructure and Transport
------	-----------------------	--	---

**Response:**

I believe that Safer Routes to School and improving school transport can make a significant contribution to reducing congestion. Whilst the review did undertake assessment of safer routes to school and school transport as individual options (options 3 and 4 respectively with assessment summaries at 103 and 104 of the report at appendix 3 of the council papers) they were not options which could be specifically modelled in detail. As components of package A and B we do have an assessment of impact on various aspects of congestion and these include:

- 15% forecast reduced delay at junctions across the city
- 7% forecast reduced delay at junctions in the city centre

- 2% reduction in journey terms along key corridors

These figures relate to a comparison with do minimum (no new transport improvements) for the forecast year of 2026.

**Supplementary Question:**

Historically there has been little to no capital funding to help schools deliver ambitions for active school travel plans and school playing fields have been sacrificed to provide increased car parking.

With some areas of Hereford suffering much higher levels of childhood obesity levels than the national average, is the prioritisation of safe, active travel measures to school in Hereford supported by the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee & Directorate as well as the Health & Wellbeing Board and the Public Health officer?

**Responses to supplementary question:**

Chairperson of children and young people scrutiny committee

The committee had undertaken some work on childhood obesity and diabetes. Government had put certain measures in place to reduce childhood obesity which was key to addressing childhood obesity which the pandemic would have impacted upon.

Cabinet member children and families

The Children and Families directorate was keen to encourage children to walk to school and recognised obesity problems. The cabinet member infrastructure and transport was being consulted on what further steps could be taken to encourage active travel to schools and was something that would be taken forward together with green school travel plans.

Chairperson of the health and wellbeing board

The concern regarding childhood obesity was felt by the health and wellbeing board and the item was on the board's agenda. It was being looked at with the assistance of the public health team.

Cabinet member infrastructure and transport

The problem relates to an underlying problem that there used to be proper funding for school travel plans and there used to be more effort to work with schools to provide provision and training for cycling and pedestrians but the little revenue that was dedicated to such initiatives had been directed towards the two large road schemes more recently. There has been a disadvantage created by the desire to pursue road schemes against a more balanced approach.

PQ 9	Mrs Richards, Hereford	The Transport report makes mention that without new road infrastructure, strategic housing sites in Hereford may not be built out to the inflated housing levels planned in the Core Strategy. According to the Core Strategy, the City Link Road would help unlock land for 800 new homes in the Urban Village. How many new homes for local people, particularly affordable homes, have been delivered in the Urban Village since the road was completed and opened 3 years ago?	Cabinet member Infrastructure and Transport
------	------------------------	--	---

**Response:**

The Core Strategy in policy HD2 proposes that around 800 new homes will be accommodated in Hereford City Centre over the plan period 2011-31, which includes development within the urban village.

Between April 2011 and April 2020 (which is the last monitoring period) there had been 372 housing completions in the central area 181 of which had been completed in the three years since 2017-18. In addition, there were 188 outstanding planning permissions as of April 2020.

In respect of affordable housing, 76 have been provided in the past three years in central Hereford with a further 74 anticipated to be delivered in the next few months.

Consideration is also being given to the opportunity to bring forward housing on Council owned sites in the vicinity of the city link road.

**Supplementary Question:**

Please confirm that the real reasons why housing at 3 Elms, in the Urban Village and Lower Bullingham has not been developed as proposed by the adopted Core strategy, is not to do with the lack of a new 60mph road through the new housing estates in the West of the City, but: -

- a) the inflated housing growth figures;
- b) the flood risk associated with the proposed development sites in Hereford;
- c) the risk of contamination of underground fresh water supplies to 2 of the largest employers in Hereford, posing a risk to over 5,000 jobs in the city and more within the supply chain?

**Response to supplementary question – Cabinet Member:**

In essence it is correct, permission already exists for development to begin if other conditions are met. The planning inspector of the core strategy did not base their acceptance of the allocations of development in the west of Hereford on the provision of a bypass. The issues that are holding up the developments are outlined in the supplementary question.

PQ 10	Mrs Morawiecka, Breinton	Core Strategy Policy HD5 Western Urban Expansion allowed for a minimum 1,000 new homes, “a mix of market and affordable house sizes and types that meet the requirements of policy H3 and the needs identified in the latest version of the Herefordshire Local Housing Market Assessment”. The developer informed Herefordshire Council that contributing to a Western Relief Road would make it unviable to deliver 35% affordable housing out of the 1,200 units in their planning application, 20% more homes than in the Core Strategy. This site is well linked to schools, employment and the city centre by flat cycling infrastructure and regular bus services, which could be enhanced further with developer contributions. Surely cancelling the Western Bypass is an opportunity to promote truly sustainable development, whilst delivering much needed affordable housing, designed around people rather than the car?	Cabinet member Infrastructure and Transport
-------	--------------------------	--	---

**Response:**

The question refers to an historic position taken by the developer of the site (HD5) which has been updated to confirm their intention to comply with the requirement for affordable housing.

As is set out in the report to council, we will need to continue working with developers to ensure that any planning applications comply with Policy HD3 of the core strategy on Hereford Movement and include robust assessment of their transport impacts and identify and contribute to any mitigation required for the development to proceed. In addition, policy H1 states that evidence of housing need and an assessment of viability of developments will be necessary where viability is questionable.

I agree that cancelling the Western Bypass is the right thing to do and the preferred transport strategy does indeed represent an opportunity to support sustainable development and for developers to bring forward such development, with significant investment in active travel measures and passenger transport.

**Supplementary Question:**

The Herefordshire Council Land Drainage report Nov 2020 on the 3 Elms development says:

“The bypass is also likely to require provision of floodplain compensation to the west of the bypass (in the area of the proposed employment land), the partial realignment of the Yazor Brook to move the watercourse south and facilitate an improved crossing beneath the bypass, and the provision of surface water attenuation basins that will drain to the Yazor Brook”

If the Council don't cancel the Western Relief Road, where are Herefordshire Council anticipating the 1,200 new householders work when the construction of the road requires the 3 Elms Employment site to become a vast flood plain, upstream of the City and what risk does this new flood plain pose to the city of Hereford situated downstream of this location, considering weather events in recent years?

**Response to supplementary question – Cabinet Member:**

There are issues associated with bringing forward this site in relation to flood plains, the water table and to ensure the two large businesses nearby were not impacted adversely. It was a question that the council would need to consider further.

PQ 11	Ms Smith, Hereford	<p>We would like to know why Huntington Hamlet Association was not invited to attend a meeting with Herefordshire Council, Developers, Church Commissioners with reference to the proposed Western Bypass. The Consultants reports stated that 3rd party consent would be required from the Landowners with Riperian Ownership in Huntington Hamlet as the Yazor Brook, SINC, flowed through their land forming a pond at Huntington House Grade II and Huntington Court Grade II with a lake flowing through 4 acres.</p> <p>All activities undertaken to build the Western Bypass and bridge over the Yazor Brook which cause water pollution, increase the water levels causing flooding further downstream to Huntington Hamlet without the consent of the Riperian Owners will result in legal action being taken against all persons responsible. The developers have already stated that they cannot guarantee 100% protection.</p>	Cabinet member Infrastructure and Transport
-------	--------------------	--	---

**Response:**

Technical meetings were held between the consultants progressing the HTP and consultants supporting the development of the Three Elms planning application to

consider the delivery/impacts of delivering both projects. These were initial technical fact findings meetings not stakeholder events and these ceased at the point at which the HTP was paused.

**Supplementary Question:**

In 2015 we advised Herefordshire Council to conduct a full land survey, including FRA on the southern and northern boundaries of the Roman Road but no action taken. There are many overground and underground streams in the area which have not been identified or mapped. Those on the northern boundary flow under the Roman Road to Yazor Brook Sire of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Huntington Hamlet and surrounding areas increasing the flood risks south. We are asking Herefordshire Council to conduct a survey as a matter of urgency.

Due to Climate Change storms have become more frequent, winters wetter and the land waterlogged. Flood events increasing and water levels rising rapidly over wider areas not known to previously flood. Due to planning applications (PAs) being passed on flood plains Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) drainage being used, surface waters cannot always be contained on site.

**Response to supplementary question – Cabinet Member:**

This concerns a period prior to my role as cabinet member and a written response can be provided. I appreciate the ecological value of the area around Huntington and Yazor Brook and if there is good evidence to take forward a study it would be supported.

PQ 12	Mr Price, Preston-on-Wye	<p>In response to public questions at Cabinet 21 Jan, Cllr Harrington said “. The Western Bypass package, is forecast to cost £261 million.”</p> <p>The technical review costs for HTP bypass including the SLR are estimated as £190m.</p> <p>The table at Agenda item 34 shows the total costs to date, of the HTP and SWTP as £17.764m with no revenue costs on the SWTP.</p> <p>Please explain how in one week the cost of the western bypass can change by £71m and the total cost of these projects to date aren't showing non-capitalised revenue spend for SWTP; what are the full costs that should be included in the table, and an explanation given as to what “earmarked” projects won't be delivered because of decapitalising these costs?</p>	Cabinet member Infrastructure and Transport
-------	-----------------------------	---	--

**Response:**

I can clarify that the cost of £261m refers to the full estimated cost of package A+C+D as assessed in the review. Package D is the western bypass and southern link road with a combined estimated capital cost of £190m. The difference in the two figures of £71m is the estimated capital costs associated with package A (active travel measures) and package C (demand management including bus priority).

The table at paragraph 34 of the report shows the full costs of the Hereford and South Wye Transport Packages with final costs estimated to give an overall cost of £17.764m, including all revenue and capital spend. The tables are accurate and SWTP feasibility

was treated as capital throughout as feasibility can be capital spend as there would potentially have been an asset created at the end of the project and therefore all costs included as capital. HTP was treated as revenue as per CIPFA guidance until a route was chosen as costs on option appraisal and options not being progressed is not eligible capital spend and at that point costs are then treated as capital included feasibility etc.

The use of earmarked reserves to cover the decapitalisation costs of the HTP and SWTP does not impact any planned projects.



## **Minutes of the meeting of Council held at Online meeting only on Friday 12 February 2021 at 10.00 am**

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

**Councillors:** Graham Andrews, 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, 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 Tillett, Diana Toynbee, Ange Tyler, Yolande Watson and William Wilding

**Officers:** Director for children and families, Director for economy and place, Interim Head of Legal Services, Democratic services manager, Acting Director of Public Health, Director for adults and communities and Solicitor to the council

### **37. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **38. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Felicity Norman declared a schedule 2 interest in agenda item no. 8, 2021/22 Capital Investment Budget and Capital Strategy Update, as a member of the LARC (Grange Court) management committee.

Councillor John Stone declared a schedule 2 interest in agenda item no. 8, 2021/22 Capital Investment Budget and Capital Strategy Update, as a member of the LARC (Grange Court) management committee.

Councillor Roger Phillips declared an other interest in agenda item no. 10, Pay Policy Statement, as the vice chairman of the national joint council (NJC) for local government services.

### **39. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the ordinary meeting of Council on 11 December 2020 and the extraordinary meeting of Council on 22 January 2021 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **40. CHAIRMAN AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Council noted the Chairman and Chief Executive's announcements as printed in the agenda papers and in the supplement published on 10 February.

**41. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC** (Pages 11 - 12)

A copy of the public question and written answer is attached to the Minutes at Appendix 1.

**42. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL** (Pages 13 - 18)

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.

**43. 2021/22 COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME**

Council considered a report by the Leader to agree the council tax reduction scheme for 2021/22.

The Cabinet Member Finance and Corporate Services proposed the council tax reduction scheme for 2021/22, with increased discounts compared to the existing scheme, for approval. In introducing the report it was explained that changes to the scheme responded to current economic pressures and provided broader support to people who were out of work. The changes to the scheme had been supported during the consultation exercise.

The Leader seconded the council tax reduction scheme for 2021/22 for approval and explained that there was a need for the changes proposed in the scheme for 2021/22 to respond to difficult times.

The principal points below were raised during the debate:

- The scheme would offer direct support to people who needed it most.
- There was concern for those local residents who were just above the eligibility criteria.

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 Graham Andrews, 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, 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**

- (a) The council tax reduction scheme for 2021/22, with increased discounts compared to the existing scheme, is approved.**

#### **44. 2021/22 CAPITAL INVESTMENT BUDGET AND CAPITAL STRATEGY UPDATE**

Council considered a report by the Leader to approve the 2021/22 capital investment budget and capital strategy update.

The cabinet member finance and corporate services moved the report and proposed the recommendations. She explained that the report contained detail of the investment necessary to provide community facilities and infrastructure. All borrowing was subject to review and a number of projects in the capital programme had been clarified. The building of affordable housing in the county was proposed to help address a shortfall and greater investment in the market towns. Delivering projects within the capital investment budget on time and within budget was key and a new programme management scheme would oversee delivery.

The Leader seconded the report and the recommendations. He explained that the capital investment budget reflected the county plan. It proposed investment across the market towns and took advantage of government grants where possible.

In discussion the following principal points were raised:

- A sustainable transport system and the suitability of electric buses in rural areas and the future of hydrogen fuelled transport;
- The continuation of the warm homes fund;
- The support provided to the market towns was welcomed and a suggestion that similar support is provided to large parish councils;
- The investment in the enterprise zone and recent job creation;
- The absence of a large infrastructure project in the capital investment budget, such as the south wye transport package;
- Capital receipts resulting from the disposal of council assets;
- The work with Western Power Distribution to ensure the resilience of the power network to cope with an increase in electric vehicles;
- The construction of quality affordable housing to meet a shortage and the revenue cost neutrality of the scheme;
- The scheduling of active travel measures projects which could be progressed more quickly following the cancellation of the western bypass; and
- The support for the principles of the County Plan through the capital investment budget.

The 2021/22 capital investment budget and capital strategy update was put to the recorded vote and carried by a simple majority.

FOR (46): Councillors Graham Andrews, 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, l'Anson, James, Jinman, Graham Jones, Mike Jones, Kenyon, Lester, Marsh, Matthews, Millmore, Milln, Phillips, Price, Seldon, Stark, Summers, Swinglehurst, Tillet, Toynbee, Tyler, Watson and Wilding.

Against (2); Councillors Johnson and Rone

Abstentions (2): Councillors Shaw and Symonds

Councillors Norman and Stone re-joined the meeting.

There was an adjournment at 11.44 a.m. the meeting reconvened at 12.04 p.m.

#### **45. 2021/22 BUDGET SETTING**

Council considered a report from the Leader to set the 2021/22 budget.

The cabinet member finance and corporate services introduced and moved the budget and explained that the budget reflected the challenges presented by the COVID pandemic. The budget needed to plan for an uplift in service delivery and a reduction in income; it proposed the largest savings programme to be undertaken at the council. Pressures involved in the delivery of adults social care services had informed the decision to propose a precept of 4.99% including 3% in respect of adult social care. A wide-ranging consultation had been undertaken and support had been expressed to increase council tax to support the provision of local services.

The Leader seconded the budget and explained the significant increases to the base budgets for adults' and children's services. The council tax increase was proposed reluctantly at what was a difficult time but the increase would allow for: the expansion of the tax base; an increase in support for people unable to pay council tax; and the council to take advantage of government grants. The budget that was proposed was a balance between savings, the preservation of services and a council tax increase.

Councillor Jonathan Lester expressed concern regarding the deliverability of the savings proposals and acknowledged the strain on resources due to the COVID pandemic. The precept increase was not supported and an amendment would be considered to reduce the level of the adult social care precept by using the New Homes Bonus.

Councillor John Hardwick explained that the budget supported the County Plan and if the precept of 4.99% was not agreed it would be difficult to access additional funding from government. The consultation had engaged with stakeholders, parish councils and the scrutiny committees.

Councillor Alan Seldon explained that the savings proposed were part of a high level of savings across the public sector and the additional pressures posed by adults' and children's services were significant and could impact upon the delivery of other core services.

Councillor Terry James explained that the proposed increase in the rate of council tax was too high and would have an adverse impact upon local residents who were just outside the thresholds for the council tax reduction scheme. Reserves should be used in place of the proposed increase to the precept.

Councillor Ellie Chowns explained that the council was facing significant increase in the level of demand for services. Savings and the precept increase would meet the cost of this demand whilst support for people who were struggling and unable to afford the council tax was in place.

Councillor Bob Matthews explained that the precept increase would affect rural communities with greater levels of poverty. Parish councils were expected to provide more services and there was concern about reduced street lighting levels.

In the discussion that followed the principal points below were raised:

- The precept would impact on local residents who were financially insecure;
- The increasing cost of adult social care;

- The work of the Adults' and Communities directorate and the Talk Community programme;
- Income from the rural sparsity grant and the pressures of providing services in a rural area;
- The loss of income for local residents and redundancies;
- A typographical error under paragraph 5 of the medium term financial strategy which stated the current financial year: 2020/21;
- The requirement for efficiency savings in the budget;
- Community support for priorities including the construction of affordable housing and the provision of care for vulnerable residents;
- The increase in costs to deliver children's services and the improvement programmes currently in progress;
- The reductions in grants from central government to local government;
- Alternative methods to fund services which could be considered in preference to an increase in the precept.

**Amendment 1 – Proposed by Councillor Nigel Shaw and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lester**

**Replace word(s) in paragraph c of the Recommendations (the Motion) with the following’:-**

- c) an additional precept in respect of adult social care costs of 2% applied to council tax in 2021/22 resulting in a total council tax increase of 3.99%, increasing the band D charge from £1,573.77 to £1,636.57 for Herefordshire Council in 2021/22; deferring a 1% increase until 2022/23 in line with government policy.**

Councillor Shaw proposed the budget amendment and explained that despite the council tax reduction scheme a number of local residents would have to economise to pay the proposed precept of 4.99%. The decrease of 1% would help local residents who were struggling to meet their council tax obligations. By reducing the precept to 3.99% and deferring 1% until 2022/23 the council would send a signal to local residents that it was listening and responding to difficulties encountered by local communities due to the COVID pandemic.

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

- Extra investment had been dedicated to help local residents who were struggling to pay council tax;
- During the consultation there had been support for the proposed precept of 4.99%;
- The proposals to reduce the adult social care precept should have been considered at scrutiny;
- Central government should be funding the council to meet the cost of the response to COVID;
- The impact of the proposal on sustainable transport plans;
- The potential hardship caused to local residents and the reduction in their spending power of a precept of 4.99%.

Councillor Lester seconded the amendment and explained that the amendment proposed a balanced approach that used existing funds to cushion local residents against the greatest precept increase whilst ensuring a balanced budget.

Councillor Harvey, as the mover of the original motion, responded to the amendment and explained that the New Homes Bonus funds identified in the amendments was to be

allocated in part to sustainable transport measures to address traffic problems and also to the council tax reduction scheme to help people struggling to pay council tax. There was disappointment regarding the late amendments to the budget as opportunities for engagement with the budget process had existed at an earlier stage.

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

For (17): Councillors Bolderson, Durkin, Gandy, Guthrie, l'Anson, Johnson, Mike Jones, Lester, Matthews, Millmore, Phillips, Price, Rone, Shaw, Stone, Swinglehurst and Tillett.

Against (28): Councillors Graham Andrews, Paul Andrews, Bartlett, Bartrum, Boulter, Bowes, Chowns, Crockett, Davies, Fagan, Foxton, Hardwick, Harrington, Harvey, Hewitt, Hey, Hitchiner, Jinman, Kenyon, Marsh, Milln, Norman, Seldon, Summers, Toynbee, Tyler, Watson and Wilding.

Abstain (7): Councillors Polly Andrews, Bowen, Howells, James, Graham Jones, Stark and Symonds.

### **Amendment 2 – Proposed by Councillor Nigel Shaw and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lester**

**'Add an additional recommendation with the following at paragraph i':-**

- i) Defer delivery of proposed £200k savings for waste recycling, Saving \$13 (appendix B, page 252). Funding the recommendation through £200k from the New Homes Bonus Funding.**

Councillor Shaw proposed the budget amendment and explained that the proposal to reduce the opening hours of the household waste recycling centres (HWRCs) was inconsistent with a priority to encourage waste minimisation. A reduction in the opening hours was likely to increase the level of fly tipping therefore the amendment proposed the use of the New Homes Bonus to defer the proposed savings.

In discussion the following principal points were raised on amendment 2:

- The amendment proposed reallocating money from sustainable travel measures which had been supported strongly by the general scrutiny committee;
- The reduction in opening hours would only be considered after other savings options, including the continuation of the booking system, had been explored;
- Concern that a reduction in opening hours would encourage fly tipping;
- The triaging of waste taken to the HWRCs should be considered to increase recycling rates and support potential income generation;
- A lack of evidence that any increase in fly tipping was linked to the introduction of the booking system over the period of the COVID pandemic.

Councillor Lester seconded the amendment and explained that the amendment was an attempt to ensure that savings did not need to be made and that the service at the HWRCs was protected.

Councillor Harvey, as the mover of the original motion, responded to the amendment and explained that the changing of the opening hours to achieve savings would only be considered after other preferable options, such as income generation and the booking system, were explored. The proposed saving was a small but important element of the savings programme; potential savings needed to be identified wherever they were possible.

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

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

Against (29): Councillors Graham Andrews, Paul Andrews, Polly Andrews, Bartlett, Boulter, Bowes, Chowens, Crockett, Davies, Fagan, Foxton, Hardwick, Harrington, Harvey, Hewitt, Hey, Hitchiner, Howells, Jinman, Marsh, Milln, Norman, Seldon, Stark, Summers, Toynbee, Tyler, Watson and Wilding.

Abstain (1): Councillor Bowen.

**Amendment 3 – Proposed by Councillor Nigel Shaw and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lester**

**'Add an additional recommendation with the following at paragraph j':-**

**j) introduction of grant scheme to fund an offer to parish councils to bid for schemes to alleviate and prevent flooding to be funded from 341k of New Homes Bonus funding.**

Councillor Shaw proposed the budget amendment and explained that parish councils and lengthsman were often frustrated that they were unable to resolve local flooding issues. The amendment sought to provide funds to local parish and town councils to address perennial flooding problems.

In discussion the following principal points were raised on amendment 3:

- Parish councils had been very active and creative in seeking to address flooding problems but they required assistance;
- The fund was only a small sum of money and could help local residents affected by persistent flooding problems;
- The amendment would reallocate money dedicated to sustainable transport projects;
- The proposed fund represented only a small sum per parish council and flood alleviation schemes required significant funding;
- A system-wide approach to flooding issues needed to be undertaken and funding from central government was not sufficient to meet the need of local communities;
- Works to address local flooding problems should be undertaken through the public realm contract with Balfour Beatty Living Places (BBLP).

Councillor Lester seconded the amendment and explained flooding was a significant problems and much could be achieved with only a small sum of money.

Councillor Harvey, as the mover of the original motion, responded to the amendment and explained that flooding alleviation works were being undertaken in consultation with community groups and through the BBLP contract which ensured a multiagency approach.

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

For (20): Councillors Polly Andrews, Bartrum, Bolderson, Durkin, Gandy, Guthrie, l'Anson, James, Johnson, Graham Jones, Mike Jones, Lester, Matthews, Millmore, Price, Rone, Shaw, Stone, Symonds and Tillett.

Against (28): Councillors Graham Andrews, Paul Andrews, Bartlett, Boulter, Bowes, Chowns, Crockett, Davies, Fagan, Foxton, Hardwick, Harrington, Harvey, Hewitt, Hey, Hitchiner, Howells, Jinman, Kenyon, Marsh, Milln, Norman, Seldon, Summers, Toynbee, Tyler, Watson and Wilding.

Abstain (2): Councillors Bowen and Stark.

**Amendment 4 – Proposed by Councillor Terry James and seconded by Councillor Kevin Tillett**

**This council is aware of the exceptional economic circumstances that households find themselves in, nationally and locally, and the financial hardships that are to be placed on council tax payers this year and next year. It is therefore proposed that the 2021/22 Council Tax increase is set at 3% instead of the proposed 4.99%.**

**Therefore, we amend item B as follows –**

**b. (Remove an and replace with Zero) increase in core council tax in 2021/22 (delete “of 1.99%”);**

**to read –**

**b. Zero increase in core council tax in 2021/22**

**The £1.4 million shortfall can be recovered from the following sources:-**

- 1 - £700,000 from the New Home Bonus**
- 2 - £700,000 from the financial resilience reserves**

**The effect on section (f)**

**f. the medium term financial strategy (MTFS) 2021-24 at appendix A; and**

**from changes to (b) will be solved by–**

**For the life of the medium term financial strategy (MTFS) the future impact of the zero increase of core council tax in 2021/22 is borne by the financial resilience reserve.**

Councillor James proposed the budget amendment and explained that taxpayers in the middle band of income in the county and those just above the thresholds for the council tax reduction scheme would struggle to pay the proposed precept of 4.99%. The proposed amendment sought to assist local residents in financial difficulties by reducing the council tax increase.

In discussion the following principal points were raised on amendment 4:

- Local residents who were just about managing required support;
- Concern was expressed regarding the use of reserves in the amendment;
- The expansion of the council tax reduction scheme and the proposed precept increase to the maximum permissible amount without a referendum was questioned as illogical;
- The amendment would reallocate money dedicated to sustainable transport measures;
- The proposal outlined in the amendment should have been considered at scrutiny;
- Local authorities in neighbouring areas had proposed lower precept increases than Herefordshire Council;



- The budget consultation had produced support for the 4.99% precept increase.

Councillor Tillett seconded the amendment and explained the current financial difficulties experienced by a number of local residents. The amendment sought to support the budget and protect services whilst easing the burden on local residents.

Councillor Harvey, as the mover of the original motion, responded to the amendment and explained that it was not responsible to take money from reserves.

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

For (20): Councillors Polly Andrews, Bartrum, Durkin, Gandy, Guthrie, Howells, l'Anson, James, Johnson, Graham Jones, Mike Jones, Lester, Matthews, Millmore, Price, Shaw, Stark, Stone, Symonds and Tillett.

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

Abstain (1): Councillor Bowen.

Councillor Harvey, as the mover of the original motion, responded to the budget debate and thanked all involved in the setting of the budget. It was now important to deliver on the promises in the budget and meet the expectations of local residents.

The 2021/22 budget and associated medium term financial strategy and treasury management strategy as contained in the report was put to the recorded vote and was approved by a simple majority.

For (29): Councillors Graham Andrews, Paul Andrews, Bartlett, Boulter, Bowen, Bowes, Chowns, Crockett, Davies, Fagan, Foxtan, Hardwick, Harrington, Harvey, Hewitt, Hey, Hitchiner, Jinman, Graham Jones, Kenyon, Marsh, Milln, Norman, Seldon, Summers, Toynbee, Tyler, Watson and Wilding.

Against (18): Councillors Polly Andrews, Bartrum, Durkin, Gandy, Guthrie, Howells, l'Anson, James, Johnson, Mike Jones, Lester, Millmore, Price, Shaw, Stark, Stone, Symonds and Tillett.

Abstain (1): Councillor Matthews.

#### **RESOLVED - That:**

#### **Council approves;**

- a. **the council tax base of 68,355.22 Band D equivalents in 2021/22;**
- b. **an increase in core council tax in 2021/22 of 1.99%;**
- c. **an additional precept in respect of adult social care costs of 3% applied to council tax in 2021/22 resulting in a total council tax increase of 4.99%, increasing the band D charge from £1,573.77 to £1,652.30 for Herefordshire Council in 2021/22;**
- d. **the balanced 2021/22 revenue budget proposal totalling £161.0m, subject to any amendments approved at the meeting, specifically the net spending limits for each directorate as at appendix C;**
- 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) 2021-24 at appendix A;  
and
- g. the treasury management strategy at appendix D be approved.
- h. a growth bid to fund a Armed Forces Covenant Support Officer,  
attached at appendix J.

#### 46. PAY POLICY STATEMENT

Council considered a report by the chairperson of the employment panel to approve the pay policy statement for 2021.

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 versions of the report the hourly rate reflects productive officer time and deducts elements such as annual leave, training and team sickness. *The Leader explained that he would discuss the request with the Assistant Director People.*

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

#### **RESOLVED – That:**

- (a) the pay policy statement at appendix A is approved for publication.**

The meeting ended at 3.46 pm

**Chairperson**

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

Question Number	Questioner	Question	Question to
PQ 1	Mr Snow, Hereford	Does increased concern that Herefordshire’s poor performance in the tourism sector (relative to the rest of the UK) is directly related to the fact that it has more intensively farmed poultry units than any other county in the UK (please see recent thesis by Cardiff University - <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E2Qk48qxQ3U">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E2Qk48qxQ3U</a> ) mean that it is disingenuous (at best) or fraudulent (at worst) to accept over £440,000 from the Marches Investment Fund to promote tourism whilst still giving planning permission for yet more poultry units to be built in the County?	Cabinet member environment, economy and skills

**Response:**

Thank you for your question. I am aware of the research of Dr Alison Caffyn that you highlight in the question, and indeed I and other Council colleagues will be meeting with her shortly.

I recognise and share the widespread concern about the impact of intensive poultry units on the quality of our precious local rivers, and am working very closely with colleagues to try to address this problem, including through development of supplementary planning guidance.

The evidence presented by Dr Caffyn is indeed interesting and concerning. However, I do not think it is a reason not to invest in development of the local tourism sector.

Over the last circa 10 years there has unfortunately been limited council support for, or promotion of, the fantastic tourism opportunities in the county. This is a real shame as tourism is a sector of great importance to our local economy, with lots of potential. That’s why our County Plan 2020-24 states that supporting the development of tourism is a priority for the council.

The Marches Investment Fund grant from the Marches Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) has been awarded to support the recovery of the large number of existing visitor economy businesses across the county from the severe impacts of Covid 19. The project has already had a very positive impact, for example the PR element of the work has led to significant national press coverage including Herefordshire being named by the Telegraph Media Group in their top ten best tucked-away spots in Britain (<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/travel/lists/hidden-corners-britain-escape-crowds-summer/>), Conde Nast Traveller tipped the county as one of the ten best places to visit in 2021 in the UK (<https://www.cntraveller.com/gallery/places-to-visit-uk>), and recognition by Forbes with Herefordshire included in their ‘Essential Travel Forecast Report’ as one of the regions of the UK worth considering for a staycation.

We have been working closely with visitor economy businesses in implementing this very welcome LEP-funded project. As part of this project a great deal of consultation has been done with the local tourism sector, and as far as I am aware none of them have mentioned concern about intensive poultry units affecting their business.

I personally agree with you that planning permission should not be given for additional intensive poultry units currently, while there are limit-breaking levels of pollution in our rivers. The council and the local construction sector have unfortunately and unfairly had to bear the brunt of the cost of this pollution, in the form of the moratorium on housebuilding, despite the fact that the best available data shows that most of the pollution is from agricultural sources. We do indeed need a joined-up policy for protection and development of our beautiful county – one that recognises the costs of externalities such as agricultural pollution and acknowledges the impact of these costs on other sectors. However, as a council our powers to address this are unfortunately limited – by planning law, and by the actions or otherwise of regulatory agencies such as Natural England and the Environment Agency, who have direct responsibility in this arena.

## Appendix 2 - Questions from members of the Council

Question Number	Questioner	Question	Question to
MQ 1	Councillor Paul Symonds, Ross East	The proposed capital programme growth includes an item of £192k for air quality monitoring stations in Hereford and Leominster. What alternatives were considered to this proposal, for example diffusion tubes, and how do the capital and revenue impacts of alternative options compare to the proposed option?	Cabinet member housing, regulatory services and community safety
<p><b>Response:</b>                      The £192k proposed for air quality monitoring sites aims to upgrade the existing air quality monitoring station on Victoria Street in Hereford and also construct a completely new monitoring station at the Bargates junction in Leominster. Both will be for continuous monitoring of nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter to gauge compliance with the air quality objectives set by the government and for which nitrogen dioxide is potentially exceeded at both locations. Although diffusion tubes offer a much cheaper and basic alternative from a revenue point of view, only nitrogen dioxide can be measured in this way and the diffusion tube data can only provide monthly averages which are then used to provide annual means. The accuracy is also challengeable.</p> <p>However, the proposed monitoring stations will provide real time measurements for both nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter that will offer a much greater insight into the pollution levels at both locations and will assist officers in their understanding of traffic impacts and help us gauge the effectiveness of any measures put in place on an hour by hour basis. There is also scope and opportunity for expanding this suite of parameters, including those that will help inform the Council's climate emergency agenda</p>			
<p><b>Supplementary question:</b>                      Could we be informed of the capital and revenue cost difference between the proposed electronic monitoring stations and the diffusion tube, nitrogen dioxide system?</p>			
<p><b>Cabinet Member response to supplementary question:</b>                      An officer response would be provided.</p>			
MQ 2	Councillor Bob Matthews, Credenhill	At the full council meeting held on the 2nd of February 2021 when the Hereford transport strategy was debated I supported the administrations recommendations to stop the Western bypass and Southern Link Road in its present form and when speaking to the amendment proposed that officers be instructed to deliver a more cost effective environmentally	Leader

		<p>sustainable route between the A465 and A49 utilising a small section of the existing plan.</p> <p>Does the leader agree if this modest compromise had been agreed it would have saved this Council and the taxpayer £7.8 million?</p>	
<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>Thank you Councillor Matthews. You refer to saving the Council £7.8m by agreeing to include part of the proposed SLR. I question the use of the word “saving”. The money has already been spent. There would have been no saving for the Council or the taxpayer.</p> <p>The £7.8m has been taken out of reserves and I acknowledge that therefore the total amount of the resilience reserve has been reduced, meaning that portion of the reserve cannot be used for something else. However there remains a balance of £4.2m (agenda item 9, paragraph 22, page 212) in the resilience reserve which can continue to be used for the purposes for which it is intended, and the repayment of the capital does not impact on the council’s ongoing revenue budget.</p> <p>The decision of council on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of February makes it clear that the council will be focusing on sustainable and resilient transport activities for the city and the county from now on.</p> <p>Cllr Harrington has already confirmed that future work will include consideration of improvements to the traffic connections between the A465 and the A49 beyond Belmont. He looks forward to working with you and other Councillors to identify the most practical and cost effective solutions to achieve that.</p>			
<p><b>Supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Can the Leader consider the impact of traffic and congestion on the health and wellbeing of local people in Newton Farm and address this issue as a matter of urgency?</p>			
<p><b>Leader response to supplementary question:</b></p> <p>We are concerned about the health of local residents and the pollution caused by traffic queuing on the Belmont Road and many of us were not satisfied that the construction of a southern relief road would have an impact on congestion in this area. We are looking at other measures and trust that following the budget discussion there will be sufficient money to progress our proposals.</p>			
MQ 3	Councillor Nigel Shaw, Bromyard Bringsty	<p>In 2019/20 Herefordshire collected 98% of the council tax due and was 11<sup>th</sup> out of 57 unitary councils in terms of its collection rate.</p> <p>Key to the rationale in amending Council tax reduction scheme, Para 8 states, “It is, however, likely that the charges raised would not be settled quickly and could in fact become outstanding debt against those that are charged.”</p> <p>What evidence is there that that is the case?</p>	Cabinet member finance and corporate services

**Response:**

Collection rates have fallen since the pandemic and are currently behind the same point in time in 2019/20 even though many more accounts are being reduced by council tax reduction and a hardship award. Historically the collection rate of accounts in receipt of council tax reduction has always been around 83% reflecting that a number are on low level repayment plans, having this collection rate on a higher number of accounts, coupled with an increase in the council tax charge, would indicate that if the discount was not increased to 100% an additional amount of outstanding debt would accrue. At this difficult time, this administration considers it preferable to increase the 2021 discount to 100% rather than risk pushing more families into long-term debt.

**Supplementary question:**

The loss in revenue for this Council for the change to the council tax reduction scheme is £2million every year going forwards which will be cushioned by the use of one-off grant funding this year. Would the 151 officer not expect to see a more comprehensive business case were it one of the front line departments asked for this level of £2million of spending?

**Response to supplementary question:**

Section 151 officer response - There was a very detailed business case to support the assumptions of the CT base and collection rates. Happy to discuss with Chairman of the general scrutiny committee as a potential item for the committee's work programme.

MQ 4	Councillor Jonathan Lester, Three Crosses	In the February 2020 budget meeting Council approved £2m of new homes bonus be spent and capitalised on the Integrated Wetlands project. Subsequent to that meeting £2m of LEP capital funding was won. What has happened to the £2m of the new homes bonus funding, where does the Capital Programme reflect the LEP decision in November 2020 to reduce it's grant to £1m and is the current spend on forecast to defray required sums by March 31 <sup>st</sup> 2021?	Cabinet member finance and corporate services
------	---	--	---

**Response:**

The £2m from the New Homes Bonus agreed at the Council meeting in February 2020 was allocated to the Integrated Wetlands project in the capital programme to deliver up to 9 integrated constructed wetlands and purchase land for rewilding to improve the water quality of the River Lugg and in so doing, unblock development in the Lugg catchment. Following this project approval, the LEP then awarded £1m towards this same project.

The project has remained in the capital programme at £2m, however, funded equally by £1m from the LEP and £1m from the New Homes Bonus. The residual £1m from the NHB has been placed in a provision as land negotiations are making it increasingly apparent that £2m will not be sufficient to deliver the schemes. The team are continuing to work to meet the tight programme of delivering these wetland schemes and to also meet the LEP's funding requirements.

£500k of LEP funding is required to spend by the 31<sup>st</sup> March, but due to delayed land negotiations a significant proportion of this sum may not be defrayed until April/May time. Currently the Council is in discussion with the LEP to use freedoms and flexibilities to utilise this grant

funding for other Council projects in year, with a legal requirement to spend on the integrated wetlands project using Council funding to the same value in the following year.

**Supplementary question:**

- i) Can the cabinet member infrastructure and transport confirm if there is a resource issue in progressing work on the phosphate issue?
- ii) The New Homes Bonus money that has been set aside has been allocated to the capital programme but can the section 151 officer clarify if the money can be used for revenue purposes?

**Response to supplementary question:**

- i) The cabinet member for infrastructure and transport – It is the responsibility of the Environment Agency and Natural England to look after major water course however we have been working to find a solution to the moratorium that has been imposed. We have identified nine farms/pieces of land that we can purchase and we are at the stage of discussing with the landowners. Two private planning applications have recently been submitted one of which is in the planning system.
- ii) Section 151 officer – The New Homes Bonus can be used for revenue or capital purposes which will be determined later in the meeting.

MQ 5	Councillor Barry Durkin, Old Gore	Is the ongoing road works at Fiddlers Green, Fownhope, fully reflected in the budget presented before Council today?	Cabinet member finance and corporate services
------	-----------------------------------	--	---

**Response:**

The budget for the works to Fiddlers Green, Fownhope is fully reflected in the capital budget of £4.027m for Priority Flood Repair Works added to the capital programme as agreed by Council on 4 August 2020. This sum is included in the budget presented today, the 12 February 2021, at Appendix C to item 8, the 2021/22 capital investment budget and capital strategy update.

**Supplementary question:**

Why was the funding for the reinstatement of the B4224 not made available as soon as possible considering the statement in the County Plan to target the repair of roads that were in greatest need of repair and what work would be undertaken to repair the verges in Woolhope?

**Response to supplementary question:**



Cabinet member for finance and corporate services – Money had been made available at an early stage to fund the first stage of works and the second stage required further engineering design. Money had not been forthcoming from central government to fund the repair therefore the council had made provision in the budget which was agreed earlier in the 20/21 financial year.

Cabinet member for infrastructure and transport – Plans had been made to ensure the roads around Woolhope that had been damaged would be repaired after the works on the B4224 were completed. There have been many challenges with the repair of the road and a review would be completed to evaluate the performance of the contractors.



## All necessary decisions in cases of emergency

Under paragraph 3.7.9 of the constitution the chief executive is authorised to take necessary decisions in cases of emergency.

‘All necessary decisions’ includes decisions to take such action as is necessary within the law to protect life, health, safety, the economic, social or environmental wellbeing of the county, its communities and individuals living, working or visiting, and to preserve property belonging to the council or others.

An emergency is defined as any situation in which the chief executive believes that there is a risk of damage to property, a threat to the health or wellbeing of an individual, or that the interests of the council may be compromised.

In the chief executives scheme of delegation emergency decisions are delegated to the chief executive and directors. Before exercising this delegated authority any officer shall use their endeavours if, in their opinion, time or circumstances permit, to consult the Leader, or, in their absence, the appropriate cabinet member, and the chairman of the relevant scrutiny committee and in any case, inform them of their actions as soon as practicable.

Since the beginning of 2020 there have been 2 emergencies: the February 2020 floods and the coronavirus pandemic. Schedules of emergency decisions taken in response to these emergencies were presented to meetings of the full Council on 17 July 2020, 11 September 2020, 9 October 2020, 11 December 2020 and 12 February 2021.

Paragraph 15 of the chief executive scheme of delegation, requires that all emergency decisions taken by officers are reported to full Council at the next meeting, including the extent to which it has been necessary to operate outside the contract and financial procedure rules. Each decision contains an assessment of risk including finance, legal and equality considerations.

Below is a schedule of all necessary decisions in cases of emergency published since the budget meeting of full Council on 12 February 2021.

### Covid-19 – February 2021

**Decision to accept and approve the distribution of the council’s allocation (£2,335,048) from the Infection Control Fund Round 2 to care homes and the care sector across Herefordshire in accordance with the grant determination letter issued by the Secretary of State on 1 October 2020**

**Decision Maker:** Director of Adults and Communities

**Date of decision:** 03/02/2021

<http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?id=7625&LLL=0>,

**Decision to approve the second instalment and 20% discretionary funding to be paid from the council’s allocation of the Infection Control Fund Round 2 to care homes and the care sector across Herefordshire in accordance with the grant determination letter issued by the Secretary of State on 1 October 2020**

**Decision Maker:** Director of Adults and Communities

**Date of decision:** 03/02/2021

[http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?id=7626&LLL=0,](http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?id=7626&LLL=0)

**Decision to approve the allocation of the Rapid Testing Funding (£677,049) to care homes across Herefordshire in accordance with the grant determination letter issued by the Secretary of State on 23 December 2020**

**Decision Maker:** Director of Adults and Communities

**Date of decision:** 04/02/2021

[http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?id=7623&LLL=0,](http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?id=7623&LLL=0)

**Enabling pupils to access education remotely**

**Decision Maker:** Chief Finance Officer

**Date of decision:** 05/02/2021

[http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?id=7621&LLL=0,](http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?id=7621&LLL=0)

**Decision to approve spending of the Covid 19 Winter Grant**

**Decision Maker:** Chief Finance Officer

**Date of decision:** 09/02/2021

[http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?id=7633&LLL=0,](http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?id=7633&LLL=0)

**Temporary closure of Herefordshire Archive & Records Centre (HARC), Hereford Museum & Art Gallery and Black & White House Museum**

**Decision Maker:** Director of Economy and Place

**Date of decision:** 10/02/2021

[http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?id=7638&LLL=0,](http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?id=7638&LLL=0)

**Dealing with newly registered low risk Food hygiene premises**

**Decision Maker:** Director of Economy and Place

**Date of decision:** 16/02/2021

[http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?id=7651&LLL=0,](http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?id=7651&LLL=0)



## Title of report: 2021/22 council tax setting report

**Meeting: Council**

**Meeting date: Friday 5 March 2021**

**Report by: Leader (corporate strategy and budget);**

### Classification

Open

### Decision type

Budget and policy framework

### Wards affected

(All Wards);

### Purpose

To set the council tax and precepts for 2021/22.

At its meeting on 12 February Herefordshire Council approved the net budget requirement for 2021/22 at £161.0m and an associated council tax requirement of £112.9m on a tax base of 68,355.22 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 2021/22.

### 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 2021/22 in accordance with sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, regulation 6 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011):**

- a. **£386,183,501 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. **£268,356,670 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. **£117,826,831 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. **£1,723.74 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. **£4,883,501 being the aggregate amount of all special items (parish precepts) referred to in section 34(1) of the act;**
  - f. **£1,652.30 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 2021/22;**
- 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. Council approved the net tax base on which the precept is in part based at its meeting on 12 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 4.99% (inclusive of 3% adult care precept) above the rate of council tax for 2021/22 at its meeting on 12 February 2021. The council's band D council tax for 2021/22 becomes set at £1,652.30.
5. The parish precepts for 2021/22 is attached at appendix 1, total £4,883,501 amounting to an average band D council tax charge of £71.44. This represents an average increase of 2.3% over 2020/21. The charge by each property band, inclusive of the Herefordshire Council charge, is set out in appendix 2.
6. The precepts for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for West Mercia, an increase of 6.66%, and Hereford and Worcester Fire Authority, an increase of 1.97%, are shown in appendices 3 and 4.
7. 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.

## Council tax calculations

8. 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 table below meets this requirement:

	Herefordshire Council £	Parish precepts £	Herefordshire incl. parishes (average) £
Estimated gross expenditure	381,300,000	4,883,501	386,183,501
LESS estimated income	(220,304,000)	Not applicable	(220,304,000)
<b>Net budget requirement</b>	<b>160,996,000</b>	<b>4,883,501</b>	<b>165,879,501</b>
LESS retained business rates	(36,754,158)	Not applicable	(36,754,158)
LESS revenue support grant	(638,164)	Not applicable	(638,164)
LESS rural services delivery grant	(5,352,550)	Not applicable	(5,352,550)
LESS adult social care grant	(5,507,798)	Not applicable	(5,507,798)

PLUS collection fund deficit	200,000	Not applicable	200,000
<b>Council tax requirement</b>	<b>112,943,330</b>	<b>4,883,501</b>	<b>117,826,831</b>
Council net tax base (band D equivalent)	68,355.22	68,355.22	68,355.22
<b>Council tax charge at band D</b>	<b>1,652.30</b>	<b>71.44</b>	<b>1,723.74</b>

### Council tax amounts

9. 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.
10. Herefordshire Council's band D council tax for 2021/22 is £1,652.30, which is an increase of £78.53 (4.99%) compared to 2020/21.
11. As part of the process we are required to include precepts from other bodies that will be included on council tax bills.
12. 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.
13. The charge by each property band, inclusive of the Herefordshire Council charge, is set out in appendix 2.
14. The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for West Mercia precept is set out in appendix 3 (£240.19 at band D).
15. The Hereford and Worcester Fire Authority precept is set out in appendix 4 (£87.68 at band D).
16. 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.

### Community impact

17. 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 local assistance fund. The Council provides council tax discount to care leavers and foster carers.

### Environmental Impact



18. Whilst this is a decision on back office functions and will have minimal environmental impacts, consideration has been made to minimise waste and resource use in line with the Council's Environmental Policy. All council tax payers are encouraged to manage their account online and to activate electronic billing.

## **Equality duty**

19. 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.
20. The public sector equality duty (specific duty) requires us to consider how we can positively contribute to the advancement of equality and good relations, and demonstrate that we are paying 'due regard' in our decision making in the design of policies and in the delivery of services. The council tax charges may have an impact on households and there are a variety of schemes in place to mitigate against a negative impact, including single person discount and council tax reduction. Further details how to make such claims can be found on the council's website.

## **Resource implications**

21. 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**

22. The Local Government Finance 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 each year.
23. 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.
24. 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**

25. 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**

26. The council consulted with the public on the proposed budget for 2021/22. Local consultation with parish and town councils, businesses and organisations was completed in November, 17 events were held with 96 participants, 45% of people thought the proposed council tax & social care precept increase of 4.99% was about right.
27. An online public consultation was open from 18 December 2020 and closed on the 10 January 2021 in the form of a Residents Survey and Organisation (business) Survey. A total of 265 responses were received to the resident's questionnaire, a similar response to last year, and there were 33 responses to the organisational questionnaire, compared to 3 last year. 71% of respondents supported a council tax in increase of either 3.99% or 4.99%, with more in favour of the higher increase (41%).

## **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 (net)	Tax Base (Band D)	2021/22 Parish Precept Basic Tax Rate (Band D)	2020/21 Parish Precept Basic Tax Rate (Band D)	% change from 2019/20 to 2020/21	Band D Charge (Parish and Herefordshire Council's Basic Rate - £1,652.30)
	£		£	£	%	£
Abbeystre & Bacton Group Parish Council	9,200.00	160.08	57.47	56.04	2.6%	1,709.77
Aconbury Parish Meeting	150.00	37.44	4.01	4.07	(1.5%)	1,656.31
Acton Beauchamp Group Parish Council	6,500.00	179.94	36.12	35.44	1.9%	1,688.42
Allensmore Parish Council	6,250.00	268.29	23.30	23.61	(1.3%)	1,675.60
Almeley Parish Council	15,850.00	259.87	60.99	60.12	1.4%	1,713.29
Ashperton Parish Council	9,250.00	123.12	75.13	75.04	0.1%	1,727.43
Aston Ingham Parish Council	8,300.00	210.19	39.49	35.42	11.5%	1,691.79
Avenbury Parish Council	5,450.00	117.05	46.56	41.50	12.2%	1,698.86
Aymestrey Parish Council	10,750.00	165.47	64.97	66.39	(2.1%)	1,717.27
Ballingham, Bolstone & Hentland Group	13,250.00	302.33	43.83	44.33	(1.1%)	1,696.13
Bartestree & Lugwardine Group Parish Council	50,500.00	946.23	53.37	54.77	(2.6%)	1,705.67
Belmont Rural Parish Council	60,000.00	1,307.66	45.88	45.07	1.8%	1,698.18
Birley with Upper Hill Parish Council	3,000.00	138.96	21.59	21.45	0.7%	1,673.89
Bishop's Frome Parish Council	25,000.00	335.52	74.51	72.18	3.2%	1,726.81
Bishopstone Group Parish Council	8,500.00	199.95	42.51	40.75	4.3%	1,694.81
Bodenham Parish Council	15,000.00	498.48	30.09	30.35	(0.9%)	1,682.39
Border Group Parish Council	8,400.00	296.14	28.36	31.04	(8.6%)	1,680.66
Bosbury and Coddington Parish Council	20,500.00	363.98	56.32	56.05	0.5%	1,708.62
Brampton Abbots & Foy Group Parish Council	13,552.00	221.38	61.22	60.93	0.5%	1,713.52
Bredonbury & District Group Parish Council	8,560.00	159.00	53.84	53.46	0.7%	1,706.14
Breinton Parish Council	13,165.00	403.06	32.66	32.49	0.5%	1,684.96
Bridstow Parish Council	8,000.00	402.25	19.89	19.90	(0.1%)	1,672.19
Brilley Parish Council	11,500.00	120.34	95.56	97.28	(1.8%)	1,747.86
Brimfield and Little Hereford Group Parish Council	12,500.00	508.70	24.57	24.36	0.9%	1,676.87
Brockhampton with Much Fawley Parish Council	3,600.00	94.08	38.27	38.67	(1.0%)	1,690.57
Brockhampton Group Parish Council	10,500.00	325.08	32.30	28.51	13.3%	1,684.60
Bromyard & Winslow Town Council	240,815.00	1,383.63	174.05	166.09	4.8%	1,826.35
Burghill Parish Council	21,245.00	716.69	29.64	29.36	1.0%	1,681.94
Callow & Haywood Group Parish Council	7,500.00	220.89	33.95	33.57	1.1%	1,686.25
Cleghonger Parish Council	22,800.00	529.04	43.10	45.03	(4.3%)	1,695.40
Clifford Parish Council	5,800.00	262.72	22.08	21.22	4.1%	1,674.38
Colwall Parish Council	88,216.00	1,183.30	74.55	72.60	2.7%	1,726.85
Malvern Hills Trust (Colwall Parish Council)	47,500.00		40.14	37.47	7.1%	40.14
Cradley Parish Council	45,000.00	803.04	56.04	55.14	1.6%	1,708.34
Credenhill Parish Council	44,000.00	633.55	69.45	67.38	3.1%	1,721.75
Cusop Parish Council	8,500.00	202.98	41.88	45.02	(7.0%)	1,694.18
Dilwyn Parish Council	25,000.00	303.58	82.35	80.58	2.2%	1,734.65
Dinedor Parish Council	9,500.00	132.89	71.49	71.70	(0.3%)	1,723.79
Dinmore Parish Meeting	-	9.65	-	-	0.0%	1,652.30
Dormington & Mordiford Group Parish Council	22,445.00	308.92	72.66	71.26	2.0%	1,724.96
Dorstone Parish Council	6,500.00	182.96	35.53	35.51	0.1%	1,687.83
Eardisland Parish Council	27,854.00	233.91	119.08	109.15	9.1%	1,771.38
Eardisley Group Parish Council	18,000.00	520.65	34.57	32.56	6.2%	1,686.87
Eastnor & Donnington Parish Council	5,500.00	143.89	38.22	36.40	5.0%	1,690.52
Eaton Bishop Parish Council	13,250.00	190.11	69.70	68.67	1.5%	1,722.00
Ewyas Harold Group Parish Council	44,000.00	421.86	104.30	106.63	(2.2%)	1,756.60
Fownhope Parish Council	32,000.00	421.80	75.87	69.38	9.4%	1,728.17
Foxley Group Parish Council	2,500.00	159.31	15.69	15.58	0.7%	1,667.99
Garway Parish Council	17,160.00	182.23	94.17	98.48	(4.4%)	1,746.47
Goodrich & Welsh Bicknor Group Parish Council	8,979.00	274.20	32.75	33.31	(1.7%)	1,685.05
Hampton Bishop Parish Council	17,500.00	311.55	56.17	55.34	1.5%	1,708.47
Hampton Charles Parish Meeting	-	21.75	-	-	-	1,652.30
Hatfield and District Group Parish Council	6,000.00	203.82	29.44	29.36	0.3%	1,681.74
Hereford City Council	853,820.00	15,617.63	54.67	54.67	0.0%	1,706.97
Holme Lacy Parish Council	19,500.00	193.12	100.97	98.98	2.0%	1,753.27
Holmer & Shelwick Parish Council	19,500.00	1,029.12	18.95	18.68	1.4%	1,671.25
Hope Mansell Parish Council	2,500.00	133.69	18.70	15.35	21.8%	1,671.00
Hope under Dinmore Group Parish Council	14,000.00	152.89	91.57	74.14	23.5%	1,743.87

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

Parish	Parish Precept (net)	Tax Base (Band D)	2021/22 Parish Precept Basic Tax Rate (Band D)	2020/21 Parish Precept Basic Tax Rate (Band D)	% change from 2019/20 to 2020/21	Band D Charge (Parish and Herefordshire Council's Basic Rate - £1,652.30)
	£		£	£	%	£
How Caple, Sollershope & Yatton Group Parish Council	8,300.00	162.62	51.04	53.28	(4.2%)	1,703.34
Humber, Stoke Prior & Ford Group Parish Council	12,289.00	292.71	41.98	41.71	0.6%	1,694.28
Huntington Parish Council	750.00	47.65	15.74	15.33	2.7%	1,668.04
Kentchurch Parish Council	8,750.00	108.58	80.59	82.40	(2.2%)	1,732.89
Kilpeck Group Parish Council	17,600.00	198.65	88.60	88.16	0.5%	1,740.90
Kimbolton Parish Council	9,551.50	200.40	47.66	46.86	1.7%	1,699.96
Kings Caple Parish Council	8,000.00	141.29	56.62	54.81	3.3%	1,708.92
Kingsland Parish Council	16,000.00	517.68	30.91	32.02	(3.5%)	1,683.21
Kingstone & Thrupton Group Parish Council	15,000.00	447.48	33.52	26.93	24.5%	1,685.82
Kington Rural and Lower Harpton Group Parish Council	9,000.00	239.42	37.59	29.73	26.4%	1,689.89
Kington Town Council	112,000.00	858.24	130.50	120.18	8.6%	1,782.80
Kinnersley and District Group Parish Council	6,500.00	247.66	26.25	25.96	1.1%	1,678.55
Lea Parish Council	18,000.00	284.75	63.21	56.73	11.4%	1,715.51
Ledbury Town Council	571,081.00	3,325.80	171.71	155.42	10.5%	1,824.01
Leintwardine Group Parish Council	28,167.00	453.08	62.17	55.03	13.0%	1,714.47
Leominster Town Council	544,536.00	3,446.71	157.99	151.58	4.2%	1,810.29
Linton Parish Council	14,400.00	484.22	29.74	25.00	19.0%	1,682.04
Little Birch Parish Council	6,350.00	99.33	63.93	56.03	14.1%	1,716.23
Little Dewchurch Parish Council	10,369.00	179.11	57.89	57.21	1.2%	1,710.19
Llangarron Parish Council	27,500.00	505.53	54.40	53.71	1.3%	1,706.70
Llanwarne & District Group Parish Council	10,000.00	275.95	36.24	33.75	7.4%	1,688.54
Longtown Group Parish Council	17,165.00	419.47	40.92	40.93	(0.0%)	1,693.22
Lower Bullingham Parish Council	13,000.00	583.15	22.29	21.60	3.2%	1,674.59
Luston Group Parish Council	16,000.00	387.61	41.28	41.20	0.2%	1,693.58
Lyonshall Parish Council	21,000.00	290.85	72.20	68.40	5.6%	1,724.50
Madley Parish Council	23,200.00	416.58	55.69	55.16	1.0%	1,707.99
Marden Parish Council	51,500.00	542.07	95.01	92.84	2.3%	1,747.31
Marstow Parish Council	9,500.00	161.10	58.97	53.68	9.9%	1,711.27
Mathon Parish Council	7,998.00	166.48	48.04	49.65	(3.2%)	1,700.34
Malvern Hills Trust (Mathon)	6,300.00		37.84	36.93	2.5%	37.84
Middleton-on-the-Hill and Leysters Group Parish Council	4,223.00	190.50	22.17	22.20	(0.1%)	1,674.47
Monkland and Stretford Parish Council	10,000.00	83.27	120.09	115.26	4.2%	1,772.39
Moreton on Lugg Parish Council	20,500.00	290.41	70.59	67.34	4.8%	1,722.89
Much Birch Parish Council	6,750.00	408.81	16.51	16.37	0.9%	1,668.81
Much Cowarne Group Parish Council	3,708.00	215.58	17.20	17.47	(1.5%)	1,669.50
Much Dewchurch Parish Council	8,500.00	265.33	32.04	32.01	0.1%	1,684.34
Much Marcle Parish Council	8,755.00	299.87	29.20	28.99	0.7%	1,681.50
North Bromyard Group Parish Council	10,000.00	351.58	28.44	28.64	(0.7%)	1,680.74
Ocle Pychard Parish Council	17,500.00	259.32	67.48	66.25	1.9%	1,719.78
Orcop Parish Council	9,200.00	172.41	53.36	53.83	(0.9%)	1,705.66
Orleton Parish Council	25,500.00	364.77	69.91	69.49	0.6%	1,722.21
Pembridge Parish Council	24,000.00	477.88	50.22	70.98	(29.2%)	1,702.52
Pencombe Group Parish Council	13,875.00	195.07	71.13	70.12	1.4%	1,723.43
Peterchurch Parish Council	21,660.00	366.58	59.09	55.88	5.7%	1,711.39
Peterstow Parish Council	9,618.26	192.37	50.00	47.12	6.1%	1,702.30
Pipe and Lyde Parish Council	3,780.00	145.09	26.05	25.81	0.9%	1,678.35
Pixley & District Parish Council	8,580.00	228.94	37.48	37.19	0.8%	1,689.78
Putley Parish Council	9,000.00	104.66	85.99	84.36	1.9%	1,738.29
Pyons Group Parish Council	14,500.00	404.72	35.83	33.68	6.4%	1,688.13
Richard's Castle (Herefordshire) Parish Council	9,000.00	131.26	68.57	64.42	6.4%	1,720.87
Ross-on-Wye Parish Council	496,823.00	3,785.60	131.24	131.24	0.0%	1,783.54
Sellack Parish Council	9,500.00	131.43	72.28	63.33	14.1%	1,724.58
Shobdon Parish Council	25,500.00	331.19	77.00	74.43	3.5%	1,729.30
St. Weonards Parish Council	6,900.00	160.69	42.94	44.12	(2.7%)	1,695.24
Stapleton Group Parish Council	9,400.00	141.49	66.44	64.66	2.8%	1,718.74
Staunton-on-Wye and District Group Parish Council	3,700.00	197.30	18.75	17.92	4.6%	1,671.05

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

Parish	Parish Precept (net)	Tax Base (Band D)	2021/22 Parish Precept Basic Tax Rate (Band D)	2020/21 Parish Precept Basic Tax Rate (Band D)	% change from 2019/20 to 2020/21	Band D Charge (Parish and Herefordshire Council's Basic Rate - £1,652.30)
	£		£	£	%	£
Stoke Edith Parish Meeting (Chairman)	-	43.91	-	-	-	1,652.30
Stoke Lacy Parish Council	9,000.00	171.78	52.39	58.38	(10.3%)	1,704.69
Stretton Grandison Group Parish Council	14,000.00	227.93	61.42	61.22	0.3%	1,713.72
Stretton Sugwas Parish Council	7,850.00	151.39	51.85	50.80	2.1%	1,704.15
Sutton Parish Council	30,000.00	392.79	76.38	70.81	7.9%	1,728.68
Tarrington Parish Council	16,500.00	222.60	74.12	72.35	2.4%	1,726.42
Thornbury Group Parish Council	4,987.50	183.52	27.18	25.54	6.4%	1,679.48
Titley and District Group Parish Council	10,000.00	235.84	42.40	45.35	(6.5%)	1,694.70
Upton Bishop Parish Council	18,171.00	265.29	68.49	65.89	3.9%	1,720.79
Vowchurch & District Group Parish Council	13,570.15	345.68	39.26	38.93	0.8%	1,691.56
Walford Parish Council	27,825.00	646.29	43.05	42.50	1.3%	1,695.35
Wellington Parish Council	22,500.00	457.64	49.17	48.81	0.7%	1,701.47
Wellington Heath Parish Council	10,000.00	239.60	41.74	39.34	6.1%	1,694.04
Welsh Newton & Llanrothal Group Parish Council	13,900.00	148.46	93.63	93.05	0.6%	1,745.93
Weobley Parish Council	32,114.00	476.52	67.39	60.74	10.9%	1,719.69
Weston Beggard Parish Council	4,000.00	84.29	47.46	45.81	3.6%	1,699.76
Weston-under-Penyard Parish Council	13,500.00	498.73	27.07	15.50	74.6%	1,679.37
Whitbourne Parish Council	12,000.00	346.45	34.64	34.67	(0.1%)	1,686.94
Whitchurch & Ganarew Group Parish Council	52,500.00	508.67	103.21	97.54	5.8%	1,755.51
Wigmore Group Parish Council	18,736.00	362.59	51.67	65.06	(20.6%)	1,703.97
Withington Group Parish Council	31,000.00	726.02	42.70	31.82	34.2%	1,695.00
Woolhope Parish Council	14,000.00	213.03	65.72	57.60	14.1%	1,718.02
Wyeside Group Parish Council	9,720.00	305.56	31.81	32.27	(1.4%)	1,684.11
Yarkhill Parish Council	8,238.00	141.14	58.37	58.04	0.6%	1,710.67
Yarpole Group Parish Council	25,000.00	349.25	71.58	67.99	5.3%	1,723.88
<b>Total/Average</b>	<b>4,883,501.41</b>	<b>68,355.22</b>	<b>71.44</b>	<b>69.81</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>1,723.74</b>





APPENDIX 2								
Council Tax for each valuation band, by Parish, without the Police & Fire precepts								
PARISH	VALUATION BANDS							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Abbeystead & Bacton Group Parish Council	1,139.84	1,329.82	1,519.79	1,709.77	2,089.72	2,469.67	2,849.61	3,419.54
Aconbury Parish Meeting	1,104.20	1,288.24	1,472.27	1,656.31	2,024.38	2,392.45	2,760.51	3,312.62
Acton Beauchamp Group Parish Council	1,125.61	1,313.21	1,500.82	1,688.42	2,063.63	2,438.83	2,814.03	3,376.84
Allensmore Parish Council	1,117.06	1,303.24	1,489.42	1,675.60	2,047.96	2,420.32	2,792.66	3,351.20
Almeley Parish Council	1,142.19	1,332.56	1,522.92	1,713.29	2,094.02	2,474.76	2,855.48	3,426.58
Ashperton Parish Council	1,151.62	1,343.55	1,535.49	1,727.43	2,111.31	2,495.18	2,879.05	3,454.86
Aston Ingham Parish Council	1,127.86	1,315.83	1,503.81	1,691.79	2,067.75	2,443.70	2,819.65	3,383.58
Avenbury Parish Council	1,132.57	1,321.33	1,510.10	1,698.86	2,076.39	2,453.91	2,831.43	3,397.72
Aymestrey Parish Council	1,144.84	1,335.65	1,526.46	1,717.27	2,098.89	2,480.51	2,862.11	3,434.54
Ballingham, Bolstone & Hentland Group	1,130.75	1,319.21	1,507.67	1,696.13	2,073.05	2,449.97	2,826.88	3,392.26
Bartestree & Lugwardine Group Parish Council	1,137.11	1,326.63	1,516.15	1,705.67	2,084.71	2,463.75	2,842.78	3,411.34
Belmont Rural Parish Council	1,132.12	1,320.80	1,509.49	1,698.18	2,075.56	2,452.93	2,830.30	3,396.36
Birley with Upper Hill Parish Council	1,115.92	1,301.91	1,487.90	1,673.89	2,045.87	2,417.85	2,789.81	3,347.78
Bishop's Frome Parish Council	1,151.20	1,343.07	1,534.94	1,726.81	2,110.55	2,494.29	2,878.01	3,453.62
Bishopstone & District Group Parish Council	1,129.87	1,318.18	1,506.50	1,694.81	2,071.44	2,448.06	2,824.68	3,389.62
Bodenham Parish Council	1,121.59	1,308.52	1,495.46	1,682.39	2,056.26	2,430.12	2,803.98	3,364.78
Border Group Parish Council	1,120.44	1,307.18	1,493.92	1,680.66	2,054.14	2,427.62	2,801.10	3,361.32
Bosbury and Coddington Parish Council	1,139.08	1,328.92	1,518.77	1,708.62	2,088.32	2,468.01	2,847.70	3,417.24
Brampton Abbots & Foy Group Parish Council	1,142.34	1,332.74	1,523.13	1,713.52	2,094.30	2,475.09	2,855.86	3,427.04
Bredenbury & District Group Parish Council	1,137.42	1,327.00	1,516.57	1,706.14	2,085.28	2,464.43	2,843.56	3,412.28
Breinton Parish Council	1,123.30	1,310.52	1,497.74	1,684.96	2,059.40	2,433.84	2,808.26	3,369.92
Bridstow Parish Council	1,114.79	1,300.59	1,486.39	1,672.19	2,043.79	2,415.39	2,786.98	3,344.38
Brilley Parish Council	1,165.24	1,359.44	1,553.65	1,747.86	2,136.28	2,524.69	2,913.10	3,495.72
Brimfield and Little Hereford Group Parish Council	1,117.91	1,304.23	1,490.55	1,676.87	2,049.51	2,422.15	2,794.78	3,353.74
Brockhampton with Much Fawley Parish Council	1,127.04	1,314.89	1,502.73	1,690.57	2,066.25	2,441.94	2,817.61	3,381.14
Brockhampton Group Parish Council	1,123.06	1,310.24	1,497.42	1,684.60	2,058.96	2,433.32	2,807.66	3,369.20
Bromyard & Winslow Town Council	1,217.56	1,420.49	1,623.42	1,826.35	2,232.21	2,638.07	3,043.91	3,652.70
Burghill Parish Council	1,121.29	1,308.17	1,495.06	1,681.94	2,055.71	2,429.47	2,803.23	3,363.88
Callow & Haywood Group Parish Council	1,124.16	1,311.53	1,498.89	1,686.25	2,060.97	2,435.70	2,810.41	3,372.50
Cleghonger Parish Council	1,130.26	1,318.64	1,507.02	1,695.40	2,072.16	2,448.92	2,825.66	3,390.80
Clifford Parish Council	1,116.25	1,302.29	1,488.34	1,674.38	2,046.47	2,418.55	2,790.63	3,348.76
Colwall Parish Council (inc Malvern Hills Trust)	1,177.99	1,374.32	1,570.66	1,766.99	2,159.66	2,552.32	2,944.98	3,533.98
Cradley Parish Council	1,138.89	1,328.71	1,518.52	1,708.34	2,087.97	2,467.61	2,847.23	3,416.68
Credenhill Parish Council	1,147.83	1,339.14	1,530.44	1,721.75	2,104.36	2,486.98	2,869.58	3,443.50
Cusop Parish Council	1,129.45	1,317.69	1,505.94	1,694.18	2,070.67	2,447.15	2,823.63	3,388.36
Dilwyn Parish Council	1,156.43	1,349.17	1,541.91	1,734.65	2,120.13	2,505.61	2,891.08	3,469.30
Dinedor Parish Council	1,149.19	1,340.72	1,532.26	1,723.79	2,106.86	2,489.92	2,872.98	3,447.58
Dinmore Parish Meeting	1,101.53	1,285.12	1,468.71	1,652.30	2,019.48	2,386.66	2,753.83	3,304.60
Dormington & Mordiford Group Parish Council	1,149.97	1,341.63	1,533.30	1,724.96	2,108.29	2,491.61	2,874.93	3,449.92
Dorstone Parish Council	1,125.22	1,312.75	1,500.29	1,687.83	2,062.91	2,437.98	2,813.05	3,375.66
Eardisland Parish Council	1,180.92	1,377.74	1,574.56	1,771.38	2,165.02	2,558.66	2,952.30	3,542.76
Eardisley Group Parish Council	1,124.58	1,312.01	1,499.44	1,686.87	2,061.73	2,436.59	2,811.45	3,373.74
Eastnor & Donnington Parish Council	1,127.01	1,314.85	1,502.68	1,690.52	2,066.19	2,441.87	2,817.53	3,381.04
Eaton Bishop Parish Council	1,148.00	1,339.33	1,530.67	1,722.00	2,104.67	2,487.34	2,870.00	3,444.00
Ewyas Harold Group Parish Council	1,171.06	1,366.24	1,561.42	1,756.60	2,146.96	2,537.32	2,927.66	3,513.20
Fownhope Parish Council	1,152.11	1,344.13	1,536.15	1,728.17	2,112.21	2,496.25	2,880.28	3,456.34
Foxley Group Parish Council	1,111.99	1,297.32	1,482.66	1,667.99	2,038.66	2,409.32	2,779.98	3,335.98
Garway Parish Council	1,164.31	1,358.36	1,552.42	1,746.47	2,134.58	2,522.68	2,910.78	3,492.94
Goodrich & Welsh Bicknor Group Parish Council	1,123.36	1,310.59	1,497.82	1,685.05	2,059.51	2,433.97	2,808.41	3,370.10
Hampton Bishop Parish Council	1,138.98	1,328.81	1,518.64	1,708.47	2,088.13	2,467.79	2,847.45	3,416.94
Hampton Charles Parish Meeting	1,101.53	1,285.12	1,468.71	1,652.30	2,019.48	2,386.66	2,753.83	3,304.60
Hatfield and District Group Parish Council	1,121.16	1,308.02	1,494.88	1,681.74	2,055.46	2,429.18	2,802.90	3,363.48
Hereford City Council	1,137.98	1,327.64	1,517.31	1,706.97	2,086.30	2,465.63	2,844.95	3,413.94
Holme Lacy Parish Council	1,168.84	1,363.65	1,558.46	1,753.27	2,142.89	2,532.51	2,922.11	3,506.54
Holmer & Shelwick Parish Council	1,114.16	1,299.86	1,485.55	1,671.25	2,042.64	2,414.03	2,785.41	3,342.50
Hope Mansell Parish Council	1,114.00	1,299.66	1,485.33	1,671.00	2,042.34	2,413.67	2,785.00	3,342.00
Hope under Dinmore Group Parish Council	1,162.58	1,356.34	1,550.11	1,743.87	2,131.40	2,518.93	2,906.45	3,487.74
How Caple, Sollershope & Yatton Group Parish Council	1,135.56	1,324.82	1,514.08	1,703.34	2,081.86	2,460.38	2,838.90	3,406.68
Humber, Stoke Prior & Ford Group Parish Council	1,129.52	1,317.77	1,506.03	1,694.28	2,070.79	2,447.30	2,823.80	3,388.56
Huntington Parish Council	1,112.02	1,297.36	1,482.70	1,668.04	2,038.72	2,409.40	2,780.06	3,336.08
Kentchurch Parish Council	1,155.26	1,347.80	1,540.35	1,732.89	2,117.98	2,503.07	2,888.15	3,465.78
Kilpeck Group Parish Council	1,160.60	1,354.03	1,547.47	1,740.90	2,127.77	2,514.64	2,901.50	3,481.80
Kimbolton Parish Council	1,133.30	1,322.19	1,511.07	1,699.96	2,077.73	2,455.50	2,833.26	3,399.92
Kings Caple Parish Council	1,139.28	1,329.16	1,519.04	1,708.92	2,088.68	2,468.44	2,848.20	3,417.84
Kingsland Parish Council	1,122.14	1,309.16	1,496.19	1,683.21	2,057.26	2,431.31	2,805.35	3,366.42
Kingstone & Thruxton Group Parish Council	1,123.88	1,311.19	1,498.51	1,685.82	2,060.45	2,435.08	2,809.70	3,371.64
Kington Rural and Lower Harpton Group Parish Council	1,126.59	1,314.36	1,502.12	1,689.89	2,065.42	2,440.96	2,816.48	3,379.78
Kington Town Council	1,188.53	1,386.62	1,584.71	1,782.80	2,178.98	2,575.16	2,971.33	3,565.60
Kinnerley and District Group Parish Council	1,119.03	1,305.54	1,492.04	1,678.55	2,051.56	2,424.58	2,797.58	3,357.10

<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	1,143.67	1,334.28	1,524.90	1,715.51	2,096.74	2,477.96	2,859.18	3,431.02
Ledbury Town Council	1,216.00	1,418.67	1,621.34	1,824.01	2,229.35	2,634.69	3,040.01	3,648.02
Leintwardine Group Parish Council	1,142.98	1,333.47	1,523.97	1,714.47	2,095.47	2,476.46	2,857.45	3,428.94
Leominster Town Council	1,206.86	1,408.00	1,609.15	1,810.29	2,212.58	2,614.87	3,017.15	3,620.58
Linton Parish Council	1,121.36	1,308.25	1,495.15	1,682.04	2,055.83	2,429.62	2,803.40	3,364.08
Little Birch Parish Council	1,144.15	1,334.84	1,525.54	1,716.23	2,097.62	2,479.00	2,860.38	3,432.46
Little Dewchurch Parish Council	1,140.12	1,330.15	1,520.17	1,710.19	2,090.23	2,470.28	2,850.31	3,420.38
Llangarron Parish Council	1,137.80	1,327.43	1,517.07	1,706.70	2,085.97	2,465.24	2,844.50	3,413.40
Llanwarne & District Group Parish Council	1,125.69	1,313.31	1,500.92	1,688.54	2,063.77	2,439.01	2,814.23	3,377.08
Longtown Group Parish Council	1,128.81	1,316.95	1,505.08	1,693.22	2,069.49	2,445.77	2,822.03	3,386.44
Lower Bullingham Parish Council	1,116.39	1,302.46	1,488.52	1,674.59	2,046.72	2,418.86	2,790.98	3,349.18
Luston Group Parish Council	1,129.05	1,317.23	1,505.40	1,693.58	2,069.93	2,446.29	2,822.63	3,387.16
Lyonshall Parish Council	1,149.66	1,341.28	1,532.89	1,724.50	2,107.72	2,490.95	2,874.16	3,449.00
Madley Parish Council	1,138.66	1,328.43	1,518.21	1,707.99	2,087.55	2,467.10	2,846.65	3,415.98
Marden Parish Council	1,164.87	1,359.02	1,553.16	1,747.31	2,135.60	2,523.90	2,912.18	3,494.62
Marstow Parish Council	1,140.84	1,330.99	1,521.13	1,711.27	2,091.55	2,471.84	2,852.11	3,422.54
Mathon Parish Council (inc Malvern Hills Trust)	1,158.79	1,351.91	1,545.05	1,738.18	2,124.45	2,510.71	2,896.97	3,476.36
Middleton-on-the-Hill and Leysters Group Parish Council	1,116.31	1,302.36	1,488.42	1,674.47	2,046.58	2,418.68	2,790.78	3,348.94
Monkland and Stretford Parish Council	1,181.59	1,378.52	1,575.46	1,772.39	2,166.26	2,560.12	2,953.98	3,544.78
Moreton on Lugg Parish Council	1,148.59	1,340.02	1,531.46	1,722.89	2,105.76	2,488.62	2,871.48	3,445.78
Much Birch Parish Council	1,112.54	1,297.96	1,483.39	1,668.81	2,039.66	2,410.51	2,781.35	3,337.62
Much Cowarne Group Parish Council	1,113.00	1,298.50	1,484.00	1,669.50	2,040.50	2,411.50	2,782.50	3,339.00
Much Dewchurch Parish Council	1,122.89	1,310.04	1,497.19	1,684.34	2,058.64	2,432.94	2,807.23	3,368.68
Much Marcle Parish Council	1,121.00	1,307.83	1,494.67	1,681.50	2,055.17	2,428.84	2,802.50	3,363.00
North Bromyard Group Parish Council	1,120.49	1,307.24	1,493.99	1,680.74	2,054.24	2,427.74	2,801.23	3,361.48
Ocle Pychard Parish Council	1,146.52	1,337.60	1,528.69	1,719.78	2,101.96	2,484.13	2,866.30	3,439.56
Orcop Parish Council	1,137.10	1,326.62	1,516.14	1,705.66	2,084.70	2,463.74	2,842.76	3,411.32
Orleton Parish Council	1,148.14	1,339.49	1,530.85	1,722.21	2,104.93	2,487.64	2,870.35	3,444.42
Pembridge Parish Council	1,135.01	1,324.18	1,513.35	1,702.52	2,080.86	2,459.20	2,837.53	3,405.04
Pencombe Group Parish Council	1,148.95	1,340.44	1,531.94	1,723.43	2,106.42	2,489.40	2,872.38	3,446.86
Peterchurch Parish Council	1,140.92	1,331.08	1,521.23	1,711.39	2,091.70	2,472.01	2,852.31	3,422.78
Peterstow Parish Council	1,134.86	1,324.01	1,513.15	1,702.30	2,080.59	2,458.88	2,837.16	3,404.60
Pipe and Lyde Parish Council	1,118.90	1,305.38	1,491.87	1,678.35	2,051.32	2,424.29	2,797.25	3,356.70
Pixley & District Parish Council	1,126.52	1,314.27	1,502.03	1,689.78	2,065.29	2,440.80	2,816.30	3,379.56
Putley Parish Council	1,158.86	1,352.00	1,545.15	1,738.29	2,124.58	2,510.87	2,897.15	3,476.58
Pyons Group Parish Council	1,125.42	1,312.99	1,500.56	1,688.13	2,063.27	2,438.41	2,813.55	3,376.26
Richard's Castle (Herefordshire) Parish Council	1,147.24	1,338.45	1,529.66	1,720.87	2,103.29	2,485.71	2,868.11	3,441.74
Ross-on-Wye Parish Council	1,189.02	1,387.20	1,585.37	1,783.54	2,179.88	2,576.23	2,972.56	3,567.08
Sellack Parish Council	1,149.72	1,341.34	1,532.96	1,724.58	2,107.82	2,491.06	2,874.30	3,449.16
Shobdon Parish Council	1,152.86	1,345.01	1,537.15	1,729.30	2,113.59	2,497.88	2,882.16	3,458.60
St. Weonards Parish Council	1,130.16	1,318.52	1,506.88	1,695.24	2,071.96	2,448.68	2,825.40	3,390.48
Stapleton Group Parish Council	1,145.82	1,336.80	1,527.77	1,718.74	2,100.68	2,482.63	2,864.56	3,437.48
Staunton-on-Wye and District Group 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
Stoke Edith Parish Meeting	1,101.53	1,285.12	1,468.71	1,652.30	2,019.48	2,386.66	2,753.83	3,304.60
Stoke Lacy Parish Council	1,136.46	1,325.87	1,515.28	1,704.69	2,083.51	2,462.33	2,841.15	3,409.38
Stretton Grandison Group Parish Council	1,142.48	1,332.89	1,523.31	1,713.72	2,094.55	2,475.38	2,856.20	3,427.44
Stretton Sugwas Parish Council	1,136.10	1,325.45	1,514.80	1,704.15	2,082.85	2,461.55	2,840.25	3,408.30
Sutton Parish Council	1,152.45	1,344.53	1,536.60	1,728.68	2,112.83	2,496.99	2,881.13	3,457.36
Tarrington Parish Council	1,150.94	1,342.77	1,534.59	1,726.42	2,110.07	2,493.72	2,877.36	3,452.84
Thornbury Group Parish Council	1,119.65	1,306.26	1,492.87	1,679.48	2,052.70	2,425.92	2,799.13	3,358.96
Titley and District Group Parish Council	1,129.80	1,318.10	1,506.40	1,694.70	2,071.30	2,447.90	2,824.50	3,389.40
Upton Bishop Parish Council	1,147.19	1,338.39	1,529.59	1,720.79	2,103.19	2,485.59	2,867.98	3,441.58
Vowchurch & District Group Parish Council	1,127.70	1,315.66	1,503.61	1,691.56	2,067.46	2,443.37	2,819.26	3,383.12
Walford Parish Council	1,130.23	1,318.60	1,506.98	1,695.35	2,072.10	2,448.84	2,825.58	3,390.70
Wellington Parish Council	1,134.31	1,323.36	1,512.42	1,701.47	2,079.58	2,457.68	2,835.78	3,402.94
Wellington Heath Parish Council	1,129.36	1,317.58	1,505.81	1,694.04	2,070.50	2,446.95	2,823.40	3,388.08
Welsh Newton & Llanrothal Group Parish Council	1,163.95	1,357.94	1,551.94	1,745.93	2,133.92	2,521.90	2,909.88	3,491.86
Weobley Parish Council	1,146.46	1,337.53	1,528.61	1,719.69	2,101.85	2,484.00	2,866.15	3,439.38
Weston Beggard Parish Council	1,133.17	1,322.03	1,510.90	1,699.76	2,077.49	2,455.21	2,832.93	3,399.52
Weston-under-Penyard Parish Council	1,119.58	1,306.17	1,492.77	1,679.37	2,052.57	2,425.76	2,798.95	3,358.74
Whitbourne Parish Council	1,124.62	1,312.06	1,499.50	1,686.94	2,061.82	2,436.70	2,811.56	3,373.88
Whitchurch & Ganarew Group Parish Council	1,170.34	1,365.39	1,560.45	1,755.51	2,145.63	2,535.74	2,925.85	3,511.02
Wigmore Group Parish Council	1,135.98	1,325.31	1,514.64	1,703.97	2,082.63	2,461.29	2,839.95	3,407.94
Withington Group Parish Council	1,130.00	1,318.33	1,506.67	1,695.00	2,071.67	2,448.34	2,825.00	3,390.00
Woolhope Parish Council	1,145.34	1,336.24	1,527.13	1,718.02	2,099.80	2,481.59	2,863.36	3,436.04
Wyeside Group Parish Council	1,122.74	1,309.86	1,496.99	1,684.11	2,058.36	2,432.61	2,806.85	3,368.22
Yarkhill Parish Council	1,140.44	1,330.52	1,520.59	1,710.67	2,090.82	2,470.97	2,851.11	3,421.34
Yarpole Group Parish Council	1,149.25	1,340.79	1,532.34	1,723.88	2,106.97	2,490.05	2,873.13	3,447.76

**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>	160.13	186.81	213.50	240.19	293.57	346.94	400.32	480.38

A total 2021/22 precept from Herefordshire Council of £16,418,240 (2020/21 £15,708,861).

The band D council tax charge amounts to £240.19 an increase of £14.94 or 6.66% 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>	58.45	68.20	77.94	87.68	107.16	126.65	146.13	175.36

A 2021/22 total precept from Herefordshire Council of £5,993,0727 (2020/21 £5,998,340).

The band D council tax charge for Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority amounts to £87.68, an increase of £1.69 or 1.97% over the previous year.



								APPENDIX 5
<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	1,358.42	1,584.83	1,811.23	2,037.64	2,490.45	2,943.26	3,396.06	4,075.28
Aconbury Parish Meeting	1,322.78	1,543.25	1,763.71	1,984.18	2,425.11	2,866.04	3,306.96	3,968.36
Acton Beauchamp Group Parish Council	1,344.19	1,568.22	1,792.26	2,016.29	2,464.36	2,912.42	3,360.48	4,032.58
Allensmore Parish Council	1,335.64	1,558.25	1,780.86	2,003.47	2,448.69	2,893.91	3,339.11	4,006.94
Almeley Parish Council	1,360.77	1,587.57	1,814.36	2,041.16	2,494.75	2,948.35	3,401.93	4,082.32
Ashperton Parish Council	1,370.20	1,598.56	1,826.93	2,055.30	2,512.04	2,968.77	3,425.50	4,110.60
Aston Ingham Parish Council	1,346.44	1,570.84	1,795.25	2,019.66	2,468.48	2,917.29	3,366.10	4,039.32
Avenbury Parish Council	1,351.15	1,576.34	1,801.54	2,026.73	2,477.12	2,927.50	3,377.88	4,053.46
Aymestrey Parish Council	1,363.42	1,590.66	1,817.90	2,045.14	2,499.62	2,954.10	3,408.56	4,090.28
Ballingham, Bolstone & Hentland Group	1,349.33	1,574.22	1,799.11	2,024.00	2,473.78	2,923.56	3,373.33	4,048.00
Bartestree & Lugwardine Group Parish Council	1,355.69	1,581.64	1,807.59	2,033.54	2,485.44	2,937.34	3,389.23	4,067.08
Belmont Rural Parish Council	1,350.70	1,575.81	1,800.93	2,026.05	2,476.29	2,926.52	3,376.75	4,052.10
Birley with Upper Hill Parish Council	1,334.50	1,556.92	1,779.34	2,001.76	2,446.60	2,891.44	3,336.26	4,003.52
Bishop's Frome Parish Council	1,369.78	1,598.08	1,826.38	2,054.68	2,511.28	2,967.88	3,424.46	4,109.36
Bishopstone Group Parish Council	1,348.45	1,573.19	1,797.94	2,022.68	2,472.17	2,921.65	3,371.13	4,045.36
Bodenham Parish Council	1,340.17	1,563.53	1,786.90	2,010.26	2,456.99	2,903.71	3,350.43	4,020.52
Border Group Parish Council	1,339.02	1,562.19	1,785.36	2,008.53	2,454.87	2,901.21	3,347.55	4,017.06
Bosbury and Coddington Parish Council	1,357.66	1,583.93	1,810.21	2,036.49	2,489.05	2,941.60	3,394.15	4,072.98
Brampton Abbots & Foy Group Parish Council	1,360.92	1,587.75	1,814.57	2,041.39	2,495.03	2,948.68	3,402.31	4,082.78
Bredenbury & District Group Parish Council	1,356.00	1,582.01	1,808.01	2,034.01	2,486.01	2,938.02	3,390.01	4,068.02
Breinton Parish Council	1,341.88	1,565.53	1,789.18	2,012.83	2,460.13	2,907.43	3,354.71	4,025.66
Bridstow Parish Council	1,333.37	1,555.60	1,777.83	2,000.06	2,444.52	2,888.98	3,333.43	4,000.12
Brilley Parish Council	1,383.82	1,614.45	1,845.09	2,075.73	2,537.01	2,998.28	3,459.55	4,151.46
Brimfield and Little Hereford Group Parish Council	1,336.49	1,559.24	1,781.99	2,004.74	2,450.24	2,895.74	3,341.23	4,009.48
Brockhampton with Much Fawley Parish Council	1,345.62	1,569.90	1,794.17	2,018.44	2,466.98	2,915.53	3,364.06	4,036.88
Brockhampton Group Parish Council	1,341.64	1,565.25	1,788.86	2,012.47	2,459.69	2,906.91	3,354.11	4,024.94
Bromyard & Winslow Town Council	1,436.14	1,675.50	1,914.86	2,154.22	2,632.94	3,111.66	3,590.36	4,308.44
Burghill Parish Council	1,339.87	1,563.18	1,786.50	2,009.81	2,456.44	2,903.06	3,349.68	4,019.62
Callow & Haywood Group Parish Council	1,342.74	1,566.54	1,790.33	2,014.12	2,461.70	2,909.29	3,356.86	4,028.24
Clehonger Parish Council	1,348.84	1,573.65	1,798.46	2,023.27	2,472.89	2,922.51	3,372.11	4,046.54
Clifford Parish Council	1,334.83	1,557.30	1,779.78	2,002.25	2,447.20	2,892.14	3,337.08	4,004.50
Colwall Parish Council (including Malvern Hills Trust (C	1,396.57	1,629.33	1,862.10	2,094.86	2,560.39	3,025.91	3,491.43	4,189.72
Cradley Parish Council	1,357.47	1,583.72	1,809.96	2,036.21	2,488.70	2,941.20	3,393.68	4,072.42
Credenhill Parish Council	1,366.41	1,594.15	1,821.88	2,049.62	2,505.09	2,960.57	3,416.03	4,099.24
Cusop Parish Council	1,348.03	1,572.70	1,797.38	2,022.05	2,471.40	2,920.74	3,370.08	4,044.10
Dilwyn Parish Council	1,375.01	1,604.18	1,833.35	2,062.52	2,520.86	2,979.20	3,437.53	4,125.04
Dinedor Parish Council	1,367.77	1,595.73	1,823.70	2,051.66	2,507.59	2,963.51	3,419.43	4,103.32
Dinmore Parish Meeting	1,320.11	1,540.13	1,760.15	1,980.17	2,420.21	2,860.25	3,300.28	3,960.34
Dormington & Mordiford Group Parish Council	1,368.55	1,596.64	1,824.74	2,052.83	2,509.02	2,965.20	3,421.38	4,105.66
Dorstone Parish Council	1,343.80	1,567.76	1,791.73	2,015.70	2,463.64	2,911.57	3,359.50	4,031.40
Eardisland Parish Council	1,399.50	1,632.75	1,866.00	2,099.25	2,565.75	3,032.25	3,498.75	4,198.50
Eardisley Group Parish Council	1,343.16	1,567.02	1,790.88	2,014.74	2,462.46	2,910.18	3,357.90	4,029.48
Eastnor & Donnington Parish Council	1,345.59	1,569.86	1,794.12	2,018.39	2,466.92	2,915.46	3,363.98	4,036.78
Eaton Bishop Parish Council	1,366.58	1,594.34	1,822.11	2,049.87	2,505.40	2,960.93	3,416.45	4,099.74
Ewyas Harold Group Parish Council	1,389.64	1,621.25	1,852.86	2,084.47	2,547.69	3,010.91	3,474.11	4,168.94
Fownhope Parish Council	1,370.69	1,599.14	1,827.59	2,056.04	2,512.94	2,969.84	3,426.73	4,112.08
Foxley Group Parish Council	1,330.57	1,552.33	1,774.10	1,995.86	2,439.39	2,882.91	3,326.43	3,991.72
Garway Parish Council	1,382.89	1,613.37	1,843.86	2,074.34	2,535.31	2,996.27	3,457.23	4,148.68
Goodrich & Welsh Bicknor Group Parish Council	1,341.94	1,565.60	1,789.26	2,012.92	2,460.24	2,907.56	3,354.86	4,025.84

<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	1,357.56	1,583.82	1,810.08	2,036.34	2,488.86	2,941.38	3,393.90	4,072.68
Hampton Charles Parish Meeting	1,320.11	1,540.13	1,760.15	1,980.17	2,420.21	2,860.25	3,300.28	3,960.34
Hatfield and District Group Parish Council	1,339.74	1,563.03	1,786.32	2,009.61	2,456.19	2,902.77	3,349.35	4,019.22
Hereford City Council	1,356.56	1,582.65	1,808.75	2,034.84	2,487.03	2,939.22	3,391.40	4,069.68
Holme Lacy Parish Council	1,387.42	1,618.66	1,849.90	2,081.14	2,543.62	3,006.10	3,468.56	4,162.28
Holmer & Shelwick Parish Council	1,332.74	1,554.87	1,776.99	1,999.12	2,443.37	2,887.62	3,331.86	3,998.24
Hope Mansell Parish Council	1,332.58	1,554.67	1,776.77	1,998.87	2,443.07	2,887.26	3,331.45	3,997.74
Hope under Dinmore Group Parish Council	1,381.16	1,611.35	1,841.55	2,071.74	2,532.13	2,992.52	3,452.90	4,143.48
How Caple, Sollershope & Yatton Group Parish Council	1,354.14	1,579.83	1,805.52	2,031.21	2,482.59	2,933.97	3,385.35	4,062.42
Humber, Stoke Prior & Ford Group Parish Council	1,348.10	1,572.78	1,797.47	2,022.15	2,471.52	2,920.89	3,370.25	4,044.30
Huntington Parish Council	1,330.60	1,552.37	1,774.14	1,995.91	2,439.45	2,882.99	3,326.51	3,991.82
Kentchurch Parish Council	1,373.84	1,602.81	1,831.79	2,060.76	2,518.71	2,976.66	3,434.60	4,121.52
Kilpeck Group Parish Council	1,379.18	1,609.04	1,838.91	2,068.77	2,528.50	2,988.23	3,447.95	4,137.54
Kimbolton Parish Council	1,351.88	1,577.20	1,802.51	2,027.83	2,478.46	2,929.09	3,379.71	4,055.66
Kings Caple Parish Council	1,357.86	1,584.17	1,810.48	2,036.79	2,489.41	2,942.03	3,394.65	4,073.58
Kingsland Parish Council	1,340.72	1,564.17	1,787.63	2,011.08	2,457.99	2,904.90	3,351.80	4,022.16
Kingstone & Thruxton Group Parish Council	1,342.46	1,566.20	1,789.95	2,013.69	2,461.18	2,908.67	3,356.15	4,027.38
Kington Rural and Lower Harpton Group Parish Council	1,345.17	1,569.37	1,793.56	2,017.76	2,466.15	2,914.55	3,362.93	4,035.52
Kington Town Council	1,407.11	1,641.63	1,876.15	2,110.67	2,579.71	3,048.75	3,517.78	4,221.34
Kinnersley and District Group Parish Council	1,337.61	1,560.55	1,783.48	2,006.42	2,452.29	2,898.17	3,344.03	4,012.84
Lea Parish Council	1,362.25	1,589.29	1,816.34	2,043.38	2,497.47	2,951.55	3,405.63	4,086.76
Ledbury Town Council	1,434.58	1,673.68	1,912.78	2,151.88	2,630.08	3,108.28	3,586.46	4,303.76
Leintwardine Group Parish Council	1,361.56	1,588.48	1,815.41	2,042.34	2,496.20	2,950.05	3,403.90	4,084.68
Leominster Town Council	1,425.44	1,663.01	1,900.59	2,138.16	2,613.31	3,088.46	3,563.60	4,276.32
Linton Parish Council	1,339.94	1,563.26	1,786.59	2,009.91	2,456.56	2,903.21	3,349.85	4,019.82
Little Birch Parish Council	1,362.73	1,589.85	1,816.98	2,044.10	2,498.35	2,952.59	3,406.83	4,088.20
Little Dewchurch Parish Council	1,358.70	1,585.16	1,811.61	2,038.06	2,490.96	2,943.87	3,396.76	4,076.12
Llangarron Parish Council	1,356.38	1,582.44	1,808.51	2,034.57	2,486.70	2,938.83	3,390.95	4,069.14
Llanwarne & District Group Parish Council	1,344.27	1,568.32	1,792.36	2,016.41	2,464.50	2,912.60	3,360.68	4,032.82
Longtown Group Parish Council	1,347.39	1,571.96	1,796.52	2,021.09	2,470.22	2,919.36	3,368.48	4,042.18
Lower Bullingham Parish Council	1,334.97	1,557.47	1,779.96	2,002.46	2,447.45	2,892.45	3,337.43	4,004.92
Luston Group Parish Council	1,347.63	1,572.24	1,796.84	2,021.45	2,470.66	2,919.88	3,369.08	4,042.90
Lyonshall Parish Council	1,368.24	1,596.29	1,824.33	2,052.37	2,508.45	2,964.54	3,420.61	4,104.74
Madley Parish Council	1,357.24	1,583.44	1,809.65	2,035.86	2,488.28	2,940.69	3,393.10	4,071.72
Marden Parish Council	1,383.45	1,614.03	1,844.60	2,075.18	2,536.33	2,997.49	3,458.63	4,150.36
Marstow Parish Council	1,359.42	1,586.00	1,812.57	2,039.14	2,492.28	2,945.43	3,398.56	4,078.28
Mathon Parish Council (includes Malvern Hills Trust (M	1,377.37	1,606.92	1,836.49	2,066.05	2,525.18	2,984.30	3,443.42	4,132.10
Middleton-on-the-Hill and Leysters Group Parish Council	1,334.89	1,557.37	1,779.86	2,002.34	2,447.31	2,892.27	3,337.23	4,004.68
Monkland and Stretford Parish Council	1,400.17	1,633.53	1,866.90	2,100.26	2,566.99	3,033.71	3,500.43	4,200.52
Moreton on Lugg Parish Council	1,367.17	1,595.03	1,822.90	2,050.76	2,506.49	2,962.21	3,417.93	4,101.52
Much Birch Parish Council	1,331.12	1,552.97	1,774.83	1,996.68	2,440.39	2,884.10	3,327.80	3,993.36
Much Cowarne Group Parish Council	1,331.58	1,553.51	1,775.44	1,997.37	2,441.23	2,885.09	3,328.95	3,994.74
Much Dewchurch Parish Council	1,341.47	1,565.05	1,788.63	2,012.21	2,459.37	2,906.53	3,353.68	4,024.42
Much Marcle Parish Council	1,339.58	1,562.84	1,786.11	2,009.37	2,455.90	2,902.43	3,348.95	4,018.74
North Bromyard Group Parish Council	1,339.07	1,562.25	1,785.43	2,008.61	2,454.97	2,901.33	3,347.68	4,017.22
Ocle Pychard Parish Council	1,365.10	1,592.61	1,820.13	2,047.65	2,502.69	2,957.72	3,412.75	4,095.30
Orcop Parish Council	1,355.68	1,581.63	1,807.58	2,033.53	2,485.43	2,937.33	3,389.21	4,067.06
Orleton Parish Council	1,366.72	1,594.50	1,822.29	2,050.08	2,505.66	2,961.23	3,416.80	4,100.16
Pembridge Parish Council	1,353.59	1,579.19	1,804.79	2,030.39	2,481.59	2,932.79	3,383.98	4,060.78
Pencombe Group Parish Council	1,367.53	1,595.45	1,823.38	2,051.30	2,507.15	2,962.99	3,418.83	4,102.60



<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	1,359.50	1,586.09	1,812.67	2,039.26	2,492.43	2,945.60	3,398.76	4,078.52
Peterstow Parish council	1,353.44	1,579.02	1,804.59	2,030.17	2,481.32	2,932.47	3,383.61	4,060.34
Pipe and Lyde Parish Council	1,337.48	1,560.39	1,783.31	2,006.22	2,452.05	2,897.88	3,343.70	4,012.44
Pixley & District Parish Council	1,345.10	1,569.28	1,793.47	2,017.65	2,466.02	2,914.39	3,362.75	4,035.30
Putley Parish Council	1,377.44	1,607.01	1,836.59	2,066.16	2,525.31	2,984.46	3,443.60	4,132.32
Pyons Group Parish Council	1,344.00	1,568.00	1,792.00	2,016.00	2,464.00	2,912.00	3,360.00	4,032.00
Richard's Castle (Herefordshire) Parish Council	1,365.82	1,593.46	1,821.10	2,048.74	2,504.02	2,959.30	3,414.56	4,097.48
Ross-on-Wye Parish Council	1,407.60	1,642.21	1,876.81	2,111.41	2,580.61	3,049.82	3,519.01	4,222.82
Sellack Parish Council	1,368.30	1,596.35	1,824.40	2,052.45	2,508.55	2,964.65	3,420.75	4,104.90
Shobdon Parish Council	1,371.44	1,600.02	1,828.59	2,057.17	2,514.32	2,971.47	3,428.61	4,114.34
St. Weonards Parish Council	1,348.74	1,573.53	1,798.32	2,023.11	2,472.69	2,922.27	3,371.85	4,046.22
Stapleton Group Parish Council	1,364.40	1,591.81	1,819.21	2,046.61	2,501.41	2,956.22	3,411.01	4,093.22
Staunton-on-Wye and District Group Parish Council	1,332.61	1,554.71	1,776.82	1,998.92	2,443.13	2,887.33	3,331.53	3,997.84
Stoke Edith Parish Meeting (Chairman)	1,320.11	1,540.13	1,760.15	1,980.17	2,420.21	2,860.25	3,300.28	3,960.34
Stoke Lacy Parish Council	1,355.04	1,580.88	1,806.72	2,032.56	2,484.24	2,935.92	3,387.60	4,065.12
Stretton Grandison Group Parish Council	1,361.06	1,587.90	1,814.75	2,041.59	2,495.28	2,948.97	3,402.65	4,083.18
Stretton Sugwas Parish Council	1,354.68	1,580.46	1,806.24	2,032.02	2,483.58	2,935.14	3,386.70	4,064.04
Sutton Parish Council	1,371.03	1,599.54	1,828.04	2,056.55	2,513.56	2,970.58	3,427.58	4,113.10
Tarrington Parish Council	1,369.52	1,597.78	1,826.03	2,054.29	2,510.80	2,967.31	3,423.81	4,108.58
Thornbury Group Parish Council	1,338.23	1,561.27	1,784.31	2,007.35	2,453.43	2,899.51	3,345.58	4,014.70
Titley and District Group Parish Council	1,348.38	1,573.11	1,797.84	2,022.57	2,472.03	2,921.49	3,370.95	4,045.14
Upton Bishop Parish Council	1,365.77	1,593.40	1,821.03	2,048.66	2,503.92	2,959.18	3,414.43	4,097.32
Vowchurch & District Group Parish Council	1,346.28	1,570.67	1,795.05	2,019.43	2,468.19	2,916.96	3,365.71	4,038.86
Walford Parish Council	1,348.81	1,573.61	1,798.42	2,023.22	2,472.83	2,922.43	3,372.03	4,046.44
Wellington Parish Council	1,352.89	1,578.37	1,803.86	2,029.34	2,480.31	2,931.27	3,382.23	4,058.68
Wellington Heath Parish Council	1,347.94	1,572.59	1,797.25	2,021.91	2,471.23	2,920.54	3,369.85	4,043.82
Welsh Newton & Llanrothal Group Parish Council	1,382.53	1,612.95	1,843.38	2,073.80	2,534.65	2,995.49	3,456.33	4,147.60
Weobley Parish Council	1,365.04	1,592.54	1,820.05	2,047.56	2,502.58	2,957.59	3,412.60	4,095.12
Weston Beggard Parish Council	1,351.75	1,577.04	1,802.34	2,027.63	2,478.22	2,928.80	3,379.38	4,055.26
Weston-under-Penyard Parish Council	1,338.16	1,561.18	1,784.21	2,007.24	2,453.30	2,899.35	3,345.40	4,014.48
Whitbourne Parish Council	1,343.20	1,567.07	1,790.94	2,014.81	2,462.55	2,910.29	3,358.01	4,029.62
Whitchurch & Ganarew Group Parish Council	1,388.92	1,620.40	1,851.89	2,083.38	2,546.36	3,009.33	3,472.30	4,166.76
Wigmore Group Parish Council	1,354.56	1,580.32	1,806.08	2,031.84	2,483.36	2,934.88	3,386.40	4,063.68
Withington Group Parish Council	1,348.58	1,573.34	1,798.11	2,022.87	2,472.40	2,921.93	3,371.45	4,045.74
Woolhope Parish Council	1,363.92	1,591.25	1,818.57	2,045.89	2,500.53	2,955.18	3,409.81	4,091.78
Wyeside Group Parish Council	1,341.32	1,564.87	1,788.43	2,011.98	2,459.09	2,906.20	3,353.30	4,023.96
Yarkhill Parish Council	1,359.02	1,585.53	1,812.03	2,038.54	2,491.55	2,944.56	3,397.56	4,077.08
Yarpole Group Parish Council	1,367.83	1,595.80	1,823.78	2,051.75	2,507.70	2,963.64	3,419.58	4,103.50





## Title of report: Leader's report to Council

**Meeting: Council**

**Meeting date: Friday 5 March 2021**

**Report by: Leader of the Council**

### **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 previous meeting of the Council and an annual report on the priorities of the Cabinet and progress made in meeting those priorities. A brief summary of decisions taken by the executive is provided at appendix A and all decision reports and notices are available on the council's website.

The report provides a summary of progress made against the areas of focus identified in the County Plan. More detail about the council's performance and how that is reported is available on the performance management page of 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. I am pleased to provide to Council my Leader's report. Within the report I have set out the priorities of the cabinet and progress made in meeting the ambitions and objectives that are set out in the council's County and Delivery plans. This report covers the period from my last report, to Council for the meeting on 11 December 2020 to the date of this report.
3. As members will be all too aware the COVID 19 pandemic has continued to dominate how we all are able to live our lives and go about our daily business. In my report in March 2020, I reported on the emerging public health situation. None of us could have predicted the scale or devastation this new virus has had. Our thoughts and prayers go out to all of those who have lost loved ones and to those who continue to support friends or family who may have virus.
4. The Cabinet has continued through this crisis to receive a weekly briefing from the Chief Executive and the Director of Public Health.
5. As devastating as this deadly virus has been there are clear signs that the current lockdown measures are facilitating a sustained reduction in the number of cases, both nationally and locally. At the time of drafting, the weekly rolling rate of cases per 100,000 in Herefordshire was 99.6. Many of us will have friends or family members who have now had their vaccinations. So while we must remain under current lockdown conditions, there is real hope and optimism for the future.

In the period since my last report there have been three meetings of Council.

6. At the meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2021 Council approved the appointment of the new Chief Executive, Paul Walker. I am pleased to report that Paul will be joining us from 3 May 2021. Paul is well equipped to help us to recover from Covid having co designed the West London Economic Recovery plan – a £74bn economy. He also leads the West London Green recovery delivery plan across 6 London Boroughs. Among many contributions I am hoping that he will bring his skills to the environmental and ecological emergency agenda.
7. Paul brings with him huge experience and practice of working in regeneration projects, cross council partnership working on the climate emergency and, a threat we know all too well in Herefordshire, dealing with flooding crises. I know he will bring new drive and energy and a proven ability to translate strategic visions into action and delivery on the ground. I speak at least weekly to Paul apprising him of significant developments and giving him information about the Council and its culture which will enable him to make a quick impact when he joins. I have found him very easy to communicate with and am confident that you will find his appointment to have been an excellent choice. He is having regular meetings with members of the Senior Management Team and is starting to have meetings with Cabinet Portfolio holders.
8. Until he joins we remain under the capable leadership of Claire Ward and Andrew Lovegrove as joint deputy chief executives. Claire is also acting as the Head of Paid Service with Kate Charlton taking on the role as Monitoring Officer until Paul joins us in May.
9. At the Extraordinary meeting on 2 February 2021 Council voted to abandon the Plans for the Western Bypass and the Southern Link Road. This followed a long period of

review and consultation which was appropriate for a project of such significance. The Cabinet looks forward to the alternative measures set out in the WPP report coming forward for detailed consideration.

10. At the Budget meeting on 12 February 2021 the Budget for 2021/22 was approved. There was a significant contrast between the process last year with a requirement to save over £11m in the revenue budget caused by the impact of Covid and also by significant increases in costs of social care. The Cabinet are particularly grateful for the work put into this by officers in coming up with a balanced budget.
11. Recent rains have caused further flooding to properties in the County. Such events are becoming a more regular occurrence with recent rain events in January and February this year causing further flooding across the county. Storm Christoph in January brought high river levels and significant surface water across the county. During the event a number of roads were closed across the county and nearly 60 properties were flooded as a result. Earlier this month significant rain in Wales resulted in high river levels in main rivers in Herefordshire and some flooding on roads across the county.

As the Lead Local Flood Authority, the council is responsible for coordinating flood management activities with other risk management authorities (eg Environment Agency (EA), Welsh Water). It is common for flooding to be attributable to multiple sources and not just one source and so a joint approach is often required.

We work with the EA on improving maintenance and repair of the drainage system assets and the council chairs regular meetings with Balfour Beatty Living Places and the EA for the purpose of identifying opportunities to reduce flood risk in a collaborative manner. A range of options is being considered for locations including Greyfriars, Hampton Bishop, Leintwardine/Walford.

12. Notwithstanding the ongoing public health crisis and the departure and recruitment of senior staff at the council, the Cabinet has continued to move forward in delivering the ambitions set out within our County and Delivery plans at pace. I provide details of the most significant decisions the executive have taken since my last report below in (**15 A to L**) In addition to our formal decisions, I would like the following areas to be noted for their achievement and success.

- i. **A new and consistent cross border approach to managing phosphate levels.** In December we received confirmation that our planning colleagues in Wales will deal with these issues in the same way as in England by Natural Resources Wales (the equivalent of our Environment Agency and Natural England combined). This is indeed good news for the rivers Wye and Lugg. Herefordshire Council, Natural England and the Environment Agency Officers were instrumental in achieving this through their lobbying of our Welsh colleagues through the Nutrient Management Board (NMB). NMB meetings are now assisting the local planning authorities in Powys and the Brecon Beacons on how they strengthen their mitigation of harmful phosphate levels in our locally and nationally treasured rivers.

Significant broader issues remain concerning the levels of phosphates. Here the Council is making good progress with our own integrated wetland project and we will shortly be sharing a first draft of our new phosphate calculator for comment and input from partners.

- ii. **Ofsted report rates Herefordshire primary schools as top in the West Midlands region:** In January, I was pleased to be notified that Herefordshire primary schools have been rated top in the West Midlands by Ofsted. Ofsted's annual report on children's services and skills has recognised 96% of Herefordshire's primary schools are rated as good or outstanding and found that the county also has the highest rate of improvement in the proportion of good or outstanding secondary schools in the West Midlands region. In addition, 80% of our secondary schools were rated as good or outstanding, putting Herefordshire in the top three Local Authorities in the West Midlands. Herefordshire schools came out joint top in the 2019/20 results in the West Midlands for the proportion of pupils reaching the expected standard in key stage 2 in reading, writing and maths.
  
- iii. **Signs of safety roll out is underway;** the Signs of Safety workflow is live on MOSAIC, the case management system used for social care. This is a significant milestone on our implementation journey. It is a ground-breaking new initiative – Herefordshire is the first authority in the country to go live with this new suite of forms. Staff have been embracing the new workflows and coping admirably with the changes. Andy Gill, Assistant Director Children's Safeguarding Quality & Improvement is providing daily blog updates to staff on progress of the rollout. I know we all in our corporate parenting role have a shared endeavour to ensure that we provide the best possible care and safeguarding for the children in our care and it is encouraging to see this new initiative underway. We will look to provide further updates in the weeks and months ahead.
  
- iv. **Schools' capital investment;** the Cabinet have approved a major investment in capital premises improvements. This is a two year programme of around £3m to improve, upgrade and develop the schools premises around the county. This will allow for upgrades to fire alarms, asbestos removal, roofing and heating repairs and improvements to ventilation systems. One particular success story has been the recent completion of the expansion of Marlbrook Primary School at Green Croft. The new buildings have been completed on time and within budget meaning that we can now safely remove temporary classrooms from the site and pupils will be taught in permanent purpose built modern facilities. I offer my thanks and congratulations to the project team leading this work.
  
- v. **Free school meals decision;** Herefordshire Council has been awarded more than £537,000 under the Government's COVID Winter Grant scheme to ensure vulnerable individuals and families don't go hungry this winter. The scheme has been set up to provide support to vulnerable individuals and households with children, particularly affected by the pandemic throughout the winter months. The funding is available from December until the end of March 2021, and a large portion of the money will go towards providing free school meals for vulnerable children.

Families with an eligible child will receive a local supermarket voucher for the value of £75 to cover the cost of food for the two week Christmas holiday period, enabling household funds to be redirected to pay utility bills. The council's decision to continue to support the free school meals provision throughout the holidays will help to ensure that vulnerable Herefordshire families don't go hungry. Under the extended scheme primary and secondary school pupils who are entitled to benefits related free school meals will receive meal provision up

to the value of £15 to cover the cost of food for the week of the February half term holidays and up to £33 to cover meals for the longer Easter break through their schools.

- vi. **Supporting schools and settings with working under lockdown;** Schools are now involved in regular COVID testing with plans to extend this to Early Years settings. Advice and guidance is issued weekly on dealing with the pandemic and also strengthening the on line offer in schools.
- vii. **Adult social care - update for market position statement;** the market position statement is on the agenda for the Cabinet meeting on February 25th. This document is aimed at care and support providers across Herefordshire to inform them of future demand and growth and what the council's commissioning intentions will be over the next 5 years. The information is based upon research and data on previous year's trends as well as predicted numbers based on demographic changes to inform need. Its aim is to support the market to grow and develop, ensuring it provides choice, quality, sustainable and cost effective services to meet the needs of the residents across the county. It is an impressive document.
- viii. **Infection Prevention and Control Grant;** reducing infection transmission between and by care staff and safer visiting in care homes is a government and local authority priority. £3.58m of government funding has been distributed to Herefordshire care homes and community care providers with a further £1.47m being distributed during February. A new Adult Social Care Rapid Testing Grant of a further £0.68m is being distributed to care home providers to enable rapid testing of staff and visitors and £0.44m is being allocated to Herefordshire Council to assist with staffing capacity in social care provision.
- ix. **A new way of delivering project management;** the council has committed to making improvements to the way it identifies key areas of work, develops those ideas and delivers them. Key projects that are brought forward should help make the Delivery Plan a reality and if approved, be efficiently managed to optimise all aspects of resource and be able to demonstrate the difference made to our residents and businesses. A new ambitious project management system, managed by the Programme Management Office (PMO) is therefore currently being rolled out to ensure a robust and auditable process that supports the ambitions and priorities of the County Plan and makes efficient use of resources.
- x. **Visitor Economy** – The visitor economy project (funded by the Marches Local Enterprise Partnership) continues to successfully promote the county as a place for staycations as people plan for their domestic holidays when the current restrictions end. The project steering group are finalising plans for a wide ranging media advertising campaign as lockdown restrictions are lifted.
- xi. **Fastershire;** Great news on the Fastershire front this month for places across the county: In Ross on Wye, the whole town will now get an upgrade to full fibre broadband thanks to the council's partnership with Full Fibre Ltd. Shobdon Airfield has been awarded a grant of £195k. This will extend Gigaclear's full fibre network by 5km to connect over 20 businesses across the airfield site. The last 2 BT cabinets have been completed in Hereford city centre connecting over

1,000 previously non-superfast lines. And ZZOOMM is starting its full fibre build in Hereford City.

xii. **Constitutional Changes** – working is continuing with the Constitutional review with opportunities for members to provide input. On 11 October 2019, the council resolved to review its governance arrangements to investigate and explore options for the future. On 9 October 2020, the council approved a hybrid cabinet model of governance. The following guiding principles were set by the council:

- a. To maximise member engagement and participation in decision-making.
- b. To ensure decision-making is informed, transparent and efficient.
- c. To welcome public engagement.
- d. To enable member and officers to perform effectively in clearly defined functions and roles.
- e. To assess any resource implications for any proposed changes.

I am grateful to Cllr Bolderson and the working group for their time in considering this. Further progress reporting is being fed into the Audit and Governance committee on 16 March.

- 13. A list of the decisions taken by cabinet and cabinet members since the last report to Council (covering the period between 04 December to 25 February 2021) is provided at appendix A. Details of all these decisions, and of those taken by officers under delegated authority, are published on the councillors and democracy pages of the council’s website.
- 14. Since my last report, no key decisions were taken under the general exception provisions (giving more than five but less than 28 days’ notice). Two key decisions were taken under the urgency provisions (less than five days’ notice) and no decisions were subject to call in. As identified in appendix A

**Reporting progress against stated commitments in the Delivery Plan**

- 15. The following table provides a brief summary of the council’s ‘month 4’ progress against the priorities we have set out to in our delivery plan (adopted 26 November 2020). Whilst there are a number of projects planned, the proposed top strategic priorities for delivery in the coming years are:
  - I. Delivery of affordable homes built to strong environmental standards
  - II. Improving the digital connectivity of the county
  - III. Creating jobs and skills that enable our residents to earn higher wages
  - IV. Creating a modern and resilient transport network within the City and County

**Our progress from my last report, 4 December to 25 February the following key decisions have been taken.**

<i>Links to County and Delivery Plan ...</i>	<i>The steps and decisions we have taken in this reporting period</i>
County plan ambition is to ensure:	<b>A: Hereford Transport Strategy:</b>



<p><i>Future transport systems must, and will, change, so we need to rethink our investment now in transport infrastructure to tackle the 21st century challenges of climate emergency and to support the wellbeing of our population.</i></p> <p><b>Corporate delivery plan priority:</b></p> <p>EN2.1: Complete the <b>Hereford Transport Strategy Review</b> and begin implementation of the preferred options and a <i>modern and resilient transport network within the City and County</i></p> <p><b>Decision maker:</b> <i>Cabinet Member Infrastructure</i></p>	<p>The decision reached by cabinet in December to stop the western bypass and southern link road schemes was recommended to Council that these schemes be removed from the capital programme. Subject to that approval it would be necessary to reallocate finances to address spend that had been incurred, through the use of earmarked reserves.</p> <p>The cabinet and I are aware of the strong views and opinions that have shaped the debate, for many years, in Herefordshire on the transport infrastructure needs for the county. While it is always important to be appraised of these factors it is absolutely essential to consider the current and urgent matters shaping our county now. As an administration we want to deliver improvements in the travel experience for those living, working and visiting Herefordshire.</p> <p>We want decisions that can be taken in a shorter timeframe, decisions we can take now, such as investing in public transport, walking and cycling. These priorities – we believe – provide value for money, ensure that our transport options are future proofed for the anticipated growth in education and jobs and take immediate steps to act upon the climate and ecological emergency.</p> <p>Longer term, my cabinet and I recognise the need and importance of a second river crossing in the city to provide greater resilience in the network. We are working with partners including local MPs to fund and develop these proposals further. But the imperative must be to deal with the here and now; improving the transport options and experiences for those making short journeys and ensuring that whatever measures we do bring forward must show that we are serious about the climate and ecological emergencies.</p>
<p><b>Decision maker:</b> <i>Cabinet</i></p>	<p><b>B: The Budget:</b></p> <p>Perhaps the clearest statement about how much has changed for the council in the last year is captured in the difficult budget proposals put forward to council by the executive. Covid 19 has led to a significant uplift in demand in adults and childrens services. We can only plan for this demand led need continuing. Pressures involved in the delivery of adults social care services had informed the decision to propose a precept of 4.99% including 3% in respect of adult social care.</p> <p>The council tax increase was proposed reluctantly at what was a difficult time but the increase would allow for: the expansion of the tax base; an increase in support for people unable to pay council tax; and the council to take advantage of government grants.</p> <p>We also have anticipated reduction in income with many families and individuals having lost, or at high risk, of losing their primary course of income.</p> <p>Proposing the largest savings programme to be undertaken at the council is not a decision taken lightly. I firmly believe that in taking the</p>

	<p>appropriate steps now will allow the council to plan more confidently for future years to come. The budget was a balance between savings, the preservation of services and a council tax increase to ensure key frontline services are protected.</p>
<p><b>County plan ambition is to ensure:</b> <i>Public transport – safe, accessible and connecting communities</i></p> <p><b>A top priority is:</b> <i>a modern and resilient transport network within the City and County</i></p> <p><b>Decision maker:</b> <i>Cabinet Member Infrastructure</i></p>	<p><b>C: Changes to the governance of the West Midlands Rail Limited:</b></p> <p>This decision enabled the Council’s representative to vote in favour of the amendments to the company’s Articles of Association to agree government plans to devolve management of rail franchises (such as West Midlands Rail) to regions, bringing about more local control over services delivered by a franchise.</p> <p>Herefordshire Council joined membership in 2015. The West Midlands Rail Executive Board is made up of Leaders or senior cabinet members appointed by each of the Partner Authorities. The Cabinet members role on the Board is to provide the West Midlands Rail Executive with strategic and policy guidance towards developing a new, local passenger rail franchise for the West Midlands, as well as gaining influence over other key routes across the region.</p>
<p><b>A County Plan ambition is to:</b> <i>Grow jobs and keep unemployment rates low in all areas of the county</i></p> <p><i>Improve educational attainment and widen further and higher education opportunities</i></p> <p><b>Corporate delivery plan Objective EC3.1:</b></p> <p><i>Enable and support the development &amp; expansion of <b>higher education</b> in the county (NMITE, HCA), including through supporting work to increase the availability of student accommodation</i></p> <p><b>Decision maker:</b> <i>Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services</i></p>	<p><b>D: ‘Get Building Funding’ the New Model Institute Technology and Engineering (NMITE):</b></p> <p>The Get Building Fund has been established by government to support economic recovery from Covid 19.</p> <p>This decision enabled the Accountable Body, Shropshire Council, to delegate responsibility for managing the ‘Get Building Funding’ grant and the relationship with the successful grant applicant NMITE to Herefordshire Council. The grant amount of £1.6m for the project will be transferred from the Accountable Body to the Council, £800,000 in 2020/21 and £800,000 in 2021/22. The grant funding will accelerate development of NMITE’s Centre for Automated Manufacturing on the Hereford Enterprise Zone.</p> <p>Covid 19 has had an unprecedented impact on the Herefordshire population and the local economy. Nationally and locally it is recognised that the economic impact of Covid 19 has had the greatest impact on younger generations. In September 2020, the total number of claimants for out-of-work benefits was 5,000; a 137% increase since March 2020 compared to a 117% rise in England in the same period.</p> <p>A recent report by Grant Thornton for The County Councils’ Network identified Herefordshire as one of the counties estimated to have experienced a greater than average decline in Gross Value Added (GVA) and classified 55.59% of employment in the county as currently ‘at risk’ compared to 48.78% in England as a whole.</p> <p>The Get Building Funding will enable NMITE to accelerate the development of the Centre for Automated Manufacturing (CAM) providing trade and employment to local contractors initially, as well as new jobs and learning opportunities when the centre is completed.</p>

	<p>The NMITE project will also help address some of Herefordshire's longer term economic challenges, such as a low wage economy (weekly wages circa 20% below the national average), low productivity (27% below the national average), and ageing population (24% aged 65 or over).</p> <p>The development of Higher Education provision in Herefordshire could have a transformational impact in addressing these issues, retaining/ attracting younger generations to study and live in the county, attracting new businesses to invest in Herefordshire offering higher value employment opportunities, and establishing an engineering skills base in a sector where there is a recognised significant national shortage. Students living and studying in the county will also have a significant impact on the local economy.</p>
<p><b>A County Plan priority is to:</b></p> <p><i>Spend public money in the local economy wherever possible</i></p> <p><b>Corporate Delivery Plan Objective - EC6.1:</b></p> <p><i>Develop and implement a <b>Social Value procurement policy</b> to maximise the local benefit of all council spending</i></p> <p><b>Decision maker:</b> Cabinet Member for commissioning, procurement and assets.</p>	<p><b>E: Herefordshire Council Social Value:</b></p> <p>Herefordshire Council Social value is a decision we have taken to approve a new social value approach for Herefordshire Council, encompassing a social value definition, pledges, key value indicators and measurement framework.</p> <p>The Social Value Act 2012 came into force on 31 January 2013. It requires those who commission public services to consider how they can also secure wider social, economic and environmental benefits through their contracting arrangements. The council has built into our contract procedure rules the need for social value to be considered through the contracting process.</p> <p>In 2020 a review of the council's approach to social value was undertaken working with Social Value Business Ltd who were commissioned to support the research into best practice. To inform the approach and priority areas to focus the review involved an assessment of the council's county plan, procurement and commissioning strategy and joint needs assessment. Internal and external stakeholders were consulted, including local third sector organisations, a selection of suppliers via a survey and targeted discussions with five of the council's high value suppliers to understand their approach and commitment to social value</p> <p>In addition to placing local prosperity (in the widest sense), improving quality of life, supporting local employment, skills and developing income at the council is seeking to build into our procurement social value.</p>
<p><b>A County Plan priority is to:</b></p> <p><i>Increase road safety in the county and improve the overall condition of the road network</i></p> <p><b>Corporate Delivery Plan Objective -</b></p>	<p><b>F: £2m Investment in the local road network:</b></p> <p>In January, the proposed allocation of £2m investment in C and U roads was approved. This followed the full Council resolution (14 February 2020), that the capital programme for 2020/21 would be amended to re-allocate £2m for the Hereford Transport Package to repair and maintain the U and C roads network.</p>

<p><i>CO0.4: Deliver the <b>asset management plan</b> to improve road conditions across the county</i></p> <p><b>Decision maker:</b> Cabinet Member for infrastructure and transport</p>	<p>The investment will be prioritised on known data of areas of highest investment need within the asset management team. The data has been cross referenced with ‘in year’ surveys producing a map-based interface to identify areas of repair. The programme for delivery was subject to a survey of the C and U road highway network and assessment of the network. The works identified began implementation in January 2021 and we expect completion by March 2021.</p> <p>This investment will go a small way towards rectifying defects in or road system which has suffered from inadequate funding for many years.</p>
<p><b>A County Plan priority is to:</b></p> <p><i>Make Herefordshire a destination of choice for walking and cycling tourism and to increase significantly the use of these active means of travel by local residents.</i></p> <p><i>Enable more healthy low carbon travel options, including walking, public transport and cycling, to reduce congestion, improve local air quality and enhance health and wellbeing.</i></p> <p><b>Corporate Delivery Plan Objective:</b></p> <p>Creating a modern and resilient transport network within the City and County</p> <p><b>Decision maker:</b> Cabinet Member for infrastructure and transport</p>	<p><b>G: The Hereford City Centre Transport Package (HCCTP):</b></p> <p>The HCCTP is a key project in supporting the development and growth of Hereford. It is an integrated package of schemes comprising a new link road between the A465 and A49(T); public transport, pedestrian and cycle infrastructure improvements and public transport infrastructure in Commercial Road, Blueschool Street and Newmarket Street and a new multi-modal Transport Hub at Hereford railway station.</p> <p>After the City Link Road was completed and opened to traffic at the end of 2017 access to plots of land for future development has been realised. The construction of a new medical centre has been completed and a student accommodation scheme serving higher education students is nearing completion. Both projects are anticipated to increase patronage and demand for better public transport, including improvements to public spaces and pedestrian and cycle provisions.</p> <p>My administration is keen to ensure that remaining investment gives added weight to support public transport, walking and cycling. The project will seek to continue to deliver the objectives as outlined in the 2015 business case for HCCTP.</p> <p>The progression of the remaining elements of the HCCTP will be the subject of further governance decisions which will lay out the budget and programme for these elements.</p>
<p><b>Corporate Delivery Plan Objective:</b></p> <p><i>EC2.5: Develop Maylord Orchards as a key strategic site; acting as a catalyst for the <b>regeneration of Hereford City Centre</b></i></p> <p><b>Decision maker:</b> Cabinet Member commissioning, procurement and assets.</p>	<p><b>H: Maylord Orchards Shopping Centre - Procurement of Management Contract:</b></p> <p>The current contract for the management of the Maylord Shopping Centre has been in place since the council obtained outright control of the asset in June this year. The management contract is for a period of one year and is due to expire on the 12 June 2021. This decision allows the council to move into a new contract with a service provider in order that the shopping centre can operate and that rent and service charges are collected and administered.</p> <p>The council are the freehold owners of the shopping centre – the centre itself comprises multiple tenant leases and licences of varying</p>

	<p>lengths and terms. In addition, at the time of acquiring the leasehold interest there were a considerable number of vacant shop units and in general there had been a lack of investment in the centre during the preceding years.</p> <p>Montagu Evans, who already had knowledge of the asset and experience of managing similar shopping centres throughout the country, were appointed to manage the centre for a period of one year with a new contract needing to be in place when the current contract expires in June 2021. This will be procured in accordance with the council's contract procedure rules.</p>
<p><b>Corporate Delivery Plan Objective:</b></p> <p><i>CO2.2: Continue the <b>improvement of the children's safeguarding system</b> to ensure children and families get the right support at the right time, including early help and reduce the number of children needing to be cared for by the council</i></p> <p><b>Decision maker:</b> Cabinet Member children and families</p>	<p><b>I: Strengthening the recruitment of Council Foster Carers:</b></p> <p>We have taken a decision to approve the business case for investment in commissioned marketing and engagement services to strengthen the council's in-house fostering service. We want to increase the number of general and specialist foster carers and reduce the reliance on the more costly Independent Fostering Agency (IFA) in line with Herefordshire's County Plan and Children and Young People's Plan.</p> <p>All councils have a duty to make arrangements for the accommodation and care of children for whom it has a responsibility. However, under the sufficiency duty local authorities are required to do more than simply ensure that accommodation be 'sufficient' in terms of the number of beds provided.</p> <p>We must have regard to the benefits of securing a range of accommodation through a number of providers. The accommodation must also meet the needs of children. The cabinet's preference is to place children with suitable foster carers within its own in-house fostering service before considering placement in the independent sector, as a way of ensuring children can be placed locally and of managing costs.</p> <p>Investing in new marketing and engagement activities with the expectation of increasing approvals to at least thirty per year is estimated to cost in the region of £2m-£2.6m would be avoided over a five-year period, or £400k-£520k on average per year, compared to IFA placement costs. Further costs may also be avoided as a result of other work to improve the retention of carers, reduce unnecessary use of high cost residential accommodation, and reduce placement demand as the number of children and young people in care decreases.</p>
<p><b>A County Plan priority is to:</b></p> <p><i>Protect and improve the lives of vulnerable people</i></p> <p><b>Corporate Delivery Plan Objective:</b></p>	<p><b>J: Recommissioning of Independent Advocacy Services</b></p> <p>The council has a statutory duty to provide independent advocacy services. This decision enables an external provider to deliver independent advocacy services for adults, discharging the council's statutory duties and ensuring the voices of vulnerable adults in Herefordshire are heard.</p>

<p><i>CO4 – Protect and improve the lives of vulnerable people</i></p> <p><b>Decision maker:</b> Cabinet member health and adult wellbeing</p>	<p>In addition, there is also provision of generic advocacy. Whilst this is not a statutory requirement, the council has provided it through the advocacy commissioned provider. There is anecdotal evidence that the provision of this advocacy eases pressures elsewhere in the system. For example many of the referrals during the peak of the recent pandemic related to people with mental health issues as a consequence of concerns or changes arising from the pandemic.</p> <p>There is a small, but competitive market of providers who are able to offer advocacy services. Therefore we will complete a competitive open tender exercise to procure a five year contract. There is a consistent level of demand, so that in an average 3 month period there would be around 450 vulnerable Herefordshire residents actively supported by advocacy services. Over 90 per cent of this demand is for statutory advocacy, with 70 percent for advocacy provided under the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act.</p>
<p><b>A County Plan priority is to:</b></p> <p>Continue to support the significant growth of education opportunities within the county to provide new opportunities for younger people to live and learn locally. The council will promote a culture of lifelong learning throughout the county and enable access to tools and resources to support upskilling, reskilling and employability by providing routes to training opportunities, apprenticeships and hands-on experience.</p> <p><b>Links with the Corporate Delivery Plan Objective:</b></p> <p>Increase the number of HE (Higher Education) students, adult and community learning students, apprenticeships and job placements, and quality of the provision in each, and</p> <p>EC3.3: Provide more <b>apprenticeships</b>, including through the council's direct contracts</p> <p><b>Decision maker:</b> Cabinet member, environment, economy and skills.</p>	<p><b>K: Kickstart scheme, providing work experience placements to 16 to 24 year olds:</b></p> <p>In February we approved and accepted grant funding offered by the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP). The council successfully applied to DWP to be a gateway authority for the delivery of the Kickstart scheme across Herefordshire.</p> <p>The Kickstart scheme funds 6 monthly work experience placements for 16 to 24 year olds receiving universal credit as part of the Governments Covid 19 response. The Kickstart scheme funds 16-24 year olds receiving universal credit to participate on a job placement for a minimum of 25 hours per week for 6 months, and paid at least national minimum wage.</p> <p>Across the UK younger generations have been some of those worst affected economically by the pandemic. In Herefordshire there has been a 108% increase in people aged between 18 and 24 claiming out of work benefits since March 2020.</p> <p>The Kickstart scheme fully meets the salary and on costs for each placement, as well as providing £1,500 towards supporting the individual with skills and wrap around support during their placement. The scheme provides 16 to 24 year olds to gain valuable work experience and develop employability skills, as well as providing employers new opportunities.</p> <p>At the end of December 2020 DWP approved the council's gateway application, issuing a funding offer letter to support 105 placements in 22 of the organisations that have offered placements to date (including the council and Hoople).</p> <p>It is anticipated that the number of placements may increase, once selected as a 'gateway' it is possible to request funding for additional placements as they become available up until end of December 2021.</p>

<p><b>County Plan stated ambition:</b></p> <p><i>Minimise waste and increase reuse, repair and recycling</i></p> <p><b>Corporate Delivery plan objective:</b></p> <p><i>EN1.1 Develop a new <b>waste strategy</b> that drives the environmental ambition of the council, delivers value for money and meets residents' expectation. The new strategy will inform the future commissioning of waste collection and disposal in Herefordshire</i></p> <p><b>Decision maker:</b> Cabinet member commissioning procurement and assets.</p>	<p><b>L: Review and authorise a resourcing plan to take forward and implement the waste management review:</b></p> <p>The council is currently undertaking a waste management review whereby the council is likely to be responsible for delivering a significant change programme in the way that waste is collected and disposed of throughout the county.</p> <p>This decision authorises expenditure of up to £821,000 to resource and implement the outcome of the waste review. Two options are under consideration. Two stream recycling - materials are presented for collection in two streams each collected every three weeks (alternating on the third week with residual). And Kerbside Sort recycling where materials are presented weekly for collection in three streams and separated into four compartments on the vehicle.</p> <p>Both options are in line with the government's expectation as outlined in the Resource and Waste Strategy 2018 (RWS 2018), the expected change in legislation around the collection of food waste. This is in line with the council's own commitments and objectives as outlined in the County Plan and in response to the climate and ecological emergency as declared by the council in March 2019.</p> <p>Currently the collection contract is worth £4m per year and the disposable contract is worth £11m per year. The council has undertaken a public consultation with residents and businesses in Herefordshire which was launched in December 2020 and concluding in February 2021.</p>
--	--

## Community impact

16. The County Plan shapes the future of Herefordshire and aims to encourage and strengthen our vibrant communities, create a thriving local economy and protect and enhance our environment to ensure Herefordshire remains a great place to live, visit, work, learn and do business. The plan guides the work of the council and our relationship with individuals, families, communities and partners over the next four years. Our recently published delivery plan outlines the detailed work that we have committed to delivering over the next eighteen months.
17. 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.

## Environmental Impact

18. A central underpinning of Herefordshire Council's County Plan is healthy, connected and vibrant ecosystems strongly support the local economy, improve health and wellbeing and make the county an attractive place to live and to visit. It is a commitment of the plan to protect and enhance this environment while stewarding it for future generations.

19. The council's delivery plan is underpinned by the commitment of this executive to use our unique role as leaders of the places we represent to help people feel safe, supported and proud of our unique and beautiful environment and we shall tackle the climate challenge through new approaches to sustainability. In doing this we will base our work on the lessons we have learned, what our residents and businesses tell us and our understanding of what our county needs for a successful future.

### **Equality duty**

20. 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.
21. 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. Our providers will be made aware of their contractual requirements in regards to equality legislation.
  22. The Equality Act 2010 established a positive obligation on local authorities to promote equality and to reduce discrimination in relation to any of the nine 'protected characteristics' (age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; marriage and civil partnership; race; religion or belief; sex; and sexual orientation). In particular, the council must have 'due regard' to the public sector equality duty when taking any decisions on service changes.

### **Resource implications**

23. There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations of this report. The financial 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**

24. 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, on the priorities of the cabinet and (except in a year when there are ordinary elections) progress made in meeting those priorities. Appointment of cabinet members and allocation of portfolio responsibilities are responsibilities of the Leader of the Council,



and the constitution requires that any changes are subsequently reported to Council. This report ensures these requirements are met.

25. 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**

26. 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**

27. None.

### **Appendices**

- Appendix A - Executive decisions taken from 4 December 2020 to 25 February, 2021.
- Appendix B – Cabinet Member Portfolios

### **Background papers**

None



**Executive decisions taken from 4 December to 26 February 2021.**

	<b>Decision and purpose</b>	<b>Decision Type</b>	<b>Implementation Date</b>	<b>Taken by</b>
1.	<b>West Midlands Rail Ltd - proposed governance change:</b> To agree the council's response to proposed changes in the governance of West Midlands Rail Limited (WMRL).	Key	19/12/2020	Cabinet member Infrastructure and transport
2.	<b>Herefordshire Council social value:</b> To agree Herefordshire Council's social value pledges and key value indicators to be used to inform the development of a corporate social value framework.	Key	22/12/2020	Cabinet member commissioning, procurement and assets
3.	<b>Brimfield, Orleton and Little Hereford Flood Alleviation Scheme.</b> The report seeks approval for the Council to accept funding of £234,465, to survey, design and install Property Flood Resilience measures.	Non Key	23/12/2020	Cabinet member Infrastructure and transport
4.	<b>Recommendation for the first proceedable affordable housing scheme:</b> To approve the development work for the first proceedable site for affordable housing in Herefordshire.	Non Key	24/12/2020	Cabinet
5.	<b>Local authority school buildings maintenance works 2021-2023:</b> To approve the proposed expenditure of capital grants for school buildings maintenance works.	Key	24/12/2020	Cabinet
6.	<b>Review of fostering allowances and fees for foster carers:</b> To increase fostering allowances and fees for foster carers so that the Fostering service can recruit and retain sufficient foster carers to meet the needs of children and young people in care.	Key	24/12/2020	Cabinet
7.	<b>Transfer of Get Building Funding the New Model Institute Technology and Engineering:</b> To enable the accountable body, Shropshire Council, to delegate responsibility for the managing of the Get Building Funding grant and the relationship with the successful grant applicant (NMiTE) to the council. The full grant amount of £1.6m for project will be transferred from the accountable body to the council in advance of project delivery. The grant funding will be utilised to accelerate development of NMITE's Centre for Automated Manufacturing on the Herefordshire Enterprise Zone.	Key	12/01/2021	Cabinet member finance and corporate services
8.	<b>Workforce and OD Strategy:</b> The workforce and organisation development strategy outlines the work we will do over the next two years to support the delivery of the	Non Key	19/01/2021	Cabinet member finance and

	<b>Decision and purpose</b>	<b>Decision Type</b>	<b>Implementation Date</b>	<b>Taken by</b>
	corporate plan by how we recruit, manage, develop, reward and engage our employees. Cabinet are asked for their views on this strategy.			corporate services
9. 17	<b>£2m Investment in the C and U road network - confirmation of the delivery programme:</b> To approve the programme of works on the C and U road network further to the decision by the cabinet member of 6 August 2020 and resolution of the Council of 14 February 2020.	Key	21/01/2021	Cabinet member Infrastructure and transport
10.	<b>Hereford Transport Strategy:</b> For cabinet to set out its recommendations with regard to current road proposals and allocation of capital funds for consideration of full council and confirm how it will take forward its preferred transport strategy for Hereford.	Key Budget and Policy Framework	21/01/2021	Cabinet
11.	<b>Property services estates capital programme 2021/22:</b> To agree the property services 2021/22 estates capital works programme. The proposed programme of works as set out in appendix A, incorporates a series of planned project works that enables the council to deliver on its obligations to maintain buildings fit for purpose utilising the agreed £1.39m capital budget which was approved at council budget meeting of 15 February 2019	Key	28/01/2021	Cabinet member commissioning, procurement and assets
12.	<b>Schools Capital Investment Programme</b>  To approve the proposed expenditure of the preliminary works budget included in the capital programme.	Key	28/01/2021	Cabinet
13.	<b>Hereford Towns Fund town investment plan submission</b>  Endorsement of the Hereford Towns Fund town investment plan submission and approval to act as accountable body for any subsequent Town Deal agreed with government.	Key	28/01/2021	Cabinet
14.	<b>2021/22 Council Tax reduction Scheme:</b> To recommend to Council the 2021/22 local council tax reduction scheme (CTR). Council tax charges can be reduced where the bill payer meets certain set criteria contained in the council tax reduction scheme (CTR). The current scheme was initially approved by Council on 18 December 2015, amendments to the scheme are recommended to commence from 1 April 2021 to increase the discount support available. It is a legal requirement to annually review	Budget and Policy Framework  Forwarded to Council	28/01/2021	Cabinet

	Decision and purpose	Decision Type	Implementation Date	Taken by
	the council's council tax reduction scheme and the decision to approve the scheme is reserved to full Council.			
15.	<p><b>2021/22 Capital Investment Budget and Capital Strategy Update</b></p> <p>To recommend to Council for approval the capital investment budget and capital strategy for 2021/22 onwards.</p> <p>Appendix A provides details of the proposed additions to the existing capital programme that have been identified and the impact of approving these additions. Eleven capital investment budget proposals totaling £20.7m have been identified, to be funded by capital grants (£14.5m), redirected funding from revenue reserves (£1.0m), returns on capital investment (£0.4m) and prudential borrowing of (£4.8m).</p> <p>In line with the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountability (CIPFA) requirements a capital strategy has been written to reflect future direction for capital investment, the strategy is included at appendix D and in line with the guidelines requires Council approval.</p>	<p>Budget and Policy Framework</p> <p>Forwarded to Council</p>	28/01/2021	Cabinet
16.	<p><b>2021/22 Budget Setting:</b> To agree the draft 2021/22 budget and associated medium term financial strategy and treasury management strategy for recommendation to Council on 12 February. The proposed budget reflects current and expected service delivery requirements and the provisional local government settlement announced on 17 December. Overall the base budget for 2021/22 is proposed to increase to fund budget pressures. Savings of £11.2m are required in 2021/22 and an increase in council tax of 4.99% (inclusive of 3% adult social care precept) is proposed to deliver a balanced budget.</p> <p>The draft medium term financial strategy (MTFS), attached at appendix A, has been updated to reflect current assumptions on future years funding and service requirements in line with the County Plan. The treasury management strategy includes the proposed borrowing and investment strategy, the council's expected minimum revenue provision and the associated prudential indicators which demonstrate that the council's proposed capital investment budget is affordable, prudent and sustainable</p>	<p>Budget and Policy Framework</p> <p>Forwarded to Council</p>	28/01/2021	Cabinet

	<b>Decision and purpose</b>	<b>Decision Type</b>	<b>Implementation Date</b>	<b>Taken by</b>
17.	<b>Hereford City Centre Transport Package (HCCTP):</b> This report provides an update on the budget for the Hereford City Centre Transport Package (HCCTP) project and seeks approval of budget adjustments.	Key	29/01/2021	Cabinet member Infrastructure and transport
18.	<b>Strengthening the recruitment of Council Foster Carers:</b> To approve the business case for investment in marketing and engagement services to strengthen the council's in-house fostering service, increase the number of general and specialist foster carers and reduce the reliance on the more costly IFA (independent fostering agency) sector.	Key	29/01/2021	Cabinet member children and families
19.	<b>Capital grant for homelessness hub:</b> To approve a capital grant to Citizen Housing for improvement works to enable the launch of a homelessness hub in Hereford. It is proposed to make a grant of capital to Citizen Housing to enable redecoration and refreshment of the accommodation at 107a Whitecross Road. The grant for works to create a homelessness hub will funded be entirely from a capital grant awarded for the purpose to the council by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) The hub will launch during April 2021 and provide drop-in advice and support, eight units of emergency accommodation and four self-contained flats for transition.	Non Key	29/01/2021	Cabinet member health and adult wellbeing
20.	<b>Maylord Shopping Centre - Procurement of Management Contract:</b> The current contract for the management of the Maylord Shopping Centre has been in place since the council obtained outright control of the asset in June this year. The management contract is for a period of one year and is due to expire on the 12June 2021. It is necessary to procure a new contract with a service provider in order that the shopping centre can operate and that rent and service charges are collected and administered.	Key	02/02/2021	Cabinet member commissioning, procurement and assets
21.	<b>Recommendation for potential sites to progress affordable housing delivery in Herefordshire:</b> At Cabinet on 26 November 2020 the decision was taken on how the council will progress the delivery of net zero carbon affordable housing across the county over the coming years. Cabinet also approved Phase 2 of this strategic work to develop a pipeline of sites suitable for development as affordable housing to support discussions with key partners including Homes England.  This paper seeks agreement to proceed with the outline feasibility of an initial number of selected council owned sites and any suitable sites in third party ownership	Non Key	04/02/2021	Cabinet

	Decision and purpose	Decision Type	Implementation Date	Taken by
	identified across the county in order to progress the pipeline of suitable sites. The aim is to identify sites and prioritise using a market needs analysis			
22.	<p><b>To accept and approve the gateway delivery of the Kickstart scheme, providing work experience placements to 16 to 24 year olds:</b> To gain approval to accept grant funding offered by the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP). The council has successfully applied to DWP to be a gateway organisation for the delivery of the Kickstart scheme across Herefordshire. As part of the Covid 19 recovery programme, the Kickstart scheme funds 6 monthly work experience placements for 16 to 24 year olds receiving universal credit.</p> <p>An urgent decision was required to accept and implement this scheme to meet the DWP deadline to accept the grant by 4 February 2021 as part of the Covid 19 response.</p>	Key Special Urgency	04/02/2021	Cabinet member environment, economy and skills
23.	<p><b>Schools Budget 2021/22:</b> To approve school forum's recommended budget proposals for school budgets, central school services and early years within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2021/22. Dedicated Schools Grant funding for the schools block in 2021/22 is £112.95m, which is an increase of £4.5m for primary pupils, £3.8m for secondary pupils, a total of £8.3m although this includes £5m of grant for Teachers pay and pensions which was previously paid separately. The funding for high needs and early years block are provisional and are both subject to final adjustments for pupil numbers and commissioned places. The school funding values and formula calculations are in accordance with the national school funding formula as set by government. The funding above that required to implement the national funding formula is proposed to be distributed to schools at £17 per pupil and £300,000 transferred to the high needs block for 2021/22</p>	Key	06/02/2021	Cabinet member children and families
24.	<p><b>Recommissioning of Independent Advocacy Services:</b> To recommission services for the provision of independent advocacy for adults.</p>	Key	10/02/2021	Cabinet member health and adult wellbeing
25.	<p><b>Building maintenance, small works and cleaning services - Service Continuity Plan:</b> Approval is being sought to enter into a new arrangement for the current Building Maintenance, Small Works and Cleaning contract which is due to cease on 31 March 2021. A procurement process for these services was undertaken but interrupted by the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020. The procurement exercise was relaunched in the autumn of 2020 that has now concluded and been unsuccessful. This therefore presents a risk in respect of service continuity. A review of available</p>	Key Special Urgency	10/02/2021	Cabinet member commissioning, procurement and assets

	Decision and purpose	Decision Type	Implementation Date	Taken by
	options has been undertaken so that an urgent decision can be taken to mitigate the risk and ensure continuity of service.			
26.	<b>Additional funding in support of Lengthsman Grant:</b> To approve £60k capital works under the public realm annual plan 2020/21 and £10k additional revenue funding to the lengthsman scheme to allow all applications received from parishes under the lengthsman scheme to be undertaken.	Non Key	11/02/2021	Cabinet member Infrastructure and transport
27.	<b>To review and authorise a resourcing plan that will be required to take forward and implement the outcome of the waste management review:</b> The council are currently undertaking a waste management review where by the council is likely to be responsible for delivering a significant change programme to deliver changes in the way that waste is collected and disposed of throughout the county. There will be a need for expertise across waste contract procurement, public communications, strategic waste management and the capacity to implement change within the organisation.	Key	12/02/2021	Cabinet member commissioning, procurement and assets
28.	<b>Community Improvement Project relating to Wilton Sports Centre, Ross-on-Wye:</b> To approve the granting of £173k to the Ross Sports Centre community interest group (CIC) to undertake the works required to the pavilion as a result of flooding in 2020. The amount is what has been agreed with the insurance brokers and is appropriate for the costs of the insured element of the reinstatement works to the building. The council requires the CIC to complete all works to the required regulatory and statutory requirements.  Currently the whole site is made up of four separate leases, in order to ensure that the CIC can obtain maximum amounts of external funding it would be appropriate to surrender the existing leases and create one lease that demonstrates the multifunctional sports use of the site	Non Key	19/02/2021	Cabinet member commissioning, procurement and assets
29.	<b>Provision of children centre service in Bromyard:</b> To approve proposals for the temporary extension of a contract for the provision of children's centre service in the Bromyard reach area for a period up to 12-months. The Bromyard Reach area is the only part of Herefordshire where Children's Centre provision is externally commissioned. All other areas are supported via an in-house service which is centrally governed and managed.	Key	26/02/2021	Cabinet member children and families



---

## Section1 - Cabinet member portfolios

**Leader (corporate strategy and budget): Councillor David Hitchiner**

**Support members: Councillor John Hardwick; Councillor Peter Jinman (European and national matters); and Councillor Alan Seldon (LGA/CCN)**

- Corporate policy and strategy
- Corporate budget
- External liaison and relationships
  - Local Government Association (LGA)/County Councils' Network (CCN)
  - European and national matters
  - Regional matters
  - Marches Local Enterprise Partnership
  - NMiTE
- Policy development, quality assurance, external liaison, performance improvement and risk assurance relevant to the portfolio at all times having regard to the cross cutting priorities of the council
- Any initiative not specifically allocated to any other portfolio

**Children and families: Councillor Felicity Norman (Deputy Leader)**

- Deputise for the leader of the council in his absence
- To provide leadership and ensure coordination across the range of council children's services, and through engagement with partners, with a particular focus on children and young people's health & wellbeing, safeguarding, education and attainment
- Services for vulnerable young people/children/families
- Lead member for children's services in accordance with the Children's Act 2004
- Children and young people's education and attainment
- Corporate parenting
- Policy development, quality assurance, external liaison, performance improvement and risk assurance relevant to the portfolio at all times having regard to the cross cutting priorities of the council
- Any other specific responsibilities as allocated by the leader

**Commissioning, procurement and assets: Councillor Gemma Davies****Support member: Councillor Jenny Bartlett (parish shared services and assets)**

- Commissioning and procurement strategy and policy
- Contract management policy
- Waste management strategy
- Waste collection and disposal
- Council asset and property strategies
- Council property services including facilities management
- Common land
- Community services:
  - Parks and countryside
  - Leisure Services
  - Cultural services
  - Libraries
  - Heritage Services
  - Archives
  - Public conveniences
- Policy development, quality assurance, external liaison, performance improvement and risk assurance relevant to the portfolio at all times having regard to the cross cutting priorities of the council
- Any other specific responsibilities as allocated by the leader

**Environment, economy and skills: Councillor Ellie Chowns**

- Economic development and regeneration (including development and regeneration programme and partnership)
- Tourism
- Post 16 education, training and skills development
- Environmental promotion, protection and sustainability including response to climate emergency.
- Broadband
- Policy development, quality assurance, external liaison, performance improvement and risk assurance relevant to the portfolio at all times having regard to the cross cutting priorities of the council
- Any other specific responsibilities as allocated by the leader

---

**Finance and corporate services: Councillor Liz Harvey**

- Agreeing and leading the process for developing revenue and capital budgets, medium term financial strategy, council tax and NNDR
- Financial policy, fees and charging policy, financial control and reporting
- Council tax benefits
- Council ICT services
- Human Resources
- Information governance and modern records
- Equality and human rights
- Health and safety, emergency planning and business continuity
- Performance, improvement, risk management, research and intelligence
- Land charges
- Legal and democratic services including member development and training
- Policy development, quality assurance, external liaison, performance improvement and risk assurance relevant to the portfolio at all times having regard to the cross cutting priorities of the council
- Any other specific responsibilities as allocated by the leader

**Health and adult wellbeing: Councillor Pauline Crockett****Support member: Councillor Yolande Watson (adults and communities)**

- Provide leadership and ensure coordination across the range of council adult social care services, and through engagement with partners
- Services for vulnerable adults
- Adult safeguarding
- Leadership of Health and Wellbeing Board and partnership working with health
- Public Health
- Community engagement and development
- Customer services
- Policy development, quality assurance, external liaison, performance improvement and risk assurance relevant to the portfolio at all times having regard to the cross cutting priorities of the council
- Any other specific responsibilities as allocated by the leader

**Infrastructure and transport: Councillor John Harrington**

- Transport and highways policy strategy and operations
- Planning, conservation and land use strategies including Core Strategy
- Land drainage, flood alleviation, rivers and waterways
- Public Rights of Way
- Streetscene design, policy and delivery
- Traffic Management
- Car parking policy and services
- Policy development, quality assurance, external liaison, performance improvement and risk assurance relevant to the portfolio at all times having regard to the cross cutting priorities of the council
- Any other specific responsibilities as allocated by the leader

**Housing, regulatory services, and community safety: Councillor Ange Tyler**

- Strategic housing, homelessness, housing allocation and condition
- Communications and web presence
- Bereavement services including Coroner services
- Registration services
- Gypsy and traveller services
- Animal health and welfare
- Environmental health and trading standards
- Markets and fairs
- Licensing
- Community Safety including the Community Safety Partnership
- Policy development, quality assurance, external liaison, performance improvement and risk assurance relevant to the portfolio at all times having regard to the cross cutting priorities of the council
- Any other specific responsibilities as allocated by the leader



## **Title of report: Motions on notice**

**Meeting: Council**

**Meeting date: Friday 5 March 2021**

**Report by: Monitoring Officer**

### **Classification**

Open

### **Decision type**

This is not an executive decision.

### **Wards affected**

Countywide

### **Purpose**

To consider motions received on notice.

### **Recommendation**

**THAT: the motion listed at paragraph 6 is 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 One motion have been received and will be debated at the meeting. The motions for discussion are set out below:

**Motion 1 – Flooding and Phosphate Management Resourcing**

(Proposed by Councillor Toni Fagan, Seconded by Councillor Elissa Swinglehurst )

**We request that the executive of Herefordshire Council to write to our MP’s and government ministers requesting urgent intervention and immediate resourcing for our statutory agencies to address the issues of flooding and phosphate overload which is ravaging Herefordshire’s economy, ecology and communities.**

- 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 six 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.  Under current practice all Council meetings are being run virtually; video-enabled and live-streamed. This experience is feeding into the procurement process and with be in effect until May 2021 at which point the current regulations for remote meetings come to an end.
RESOLVED:		
That, to align this council with best practice elsewhere, the executive is asked:		
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.		
b) To consider a trial period for live video streaming with the opportunity during the trial for feedback from elected members and the public.		

Date of meeting	Motion	Current Status
8 March 2019	Eastern City Bridge Protective	The resolution regarding an Eastern River Crossing is being taken forward following the Cabinet meeting on 3 <sup>rd</sup>

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

	Corridor	December which considered the Hereford Transport Strategy Review, and identified the preferred elements for future transport strategy which includes an eastern river crossing.
<p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>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.</p>		

Date of meeting	Motion	Current Status
12 July 2019	Community Infrastructure Levy	<p>The decision taken on the update to the Core Strategy on 9<sup>th</sup> November, see:</p> <p><a href="http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=7296">http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=7296</a></p> <p>This included resolution as follows: (e) work on progressing a Herefordshire Community Infrastructure Levy should be put on hold pending the outcome of the significant proposals for reform of planning obligations in the White Paper</p>
<p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That 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
17 July 2020	Tree Strategy	<p>An executive response is being prepared for March 2021.</p> <p>This will jointly respond to the Tree Strategy and Decline in hedgehog population motions proposing the development of a more comprehensive Nature Strategy to further protect and enhance local biodiversity.</p>
<p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>We call upon the executive to expedite the delivery of a detailed tree strategy for the county. A 2014 draft document exists that might provide the basis for a new strategy which will reinforce our commitment to the environment and align with our declaration of a climate emergency.</p>		

The Government is currently consulting on an England Tree Strategy and we ask for the council to respond to this consultation.

Furthermore, in the interim and as a matter of urgency, we ask the executive to consider what can be done to protect existing trees and to take immediate action by planting, maintaining and protecting trees in order to have established growth by 2030.

Date of meeting	Motion	Current Status
9 October 2020	Decline in hedgehog population	An executive response is being prepared for March 2021.  This will jointly respond to the Tree Strategy and Decline in hedgehog population motions proposing the development of a more comprehensive Nature Strategy to further protect and enhance local biodiversity.
<p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That –</p> <p>A recent study has shown that the UK population of Hedgehogs has declined from around 30 million to only 1 million. Whilst it is not yet a European Protected Species it is a British mammal where the population is in steep decline and I am calling upon our executive to please consider ways in which Herefordshire Council can include measures for adaptation, mitigation and for the protection of Hedgehogs to a level comparable to that required for European Protected Species.</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**

