

## General scrutiny committee schedule of recommendations made and action in response (municipal year 2020-21)

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
28 September 2020	Minerals and Waste Local Plan	<p><b>RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE EXECUTIVE:</b></p> <p><b>That</b></p> <p><b>(a) a plain English and practical guidance / executive summary document be produced to support the report;</b></p> <p><b>(b) a more explicit definition, with links to the examples of acceptable sustainable development - within the context of this report - be included</b></p> <p><b>(c) while it recognises that the insertion of a stronger line on preventing fracking/unconventional hydrocarbon extraction in Herefordshire may make the MWLP 'unsound' due to national policy guidelines - the committee wishes to voice its view and see a clearer statement from government that fracking/extraction of unconventional hydrocarbons is unacceptable in Herefordshire; and</b></p> <p><b>(d) the current draft MWLP be endorsed to go forward to public consultation.</b></p>	<p>Agreed. It would be useful to provide a non-technical summary of the MWLP, in order to reach as wide an audience as possible.</p> <p>Sustainable development has been defined in the glossary of the MWLP. In sections of the text which directly mention sustainable development, references to the glossary will be added to aid technical understanding of this phrase.</p> <p>No changes to the MWLP are required in response to this recommendation, however, officers will work with the Cabinet Member Infrastructure and Transport to lobby Government for a stronger statement on fracking to be issued.</p>	completed
28 September 2020	Task and finish group report - waste management strategic review	<p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p><b>That</b></p> <p><b>(a) the Task and Finish Group report and all of its recommendations be approved, subject to including:</b></p> <p><b>1. that, as part of the consultation process, there is clear explanation</b></p>	<p>Decision by cabinet member – commissioning, procurement and assets 26 October 2020</p> <p><a href="http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=7273">http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=7273</a></p> <p>Response to review on agenda for 26 April 2021</p> <p>(a) accept the recommendations around consulting on options 2 &amp; 3 from General Scrutiny Committee held on 28 September 2020</p>	Update to Committee in April 2021

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<p>given as to why option one is not being put forward as an option;</p> <p>2. the Waste Team continue to work with and lead the communications on each of the schemes to ensure public understanding for the preferred options is secured;</p> <p>3. asking that the reuse of waste is brought forward as quickly as possible at our local household recycling centres; and</p> <p>4. that the Task and Finish group report is shared with Defra; and</p> <p>(b) the findings and recommendations be submitted to the executive for consideration.</p>	<p>(b) consent be given for expenditure up to the value of £75,000 is allocated from the council's waste revenue reserves to the Economy &amp; Place Directorate's revenue budget for 2020/21 to award a tender and include expenditure required for resources to allow the council to carry out an effective and engaging consultation on the future of its Waste Management Service;</p> <p>(c) a further report is brought back to the cabinet member for procurement and assets outlining the resources required to deliver the waste services management review;</p> <p>(d) a further report is brought back to cabinet in Spring 2021 with a recommendation on future collection services and outlining future resources required to implement the recommendation; and</p> <p>(e) Subject to the provisions of the Financial Procedure Rules, the Assistant Director for Regulatory, Environment and Waste be authorised to take all operational decisions required to implement the above recommendations.</p>	
9 November 2020	Hereford Transport Strategy Review	<p><b>RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE EXECUTIVE:</b></p> <p><b>That</b></p> <p>(a) more detailed studies are undertaken on the benefits and dis-benefits of traffic light management in more locations in Hereford;</p> <p>(b) as a result of this review, the committee recommends that the cabinet consider 'weighting of the preferred outcomes' to help determine the preferred package to take forward;</p>	<p>(As reported to cabinet on 3 December)</p> <p>Whilst the removal of traffic signals along the A49 was looked at and discarded by the review due to negative impacts on pedestrians and cyclists, traffic light management would form an element of the Intelligent Transport Systems option (page 53 of the review) which is included in Package C.</p> <p>If cabinet is minded to support this recommendation this would be additional work which the cabinet could ask officers to consider and set out the resource requirements to progress.</p> <p>The review has specifically chosen not to weight the 4 objectives or 16 outcomes which underpin these objectives. This provides a comparative view of performance for all of the six packages. Cabinet may choose to assign its own strategic priorities in respect</p>	completed

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<p>(c) <b>support is given to promoting more ‘park and choose’ options in combination with more investment into public transport options and cycle routes to reduce demand for car journeys into or through the city centre with a particular focus given to the limited transport options currently experienced by Herefordshire’s rural communities and that the executive set up a transport team as a matter of priority to implement the planning of cycling and walking, and that the road schemes are reconfigured to accommodate walking and cycling safely within the city;</b></p>	<p>of objectives and outcomes and reference these priorities in determining its preferred package.</p> <p>If cabinet wished for weightings to be applied to the package assessments it could ask for this as a further step to the review. Cabinet would need to confirm its preferred weightings or instruct that alternative weightings are assessed. If cabinet wished to progress this work it would need to defer its decision on the preferred packages and this would extend the review.</p> <p>The recommendation is noted. Package A includes investment in park and choose options (identified as mobility hubs at page 51 of the review) and cycle routes (Page 45) and Package A+B includes significant investment in public transport options within the Hereford’s urban area and urban fringe (options set out at pages 45, 46, 47 and 49 of the review) and these will support longer distance travel needs. Cabinet will be able to select this combination of package options noting the support indicated by committee.</p> <p>Whilst this review has focused on transport issues in Hereford in line with the scope set out in the cabinet member decision of January 2020 it is appreciated that it would be helpful to review transport challenges and solutions countywide. The cabinet report sets out the original intention to review the Local Transport Plan within 5 years of its adoption which would be by 2021. It is also important to note that the core strategy update is due to comment in the next few months. As such, the intention would be to undertake a wider review of transport strategy for the whole county over the coming year.</p> <p>Cabinet may ask officers to consider the approach to designing and delivering transport schemes and report back on options and funding implications for different approaches.</p>	

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<p><b>(d) the cabinet follow up on the suggestion for a 'River-Bus Service' in ongoing refinement and review of the Hereford transport package options;</b></p> <p><b>(e) consideration is given to a wider, more in depth study, on the transport options that address countywide transport challenges and solutions, not just in Hereford City;</b></p> <p><b>(f) cabinet should not feel constrained by having to consider just the package of options that has been presented to them as part of this review.</b></p> <p><b>(g) the committee considers that further analysis is undertaken to assess further the mitigation measures of traffic utilising an eastern crossing before the dis-benefits of an eastern crossing rule it out as an option.</b></p>	<p>Whilst this proposal was not considered in the review or suggested by members or stakeholders during the engagement stages of the review cabinet could include this option in its preferred package combination and instruct that this is considered further in the context of package development work. The cost of undertaking this work would need to be confirmed and set out in a subsequent report to the cabinet member</p> <p>Whilst this review has focused on transport issues in Hereford in line with the scope set out in the cabinet member decision of January 2020 it is appreciated that it would be helpful to review transport challenges and solutions countywide. The cabinet report sets out the original intention to review the Local Transport Plan within 5 years of its adoption which would be by 2021. It is also important to note that the core strategy update is due to comment in the next few months. As such, the intention would be to undertake a wider review of transport strategy for the whole county over the coming year.</p> <p>The recommendation to cabinet sets out that cabinet may consider the packages as assessed in the review or combination of package options.</p> <p>Cabinet may choose to agree a package which includes an eastern river crossing noting that 2 eastern river crossing options have been assessed within the 6 packages. If cabinet considers that further technical work is required to understand the impacts and potential mitigations of these elements (or any other transport elements) it could ask officers ask officers to consider and set out the resource requirements for any additional technical work.</p>	

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<p><b>(h) school travel and transport is given greater priority and that more work is done to undertake survey work with schools and parents to gain a better understanding to what the barriers to uptake of school transport are;</b></p> <p><b>(i) carbon offsetting is looked at in relation to offsetting on major infrastructure projects.</b></p> <p><b>(j) the impact of assessing routes over other river crossings, in particular, the Bridge Sollars crossing, is built into the analysis of options and packages under review.</b></p> <p><b>(k) that the executive abandon the Western Bypass and reject other major road infrastructure schemes, barring only the eastern river crossing option;</b></p> <p><b>(l) the executive take a look again at the robustness of the qualitative assessment of the evidence presented; and</b></p>	<p>Whilst an assessment of the barriers to uptake of different modes of travel to school (other than by car) was not part of this review and the review did not undertake fresh and comprehensive surveys of travel to school for county schools. This is additional work which the cabinet could ask officers to consider and set out the resource requirements to progress.</p> <p>Carbon offsetting is being considered in the work being undertaken on the carbon management plan – Pathway to Carbon Neutral. The Plan indicates that offsetting is likely to follow in the 5 years following the current management plan and between 2025 and 2030.</p> <p>Cabinet is invited to consider whether or not it wishes to instruct that further work is done to understand wider traffic movements through the county and outside of the Hereford transport network in the context further development of a preferred package. This is additional work which the cabinet could ask officers to consider and set out the resource requirements to progress.</p> <p>The recommendations for cabinet include the option to stop work on the western bypass and southern link road and the western bypass as also include in package A+C+D. Two of the package options include eastern river crossings and cabinet may determine to progress either of these options. Any decision which would result in a significant change to current adopted policy and strategy may require the need for consideration by full council.</p> <p>If cabinet wished to look again at the robustness of the qualitative assessment this would extend the review and would require it to defer any decision.</p> <p>Cabinet have been briefed on the review at various stages of its development and also requested the</p>	

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<p><b>(m) Herefordshire Council should immediately implement a well-designed comprehensive safe and attractive network of active travel measures across the entire county to reduce the effect of climate change and the risk of surface flooding.</b></p>	<p>engagement of a critical friend in the form of an independent transport consultant to review the draft report and inform final reporting. The critical friend has confirmed that in their view the details of the assessment have been done at a level appropriate to the stage of work, noting that further detailed work would be required. The review includes both qualitative assessment and assessment which is based on modelled outputs. The qualitative assessment was undertaken by transport planners with experience of strategy development and scheme delivery across a range of transport interventions and work was subject to discussion and challenge with council officers, stakeholders and members through the engagement sessions.</p> <p>This aligns with policy and the types of measures identified in Package A. A number of active travel measures are being progressed which will include improvements for pedestrians, cyclists, bus and rail users and we are continuing to deliver the choose how you move behavioural change programme countywide. Clearly, more of these measures could be introduced more quickly if additional funding is available and it is anticipated that there will be further opportunities to bid for external funds over the coming months as government provides more details following its publication of 'Decarbonising Transport' and 'Gear Change' earlier in 2020.</p>	
7 December 2020	Marches Local Enterprise Partnership - Update	<p><b>That</b></p> <p><b>(a) the update from the Marches LEP including current priorities and projects be noted;</b></p> <p><b>(b) the executive be recommended that:</b></p> <p><b>(1) the LEP be asked to bear in mind the importance of having regard to the needs of the market towns and the rural areas when considering allocating funding for projects;</b></p>	<p>The important economic role of the market towns is recognised in the Marches LEP Strategic Economic Plan and the draft Local Industrial Strategy. The LEP also recognises the significant impact of Covid 19 has had on town centres, particularly retail and hospitality. At this time it is not clear what future government</p>	Recommendations f and g outstanding

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<p><b>(2) the LEP be encouraged in its stated intention to revisit its Strategic Economic Plan and other policies to ensure that they are sustainable and resilient having regard, for example, to the impact of transport schemes in the context of the declared climate emergency;</b></p> <p><b>(3) the LEP be asked to consider how it can improve its engagement with creative industries;</b></p> <p><b>(4) the LEP be asked to consider appointing a creative industries champion to the LEP Board;</b></p> <p><b>(5) the LEP Board be recommended to appoint a rural and market Towns Champion;</b></p>	<p>funding will be made available via the LEPs, in terms of the amount of funding or the related criteria. However, wherever possible, in meeting the priorities of the Strategic Economic Plan, the draft Local Industrial Strategy and in supporting the recovery of Covid 19, the LEP will ensure that the needs of the market towns are fully considered in future calls for project applications.</p> <p>It is welcomed that the Marches LEP will be revisiting the SEP and other policies to review in the context of the climate emergency. The Marches LEP will confirm the timetable for these reviews but it will be dependent on the government making resources available in 2020/21 to enable the LEP to do this work in consultation with partners.</p> <p>The Marches LEP recognises the important contribution creative industries make to the local economy. The LEP are currently considering how it can improve (with the respective local authorities) sector based engagement in each area. The LEP will ensure that engagement with the creative industries sector is fully considered and improved through this process.</p> <p>In accordance with the Articles of Association, with the exception of the Local Authority representation on the LEP Board (which is subject to the local election process), all of the remaining Board positions are openly recruited. Therefore, the LEP don't currently have a means to directly appoint a representative for a specific sector or geography, but do seek to ensure the Board is representative through the recruitment and selection process.</p> <p>As above, in accordance with the Articles of Association, with the exception of the Local Authority</p>	

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<p><b>(6) the LEP be asked to bid for funding to address the impacts of flooding, noting that these are of a significance comparable to the impacts of Covid 19 for which the Government has provided funding;</b></p> <p><b>(c) the Executive considers how it can facilitate better engagement between the Herefordshire Cultural Partnership and the LEP;</b></p> <p><b>(d) the Executive work with the LEP to make representations for there to be a small towns LEP group along the lines of the national rural LEP Group;</b></p>	<p>representation on the LEP Board (which is subject to the local election process), all of the remaining Board positions are openly recruited. Therefore, the LEP don't currently have a means to directly appoint a representative for a specific sector or geography, but do seek to ensure the Board is representative through the recruitment and selection process. As a predominately rural LEP area, a number of the existing Board members either have business interests in and/or themselves live in a rural area or market town, representing these needs.</p> <p>The LEP are a member of the River Severn Partnership alongside the local authorities, seeking to lobby government for funding to support improved infrastructure to reduce flooding and enable the growth of the local economy. Should the government provide an opportunity for the LEPs to seek funding for flood prevention, the LEP would commit to doing so. At this time, it is not yet clear what future government funding will be made available via the LEP network.</p> <p>The LEP are not currently members of the Herefordshire Cultural Partnership, but are represented on a number of cross cutting Herefordshire partnerships such as the Herefordshire Business Board (where the cultural partnership is represented) and the Hereford Towns Board. Herefordshire council are represented on the Cultural Partnership, and can ensure enhanced engagement and improved co-ordination with the LEP.</p> <p>The council and the LEP will work in partnership to encourage government and the LEP network to consider establishing a small towns LEP group. It is noted that over the last 12 months government has launched a number of council led initiatives to support towns, such as Stronger Towns Funding (Hereford and Telford currently selected), Future High Street</p>	



Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<p>(e) <b>the Executive ensures that it has a number of approved prioritised projects available for submission to the LEP in order to take advantage of funding opportunities when they arise; and</b></p> <p>(f) <b>Committee establishes a task and finish group to review the processes in place to deliver projects, ensuring that the reasons that have led to delays in the past on council managed projects have been addressed and that the current processes are fit for purpose; and</b></p> <p>(g) <b>the LEP be asked to report to the Committee on the level of inward investment achieved.</b></p>	<p>Funding, and Heritage Action Zone (Leominster selected).</p> <p>The council will ensure that a pipeline of high quality, worked up shovel ready projects are established in order to apply for funding opportunities. The council is currently working with the Hereford Towns Board to develop a Town Investment Plan, and is leading the development of Economic Development Investment Plans for each of the five market towns. These plans will identify the strategic needs/ opportunities for these areas and develop project proposals in anticipation of future government funding. A similar investment plan for the wider rural areas is also planned, identified as an action in the County Plan Delivery Plan 2020 to 2022.</p> <p>For consideration in the work before.</p> <p>The LEP and the Local Authorities work with the Department for International Trade to engage foreign owned businesses and support investment. The LEP and Herefordshire Council will work together to better monitor and report against inward investment into the county.</p>	
7 December 2020	Work Programme	<b>(d) the executive be requested to provide a fuller explanation of its response to the Committee's recommendation (b) in its consideration of the Hereford Transport Package review on 9 November that the cabinet consider 'weighting of the preferred outcomes' to help determine the preferred package to take forward'.</b>	In considering the General Scrutiny Committee's recommendation (b) of its meeting of 9 November 2020 the cabinet member confirmed at the cabinet meeting of 3 December 2020 that it was not proposed to delay making a determination on the preferred strategy to introduce a system to weight preferred outcomes. The cabinet member confirmed that cabinet was able to consider its preferred strategic packages in the context of the information provided by the review	completed

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
			and its priorities. The priorities for the review were clear and the detailed information and analysis set out in the review documents were considered sufficient to inform the decision taken by cabinet.	
15 January 2021	2021/22 Budget Setting	<p><b>The recommendations and the responses to them are set out in the 2021/22 budget setting report to council on 12 February 2021 (paragraph 51)</b></p> <p><a href="http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/documents/s50086885/202122%20Budget%20Setting.pdf">http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/documents/s50086885/202122%20Budget%20Setting.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/documents/s50086885/202122%20Budget%20Setting.pdf">http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/documents/s50086885/202122%20Budget%20Setting.pdf</a></p> <p><b>The following recommendations are for the Committee itself to address:</b></p> <p><b>(b) In its review of Covid measures the Committee consider how grants have been used and seek comparative information from other authorities;</b></p> <p><b>(c) the committee makes arrangements to include monitoring of savings plans in work programme; and</b></p> <p><b>(d) mindful of the impact of the budget proposals on the Economy and Place Budget briefings be provided to the Committee on progress in achieving the proposed savings and their impact and the Committee be informed of other savings proposals that have been identified with a view to ensuring appropriate contingency plans are in place.</b></p>	See report to Council 12 February 2021	
25 January 2021	Task and Finish Group Report – Climate Emergency Review	<p><b>RESOLVED: That the findings of the report, and recommendations as amended and set out at appendix 3 to the minutes, be submitted to the executive.</b></p> <p><a href="http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/documents/g8054/Public%20minutes%20Monday%2025-Jan-">http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/documents/g8054/Public%20minutes%20Monday%2025-Jan-</a></p>	<p>Executive response on agenda for 26 April 2021</p> <p><a href="http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=7731">http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=7731</a></p>	

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<p><a href="http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/documents/g8054/Public%20minutes%20Monday%2025-Jan-2021%2014.00%20General%20scrutiny%20committee.pdf?T=11">2021%2014.00%20General%20scrutiny%20committee.pdf?T=11</a></p> <p><a href="http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/documents/g8054/Public%20minutes%20Monday%2025-Jan-2021%2014.00%20General%20scrutiny%20committee.pdf?T=11">http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/documents/g8054/Public%20minutes%20Monday%2025-Jan-2021%2014.00%20General%20scrutiny%20committee.pdf?T=11</a></p>		
22 March 2021	Fownhope Flood Repair Work	<p><b>RESOLVED to recommend to the executive:</b></p> <p><b>That</b></p> <p>(a) the executive support and encourage the delivery by BBLP of projects for the benefit of the Fownhope and Woolhope communities;</p> <p>(b) repairs to restore roads in the locality damaged by their use as a diversion route during the closure of the Fownhope Road are prioritised;</p> <p>(c) the executive encourage Fownhope and Woolhope Parish Councils to make representations to local MPs to seek funding for highway maintenance, and highlight shortcomings in the Bellwin scheme that appear to have been revealed, and the need for that scheme to be reviewed and for other funding sources to be provided if it is concluded that the Bellwin Scheme itself does not require revision;</p> <p>(d) the executive make further representations to local MPs to seek additional grant funding for highway maintenance, and highlight shortcomings in the Bellwin scheme that appear to have been revealed, and the need for that scheme to be reviewed and for other funding sources to be provided if it is concluded that the Bellwin Scheme itself does not require revision;</p>	Update anticipated for the committee meeting on 12 July 2021.	

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<p><b>(e)</b> consideration be given to whether the situation could be presented to Government as a case study highlighting the adverse impact on the local community as a result of lack of funding;</p> <p><b>(f)</b> a robust review of the risks to other lengths of the B4224 of similar topography be conducted to establish if there is a need for preventative measures;</p> <p><b>(g)</b> given the experiences on the B4224 consideration be given to whether there any other sites in the county that could be similarly problematic in the event of flooding with a view to adopting a more preventative approach to maintenance across the county;</p> <p><b>(h)</b> action be taken to progress broadband works in the county delayed as a result of the B4224 works;</p> <p><b>(i)</b> It be ensured that parish councils and communities concerns are recognised and taken into account by the Council and their partners when taking forward repairs to infrastructure;</p> <p><b>(j)</b> the independent review be welcomed; and the following matters be considered for inclusion and if they are not included in the review they be responded to in any event by the executive:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The issues that arose because of the nature of vehicles using the diversion routes;</li> <li>2. The potential for weight restrictions on traffic in the locality and other traffic management measures;</li> <li>3. Was enough priority given to ongoing repairs needed to the routes forming the diversions;</li> </ol>		

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="674 153 1205 212">4. Pace of decision making particularly from April to August;</li> <li data-bbox="674 229 1205 384">5. The focus be on identifying lessons learned that can be applied generally to future schemes, whilst noting that matters unique to the specific sites also need to be identified;</li> <li data-bbox="674 402 1205 493">6. Fownhope and Woolhope Parish Councils be consulted on matters for inclusion in the review;</li> <li data-bbox="674 510 1218 847">7. Project management and processes, the timeframes involved, for example the time between identifying work needed, specification, commissioning the contract, to commencing work, and the incremental nature of delays. The ability of the council to have oversight of such projects and whether additional technical and project management resource in-house is required;</li> <li data-bbox="674 865 1211 957">8. The time taken to establish whether it was possible to proceed without going to open tender;</li> <li data-bbox="674 975 1211 1066">9. Has there been sufficient assessment of the risk of further failure in the highway network in the locality;</li> <li data-bbox="674 1083 1128 1142">10. Were the solutions adopted appropriate and proportionate;</li> <li data-bbox="674 1160 1205 1409">11. Managing working relationships with utility providers such as BT and gas providers and the approach to specifying works for them to undertake, including the potential benefit of a protocol for managing works in particular those of an emergency nature;</li> </ol>		

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<p>12. Clarification as to how the issue with the size of the crane required for the Stone Cottage works arose and assurance measures to avoid such occurrences in the future;</p> <p>13. Review of the robustness of the effectiveness of the liaison between the Council and BBLP in managing projects;</p> <p>14. Effectiveness of communication with the local community and speed thereof especially from the outset of an incident; and</p> <p>15. Review appropriateness of diversion routes and their signing and facilitating of road safety management.</p>		
22 March 2021	Local Flood Risk Management Strategy Action Plan	<p><b>RESOLVED: to recommend to the executive:</b></p> <p><b>That:</b></p> <p>(a) prioritisation of actions in the action plan be re-evaluated;</p> <p>(b) the council strengthen efforts with the Environment Agency to focus on flood mitigation measures for all watercourses;</p> <p>(c) further efforts be made to reinforce the message to landowners to emphasise their riparian responsibilities as riparian owners to maintain drainage and make them aware of support and assistance available through the Council;</p> <p>(d) consider how the Council can increase resources to manage drainage issues and invest in the drainage asset;</p> <p>(e) review weighting given to the threshold for action to implement measures to address flooding on lengths of highway known to</p>	Update anticipated for the committee meeting on 12 July 2021.	

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<p>flood frequently, having regard to the need to ensure access for emergency vehicles;</p> <p>(f) the liaison between the EA and the Council to disseminate flooding information to residents taking advantage of the Council's communication networks be kept under review to ensure that it is as effective as possible, noting the role parish councils and community groups can play;</p> <p>(g) consideration be given to whether the website content on flooding is readily accessible and sufficient or can be improved, with consideration given to use of apps and other methods;</p> <p>(h) improve information to local residents on respective responsibilities of residents themselves, the Council and the Environment Agency;</p> <p>(i) consideration be given to an annual survey of Parish Councils to establish information on their flooding experiences and any suggestions for improvements;</p> <p>(j) regard be had to knowledge of local residents and Parish Councils on areas subject to flooding and residents and Parish Councils be invited and encouraged to submit information;</p> <p>(k) review highways maintenance plan to see if there should be greater focus on roads subject to flooding;</p> <p>(l) consideration be given to raising awareness of the contribution to flooding made by climate change and information available via a link on the council's website; and</p> <p>(m) the mechanism for the production of Section 19 reports be reviewed and</p>		

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>streamlined to seek to ensure the pace of completion is improved and appropriate resource allocated to support this aim.</b></p>		
26 April 2021	Update on the executive responses to the committee's waste management strategic review and the review of the climate and ecological emergency	<p><i>(number references in brackets are to the recommendations made to the executive to which the executive responses referred)</i></p> <p><b>the review of the climate and ecological emergency</b></p> <p><b>That</b></p> <p><b>(a) the Committee requests the executive to reconsider its response to those recommendations that have been rejected or accepted in part and the recommendations made during the debate and an updated response be presented to the Committee's next scheduled meeting, clarifying in particular the misunderstanding that appeared to have been caused by the use of the word "rejected" which in several cases appeared misleading in the context of the detailed response;</b></p> <p><b>(b) subject to confirmation from the solicitor to the Council, the committee establish a standing Panel to monitor the executive response to the Committee's recommendations, the members of the former task and finish group being invited to consider if they would wish to serve on this Panel in the first instance, with the Panel's terms of reference to be reported to the Committee's next scheduled meeting;</b></p> <p><b>(c) further consideration be given by the executive to whether sufficient resources have been allocated to implement the recommendations of the review, mindful also of the need to manage the workload of officers;</b></p>	Update anticipated for the committee meeting on 12 July 2021.	



Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<p><b>(d)</b> (17) it be noted that this recommendation has not in effect been rejected but partly accepted and particular re-consideration be given to the production of a local list more swiftly than currently proposed;</p> <p><b>(e)</b> consideration be given to the extent to which notes of meetings between the council and the Environment Agency and others can be made public, even if an abbreviated form to avoid disclosure of confidential information and included in the NMB agenda papers;</p> <p><b>(f)</b> (20) consideration be given to introducing a mechanism to seek responses from Parish Councils to measure the effectiveness of the advisory notes issued by the Neighbourhood Planning Team in effecting change;</p> <p><b>(g)</b> (30d) this recommendation should be revisited and explored more imaginatively and constructively, for example proactively working with Verging in Wild and any other groups within the County that can promote such schemes;</p> <p><b>(h)</b> (32b) greater clarification be provided on the operation of a phosphate trading platform and what it entails as a briefing to Councillors and the NMB be invited to review the merits of the proposal with a view to information being added to the relevant section of the council's website in due course;</p> <p><b>(i)</b> (33) the committee encourages the executive to continue to explore all solutions to protecting the River Wye SAC catchment including that the possibility for a Water Protection Zone to be proactively discussed with the Environment Agency;</p>		

Meeting	item	Recommendations	Action	Status
		<p>(j) (42) work is undertaken in conjunction with the transport team to undertake surveys with schools, to identify barriers and opportunities for active travel. A full survey to commence and report back with opportunities and recommendations by November 2021; and</p> <p>(k) (54) that this response be reconsidered with a view to developing a county-wide policy.</p>		
		<p><b>Waste Management Strategic Review</b></p> <p><b>That</b></p> <p>(a) the executive's review of link between collection and disposal be welcomed.</p> <p>(b) a unified waste strategy be drawn up by the executive with an aim to provide an end to end waste service for residents spanning from repair and reuse right through to collection and disposal;</p> <p>(c) there be greater clarity as to what happens to recycled waste generated within the County;</p> <p>(d) there be greater information and clarity as to what happens to all waste generated within the County;</p> <p>(e) any new contract should maximise the scope to reduce waste to landfill;</p> <p>(f) the executive explores options for disposal of waste likely to cause nuisance because of smell or other potential nuisance/hazard; and</p> <p>(g) (22) the executive be encouraged to explore the opportunity for the public to reuse material from HRCs on existing sites and elsewhere and via the website.</p>	<p>Update anticipated for the committee meeting on 12 July 2021.</p>	