

Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Commission
10:00 a.m. Thursday, 22 January 2026, Room 77, The Guildhall
Present: Councillors Burton (Chair), Collinson M (DC), Herrera-Richmond, Healand, Kemp, North, Preston, Wood and Wilkinson.

In attendance:

A. Codd, Assistant Director, Economic Development and Regeneration, Hull City Council
 N. Turner, Head of Economic Strategy and Partnerships, Hull City Council
 D. Jones, Head of Planning, Hull City Council
 K. Ryan, Head of Transport and Traffic Management, Streetscene, Hull City Council
 C. Tyson, Parking Manager, Streetscene, Hull City Council
 A. Spouse, Scrutiny Officer, Committee and Scrutiny, Town Clerk's Service, Hull City Council

Apologies: N/A

Minute Number		Action to be Taken by
44.	(2) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	Scrutiny Officer – AS
There were no declarations of interest in regard to the following agenda items.		

45.	(3) MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 5 DECEMBER 2025	(a) Scrutiny Officer – AS
<p>The Scrutiny Officer submitted the minutes from the December meeting for consideration and approval by the Commission.</p>		
Recommendations:		Reasons for Recommendations:
<p>Agreed:</p> <p>a) That the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 5 December 2025, are agreed, and having been printed and circulated, be taken as read, and correctly recorded.</p>		<p>a) N/A</p>

46.	(3) ACTION TRACKER	(a) C. Jackson / L. Dixon / A. Holgate (b) Audit Committee / L. Dixon / A. Holgate / P. Todd / C. Jackson (c) A. Holgate / C. Brennan (d) C. Jackson / A. Blake / G. Osgerby
<p>The Commission discussed the fact they still had not received a response to their request for a Hull Maritime Programme Budget Update, despite originally requesting the information in December 2024. The Commission discussed the Council’s governance arrangements, how the matter could and should have been addressed at a much earlier stage, and how the failure to respond to a scrutiny request, might be interpreted as a lack of openness and transparency on the local authority’s part.</p>		

Recommendations:	Reasons for Recommendations:
<p>Agreed:</p> <p>a) The Commission places on record its concern that the Hull Maritime Programme Budget Update, originally requested in December 2024 is still outstanding, and the Commission believes this represents a failure in governance, comprising the scrutiny process and the requirement for the Council to carry out its business in an open and transparent manner.</p> <p>b) The matter is referred to the Council's Audit Committee, so it can be incorporated into its review of the Council's overview and scrutiny arrangements, with a view to strengthening the scrutiny framework, and in turn, the Council's governance arrangements.</p> <p>c) The matter is also referred to Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee for information.</p> <p>d) The Commission notes that because the action has been outstanding for so long, the Hull Maritime Programme is now nearing completion, and with that in mind, the action is amended, so the Commission receive a final budget breakdown, including lessons learnt, at the earliest opportunity.</p>	<p>a) As per the minute</p> <p>b) As per the minute</p> <p>c) As per the minute</p> <p>d) As per the minute</p>

47.	(5) ECONOMIC UPDATE	(a) A. Codd / N. Turner
<p>A. Codd, Assistant Director, Economic Development and Regeneration, Hull City Council, and N. Turner, Head of Economic Strategy and Partnerships, Hull City Council, attended for the item, and introduced the presentation, which sought to update the Commission on the Government's Autumn Budget, the Pride in Place Programme and the latest economic data for the City.</p> <p>The Commission discussed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Infrastructure funding and what was likely to be the Council's next ask once the A63 works were completed. The Commission was advised that rail electrification remained a key ask, despite recent announcements. The Commission discussed future capital funding, and potential projects, including replacing Sculcoates/Chapman Street Bridge and pursuing a northern bypass for the City. The Commission was advised that the Council remained in dialogue with Government. ii. The Youth Guarantee, the additional funding and what it might mean for HTAE (Hull Training and Adult Education) and Hull College. The Commission was advised that students numbers were up, but the major challenge was recruiting tutors to deliver the required training. Work was ongoing with the business community to identify potential tutors, but pay levels were an obstacle, and they were trying to utilise market supplements where possible. iii. If we knew how the extra £2 billion the Government had allocated to local roads would be distributed amongst local authorities. The Commission was advised that there were no details as yet, and it was still unclear how the funding would be distributed between local authorities and combined authorities. The funding would not be available until 2029. iv. The Pride of Place Programme and what progress had been made in regard to recruiting and appointing the independent chairs for the three boards. The Commission was advised that the Council had developed a recruitment pack. They wanted to attract applicants who had a strong and active interest in the area. The Government had provided guidance in terms of which type of community figures might be best placed to fulfil the roles. The Commission discussed the guidance and the need for flexibility at local level. v. The value in engaging the business community and opportunities for the Pride of Place Boards to draw in additional private and public sector funding going forward. 		

- vi. How the three areas identified for Pride of Place funding were all very different and how that would likely be reflected in board membership. A thank you for the level of engagement with Members and local areas to date. Whether the programme was on track given the tight timelines. The Commission was advised that a report outlining the governance arrangements was due to go to Cabinet in January, and a decision record had been prepared in order to progress the recruitment of the independent chairs.
- vii. Different community groups that operated in different areas of the City, and the need for the Pride of Place Board's to engage with stakeholders across their footprints.
- viii. How Pride of Place funding was not Council funding, but there was still an opportunity to match fund or link into other programmes. The Commission was advised that it was still early stages, and they needed to make those connections. They were three separate projects, but they were all operating within one city, which would bring additional benefits. The Council had the resources and experience to identify complimentary funding streams the Boards could potentially access.
- ix. The demands the new Pride of Place boards would place on the Council, board members and key stakeholders. The Commission was advised that the Council was the accountable body, and there would be challenges, including managing expectations in the early stages. It was hoped that the programmes would become much more fluid and efficient over time.
- x. The latest labour market statistics (page 33 of 98) which seemed to suggest Hull's unemployment figure had risen by 163% (6200 people) over the course of the year. The Commission was advised that the figure from the ONS (Office for National Statistics) was correct as supplied, but it was not considered reliable, and the Bank of England was challenging the validity of the ONS figures. The figure had been generated through a national survey, and the previous year's figure had also been queried. The claimants figures were a more reliable data source, given claimants had to register.

Recommendations:	Reasons for Recommendations:
<p>Agreed:</p> <p>a) The Commission notes the Economic Update, including the briefings on the Autumn Budget and Pride in Place funding.</p>	<p>a) N/A</p>

48.	(6) EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS ACT - OVERVIEW	(a-b) A Codd / N. Turner
<p>N. Turner, Head of Economic Strategy and Partnerships, Hull City Council, attended for the item, and introduced the presentation, which sought to update the Commission on the implementation and aims of new Employment Rights Act.</p> <p>The Commission discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Managing the potential challenges the legislative changes would present to SMEs and micro businesses in the City, and what might be done to support them during that process. The Commission was advised that the Council would continue to engage with business and provide support and advice where possible. The Commission discussed whether it would be prudent to review that support, with a view to meeting the new challenges posed by the Act. ii. How the legislation represented a positive development for employees, while recognising it might also present some challenges for employers, particularly smaller businesses, and they would need to be supported through the implementation process. iii. A business survey that had been carried out at ward level, how that had highlighted online trading and public access e.g. car parking as their main concerns, and how that information could be shared with the Council's business support team, with a view to informing the support they provided to businesses. 		
Recommendations:		Reasons for Recommendations:
<p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Commission notes the update on the Employment Rights Act, including its implementation and potential impact at local level. b) Following the discussion on the implementation of the Employment Rights Act, and the challenges facing micro businesses in the City, the Commission recommends that the Council reviews its business support offer, with a view to ensuring the Council is doing everything possible to support micro businesses in the City. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) N/A b) As per the minute

49.	(7) HULL AND EAST YORKSHIRE LOCAL NATURE RECOVERY STRATEGY	(a) Cabinet / L. Hawkins / D. Jones
<p>D. Jones, Planning Manager, Hull City Council, attended for the item and introduced the report and strategy document which was due to go to Cabinet for endorsement.</p> <p>The Commission discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. If the strategy would place extra responsibilities on residents, for example, a household not being able to remove a hedge, which could prevent vehicle access to a property. The Commission was advised that the strategy was a high level document, that fed into the Local Plan, and would only impact on planning policy and decisions that went through the planning process. ii. Targets in relation to biodiversity net gain and potential financial pressures it placed on community groups and residents. The Commission was advised that Government had acknowledged concerns around smaller developments and the need to strike the right balance. 		
Recommendations:		Reasons for Recommendations:
<p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Commission supports the officer recommendations (Option 1) and endorses the Hull and East Yorkshire Nature Recovery Strategy, with a view to enabling nature recovery in the City and wider region. 		<p>b) N/A</p>

50.	(8) PARKING AND TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT UPDATE	(a-d) A. Burton / K. Ryan / C. Tyson
<p>K. Ryan, Head of Transport and Traffic Management, Streetscene, Hull City Council, and C. Tyson, Parking Manager, Streetscene, Hull City Council, attended for the item, and introduced the presentation, which sought to update the Commission on parking enforcement powers; service delivery; body worn cameras; school camera enforcement; moving traffic powers; ticket machine upgrades; virtual permit scheme; next steps.</p> <p>The Commission discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Parking on grass verges, whether it was illegal, and whether the Council had enforcement powers. The Commission was advised that enforcement powers sat with Humberside Police. The Council had one traffic regulation order (TRO) in place that prohibited parking on grass verges. The suggestion that Humberside Police chose not to utilise their powers. How the introduction of new legislation relating to pavement parking might lead to a change in approach. ii. The insight ward councillors had gained from going out on patrol with parking enforcement officers and the suggestion that all ward councillors would benefit from, and should be invited to join a patrol. iii. If anything could be done to prevent delivery drivers parking in an inappropriate or dangerous manner. The Commission were advised that delivery drivers were allowed a certain amount of time to unload their vehicle, which made enforcement difficult. iv. School camera enforcement, the issuing of penalty charge notices (PCNs), and the fact it could only be applied to vehicles parking on zig zag lines. v. The policy change the Council had made in regard to enforcement and vehicles parking across dropped kerbs. The Commission was advised that the policy change had now been implemented, the Council website had been updated, and there would be an information campaign to highlight the change. vi. Installing bollards on grass verges to prevent illegal parking. The Commission was advised that any scheme would be dependent on location, and would therefore need to be considered on a case by case basis. The team would probably be in a stronger position to respond once the Government published its guidance on pavement parking. 		

- vii. If the parking team were still having to manage a shortfall in civil enforcement officers. The Commission was advised that they had managed to fill all vacant posts at one stage, but a number of staff had recently left their positions, so they were having to go back out to recruit. The Commission questioned the job title (civil enforcement officer), whether it discouraged people from applying, and whether it might be changed to generate more interest. The Commission was advised that the job title was prescribed by Government, but they would review the job advert to see if any changes might be made.
- viii. School camera enforcement and what criteria was used to identify which schools were suitable for the scheme. The Commission was advised that the Council had assessed every school in the City, including special and private schools. They had checked whether the roads allowed access for emergency vehicles, and whether the layout would be suitable for camera enforcement or school street status. School streets applied to those streets outside of schools, that could be partially pedestrianised when children were arriving, or leaving school (while still accommodating emergency services and local residents). The criteria could be shared with Members and officers could go through the latest data as part of a broader update.
- ix. Scheduling of enforcement patrols on local high streets, and if there would be value in sharing that information through the restructured Area Committees. The Commission was advised that a full breakdown of enforcement patrols undertaken by the parking team were uploaded to the Council website. The information had also been used to respond to queries from members of the public.

Recommendations:

Reasons for Recommendations:

Agreed:

- a) The Commission notes the Parking and Traffic Enforcement Update, welcomes the improvements in performance outlined within the presentation, and thanks the team for their continued hard work.
- b) That following the discussion on the positive engagement with Ward Councillors, and how an invitation to join a patrol provided invaluable insight, the Commission recommends that the invitation is extended to all Ward Councillors, so they can develop a better understanding of parking enforcement, and highlight local concerns.

a) N/A

b) As per the minute

<p>c) That following the discussion on school camera enforcement, the Commission asks that the Team organise an online briefing for all Members, in order to share the latest data, and help Members develop their understanding of the programme and associated criteria.</p> <p>d) That following the discussion on the scheduling of patrols, and how the information is now available on the Council website, Members are provided with a hyperlink off agenda.</p>	<p>c) AS per the minute</p> <p>d) As per the minute</p>
---	---

<p>51.</p>	<p>(9) WORK PROGRAMME 2025/26</p>	<p>(a) Scrutiny Officer – AS</p>
<p>The Scrutiny Officer submitted the latest version of the 2025/26 Work Programme for consideration and approval.</p>		
<p>Recommendations:</p>		<p>Reasons for Recommendations:</p>
<p>Agreed:</p> <p>a) That following the discussion at the December meeting, the City Centre Car Parking Strategy is provisionally scheduled for February 2026, with a view to the Commission feeding into the development process at the earliest opportunity.</p>		<p>a) N/A</p>