

**Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee****10:00am – 11:30am on Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2026****Room 77, The Guildhall, Alfred Gelder Street, Hull, HU12AA and MS Teams (Officers Only)****Present:**

Councillors: Robinson (Chair), Burton, Gardiner, Hale, Hofman, Kemp, M. Collinson

**In attendance:**

D. Bell, Executive Director of Corporate Resources, Hull City Council  
C. Jackson, Executive Director for Regeneration & Partnerships, Hull City Council  
G. Ventress, Head of ICT Digital Strategy and Development, Hull City Council  
Z. Marshall, Head of Transformation Support, Hull City Council  
A. Holgate, Head of Governance, Hull City Council  
C. Brennan, Scrutiny Officer, Hull City Council

**Apologies:**

Councillors Pantelakis, Payne, and Randall (substituted by Councillor M. Collinson).

	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	
There were no declarations of interest.		
<b>Recommendations:</b>	<b>Reasons for Recommendations:</b>	
a) That the declared interests be noted.	a) To ensure the Register of Members' Interests is updated accordingly.	
<b>58</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2025</b>	
A. Holgate (Head of Governance) submitted the minutes from the meeting held on Thursday 12 <sup>th</sup> December 2025 for approval.		
<b>Recommendations:</b>	<b>Reasons for Recommendations:</b>	
a) That the minutes of the meeting held on Friday 12 <sup>th</sup> December 2025 be taken as read and correctly recorded.	a) N/A.	
<b>59</b>	<b>PRIDE IN PLACE NEIGHBOURHOOD PROGRAMME ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDING AND DEVELOPMENT OF DELIVERY PROPOSALS</b>	

N. Turner presented the report which asked the Committee to consider the arrangement for the establishment of Neighbourhood Boards in three areas of the City to support the development of neighbourhood plans and the allocation of the Pride in Place funding provided, and outlined some of its key points including:

- i. The boundaries of the identified areas were designated by the Office for National Statistics.
- ii. There would be opportunity to work on a development programme to reflect the specific area's needs, subject to negotiation with the Neighbourhood Boards and Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG). The programme would focus on empowerment of communities in terms of the interventions and improvements to be made in their area.
- iii. The governance framework and delegations.
- iv. The first year of the 10-year programme would include establishment of the Board, the decision framework for spending, and supporting administration structures.
- v. The overall strategy for the Council was around a 'hyper local' focus.

C. Jackson highlighted that there were two options for governance arrangements, the delegation of decisions to the relevant Executive Director or the establishment of sub-committees under the relevant Area Committees to make decisions.

The Committee discussed:

- i. The timeline and procedure around the appointment of Chairs. Officers informed that a Leader Decision Record had instigated the process for recruiting each of the three new Chairs in January, to be ready for appointment by the Boards by late March. This would enable the Board to be fully established prior to the first submission to the MHCLG in July regarding membership of the Board and its governance arrangements.
- ii. The requirements around the Chair's relationship to the area. It was clarified that the legislation specified a 'strong link' but that individual areas had the flexibility to decide if it was more suitable for the Chair live or work in the area, and further, that the majority of Ward Members and MPs had expressed a preference for the Chair to live in the area. That ward Members were barred from becoming Chairs of the Board, and that this did not recognise the experience elected members have within their wards.

- iii. The advertisement of the position of Chair and who would be part of the interview panel. Officers advised that they had worked with Neighbourhood Coordinators and Community Managers on the mechanisms for publicising in each area. The process for appointing the Chair was determined by the Council as the accountable body, relevant Ward Members, and the local MP; the process by which representatives are chosen to sit on the interview panel is subject to more discussion at the local level.
- iv. The November 2026 deadline for Neighbourhood Boards to submit their Pride in Place Plan, and the capacity of staff to deliver the work. Officers notified the Committee that additional capacity would be recruited to support the programme, and that the initial submission did not require a fully detailed 10-year plan, rather, plans could be developed and submitted as the programme progressed through the three investment periods.
- v. The boundaries and data that underpinned how they were drawn. Members noted that the boundaries were drawn to meet criteria around population numbers rather than a cohesive community. However, despite this, areas falling just outside the boundary still stood to benefit from the improvements, and improvements could be made outside the boundary should they benefit those within it. Therefore, arguments for a boundary change may be unnecessary given the potential broader reach of improvements.
- vi. The assumption that delegated authority was quicker and more efficient than the sub-committee system. While some Members felt sub-committees could be faster and engender greater democratic involvement, they agreed to prioritise the quickest system.
- vii. Retention of the £150k initial grant allocation. Officers advised that the Council was expected to receive the allocation in the following week, there was provision to carry leftover funds over into the first investment period, and there would be guidance around the expenditure of the money.
- viii. Retention of the funds through to following investment periods. It was clarified that funds could be carried over provided 25% was forecast to be spent during that period.
- ix. Temporary increase to the capacity of Neighbourhood Coordinator staff in areas that may lose out as attention is drawn towards the identified Pride in Place locations. Officers noted that the extent of extra capacity would depend on the area and its neighbourhood board, and work was ongoing to identify a resource appropriately.
- x. The mechanisms in place to keep the decision-making process progressing should there be a loss of membership on the Board.
- xi. The number of elected Members on the board, and how this worked for identified areas that crossed over into more than one ward. Officers advised that there was a minimum of one elected member, but guidance did not specify arrangements for which members this should be and would be decided through conversations on the local level. Members noted that the Sub-committee

<p>system would go some way to addressing the issue as it would provide opportunity for input by members excluded from the Boards.</p> <p>xii. The allocation's split between two thirds capital and one third revenue. Members requested that Cabinet consider negotiating with the MHCLG that the split be 50/50, which would ensure the Council could fund the posts that support the implementation of the programme. Further, that Cabinet seek clarification into what flexibility existed in the £60m so that the individual areas were clear in how they may use their £20m allocation to best suit their needs. Moreover, that Officers clarify if administrative costs could be capitalised.</p>	
<b>Recommendations:</b>	<b>Reasons for Recommendations:</b>
<p>a) The Committee supported Option 1 but encouraged Cabinet to give due consideration to the sub-committee approach as a feasible governance arrangement; on condition it did not create significant delays to the decision-making process.</p> <p>b) That an off-agenda update is given that clarifies if any flexibility exists in how the revenue/capital split can be used, and if administrative costs could be capitalised.</p>	<p>a) To ensure that the most appropriate option has been selected and challenge any assumptions around the speed and efficiency of the sub-committee and delegated authority models.</p> <p>b) To ensure that decision makers can make fully informed choices through having a complete understanding of the process around expenditure of funds.</p>

<b>60</b>	<b>COUNCIL TAX BASE REPORT 2026/27</b>	
<p>D. Bell introduced the report which set out the Council Tax Base 2026/27, how it was calculated, and the timetable for meeting statutory requirements.</p> <p>The Committee discussed:</p>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Council Tax exemptions around those who were terminally ill. Officers advised that a report with proposals around council tax relief and would shortly come to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee on 13 February 2026 before later going to Cabinet and Full Council.</li> <li>ii. The omission of the word at point 8. of Appendix 1, which Officers advised they would rectify.</li> </ul>	
<b>Recommendations:</b>	<b>Reasons for Recommendations:</b>
a. That the report be noted.	a. N/A

<b>61</b>	<b>WORKDAY UPDATE</b>	<b>Gary Ventress, Zelda,</b>
<p>G. Ventress and Z. Marshall presented the Workday Update to the committee and outlined some of its key points including high level status items, readiness activity, the mobile app roll-out, and Workday AI.</p> <p>The Committee discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The systems capabilities around unconventional shift patterns. Officers informed that there had been exercises to collect data on work schedules and ways of working and had prepared the system to be capable on day one. There were also plans to eventually expand its capabilities.</li> <li>ii. Data backups and protections around data breaches. Officers advised that during the procurement process there had been extensive due diligence on Workday as a company, and Officers felt assured in Workday’s data security arrangements. The company’s experience in cloud-based technology provided Officers with confidence in Workday’s expertise and the Council’s security team had also invested time reviewing the details. Further, that should the cloud system fail, then there was an offline capability which would allow business to continue.</li> </ul>		

- iii. The 1 April 2026 date for Workday to go live. Officers clarified this was because it was the start of the financial year, which would avoid accounting issues were the systems to be switched at any other time of year.
- iv. Parallel pay-roll testing. Officers noted that the new system was not yet at 100% but testing did continue to uncover areas of improvement which engineers sought to remedy. Further, that Workday had the means to automate fixes when errors were caught by the system. Officers added that they would run a payroll once the live system was available, which would provide a test opportunity to compare the Workday output with Oracle's output.
- v. Recruitment and the potential for AI to be discriminatory. Officers noted that the Workday system would enable the collection of employee data but that it was intended only to advise individuals, such as offering insights into the careers of others who possessed similar backgrounds. It would not be used to screen individuals, and while available, there was no plans to implement screening in future. Members requested that any changes to the use of AI in recruitment should be subject to Member approval.
- vi. The carbon footprint of the Workday system. Officers advised that performance on environmental impact was considered at the tender stage and were happy with Workday's environmental policies.
- vii. Examples where testing had produced a change. Officers informed that they invested time in design workshops where they explained what was needed and how it needed to work, therefore there was no significant changes to be made at the testing stage. Testing did reveal the need for smaller changes around missing cost centres, transactions, and security profiles.
- viii. The support from Workday during the post implementation period. Officers advised that Workday would offer direct support for the first two payrolls, in addition to access to Workday's consortiums. Additional support was being explored as the council moved into a business-as-usual state.
- ix. The 99.9% uptime service level agreement, the recovery time objective and recovery point objective, and the liquidated damages. Officers advised they would provide a complete response off agenda.
- x. Comparisons in performance between Oracle and Workday. Officers clarified that while there were no direct comparisons, that given Workday's international reputation in finance packages, they were confident it would produce an accurate picture of council's finances.
- xi. Multi-tenancy cloud or private cloud. Officers clarified that the council was on a multi-tenancy segregation model.
- xii. The location of the data centre that held the cloud server. Officers advised that the servers and back up servers were located in Dublin, Republic of Ireland. They noted that while this was not in the UK it did comply with the specification to have an EU hosted data centre at the time of tender, further, that they would seek to have a UK based centre when Workday made this

# OFFICIAL

available. Members inquired into what the contingency plan was should the connecting infrastructure between the UK and Ireland fail. Officers advised they would provide a response off agenda.

- xiii. Post-implementation support for users, such as out of hours support. Officers advised that they had not completed the exercise for this but that there would be a 'war room' during the first 4-6 weeks which would meet and attempt to address problem areas. Change champions would be available to provide support both online and in office and escalate the more significant issues. After this initial period there would be a 6-month transition state where change would be managed throughout the council. Further, that post 6 months there would be a permanent workday development team which would look for ways to improve and expand the Workday offer. Members agreed to receive a future update around the post-implementation roadmap.
- xiv. The protections and regression plan in place should the transition to Workday fail. Officers advised they were confident that Workday would function on day one, and that although not every system would be online, essentials like payment of staff would function.
- xv. Workday's payroll performance test. Officers advised they were confident that they would improve on the current performance of around 97% and would run the March payroll on Workday to determine its performance. Further, that many of the variations were minor in scale.
- xvi. Information access survey for the mobile app. Officers noted that 51% of respondents indicated they were not interested in better ways to access information, but efforts were being made to engage further with the workgroups and anticipated that uptake would rise as awareness of the app's capabilities grow.
- xvii. Payroll cycles and when payroll information becomes available each month. Officer advised they would come back with a complete response off agenda.
- xviii. Maintenance of the current Oracle system. Officers confirmed that they had a third-party support provider contract and discussions on its termination were underway.

Note: The Officer response at point xii. was corrected post-meeting to say that the data centre was located in the Frankfurt, Germany.

<b>Recommendations:</b>	<b>Reasons for Recommendations:</b>
a. That the report be noted.	a. N/A b. To seek assurance around the relevant provisions.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. That an off -agenda update be provided on the service level agreement, the recovery time objective and recovery point objective, and the liquidated damages provisions.</li> <li>c. That an off-agenda update be provided on what mechanisms were in place if the UK-Europe connecting infrastructure were to fail, leaving HCC's Workday data unavailable in the Europe based data centre.</li> <li>d. That an off-agenda update be provided around how and when payroll information becomes available through the Workday app.</li> <li>e. That any changes to the policy around using AI in recruitment should be subject to Member approval.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. To seek assurance around the security and resilience of the council's Workday cloud-based data.</li> <li>d. For information.</li> <li>e. To have oversight over the use of AI in recruitment due to concerns around discrimination</li> </ul>
---	---

<p><b>62</b></p>	<p><b>REFERRAL REPORT</b></p>	
<p>C. Brennan (Scrutiny Officer) submitted the Referral Report.</p> <p>The Commission discussed the two referrals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. That consideration of the voting age motion should take account of the need for stronger wording to ensure that the council and its partners are required to fulfil their role in supporting education of the democratic process.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Recommendations:</b></p>	<p><b>Reasons for Recommendations:</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) That an agenda item around changes to voting age be added to the work programme to discuss the potential</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) To resolve the referral from Full Council.</li> <li>b) To resolve the referral from Full Council.</li> </ul>	

<p>actions the Council can take to respond to the concerns outlined in the motion.</p> <p>b) That the motion around infant bereavement be referred to the Health and Social Wellbeing Overview and Scrutiny Commission.</p>	
---	--

<p><b>63</b></p>	<p><b>OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – OUTSTANDING ACTIONS</b></p>	
------------------	--	--

A. Holgate (Head of Governance) submitted the outstanding action list.

The Commission discussed the action list.

<p><b>Recommendations:</b></p>	<p><b>Reasons for Recommendations:</b></p>
<p>c) That the completed items be removed and the Scrutiny Officer follow up on those actions that awaited a response.</p>	<p>c) To ensure recommendations of the Commission are being addressed in a timely manner.</p>

<p><b>64</b></p>	<p><b>OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME 2025-2026</b></p>	
------------------	---	--

A. Holgate (Head of Governance) submitted the draft work programme.	
<b>Recommendations:</b>	<b>Reasons for Recommendations:</b>
a. That the work programme be noted.	a. N/A