



Notice of a public meeting of

Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee (Calling In)

- To:** Councillors Wiseman (Chair), Barnes, Horton, King, McIlveen, Potter, Runciman (Vice-Chair), Steward and Warters
- Date:** Monday, 15 April 2013
- Time:** 5.30 pm
- Venue:** Severus Room (F032), West Offices, Station Rise, York YO1 6GA

AGENDA

1. **Declarations of Interest**

At this point, Members are asked to declare:

- any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests
- any prejudicial interests or
- any disclosable pecuniary interests

which they may have in respect of business on this agenda.

2. **Public Participation**

It is at this point in the meeting that members of the public who have registered to speak can do so. The deadline for registering is **5.00pm on Friday 12 April 2013**. Members of the public can speak on agenda items or matters within the remit of the committee.

To register to speak please contact the Democracy Officer for the meeting, on the details at the foot of the agenda.

3. Minutes (Pages 3 - 10)
To approve and sign the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 17 December 2012.

4. Called In Item: Street Lighting Maintenance Procurement
(Pages 11 - 24)
To consider the decisions made by the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services on 21 March 2013 in relation to the above item, which has been called in by Cllrs Reid, Runciman and Orrell in accordance with the Council's Constitution. A cover report is attached setting out the reasons for the call-in and the remit and powers of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee (Calling-In) in relation to the call-in, together with the original report and the decisions of the Cabinet Member.

5. Urgent Business
Any other business which the Chair considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972.

Democracy Officer:

Name : Jill Pickering

Contact Details:

- Telephone : 01904 552061
- E-mail : jill.pickering@york.gov.uk

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting.

- Registering to speak
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports

Contact details are set out above.

About City of York Council Meetings

Would you like to speak at this meeting?

If you would, you will need to:

- register by contacting the Democracy Officer (whose name and contact details can be found on the agenda for the meeting) **no later than 5.00 pm** on the last working day before the meeting;
- ensure that what you want to say speak relates to an item of business on the agenda or an issue which the committee has power to consider (speak to the Democracy Officer for advice on this);
- find out about the rules for public speaking from the Democracy Officer.

A leaflet on public participation is available on the Council's website or from Democratic Services by telephoning York (01904) 551088

Further information about what's being discussed at this meeting

All the reports which Members will be considering are available for viewing online on the Council's website. Alternatively, copies of individual reports or the full agenda are available from Democratic Services. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the agenda for the meeting. **Please note a small charge may be made for full copies of the agenda requested to cover administration costs.**

Access Arrangements

We will make every effort to make the meeting accessible to you. The meeting will usually be held in a wheelchair accessible venue with an induction hearing loop. We can provide the agenda or reports in large print, electronically (computer disk or by email), in Braille or on audio tape. Some formats will take longer than others so please give as much notice as possible (at least 48 hours for Braille or audio tape).

If you have any further access requirements such as parking close-by or a sign language interpreter then please let us know. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the order of business for the meeting.

Every effort will also be made to make information available in another language, either by providing translated information or an

interpreter providing sufficient advance notice is given. Telephone York (01904) 551550 for this service.

যদি যথেষ্ট আগে থেকে জানানো হয় তাহলে অন্য কোন ভাষাতে তথ্য জানানোর জন্য সব ধরনের চেষ্টা করা হবে, এর জন্য দরকার হলে তথ্য অনুবাদ করে দেয়া হবে অথবা একজন দোভাষী সরবরাহ করা হবে। টেলিফোন নম্বর (01904) 551 550।

Yeteri kadar önceden haber verilmesi koşuluyla, bilgilerin terümesini hazırlatmak ya da bir tercüman bulmak için mümkün olan herşey yapılacaktır. Tel: (01904) 551 550

我們竭力使提供的資訊備有不同語言版本，在有充足時間提前通知的情況下會安排筆譯或口譯服務。電話 (01904) 551 550。

اگر مناسب وقت سے اطلاع دی جاتی ہے تو ہم معلومات کا ترجمہ میا کرنے کی پوری کوشش کریں گے۔ ٹیلی فون (01904) 551 550

Informacja może być dostępna w tłumaczeniu, jeśli dostaniemy zapotrzebowanie z wystarczającym wyprzedzeniem. Tel: (01904) 551 550

Holding the Cabinet to Account

The majority of councillors are not appointed to the Cabinet (39 out of 47). Any 3 non-Cabinet councillors can 'call-in' an item of business following a Cabinet meeting or publication of a Cabinet Member decision. A specially convened Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee (CSMC) will then make its recommendations to the next scheduled Cabinet meeting, where a final decision on the 'called-in' business will be made.

Scrutiny Committees

The purpose of all scrutiny and ad-hoc scrutiny committees appointed by the Council is to:

- Monitor the performance and effectiveness of services;
- Review existing policies and assist in the development of new ones, as necessary; and
- Monitor best value continuous service improvement plans

Who Gets Agenda and Reports for our Meetings?

- Councillors get copies of all agenda and reports for the committees to which they are appointed by the Council;
- Relevant Council Officers get copies of relevant agenda and reports for the committees which they report to;
- York Explore Library and the Press receive copies of **all** public agenda/reports;
- All public agenda/reports can also be accessed online at other public libraries using this link

<http://democracy.york.gov.uk/ieDocHome.aspx?bcr=1>

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

MEETING	CORPORATE AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (CALLING IN)
DATE	17 DECEMBER 2012
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS BARNES, HORTON, KING, MCILVEEN, POTTER, RUNCIMAN (VICE- CHAIR, IN THE CHAIR), STEWARD, WARTERS AND BARTON (SUB FOR CLLR WISEMAN)
IN ATTENDANCE	COUNCILLORS CRISP, BROOKS, JEFFRIES, MERRETT AND WILLIAMS
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLOR WISEMAN

15. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were invited to declare, at this point in the meeting, any personal interests, not included on the Register of Interests, or any prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests they may have in respect of business on the agenda.

Councillor Potter declared a personal non prejudicial interest in relation to Agenda item 4 (City Footsteets Review – Part Two) as an employee of York Wheels and involvement with blue badges and parking dispensations.

16. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

It was reported that there had been four registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Chris Edmondson spoke as a Director of the York Independent Living Network putting forward members concerns at the decision taken in relation to Agenda item 4 (City Centre Footstreets Review – Part Two). Particularly in relation to the proposed partial closure of the route to allow access via Church Street to St Sampson's Square by green permit holders only. Their main concern related to the lack of an Equality Impact Assessment and the reference in the report that there were no equality implications in relation to these proposals when there

obviously were. Reference was made to a lack of consultation with Groups as the footstreet proposals would have a great impact on the daily lives of those with mobility issues. He requested delaying the scheme pending effective consultation with affected groups.

Katie Smith, Chair of York Carers Forum also spoke on the Footstreets Call In. It was explained that the Forum was an umbrella organisation providing a voice for carers in York and whose members required equal access in to the city to meet their needs. Their concerns related to the lack of consultation and the distance from banks and shops if parking was relocated further out of the city centre.

Irene Mace, Secretary of the York Carers' Forum also spoke on this issue, pointing out that the Forum had no objections to the footstreet proposals in general, their worries related to the lack of information on the detail and how the changes could affect their members.

Peter Broadley made representations on behalf of Holtby Parish Council in relation to Agenda item 5 (Tethered Horses – Proposed Policy Framework). He confirmed that verges around the village were occupied by traveller's tethered horses, with one dead horse being left for 18 hours on the roadside. There had been a number of road accidents, horses killed, people injured and damage to vehicles and property. Although a number of people had recently been prevented from keeping horses, the practice continued and the Parish Council asked members to use existing legal powers and take action to prevent and further accidents.

17. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 19 November 2012 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

18. **CALLED IN ITEM: CITY FOOTSTREETS REVIEW - PART TWO**

Members received a report which asked them to consider the decisions made by the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning and Sustainability on 19 November 2012 in relation to the City Centre Footstreets Review. In particular the decision to partially close off the route to all vehicles and allow access to St Sampson's Square via Church Street by green permit holders.

Details of the Cabinet Members decision were attached as Annex A to the report, with the original report to the Decision Session attached at Annex B. The decision had been called in by Cllrs Ayre, Aspden and Jeffries on the following grounds:

"This proposal will see parking for disabled drivers cut by around a 1/3 and will effectively rule certain parts of the city out of reach for some residents. Given this, we would like to call-in the decision for the following reasons:

- The lack of evidence of consultation with affected groups (badge/permit holders). The report admits that "The responses to the questionnaire (Annex A) on this issue demonstrate strong support for reviewing access and parking (Q1). However, it does also need to be said that of those responding to the questionnaire very few are holders of either Blue badges or Green permits (Q4), hence the views expressed are predominately from those with no or little difficulty with their own mobility.*
- The lack of an EIA (Equality Impact Assessment) or CIA (Community Impact Assessment).*
- The misleading claim that there are no equalities implications to this decision.*
- The policy did not go through the EAG (Equality Advisory Group) or face similar levels of scrutiny."*

Members were asked to decide whether to confirm the decision (Option a) or to refer it back to the Cabinet Member for re-consideration (Option b) as set out in the report.

Councillor Ayre addressed the meeting on behalf of the Calling-In members confirming the main reason for call in were concerns that the requirements of the Single Equality Act had

not been incorporated in to this report. Although in agreement with much of the footstreets proposals, it was the lack of an Equality Impact Assessment and consultation. Particularly in relation to the proposal to cut parking for disabled drivers cutting off certain parts of the city to many vulnerable residents with mobility problems. A crucial part of the consultation did not appear to have been undertaken, including scrutiny by the Equality Advisory Group, when the authority had a legal duty to consult these groups in order to assess the impact and in an effort to mitigate any issues arising.

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Sustainability confirmed that the City Centre Footstreets Review had arisen from the Reinvigorate York programme and the report to his Decision Session on 1 December 2011, which had set out the proposals in full. At that time, approval had been given to undertake consultation on the hours of operation of the foot streets and investigate issues surrounding the use of foot streets by blue badge and green permit holders. An EIA had also been undertaken in relation to this report and a study commissioned to examine how people with mobility issues could best obtain access to the city centre. He confirmed that the proposals had been reported to the Equality Advisory Group (EAG) earlier in the year and copies of the questionnaire sent to all groups represented on that body. A recent visit to Chester had provided useful additional information which was being examined for possible implementation in York. The work of the Scrutiny Committee, following their examination of city centre issues, were reported together with the detailed proposals set out in the report to his Decision Session on 19 November, paragraphs 16 to 33 in relation to the operation of the blue badge and green permit schemes in respect of the Davygate, St Sampson's Square and Church Street route.

Members then went on to question the Cabinet Member about the proposals, he confirmed that the maximum travel distance for green permit holders would not change, that an EIA had been carried out in relation to the 2011 proposals with no further assessment undertaken in respect of the current details.

Further information was requested in relation to the Shopmobility scheme which hired out electric scooters and wheelchairs to enable members of the public to visit the city centre.

All Members agreed that it was unfortunate that details of the original EIA had not been flagged up in the current report.

Officers presented an overview of the background and proposals for the footstreet review, confirming that consultation had been undertaken with the EAG and that consultation would continue. In response to comments Officers confirmed that the proposals were only experimental with the results being reported back to the Cabinet Member in 12 months.

Following further lengthy discussion it was

RESOLVED: That Option (a) identified in the report be approved and that the decision of the Cabinet Member be confirmed. ¹.

REASON: In accordance with the requirements of the Council's constitution.

Action Required

1. Undertake necessary consultation and implement experimental TRO's.

AB

19. CALLED IN ITEM - TETHERED HORSES - PROPOSED POLICY FRAMEWORK

Members considered a report which asked them to look at the decisions made by Cabinet on 4 December 2012, in relation to proposals for a proposed policy framework relating to tethered horses. The report to the meeting outlined proposals for the development of a joint protocol setting out how these issues could be managed by the Council and partner organisations within the legal framework and resources available.

Details of the Cabinets decision were attached as Annex A to the report, with the original report to Cabinet attached as Annex B. The decision had been called in by Cllrs Brooks, Watt and Warters on the following grounds:

- 1. The option approved by cabinet fails to initiate an EFFECTIVE course of action with the URGENCY needed to deal with the current real danger to motorists, cyclists and pedestrians posed by horses illegally tethered on verges i.e. the public highway.*

2. *The key risks associated with the cabinet report are stated as financial and reputation. There needs to be a greater consideration of the risk of public safety.*
3. *The report fails to inform whether or not the consideration of CYC purchasing land specifically for grazing horses will be a facility that can be accessed by all York residents who have or may wish to own horses. Given the equalities implications this analysis needs to be addressed.*
4. *The report fails to consider the potential animal health issues associated with tethered horses of uncertain vaccination history tethered adjacent to landowners stock.*

Members were asked to decide whether to confirm the decision (Option a) or to refer it back to Cabinet for re-consideration (Option b) as set out in the report.

Councillor Brooks addressed the meeting on behalf of the Calling-In members, referring to the urgent need for an effective course of action to deal with the dangers arising from horses being tethered adjacent to public highways for motorists, vehicles, pedestrians and the animals. She referred to four recent accidents which had involved vehicles being written off and horses killed. It was pointed out that no risk assessment of the issues had been undertaken and the authority was they felt failing in its duty to keep the highway safe. Reference was made to existing local authority owned land which could be used for grazing which would remove the danger of tethered animals from the roadside.

Members confirmed that the worst affected areas appeared to be on the A166 in the vicinity of Holtby, Sutton on Forest and adjacent to the A1079.

The Cabinet Member confirmed his sympathies with the points raised. However, although the proposals had financial implications for the authority, he confirmed the need to respond to the concerns raised, whilst ensuring a balanced approach to enforcement. He went on to explain the three phased approach proposed to deal with the problem; the identification of available land, working with the travelling community to ensure the welfare of and the reduction in horse numbers with the final option being enforcement. He confirmed his commitment to

taking enforcement action but only as part of a package of measures.

Members went on to discuss the points raised in more detail, including that of public safety, the legal powers, the micro chipping of horses, the availability of Council owned land for grazing and the recovery of costs.

In response, Officers went on to address a number of the issues raised giving an overview of work carried out to date and the likely costs to the authority. Reference was made to issues encountered by other authorities in the area and of the need for a balanced view, working in partnership and with the community. It was confirmed that the authority was not ignoring its duties but time was required to ensure that any system put in place was workable and had the confidence of the public.

Following further lengthy discussion it was

RESOLVED: That Option (a) identified in the report be approved and that the decision of Cabinet be confirmed. ¹.

REASON: In accordance with the requirements of the Council's constitution.

[Councillor Warters requested that his vote against this motion be recorded]

Action Required

1. Establish joint protocol and add report back on to Forward Plan.

SW

Cllr C Runciman, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.00 pm and finished at 7.20 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank



**Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee
(Calling – In)**

15 April 2013

Report of the Assistant Director, Governance and ICT

Called-in Item: Street Lighting Maintenance Procurement

Summary

1. This report sets out the reasons for the call-in of the decisions made by the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services on 21 March 2013 in relation to the procurement of a new street lighting maintenance contract. The report to the meeting outlined the options available for the procurement of a new contract following the expiration of the existing street lighting term maintenance contract which expired on 31 March 2013.

This cover report sets out the powers and role of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee in relation to dealing with the call-in.

Background

2. The Decision Sheet issued after the Cabinet Member made his decision is attached as Annex A to this report. This sets out the decisions taken by Cabinet Member on the called-in item. The original report to the Cabinet Member on the called-in item is attached as Annex B to this report.
3. The Cabinet Members decision has been called in by Cllrs Reid, Runciman and Orrell for review by the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee (CSMC) (Calling-In), in accordance with the constitutional requirements for call-in. The following are the reasons given for the call-in:
 - i) It is a serious concern that the Council will stop routine checking (scouting) for faulty street lighting.

- ii) The report does not refer to the experience the City had 15 years ago when it stopped scouting and found that, while some neighbourhoods were very good at reporting faults, in other areas lights were often not reported and therefore not working for weeks or months.
- iii) A lack of public consultation to determine whether the capacity exists for resident reporting to work this time.
- iv) No proper analysis of the quality of the service provided by the existing contractor or the service levels expected to be achieved by the Council.
- v) No business case for bringing the service in-house or examination of the capacity and expertise the Council has.
- vi) No apparent measures in place in the event skilled staff can not be TUPE'd across and the Council needs to recruit and train staff.

Consultation

- 4. In accordance with the requirements of the Constitution, the calling-in Members have been invited to attend and/or speak at the Call-In meeting, as appropriate.

Options

- 5. The following options are available to CSMC (Calling-In) Members in relation to dealing with this call-in, in accordance with the constitutional and legal requirements under the Local Government Act 2000:
 - a. To decide that there are no grounds to make specific recommendations to the Cabinet Member in respect of the report. If this option is chosen, the original decisions taken on the item by the Cabinet Member on 21 March 2013 will be confirmed and will take effect from the date of the CSMC (Calling-In) meeting; or
 - b. To make specific recommendations to the Cabinet Member on the report, in light of the reasons given for the call-in. If this option is chosen, the matter will be reconsidered by Cabinet at a meeting of Cabinet (Calling-In) to be held on 16 April 2013.

Analysis

6. Members need to consider the reasons for call-in and the report to the Cabinet Member and form a view on whether there is a basis to make specific recommendations to the Cabinet Member in respect of the report.

Council Plan

7. There are no direct implications for this call-in in relation to the delivery of the Council Plan and its priorities for 2011-15.

Implications

8. There are no known Financial, HR, Legal, Property, Equalities, or Crime and Disorder implications in relation to the following in terms of dealing with the specific matter before Members; namely, to determine and handle the call-in.

Risk Management

9. There are no risk management implications associated with the call in of this matter.

Recommendations:

10. Members are asked to consider the call-in and reasons for it and decide whether they wish to confirm the decisions made by the Cabinet Member or refer the matter back for reconsideration and make specific recommendations on the report to Cabinet.

Reason: To enable the called-in matter to be dealt with efficiently and in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution.

Contact details:

Author:

Dawn Steel
Head of Civic &
Democratic Services

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Andrew Docherty
Assistant Director, Governance and ICT

**Report
Approved**



Date

5 April 2013

Specialist Implications Officer(s) None

Wards Affected:

All



For further information please contact the author of the report

Annexes

Annex A – Copy of the Decision Sheet produced following the Cabinet Member's decision on the called- in item.

Annex B – Report of the Assistant Director (Highways, Waste and Fleet) to the Cabinet Member on 21 March 2013.

Background Papers

None

This page is intentionally left blank



**Decision Session - Cabinet Member for
Environmental Services**

21 March 2013

Report of the Assistant Director (Highways, Waste and Fleet)

Street Lighting Maintenance Procurement Report

Summary

1. The existing street lighting term maintenance contract expires on 31 March 2013. This report details the options available to procure a new contract and to gain approval to proceed with the preferred option.

Background

2. The reduced funding of local authorities by central government and the limited ability to raise council tax revenue has led this Council to investigate other forms of raising revenue. In response the Council is shifting to a commercial generating entrepreneurial business model.
3. The existing contract was tendered and won by Amey LG and commenced on 1 April 2007. The term of the contract is 3 years with an optional extension of a further 3 years. The contract has been extended and now expires on 31 March 2013.
4. The contract is based on the ICE Term Maintenance model. Within the contract there are services that are based on either a lump sum or specified works within a schedule of rates. Within the contract there are a number of parameters relating to average times to attend faults and the delivery of works. The contract operates night scouting of the city area at a frequency of once a month and provides a design service for schemes and projects.
5. Lighting apparatus in narrow streets and alleyways require specialist 'Skywinder' equipment to access them for maintenance and repair of faults. The current contract arrangement is that the equipment is used once a month or where there are 20 or more faults as the Skywinder is shared with other Amey contracts. The

option to bring the service in-house will alleviate this problem with access to the equipment being available as required thus reducing the time taken to repair faults.

6. The service is delivered by 9.5(fte) employees of Amey LG comprising of six operatives, 1.5 admin staff, supervising electrician and an operations manager. The client function is performed by a street lighting engineer employed by the Council. The Amey LG employees will TUPE to the new service provider whichever option is approved.
7. It is unlikely that the new operational arrangements will be in place by 1 April 2013. Consultation with the existing contractor is being undertaken to identify costs associated with an interim arrangement until 30 September 2013.
8. It has been established that the majority of councils have decided to stop their night scouting and rely wholly on the public to report fault through their public enquiry systems. The reporting will be enhanced within the Council by the Smarter York initiative that involves the public and members reporting issues through use of mobile devices. It is recommended to adopt this approach as the Council has a fully functional LAGAN system that is integrated into the back office processes and will generate efficiency savings.
9. It is envisaged that the new term maintenance arrangement will give the Council the opportunity to expand its business area providing both an installation and maintenance services to other public/private bodies and developers within the city. This would be more beneficial if the service was brought in-house as all profits from this enterprise will be received by the Council.

Consultation

10. Due to the nature of this report no consultation has been undertaken.

Options

11. There are 3 options available to the Council to procure street lighting maintenance operations following the expiry of the existing contact with Amey LG. The 3 options available are to tender the service with a new contract specifically for the Council, join the North Yorkshire CC framework contract or take the whole service in-house and operate within the highway maintenance organisation.

Analysis

12. Option 1 – Tender the Service

Advantages

- Management of the front line service being the responsibility of the contractor.
- Reduced financial risk to the Council of the effect of market forces i.e. low work volumes, high vehicle and equipment cost/repairs. The Council is not responsible for purchase or lease of plant or equipment.
- Limited liability for works and operatives as the contractor carries the risk.
- Ability to react to a programmed increase in workload.
- Contractor responsible for maintaining stocks levels and upfront costs.
- Existing Amey LG staffs will TUPE to new contractor with no cost to the Council.

Disadvantages

- Profit element built into costs attributed to the contract.
- Increased amount of administration involved in client/ contractor relationship relating to ordering, finance, scheduling and work control.
- Tendency for the contractor to share resources with other contracts/ councils.
- Overhead costs charged to the contract for commercial and management roles within the contractor's organisation.
- Variation on price and price fluctuations built into duration of the contract. The cost will increase on an annual basis.
- Limited flexibility within the contract to react to changing demands from the Council. This may lead to increase charges due to re-negotiation.
- Percentage uplift added to all materials by the contractor.

13. The option to tender the street lighting term maintenance operations will require the Council to enter an agreement with a contractor to provide this service. The setup will require a client and contractor structure to be in place. There will be limited flexibility with the contract and with uncertain budget pressures, additional costs may be incurred.

14. Option 2 – Joining the NYCC term contract

Advantages

- As option 1
- Tender process already undertaken and contract in progress with possible early start.
- Contractor mobilised and willing to extend operation within the Council area.
- Existing Amey LG staffs will TUPE to new contractor with no cost to the Council.

Disadvantages

- As option 1
- Contract terms are already in place and are managed by NYCC. This arrangement will complicate operating of the service within the Council area and will include a fee charged by NYCC.
- Conflict resolution will be more difficult as this will require consultation with NYCC.
- The Council have no experience of the NEC3 term contract arrangements.
- Contractor is not currently based within the Councils geographical area.
- Loss of local knowledge and people.

15. Comparison of the NYCC term maintenance contract with the existing Amey GL contract has established a significant increase in cost when comparing routine maintenance activities between the 2 arrangements. This may be attributed to the different geographical characteristics of the 2 administrative areas.

16. Option 3 – Transfer the Service In-house

Advantages

- Integration of the management and operations within the Highway Maintenance Services (HMS) will lead to financial efficiencies.
- Reduced cost to the Council with the removal of the profit element of the contract.
- Integration of plant and resources to benefit all of HMS, reducing cost across the department.

- Cost savings in the removal and integration of administrative duties within HMS processes.
- New skill set for the Council to expand its business areas providing both installation and maintenance service to other public/private bodies and potential developers. All profit raised through this enterprise will be received by the Council.
- More flexibility in setting and amending targets, performance and the ability to priorities budget within the service.
- Being part of an industry sector scheme will give the Council access to good practices within the industry.
- Guaranteed joined up service delivery ethos rather than a focus on a profit and loss culture.
- Consistency with existing Council's health and safety policies and practices including staff wellbeing.
- The ability to enter into joint procurement arrangements with other authorities.
- Ability to manage all aspects of the service will give the Council the opportunity to enhance the service and out perform existing standards.
- Ability to react more quickly to street lighting faults of apparatus in confined spaces which can only be accessible by Skywinder equipment. The equipment will not be shared with other contracts and will be available at all times.

Disadvantages

- There is a minimal risk that skilled staff may not TUPE leading to recruitment and training costs although this may give an opportunity to recruit local people.
 - Requirements to manage stock and the requirement to purchase materials up front.
17. The provision to bring the service in-house has a number of benefits to the Council. The service will be able to react more easily to service pressures and emergencies as they occur. The Council will also benefit financially from the promotion of a service to other public and private bodies where a profile and/or fee arrangement will be applied.
 18. A restructure of the street lighting team will be undertaken if the service is brought in-house. The process will lead to efficiency savings and it is envisaged that any costs incurred will be taken from the first year's profit and reduced costs.

19. It is anticipated that an in-house arrangement will generate a profit element of £5k for every £100k of turnover within the service. The approval of option 3 also gives the Council the opportunity to exploit other avenues of turnover which will contribute to the budget savings without affecting the level of service.

Council Plan

20. Through the proposed programme the City and Environmental Services directorate supports delivery of the create jobs and grow the economy, get York moving and protect the environment themes from the Councils key priorities.

Implications

Financial

21. Both options 1 and 2 have been identified to produce similar cost associated with existing service levels. There is a potential cost saving to the service with option 3 by taking the service in-house and removing the profit element.
22. There is a potential profit to be made by providing an installation and maintenance service to public/private bodies and developers within the Council area.

Human Resources (HR)

23. 9.5 fte staff has been identified by Amey LG to TUPE to the new service provided by a contractor or in-house arrangement.

Equalities

24. There will be no change to the current Equality Impact Assessment for the new service to be provided.

Legal

25. The existing contract cannot be extending beyond April 2013 and therefore the service should be tendered or taken in-house.
26. It is envisaged that the new service will operate with the Council being responsible for the management of third party claims and recharges.

Crime and Disorder

27. There are no crime and disorder implications.

Information Technology (IT)

28. There are no information technology implications.

Property

29. There are no property implications.

Other

30. There are no other implications.

Risk Management

31. Options 1 and 2 will transfer the majority of the risk to the contractor while option 3, taking the service in-house will transfer all the risk to the Council.
32. The existing term maintenance contract operates with a lump sum cost for the repair of faults. The risk is borne by the contractor and consequently is reflected in the lump sum costs. The majority of new term maintenance contracts do not include a lump sum arrangement preferring to use a schedule of rates. This approach has been adopted by the North Yorkshire CC term contract.
33. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, the main risks that have been identified in this report are:
- Strategic Risk, arising from judgements in relation to medium term goals for the service
 - Physical Risks, arising from potential under investment in assets
 - Financial Risk, from pressures on budgets
 - People Risks, affecting staff if budgets decline
34. Measured in terms of impact and likelihood the risk score for all of the above has been assessed at less than 16. This means that at this point the risks need only to be monitored as they do not provide a real threat to the achievement of the objectives of this report

Recommendations

35. The Cabinet Member is recommended to:
- (i) Approve option 3 of this report by taking the street lighting service in-house.
 - (ii) Cancel the night scouting operations and rely on public reporting.
36. The delivery of the benefits of option 3 for the service will be achieved by the Council managing the potential risks of an increase in faults and third party liabilities.

Contact Details**Author:**

Andy Binner
 Head of Highway
 Infrastructure
 City & Environmental
 Services
 Tel No. 553231

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Roger Ranson
 Assistant Director (Highways, Waste
 and Fleet) City and Environmental
 Services

**Report
 Approved**



Date 11 February
 2013

Wards Affected:

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers: None

Annexes: None