

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 28 February 2018 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey, KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Thursday, 10 May 2018.

(* Present)

Elected Members:

- * Mr Bob Gardner (Chairman)
- * Mr Wyatt Ramsdale (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mrs Mary Angell
- Mr Bill Chapman
- * Mr Stephen Cooksey
- * Mr Paul Deach
- * Mr Jonathan Essex
- * Mr Matt Furniss
- * Mr Eber A Kington
- * Mrs Bernie Muir
- * Mr John O'Reilly
- * Mr Stephen Spence
- Mrs Lesley Steeds
- * Mr Richard Walsh
- * Mr Richard Wilson

In attendance

- * Mr Colin Kemp
- * Mr Mike Goodman

1/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1/18]

Apologies were received from Lesley Steeds and Bill Chapman.

There were no substitutions.

2/18 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 29 NOVEMBER 2017 [Item 2/18]

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

3/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3/18]

There were none.

4/18 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4/18]

There were three questions submitted to the Committee by Cllr Barbara Thomson. These and the responses are attached as **ANNEX A**.

There were no supplementary questions.

5/18 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5/18]

The Committee received a response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Infrastructure regarding Proposals to Change Financial Arrangements for Waste Management in 2018/19. The Committee noted the response and made no further comment.

The Committee received a response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Infrastructure regarding Pay and Conserve – Car Park Charging on the Countryside Estate. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Infrastructure confirmed that officers had looked into the potential for displacement from car park charges and explained that all Members with car parks effected had received this information. It was also noted that the implementation date was projected for June 2018. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Infrastructure confirmed that one car park in each location would have a cycle rack implemented.

6/18 CONVERTING STREET LIGHTING TO LED [Item 6/18]

Declarations of interest:

None

Witnesses:

Paul Wheadon, Business Improvement & Consultancy Team Manager
Jason Russell, Deputy Director Environment & Infrastructure
Colin Kemp, Cabinet Member for Highways
Mike Goodman, Cabinet Member for Environment and Infrastructure

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Cabinet Member for Highways noted that the report put to the Committee was the beginning of the review of options and technology available to produce a sustainable business plan for the conversion to Light Emitting Diode (LED) streetlighting.
2. Members questioned whether the service could work to be more proactive with regard to technological advancements relating to streetlighting and whether there was a potential to implement some of the “smart city” technology as an early adopter, noting that other authorities, had implemented some of these technologies. The Cabinet Member for Highways stressed that the service had been considering these options from an early stage, and would work in potential feasibility into any business case proposal, but noted that some of the early adopters received greater levels of funding to implement these changes.
3. It was noted by officers and the Cabinet Member that, during the previous refresh of lighting undertaken in 2010, the cost of LED balanced against income saved made it an unviable business case. However, it was noted that the lowering cost of LED, in conjunction with savings required, ensured that a switch to LED had become a

viable course of action.

4. The Cabinet Member highlighted that the technology was constantly evolving around improvements to streetlighting and that the service felt it was not cost effective to delay with regard to potential innovations while there was an opportunity for savings to be made.
5. Members questioned the Public Finance Initiative (PFI) contract currently used by Surrey County Council to replace streetlights and whether this would interfere significantly with the Council being able to seek a competitive tender. Officers acknowledged these concerns but highlighted that there was significant value to the authority to this arrangement. Officers did note that the service could not go through a traditional competitive tender, but that the PFI contract allowed for change in the contract by highlighting the changes in a change notice to the contractor detailing requirements which puts the service in a good position to undertake this.
6. Members noted that any new proposal needed to be future proofed and forwards compatible for future technology. Officers noted that, as part of this work, they were continuously horizon scanning for new technologies and were being challenged by the Cabinet Member for Highways to find new technologies and recommend potential implementation. It was also noted that officers had held meetings with academics at the University of Surrey to identify some new technologies and how cost effective they could be.
7. Members questioned whether the service could look into other aspects of the PFI contract as part of this project and consider amending as part of the proposed change notice, expressing concerns regarding some of the current thresholds for repairs and maintenance of broken lights. The Cabinet Member highlighted the targets and timescales that the contractor was required to repair streetlights and noted that there were sufficient financial penalties in place for failure to meet these, which ensured that changes to this aspect were not required.
8. Members reflected upon some correlations that had been suggested between streetlighting and criminal activity, and whether the service would consider rolling out pilot schemes in limited areas for new technologies, such as motion sensors, to test their viability and effect. The Cabinet Member noted that they were continuing to look into this, and the potential for phased implementation of some new technologies as part of the conversion to LED. However, it noted that nowhere had currently rolled out these technologies universally as of February 2018, but there would be work to identify overall feasibility as part of work to formulate the business plan.
9. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Infrastructure noted that the service was looking at the overall strategy for lamp post charging points and electric car strategy, but noted that there needed to be further work and review to identify how to undertake this. Members stressed the importance of this work and suggested that the service

look at how to build this in to the business case if feasible.

10. Officers noted that the energy provider contract was not part of the PFI contract for streetlighting, and that the contract for energy was a separate issue that would not be considered as part of this proposal. It was noted that contract was reviewed recently and that this was undertaken in a competitive environment.
11. Members questioned whether, following any potential savings, there was a possibility to implement all night streetlighting as part of proposals. The Cabinet Member for Highways noted that any decision on this would be dependent on technology used and be reviewed as part of the overall business case proposal.
12. Members questioned whether there was ability to acquire grant funding from central government to implement some of the changes, and whether any policy shifts from central government may affect any grant funding. Officers and the Cabinet Member noted that this would shift depending whether upon what was implemented as part of the business plan and this would take this into account.
13. Members expressed concerns regarding the light emitted from LED and whether it could affect wildlife negatively. Officers stressed that the light was at least as controlled as current arrangements.
14. Members questioned whether the service was undertaking benchmarking and learning exercises with other authorities who had converted to LED. Officers and the Cabinet Member assured the Committee that they had been working with other authorities on a political and officer level to identify best practice and collaborate with authorities that had undertaken the switch and those that were planning to switch.

Recommendations:

1. That the Highways & Transport Service considers the implementation of new technologies such as LED lighting and charging points on lamp posts; and
2. The service presents a business case for use of such new technologies as outlined in the IoT (Internet of Things) UK research report for use in Surrey in 2018/19 as this presents an income opportunity.
3. That the service and Cabinet Member for Highways considers using savings generated from the implementation of new technologies (as part of the proposals to convert to LED). In addition, to include restoration of all night street lighting across the county, as part of any business case proposal.

7/18 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 7/18]

Declarations of interest:

None

Witnesses:

None

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. Members questioned the work of the Task and Finish Groups of the Committee and requested an update on work undertaken over the last six months. It was suggested that the Select Committee received an update report regarding the work of the Task Groups.
2. Members questioned whether there were any updates on the issue of fly tipping and waste. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Infrastructure explained the responsibilities of organisations regarding fly tipping and would work with officers to determine what would form part of a wider waste update to the Committee.
3. The Cabinet Member for Highways noted that the Highways Extension contract currently held by Keir was coming to a close in 2021 and suggested that the Committee assisted with forward work relating to this.
4. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Infrastructure noted that direction of waste be added to the forward plan of the Committee to determine the direction of travel for the service, including a discussion with current contractors to provide a perspective of the current market.
5. The Vice-Chairman suggested that the committee work on the Speed Limit Review and the Electric Vehicle Strategy and an overall service review regarding costs across the Directorate.

Recommendations:

1. That a wider item is brought to the Select Committee regarding waste strategy, including implications of fly tipping.
2. That the Committee consider how it can feed into work relating to the Highways Extension Contract.
3. That a Task Group update is brought to the Committee at its next meeting to monitor progress and work undertaken by these groups over the last six months.

8/18 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING [Item 8/18]

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 10 May 2018.

Meeting ended at: 12.05 pm

Chairman

All questions received from Barbara Thomson

1. QUESTION:

When we change the current lighting to LED lighting, will we be adding the motion sensors at the same time or do the contractors have to do it separately?

RESPONSE:

The potential for installing Motion Sensors to control lighting is one of a number of innovations we are seeking to explore. At present Motion Sensor technology is only being used on street lights in a small number of locations across the world. Assuming we can identify a suitable solution, it is likely we will first carry out a pilot as there would be additional investment costs to install them. Whilst they could therefore be installed at the same time, it will depend on the success of the trial.

2. QUESTION:

The present maintenance for the current system of street lighting is for every 6 years. What will be the new LED lights maintenance cycle requirement be?

RESPONSE:

The maintenance regime for streetlights is carried out every 2 years with a visual structural and electrical inspection although certain activities are carried out less frequently. For example a full electrical test is carried out every 6 years and full structural test every 12. The current lights have the lamp (bulb) changed every 6 years in line with the electrical test along with cleaning the lantern bowl and other activities. With LED lanterns, there is no need to replace the lamp however the remaining activities such as electrical and structural tests will still be carried out at the same frequencies. However Officers will be reviewing the frequency of visual inspections to ensure these are carried out in line with industry standards but may be able to deliver additional savings if they were less frequent.

3. QUESTION:

Will there be spare lights in case of failure?

RESPONSE:

As at present there will be a small stock of replacement equipment available to carry out repairs and replacements. The contractor will still be required to meet agreed response times for repairing faults which if required would include replacing faulty lanterns. Failure to meet these response times can attract financial deductions under the contract terms.

Cllr Colin Kemp
Cabinet Member for Highways

This page is intentionally left blank