



REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 12TH JUNE 2014

**SUBJECT: ENGINEERING SERVICES DIVISION MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN
2015/16 AND 2016/17 – ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

REPORT BY: ACTING DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To seek Members' comments on the suggested Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) options from the Engineering Services Division, which will subsequently be forwarded, together with other feedback, to Cabinet for their consideration.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 This report is the first of many Special Scrutiny reports from all service areas that Members will receive over the coming months. The report allows Members to consider the suggested Engineering Services Division's MTFP options and to comment on these. Members will be aware that the content of the report should not be considered in isolation to that information which will be brought forward in subsequent scrutiny reports.
- 2.2 Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee is to consider the Engineering Services Division's savings options within this report, as its contribution towards the following items identified in accordance with the Cabinet report : next stages of MTFP – 2015/16 and 2016/17 dated 16 April 2014. Namely: -
- i) Discretionary services are reviewed in full, with a view to identifying savings proposals totalling over £8m. Again, proposals to be presented to Special Scrutiny Committees after April 2014 and before October 2014.
 - ii) Further proposals for Members to consider in respect of up to 3% efficiency savings. These efficiency savings targets to be applied to those statutory and essential services that the Authority has to deliver, either directly or via a third party organisation. Reports to be presented to Special Scrutiny Committees after April 2014 and before October 2014.
- 2.3 There are 3 discretionary areas which have been identified within Appendix 1 of the report to Cabinet on 16 April 2014, namely: -
- 1) Street Lighting Energy Reduction
 - 2) School Crossing Patrol Service
 - 3) Public Transport Subsidy

These discretionary areas have been highlighted in the cabinet report on the basis that these are significant budgets as well as requiring appropriate levels of consultation due to their sensitivities. If chosen, within anticipated timescales, the options are likely to require further work which would most likely result in part savings in 2015/16 or implementation in 2016/17.

- 2.4 The fourth section of this report will be considering the 3% efficiency savings required. There will be a mix of statutory and discretionary service options to exceed the target figure.
- 2.5 With regard to the general principle that all savings options would be put before Members, Appendix 1 of this report is included to list other statutory and discretionary service areas that have previously been identified as possible savings by officers. These are over and above that required by Cabinet report (16 April 2014) and have therefore not been subject to the level of detail contained elsewhere in this report. However, they could form the basis of future consideration for savings options for the year 2016/17. The list of includes service areas which could be affected by choices contained within this report. Depending on such choices then some of these options may have to be amended/reconsidered.

3. LINKS TO STRATEGY

- 3.1 Budget decisions impact on all Council Strategies. This report relates, primarily, to the efficient and effective use of the Council's revenue and capital resources.

4. THE REPORT

4.1 Street Lighting Energy Reductions

- 4.1.1 There are a number of options that can be considered here: -

Option 1: 1 in every 3 lights to be part night lighting 4,011no = £80k annual saving. Cost to implement £120k.

Option 2: Every other light to be part night lighting 6,017 = £120k annual saving. Cost to implement £180k.

Option 3: All 12,034 residential street lights to be part night lighting = £225k annual saving. Cost to implement £361k.

NOTE: Town centres, junctions/roundabouts and security camera areas remain switched on with all options.

Payback period for investment is 1.5 years i.e. to save £100k/annum we need to invest £150k up front to convert existing lighting to part night lighting. This applies to all three options.

Option 4: 3,000no town centre; part night saving £125k. Cost to implement £190k.

Option 5: 1 in 3 residential switch off 4,011no; annual saving £160k. Cost to implement £40k.

Option 6: 1 in 2 residential switch off 6,017no; annual saving £225k. Cost to implement £60k.

Option 7: Switch off inter urban routes 5,129no; annual saving £225k. Cost to implement £51k.

Option 8: Part night all units except conflict areas 23,000no; £500k annual saving. Cost to implement £690k.

Option 9: Switch off all units except conflict areas 23,000no; annual saving £1,000k. Cost to implement £230k.

Option 10: Switch off all residential lighting 16,500no; annual saving £550k. Cost to implement £165k.

Option 11: If a Central Management System (CMS) could be funded for 23,000 columns estimated cost would be approximately £5M. This would allow control for dimming lights from the office. If all 23,000 were dimmed by 30%, which would not be noticeable to the naked eye, this would save around £300,000, this equates to a payback period of 17 years. Similar principles could apply to varying numbers of columns, which would have similar payback periods.

Option 12: Option 12 Convert all 14157 residential lighting to LED luminaires (excluding existing cosmopolis). Energy reduces from £578k to £188k saving £390k per annum. Cost to implement is £4,000,000 (10 year payback) and with telensa CMS an extra £920k (12.6 year payback).

4.1.2 There would be consultation periods with all these options and from previous experience there will be concerns raised over health and safety implications and increases in anti social behaviour. It should be noted that other authorities have already started taking options such as these forward. Current energy costs for street lighting are approximately £1,450,000. Option 2 gives around a 8% budget saving. Whereas Option 10 gives a 38% budget saving.

Any combination of the above options could be considered i.e. Option 3 & Option 7 saving £450k. Further, within reasonable limits, consideration could be given with respect to the use of general fund balances for one-off up front costs, to enable the savings to be brought forward sooner.

4.1.3 The savings in these options that achieved by energy reduction as maintenance will still be required. For options of switch off and column removal, maintenance savings would feed through but these have not been included. The 4500 residential units with dimmable ballasts (electrical components that can be adjusted from the office) or energy saving cosmopolis lamps included in options 1 to 3 would not require additional upgrading/modifications as they can be controlled from computers within Highway Operations Group office.

4.1.4 Any columns that are permanently switched off will after a 12-month period require permanent disconnection from the mains electrical supply and removal of the columns. Permanent disconnection is a requirement of the mains electricity supplier. Columns would also need to be removed as they would serve no purpose and would deteriorate as there would be little or no ongoing maintenance. If columns were left in place they would require regular structural testing and maintenance to ensure that they posed no health and safety risk to the public.

4.1.5 Approximate figures for disconnection are:

- Disconnect overhead connections remove lanterns and brackets approx £250.00 per column
- Disconnect underground connections remove columns and lanterns approx £500.00 per column

These costs would need to be added to any of the above permanent switch off proposals.

4.1.6 As an example, if Option 5 was selected to permanently disconnect and remove the columns after 12 months would cost approximately £1,500,000 (based on average cost of £375/column i.e. some overhead and some underground connections). Detailed analysis would be needed to confirm these figures, as there are varying costs dependent on whether supply is overhead or underground. The payback period for this option would then be 13 years. Applying same principles to Option 9 would cost approximately £9,000,000 with a payback of 9 years.

4.1.7 If decisions were made to reinstall 23,000 columns (Option 9) at some time in the future if they were removed the approximate cost would be £34M to supply, install and reconnect new columns (£1500/column).

4.1.8 For any part night lighting options the switch off times for the columns are approximately midnight to 5.30am. This is in accordance with previous Council approval for the part night

lighting options already implemented within the Borough.

4.1.9 The Street Lighting section, since its incorporation within Highway Operations Group, has undergone a number of service reviews. The staffing structure is now considered to be at its critical mass with staff having combined roles relating to street lighting and New Roads and Streetworks Act. The service is very streamlined, efficient and cost effective. Over the last 6 years, staffing levels have been managed to move from 7 no. Full Time Equivalent (FTE's) to approximately 3 no FTE's without any appreciable diminution in service levels.

4.1.10. Following are implication notes, which considers the options in more detail.

Budget Title / Ref	Street Lighting Energy Reduction - Option 1
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	80,000 2016/17 Option 1: 1 in every 3 lights to be part night lighting 4,011o = 80k annual saving. Cost to implement £120k.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	£10,000 to risk assess locations proposed for part night lighting. £27/cell which equates to a one off cost of £120k. This option provides a pay back in less than 2 years at current energy costs and will be a future year on year saving of at least £80k in future years. None
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	There would need to be wide spread public consultation as undertaken previously for the part night lighting of the inter urban routes. This would need to be stringently followed and fully documented and risk assessed.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Limited risk Dependent on consultation process/outcome/challenge this could be protracted.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Not applicable, staff would still need to manage the asset. Not applicable Not applicable
Other Issues	
Concern may be raised over health and safety by residents where street lights are turned off outside their properties possibly creating dark spots. NOTE: - Town centres, junctions/roundabouts and security camera areas remain switched on with all options.	

Budget Title / Ref	Street Lighting Energy Reduction - Option 2
Savings (£):	120,000
Financial Year:	2016/17
Comment:	Option 2: Every other light to be part night lighting 6,017 = 120k annual saving. Cost to implement £180k.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs:	£15,000 to risk assess locations proposed for part night lighting. £27/cell which equates to a one off cost of £180k. This option provides a pay back in less than 2 years at current energy costs and will be a future year on year saving of at least £120k in future years.
Resource Costs:	
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation:	There would need to be wide spread public consultation as undertaken previously for the part night lighting of the inter urban routes.
Statutory Process:	This would need to be stringently followed and fully documented and risk assessed.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	Limited risk
Not Achieving Timeframe:	Dependent on consultation process/outcome/challenge this could be protracted.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy:	Not applicable, staff would still need to manage the asset.
Redeployment:	Not applicable
Redirected Resource:	Not applicable
Other Issue:	
Concern may be raised over health and safety by residents where street lights are turned off outside their properties possibly creating dark spots.	
NOTE: - Town centres, junctions/roundabouts and security camera areas remain switched on with all options.	

Budget Title / Ref	Street Lighting Energy Reduction - Option 3
Savings (£):	225,000
Financial Year:	2016/17
Comment:	Option 3: All 12,034 residential street lights to be part night lighting = 225k annual saving. Cost to implement £361k.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs:	£30,000 to risk assess locations proposed for part night lighting.
Resource Costs:	£27/cell which equates to a one off cost of £360k. This option provides a pay back in less than 2 years at current energy costs and will be a future year on year saving of at least £300k in future years.
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	None
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation:	There would need to be wide spread public consultation as undertaken previously for the part night lighting of the inter urban routes.
Statutory Process:	This would need to be stringently followed and fully documented and risk assessed.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	Limited risk
Not Achieving Timeframe:	Dependent on consultation process/outcome/challenge this could be protracted.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy:	Not applicable, staff would still need to manage the asset.
Redeployment:	Not applicable
Redirected Resource:	Not applicable
Other Issues	
<p>Concern may be raised over health and safety by residents where street lights are turned off in all residential areas at midnight. There may also be concerns over possible increases in anti social behaviour and crime.</p> <p>Payback period for investment is 1.5 years i.e. to save £100k/annum there is a need to invest £150k up front to convert existing lighting to part night lighting. This applies to all three options (1, 2 and 3).</p> <p>NOTE: - Town centres, junctions/roundabouts and security camera areas remain switched on with all options.</p>	

Budget Title / Ref	Street Lighting Energy Reduction - Option 4
Savings (£):	125,000
Financial Year:	2016/17
Comment:	Option 4: 3,000 no. town centre part night - saving 125k. Cost to implement £190k.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs:	£15,000 to risk assess locations proposed for part night lighting. £27/cell which equates to a one off cost of £190k. This option provides a pay back in less than 2 years at current energy costs and will be a future year on year saving of at least £125k in future years.
Resource Costs:	
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation:	There would need to be wide spread public consultation as undertaken previously for the part night lighting of the inter urban routes.
Statutory Process:	This would need to be stringently followed and fully documented and risk assessed.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	Limited risk
Not Achieving Timeframe:	Dependent on consultation process/outcome/challenge this could be protracted.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy:	Not applicable, staff would still need to manage the asset.
Redeployment:	Not applicable
Redirected Resource:	Not applicable
Other Issues	
<p>Concern may be raised over health and safety where street lights are turned off in all residential areas at midnight. There may also be significant concerns over possible increases in anti social behaviour and crime.</p> <p>NOTE: - Town centres, junctions/roundabouts and security camera areas remain switched on with all options.</p>	

Budget Title / Ref	Street Lighting Energy Reduction - Option 5
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	160,000 2016/17 Option 5: 1 in 3 residential switch off 4,011 no. - annual saving £160k. Cost to implement £40k plus column removal as detailed in paragraph 4.1.5.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	£20,000 to risk assess locations proposed for switch off. £10 disconnection fee which equates to a one off cost of £40k. This option provides a pay back in less than 2 years at current energy costs and will be a future year on year saving of at least £160k in future years. Removal of Western Power Distribution supplies and CCBC equipment estimated to be approx. £650,000
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	There would need to be wide spread public consultation as undertaken previously for the part night lighting of the inter urban routes. This would need to be stringently followed and fully documented and risk assessed.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Limited risk Dependent on consultation process/outcome/challenge this could be protracted.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Not applicable, staff would still need to manage the asset. Not applicable Not applicable
Other Issues	
<p>Concern may be raised over health and safety where street lights are turned off in all residential areas at midnight. There may also be concerns over possible increases in anti social behaviour and crime.</p> <p>NOTE: - Town centres, junctions/roundabouts and security camera areas remain switched on with all options.</p>	

Budget Title / Ref	Street Lighting Energy Reduction - Option 6
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	225,000 2016/17 Option 6: 1 in 2 residential switch off 6,017 no. - annual saving £225k. Cost to implement £60k plus column removal as detailed in paragraph 4.1.5.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	£30,000 to risk assess locations proposed for part night lighting. £10 disconnection fee which equates to a one off cost of £60k. This option provides a pay back in less than 2 years at current energy costs and will be a future year on year saving of at least £225k in future years. Removal of Western Power Distribution supplies and CCBC equipment estimated to be approx. £950,000
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	There would need to be wide spread public consultation as undertaken previously for the part night lighting of the inter urban routes. This would need to be stringently followed and fully documented and risk assessed.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Limited risk Dependent on consultation process/outcome/challenge this could be protracted.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Not applicable, staff would still need to manage the asset. Not applicable Not applicable
Other Issues	
Concern may be raised over health and safety where street lights are turned off in all residential areas at midnight. There may also be concerns over possible increases in anti social behaviour and crime. NOTE: - Town centres, junctions/roundabouts and security camera areas remain switched on with all options.	

Budget Title / Ref	Street Lighting Energy Reduction - Option 7
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	225,000 2016/17 Option 7: Switch off inter urban routes. 5,129 no. - annual saving £225k. Cost to implement £51k plus column removal as detailed in paragraph 4.1.5.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	£30,000 to risk assess locations proposed for part night lighting. £10.00 disconnection fee which equates to a one off cost of £51k. This option provides a pay back in less than 2 years at current energy costs and will be a future year on year saving of at least £225k in future years. Removal of Western Power Distribution supplies and CCBC equipment estimated to be approx. £1,000,000
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	There would need to be wide spread public consultation as undertaken previously for the part night lighting of the inter urban routes. This would need to be stringently followed and fully documented and risk assessed.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Limited risk Dependent on consultation process/outcome/challenge this could be protracted.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Not applicable, staff would still need to manage the asset. Not applicable Possible impact on 1no staff member
Other Issues	
<p>Concern may be raised over health and safety where street lights are turned off in all residential areas at midnight. There may also be concerns over possible increases in anti social behaviour and crime.</p> <p>There could be staffing implications if there is a reduction in the stock that is managed where this resource would be redirected to other asset management duties.</p> <p>NOTE: - Town centres, junctions/roundabouts and security camera areas remain switched on with all options.</p>	

Budget Title / Ref	Street Lighting Energy Reduction - Option 8
Savings (£):	500,000
Financial Year:	2016/17
Comment:	Option 8: Part night all units except conflict areas 23,000 no. £500k annual saving. Cost to implement £690k.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs:	£40,000 to risk assess locations proposed for part night lighting.
Resource Costs:	£27/cell which equates to a one off cost of £690k. This option provides a pay back in less than 2 years at current energy costs and will be a future year on year saving of at least £500k in future years.
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	None
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation:	There would need to be wide spread public consultation as undertaken previously for the part night lighting of the inter urban routes.
Statutory Process:	This would need to be stringently followed and fully documented and risk assessed.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	Limited risk
Not Achieving Timeframe:	Dependent on consultation process/outcome/challenge this could be protracted.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy:	Not applicable, staff would still need to manage the asset.
Redeployment:	Not applicable
Redirected Resource:	Not applicable
Other Issues	
<p>Concern may be raised over health and safety where street lights are turned off in all residential areas at midnight. There may also be concerns over possible increases in anti social behaviour and crime.</p> <p>NOTE: - Town centres, junctions/roundabouts and security camera areas remain switched on with all options.</p>	

Budget Title / Ref	Street Lighting Energy Reduction - Option 9
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	1,000,000 2016/17 Option 9: Switch off all units except conflict areas 23,000 no. annual saving £1000k. Cost to implement £230k plus column removal as detailed in paragraph 4.1.5.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	£50,000 to risk assess locations proposed for part night lighting. £10 disconnection fee which equates to a one off cost of £230k. This option provides a pay back in less than 2 years at current energy costs and will be a future year on year saving of at least £500k in future years. Removal of Western Power Distribution supplies and CCBC equipment estimated to be approx. £2,500,000
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	There would need to be wide spread public consultation as undertaken previously for the part night lighting of the inter urban routes. This would need to be stringently followed and fully documented and risk assessed.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Limited risk Dependent on consultation process/outcome/challenge this could be protracted.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Not applicable, staff would still need to manage the asset. Not applicable Likely to impact on 1-2no staff
Other Issues	
<p>Concern may be raised over health and safety where street lights are turned off in all residential areas at midnight. There may also be concerns over possible increases in anti social behaviour and crime.</p> <p>There could be staffing implications if there is a reduction in the stock that is managed where this resource would still need to be involved in decommissioning and would also be redirected to other asset management duties.</p> <p>NOTE: - Town centres, junctions/roundabouts and security camera areas remain switched on with all options.</p>	

Budget Title / Ref	Street Lighting Energy Reduction - Option 10
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	550,000 2016/17 Option 10: Switch off all residential lighting 16,500 no. Annual saving £550k Cost to implement £165k plus column removal as detailed in paragraph 4.1.5.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	£40,000 to risk assess locations proposed for part night lighting. £10 disconnection fee which equates to a one off cost of £165k. This option provides a pay back in less than 2 years at current energy costs and will be a future year on year saving of at least £550k in future years. Removal of Western Power Distribution supplies and CCBC equipment estimated to be approx. £1,500,000
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	There would need to be wide spread public consultation as undertaken previously for the part night lighting of the inter urban routes. This would need to be stringently followed and fully documented and risk assessed.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Limited risk Dependent on consultation process/outcome/challenge this could be protracted.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Not applicable, staff would still need to manage the asset. Not applicable Possible impact on 1no staff member
Other Issues	
<p>Concern may be raised over health and safety where street lights are turned off in all residential areas at midnight. There may also be concerns over possible increases in anti social behaviour and crime.</p> <p>There could be staffing implications if there is a reduction in the stock that is managed where this resource would be redirected to other asset management duties.</p> <p>NOTE: - Town centres, junctions/roundabouts and security camera areas remain switched on with all options.</p>	

Budget Title / Ref	Street Lighting Energy Reduction - Option 11
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	300,000 2016/17 Option11 if a Central Management System (CMS) could be funded for 23,000 columns estimated cost would be approximately £5M. This would allow control for dimming lights from the office. If all 23,000 were dimmed by 30%, which would not be noticeable to the naked eye, this would save around £300,000, this equates to a pay back period of 17 years. Similar principles could apply to varying numbers of columns which would have similar payback periods.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	Not applicable Install CMS system approx £5M There are unlikely to be any additional costs.
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	There would need to be wide spread public consultation as undertaken previously for the part night lighting of the inter urban routes. This would need to be stringently followed and fully documented and risk assessed.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Limited risk Dependent on availability of resources etc there could be an issue with the lead in time to start implementation.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Not applicable, staff would still need to manage the asset. Not applicable Not applicable
Other Issues	
There would be minimal concern raised by the public as any changes would not be that noticeable. NOTE: - Town centres, junctions/roundabouts and security camera areas remain switched on with all options.	

Budget Title / Ref	Street Lighting Energy Reduction - Option 12
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	390,000 2016/17 Option 12: Convert all 14157 residential lighting to LED luminaires (excluding existing cosmopolis). Energy reduces from £578k to £188k saving £390k per annum Cost to implement is £4,000,000 (10 year payback) and with telensa CMS an extra £920k (12.6 year payback).
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	Not applicable Approximately £4M plus £920k if the preferred option with Telensa CMS was selected There are unlikely to be any additional costs.
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	There would need to be wide spread public consultation as undertaken previously for the part night lighting of the inter urban routes. This would need to be stringently followed and fully documented and risk assessed.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Limited risk Dependent on availability of resources etc there could be an issue with the lead in time to start implementation.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Not applicable, staff would still need to manage the asset. Not applicable Not applicable
Other Issues	
There would be minimal if any concern raised by the public as the standard of lighting is being improved. NOTE: - Town centres, junctions/roundabouts and security camera areas remain switched on with all options.	

4.2 School Crossing Patrol Services

4.2.1 At present the School Crossing Patrol (SCP) service serves 42 primary, junior and infant schools across the county. This budget saving option is to withdraw the SCP service and would require a period of consultation. Experience would suggest that this is likely to lead to significant objections and concerns over safety from schools, parents and Members. Current staff complement 1 SCP Supervisor, 63 permanent SCPs and 5 relief SCPs.

4.2.2 The following Implication Note considers this option in more detail.

Budget Title / Ref	SCP staff costs
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	360,000 2015/16 Withdraw the SCP service. Likely to lead to significant objections and concerns over safety from schools, parents and Members. Requires significant lead in time in order to achieve the savings for 2015/16. This would lead to the redundancy of the SCP staff and SCP Supervisor post. Exact redundancy costs and pension costs have yet to be calculated in detail. Current staff complement 1 SCP Supervisor, 63 permanent SCP's and 5 relief SCPs.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	None. None. Redundancy costs (estimated at one off £200k).
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	Schools and ward Members. There is no constitutional requirement to consult town and community councils and community partnerships. None.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Budgets cuts would be required elsewhere to services. No risk, can be implemented as 2015/16 provided consultation is undertaken in 2014/15.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Yes, all SCP staff and SCP supervisor. All staff would need to enter the redeployment pool. Not applicable.
Other Issues	
Will meet with significant opposition and claims of putting the most vulnerable road users i.e. children, at risk of road safety danger.	
There could be up to 18 months worth of protected salary costs if it is possible to redeploy any of the affected staff.	
Powys are the only Welsh LA not to provide SCPs. Wrexham and Torfaen have recently announced this as a possible financial saving.	

4.3 Public Transport Subsidy

- 4.3.1 The Council provides financial support for routes that are not provided by bus operators on a commercial basis. Most bus journeys in the county borough operate commercially, without subsidy, with Stagecoach being the dominant provider. On commercial routes, revenue is derived from fare paying passengers and reimbursement for carrying passengers travelling free under the concessionary travel scheme.
- 4.3.2 All evening and Sunday services are subsidised, along with many daytime routes that typically serve more isolated communities some distance away from main public transport links. Currently, the Council spends £700k maintaining these services, supplemented by £380k grant funding from the Welsh Government, that has to be directed to routes with a more regional aspect. There are a number of options that can be considered here: -

Option 1: Withdraw Sunday and Bank holiday services. Sunday services were reviewed and new timetables introduced in July 2011 to suit current Sunday activities – patronage has grown by over 20%. Reduction in service will impact on access to jobs / services that have become part of Sunday lifestyles. An estimated 100,200 passengers per annum would be affected.

Option 2: Withdraw evening services. This would result in some communities not having a service and would impact on commercial networks (e.g. most services are covered by a two shift working pattern – removal of the evening work would lead to a review of the remaining operations and the working day reduced to a one shift pattern of cover – this would reduce the operating day significantly), with consequent impacts on passengers who travel to work / college etc. An estimated 336,200 passengers per annum would be affected.

Option 3: Target contracts with a subsidy in excess of £3 per passenger – this includes the Blackwood rail Linc to Ystrad Mynach Station and the removal of the recently reduced evening services in the Upper Rhymney Valley. This is estimated to affect 57,630 passengers per annum.

Option 4: Target contracts with a subsidy in excess of £1.50 per passenger – would include the above plus some daytime services (e.g. Service H Caerphilly to Graig y Rhacca); some evening services (e.g. Caerphilly – Nelson; Blackwood – Wyllie / New Tredegar / Bargoed; Blackwood – Abertillery via Trinant; some Sunday services (e.g. Risca to Newport via Ty Sign; remaining Sunday service between Bargoed and Merthyr via Deri); fare paying school services (Gelligaer to Glyngaer Village School; Gilfach Estate to Gilfach Fargoed School; Britannia to Pengam Junior School; Aber Station area to Twyn Junior School). An estimated 160,800 passengers per annum would be affected.

Option 5: Withdraw support for daytime services. This would result in some communities having no service at all. This is estimated to affect 1,083,900 passengers per annum.

- 4.3.3. Levels of daytime and evening provision vary across the county borough and have evolved in various ways. Whilst the daytime and evening options are mutually exclusive, the majority of the daytime bus network is provided on a commercial basis and these by definition are the strongest routes (carrying most passengers to areas of highest demand). These services tend to have the complementary evening and Sunday subsidised journeys, rather than the tendered daytime routes, which generally have no evening or Sunday services.

All these proposals would require extensive consultation, in accordance with the Council's constitution, and appropriate timescale for this. They would also be in addition to the budget savings previously implemented in September 2013.

There may be redundancy implications and this will need to be considered in further detail, depending on the option being explored.

4.3.4 In March 2010 the Council commenced the Connect2 flexible transport service that was to provide a transport solution to tackle the issue of transport as a barrier to opportunities, by improving links between rural communities, conventional public transport services, employment sites and other services and facilities, with an emphasis on improving access to employment and / or training opportunities. The service has increased its effectiveness from carrying around 10,400 passengers in 2010/11 to over 31,000 in 2013/14 and has expanded to cover some areas of conventional bus services and school transport related services when possible and cost effective in order to maximise use of the current fleet. This has indirectly allowed savings to be made. There may be scope to utilise this service further depending on what changes occur in the commercial and supported bus services areas in light of future funding cuts.

4.3.5 Following are implication notes that consider the options in more detail.

Budget Title / Ref		Public Transport Subsidy – Option 1
Savings (£):	70,000	
Financial Year:	2015/16	
Comment:	Option 1: Withdraw Sunday and Bank holiday services. Sunday services were reviewed and new timetables introduced in July 2011 to suit current Sunday activities – patronage has grown by over 20%. Reduction in service will impact on access to jobs / services that have become part of Sunday lifestyles. 100,200 passengers per annum affected.	
Cost to Implement		
Staff Costs:	None.	
Resource Costs:	None.	
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	There may be higher contract as a result of service changes. This depends on impact on services from other potential funding cuts.	
Estimated Timeframe to Implement		
Consultation:	Extensive consultation required with town and community councils, community partnerships, members and other key stakeholders (e.g. equality groups) in accordance with the Council's constitution.	
Statutory Process:	12 weeks notice would have to be served on contracts.	
Estimated Risks of Implementation		
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	Budgets cuts would be required elsewhere to services.	
Not Achieving Timeframe:	Not anticipated provided consultation undertaken in 2014/15.	
Estimated Employment Effects		
Redundancy:	None anticipated.	
Redeployment:	None anticipated.	
Redirected Resource:	None anticipated. There may be the opportunity to introduce the Connect2 service to cover some services, but this would be dependent on a worthy business case (e.g. capacity, cost effectiveness etc).	

Other Issues

Will receive objections from the public and community representatives . There would be an impact on the public, employment opportunities etc.

The impact could be compounded if Welsh Government (WG) implement further cuts to the concessionary fares reimbursement scheme and other grants. Likely to be a significant detrimental effect on bus services and bus operators in 2014/15 if these are realised. Difficult to predict at this stage and the situation could be quite volatile.

This needs to be monitored throughout 2014/15 to fully understand the impact of implementing any CCBC options.

Budget Title / Ref	Public Transport Subsidy – Option 2
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	270,000 2015/16 Option 2: Withdraw evening services (from 7pm to 11pm). Many communities would be without a service and it would effect commercial networks (e.g. Most services are covered by a two shift working pattern – removal of the evening work would lead to a review of the remaining operations and the working day reduced to a one shift pattern of cover – this would reduce the operating day, with consequent impacts on passengers who travel to work / college etc. 336,200 passengers per annum affected.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	None. None. There may be higher contract as a result of service changes. This depends on impact on services from other potential funding cuts.
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	Extensive consultation required with town and community councils, community partnerships, members and other key stakeholders (e.g. equality groups) in accordance with the Council's constitution. 12 weeks notice would have to be served on contracts.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Budgets cuts would be required elsewhere to services. Not anticipated, provided consultation undertaken in 2014/15.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	None anticipated. None anticipated. None anticipated. There may be the opportunity to introduce the Connect2 service to cover some services, but this would be dependent on a worthy business case.
Other Issues	
<p>Will receive objection from the public and community representatives. There would be an impact on the public, employment opportunities etc. and isolation of many communities from the public transport network.</p> <p>The impact could be compounded if WG implement further cuts to the concessionary fares reimbursement scheme and other grants. Likely to be a significant detrimental effect on bus services and bus operators in 2014/15 if these are realised. Difficult to predict at this stage and the situation could be quite volatile.</p> <p>This needs to be monitored throughout 2014/15 to fully understand the impact of implementing any CCBC options.</p>	

Budget Title / Ref	Public Transport Subsidy– Option 3
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	150,000 2015/16 Option 3: Target contracts at over £3 subsidy per passenger – this includes the Blackwood rail Linc to Ystrad Mynach Station and the removal of the recently reduced evening services in the Upper Rhymney valley. 57,630 passengers per annum affected.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	None. None. There may be higher contract as a result of service changes. This depends on impact on services from other potential funding cuts.
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	Extensive consultation required with town and community councils, community partnerships, members and other key stakeholders (e.g. equality groups) in accordance with the Council's constitution. 12 weeks notice would have to be served on contracts.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Budgets cuts would be required elsewhere to services. Not anticipated, provided consultation undertaken in 2014/15.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	None anticipated. None anticipated. None anticipated. There may be the opportunity to introduce the Connect2 service to cover some services, but this would be dependent on a worthy business case.
Other Issues	
<p>Will receive objection from the public and community representatives. There would be an impact on the public, employment opportunities school/college transport etc. and isolation of communities from the public transport network.</p> <p>The impact could be compounded if WG implement further cuts to the concessionary fares reimbursement scheme and other grants. Likely to be a significant detrimental effect on bus services and bus operators in 2014/15 if these are realised. Difficult to predict at this stage and the situation could be quite volatile.</p> <p>This needs to be monitored throughout 2014/15 to fully understand the impact of implementing any CCBC options.</p>	

Budget Title / Ref	Public Transport Strategy – Option 4
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	340,000 2015/16 Option 4: Target contracts over £1.50 – would include the above plus some daytime services (e.g. Service H Caerphilly to Graig y Rhacca); some evening services (e.g. Caerphilly – Nelson; Blackwood – Wyllie / New Tredegar / Bargoed; Blackwood – Abertillery via Trinant; some Sunday services (e.g. Risca to Newport via Ty Sign; remaining Sunday service between Bargoed and Merthyr via Deri); fare paying school services (Gelligaer to Glyngaer village school; Gilfach Estate to Gilfach Fargoed School; Britannia to Pengam Junior School; Aber Station area to Twyn Junior School). 160,800 passengers per annum affected.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	None. None. There may be higher contract as a result of service changes. This depends on impact on services from other potential funding cuts.
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	Extensive consultation required with town and community councils, community partnerships, members and other key stakeholders (e.g. equality groups) in accordance with the Council's constitution. 12 weeks notice would have to be served on contracts.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Budgets cuts would be required elsewhere to services. Not anticipated, provided consultation undertaken in 2014/15.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	None anticipated. None anticipated. None anticipated. There may be the opportunity to introduce the Connect2 service to cover some services, but this would be dependent on a worthy business case.
Other Issues	
<p>Will receive objection from the public and community representatives. There would be an impact on the public, employment opportunities school/college transport etc. and isolation of communities from the public transport network. Day time, evening and weekend services would be affected.</p> <p>The impact could be compounded if WG implement further cuts to the concessionary fares reimbursement scheme and other grants. Likely to be a significant detrimental effect on bus services and bus operators in 2014/15 if these are realised. Difficult to predict at this stage and the situation could be quite volatile.</p> <p>This needs to be monitored throughout 2014/15 to fully understand the impact of implementing any CCBC options.</p>	

Budget Title / Ref	Public Transport Strategy – Option 5
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	550,000 2015/16 Option 5: Withdraw daytime services (6am – 7pm). Many communities throughout the county borough would not receive a service where a commercial bus service is not sustainable and currently requires support. 1,083,900 passengers per annum affected.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	None. None. There may be higher contract as a result of service changes. This depends on impact on services from other potential funding cuts.
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	Extensive consultation required with town and community councils, community partnerships, members and other key stakeholders (e.g. equality groups) in accordance with the Council's constitution. 12 weeks notice would have to be served on contracts.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Budgets cuts would be required elsewhere to services. Not anticipated, provided consultation undertaken in 2014/15.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	None anticipated. None anticipated. None anticipated. There may be the opportunity to introduce the Connect2 service cover some services, but this would be dependent on a worthy business case.
Other Issues	
<p>Will receive objection from the public and community representatives. There would be an impact on the public, employment opportunities school/college transport etc. and isolation of communities from the public transport network. Day time, evening and weekend services would be affected.</p> <p>The impact could be compounded if WG implement further cuts to the concessionary fares reimbursement scheme.</p>	

4.4 Efficiency Savings (3%)

4.4.1 The 3% efficiency saving is applied to the remaining budget after the foregoing large discretionary items have been discounted. This saving would be in the region of £250k. It is deemed appropriate that the value of savings required by the 3% target shall be taken up by both statutory and discretionary items. The following options total £352k: -

• Carriageway resurfacing – planned maintenance	£200,000
• Footway resurfacing – planned maintenance	£50,000
• Concessionary pass replacements	£7,000
• Highway adoption and agreement fees	£15,000
• Events in pay and display car parks	£20,000
• Car park tariffs	£60,000

4.4.2 Carriageway Resurfacing - Planned Maintenance

4.4.2.1 The service area of planned carriageway maintenance currently has an allocated revenue budget element of almost £2,000,000. This equates to approximately 20% of the overall highway maintenance budget. As resurfacing is a planned function rather than reactive, it is the identified area for consideration given its quantum to make savings when compared to the other budget headings. Whilst considered a statutory service, serious consideration has been given to other highway budget areas. The vast majority relate to reactive maintenance and there is considered very limited scope to reduce these reactive budgets without compromising safety of the highway. The reactive maintenance spends in these other areas are continually monitored annually and adjusted to suit the needs based on previous years expenditure along with anticipated future issues for the coming year. With climate change as well as an increasing and ageing asset base, the reactive maintenance budgets are already under significant pressure and overspends are a real concern for the future.

4.4.2.2 Carriageway Resurfacing – Planned Maintenance

Budget Title / Ref		Carriageway Resurfacing – Planned Maintenance
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	200,000 2015/16	<p>Reduce planned maintenance - Reducing the budget could increase the risk of insurance liability.</p> <p>Legislation (Highways Act) states that the asset (Highway) needs to be maintained in a safe condition for users. A more refined risk rating/prioritisation process could be developed within the Highway Asset Management Plan (HAMP) process. This would involve developing the current prioritisation process further to consider additional influencing factors. A review of this process is planned for 2014/15.</p> <p>Currently the authorities HAMP process projected over the next 20 years identifies that the road condition will decrease unless additional funding is identified over and above what has been provided in previous years.</p> <p>The £200,000 equates to approximately 13% of the current budget allocation.</p> <p>It should also be noted that combined with this approach, 2015/16 will see a decrease in planned carriageway resurfacing works than that experienced over the last 3 years as a result of the completion of the Welsh Government Local Government Borrowing Initiative (LGBI) scheme.</p>
Cost to Implement		
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	Nil. However there are some HR implications with staff noted below. Nil	<p>Possible increase in reactive maintenance and insurance liability. It is difficult to assess the financial impact of this going forward. However, the cumulative effect over the medium to long term could be a significant sum as less roads will be resurfaced and additional money will be required for increasing reactive maintenance. If no additional funding is identified it is likely that any planned resurfacing budget allocation could need to be diverted to reactive maintenance exacerbating the problem for the future.</p> <p>To bring assets back to current conditions following any proposed cuts could require an investment of full reconstruction rather than resurfacing if budget was not increased back to appropriate levels within a couple of years. The more patching undertaken to a carriageway the more the structural integrity is compromised which may result in additional structural maintenance repairs rather than resurfacing of the surface course layer only.</p>
Timeframe to Implement		
Consultation: Statutory Process:	Wider public consultation is not a statutory requirement for this service delivery area, a robust defence on selection process will be required to defend position against public criticism. Will require consultation and approval by members via the MTFP / budget setting process for 2015/16.	
Risks of Implementation		
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Limited risk as budget is under direct control of the Highway Operations Group (HOG). Limited risk as budget is under direct control of HOG. Can be implemented from April 2015.	

HR Implications	
Redundancy:	None.
Redeployment:	Not Applicable
Redirected	0.4 FTE (HOG 0.1 / EPG 0.3)
Resource:	Limited effect, although cumulative effect of savings across service may impact on staffing. The 0.1 staff reduction in HOG would be utilised to further develop and implement/monitor the risk/prioritisation process and deal with any increase in complaints. The Engineering Projects Group (EPG) would need to secure additional consultancy work to cover the loss of income.
Other Issues	
Consideration has been given to other highway budget headings. The vast majority relate to reactive maintenance and there is considered very limited scope to reduce these reactive budgets without raising major service delivery concerns. The reactive maintenance budgets are already under significant pressure and overspends are a real concern for the future.	

4.4.3 Footway Resurfacing - Planned Maintenance

4.4.3.1 The footway resurfacing – planned maintenance budget has been selected based on similar assumptions made for the planned carriageway resurfacing. Current footway resurfacing budget is approximately 5% of the overall highway maintenance budget and approx 10% of this budget reduction is suggested. The proposal is to closely monitor both areas over the short term and identify where further adjustments can be made to ensure there are minimal impacts in both areas in relation to any increase in reactive maintenance and insurance liabilities. In addition alternate funding streams need to be reviewed and considered by this council in the medium to long term to ensure that the asset is maintained at an acceptable standard.

4.4.3.2 Footway Resurfacing – Planned Maintenance

Budget Title / Ref		Footway Resurfacing – Planned Maintenance
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	50,000 2015/16	<p>Reduce planned maintenance - Reducing the budget would increase the risk of insurance liability.</p> <p>Legislation (Highways Act) states that the asset (Highway) needs to be maintained in a safe condition for users. A more refined risk rating/prioritisation process could be developed within the HAMP process. This would involve developing the current prioritisation process further to consider additional influencing factors. A review of this process is planned for 2014/15.</p> <p>Currently the authorities HAMP process projected over the next 20 years identifies that the road condition will decrease unless additional funding is identified over and above what has been provided in previous years.</p> <p>The £50,000 equates to approximately 10% of the previous budget allocation.</p> <p>It should also be noted that combined with this approach, 2015/16 will see a decrease in planned carriageway resurfacing works than that experienced over the last 3 years as a result of the completion of the Welsh Government Local Government Borrowing Initiative (LGBI) scheme.</p>
Cost to Implement		
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	Nil. However there are some HR implications with staff noted below. Nil	<p>Possible increase in reactive maintenance and insurance liability. It is difficult to assess the financial impact of this going forward. However, the cumulative effect over the medium to long term could be a significant sum as less footways will be resurfaced and additional money will be required for increasing reactive maintenance. If no additional funding is identified it is likely that any planned resurfacing budget allocation could need to be diverted to reactive maintenance exacerbating the problem for the future.</p>
Timeframe to Implement		
Consultation: Statutory Process:	Wider public consultation is not a statutory requirement for this service delivery area, a robust defence on selection process will be required to defend position against public criticism. Will require consultation and approval by members via the MTFP budget setting process for 2015/16.	
Risks of Implementation		
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Limited risk as budget is under direct control of HOG Limited risk as budget is under direct control of HOG. Can be implemented from April 2015.	

HR Implications	
Redundancy:	None.
Redeployment:	Not Applicable
Redirected	0.1 FTE HOG plus up to 1 FTE NCS
Resource:	Limited effect, although cumulative effect of savings across service may impact on staffing. The 0.1 HOG staff member could be allocated works reviewing and updating the risk/prioritisation process along with dealing with any increase in complaints. The 1no NCS staff member could be covered by reducing agency/sub-contractor usage. Works currently undertaken by agency and sub-contractors would need to be reviewed. There would be some additional training required for new methods of work if implemented. This should negate any staffing implications.
Other Issues	
<p>Consideration has been given to other highway budget headings. The vast majority relate to reactive maintenance and there is considered very limited scope to reduce these reactive budgets without raising service delivery concerns. The reactive maintenance budgets are already under significant pressure and overspends are a real concern for the future.</p>	

4.4.4 Concessionary Pass Replacements

4.4.4.1 There has been no change to the charge for replacing concessionary passes since it was introduced over five years ago i.e. no charge for the first replacement and £5 for each subsequent replacement. This proposal would increase the replacement fee to £5 for the first and £10 for subsequent replacements. This option is estimated to raise an additional £7,000 per annum and would not be significantly different from the charges levied by neighbouring local authorities.

Budget Title / Ref		Concessionary Pass Replacements
Savings (£):	7,000	
Financial Year:	2015/16	
Comment:	Increase concessionary travel pass replacement costs. Currently £5 for second and subsequent replacements – revise to £5 for first and £10 for subsequent replacements.	
Cost to Implement		
Staff Costs:	None	
Resource Costs:	None	
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	Marginal – revised guidance and forms necessary	
Estimated Timeframe to Implement		
Consultation:	With appropriate groups – the over 60's and residents with certain disabilities are eligible for a Concessionary Travel pass that entitles them to free travel on local bus services.	
Statutory Process:	None – this is a discretionary charge.	
Estimated Risks of Implementation		
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	Budgets cuts would be required elsewhere to services.	
Not Achieving Timeframe:	Not anticipated. 2014/15 allowed for consultation exercise.	
Estimated Employment Effects		
Redundancy:	None anticipated	
Redeployment:	None anticipated	
Redirected Resource:	None anticipated	
Other Issues		

4.4.5 Highway Adoptions and Agreement Fees

4.4.5.1 The fees and charges to developers to administer highway agreements and complete highway adoptions was last reviewed in 2012. It is proposed that the Council's fees and charges are reviewed again and increased to/by approximately 10%. This is estimated to achieve a £15,000 per annum saving. An exercise is ongoing to review the latest fee structure within local authorities in south Wales, and it is expected that this proposal will be largely consistent with what is being considered by other local authorities.

Budget Title / Ref	Highways Adoptions and Agreements Fees
Savings (£):	15,000
Financial Year:	2015/16
Comment:	Income target for 2013/14 is £130,000 (lowered from £165,000 in previous years because of the downturn in the economy affecting the pace of development): increase fees by 10%. Note fees were last increased in 2012. Since then there are positive signs that development activity is increasing and all LAs are reviewing their charges.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs:	None.
Resource Costs:	None.
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	None.
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation:	Scrutiny and Cabinet.
Statutory Process:	Not applicable.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	Budgets cuts would be required elsewhere to higher risk services.
Not Achieving Timeframe:	No risk anticipated.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy:	None.
Redeployment:	None.
Redirected Resource:	None.
Other Issues	
The fee increase in 2012 has had no appreciable impact on development in the borough. With neighbouring authorities also considering increases in fees, this proposal is not expected to result in any significant detrimental effect on CCBC's attractiveness for developers.	

4.4.6 Events in Pay and Display Car Park Sites

4.4.6.1 Throughout the year some public events organised or promoted by the Council take place in or impact upon the Council's off street car parks and result in a loss of income. The proposal is to cease some of those events to prevent this loss of income. This would affect events such as the big screen cinema, ice rink and Christmas market in Bargoed; the food festival, flower festival, Christmas and medieval markets in Caerphilly.

Budget Title / Ref:	Events in Pay and Display (P & D) Car Park Sites
Savings (£):	20,000
Financial Year:	2015/16
Comment:	Cease holding events in public P & D car parks. Estimated £20k additional saving/annum.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs:	None.
Resource Costs:	None.
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	None.
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation:	None
Statutory Process:	Not applicable
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	Budgets cuts would be required elsewhere to services likely to be of a higher impact.
Not Achieving Timeframe:	No risk, can be implemented immediately.
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy:	None
Redeployment:	None
Redirected Resource:	None
Other Issues:	
Likely to lead to impact/disruption of corporate events. May reduce the number of corporate events unless suitable alternative venues secured.	

4.4.7 Car Park Tariffs

4.4.7.1 The Council operates pay and display parking (including season tickets) in 21 car parks in Bargoed, Blackwood, Caerphilly and Ystrad Mynach. The tariffs were last changed in September 2010 (and April 2007 before that), and this proposal considers an option which is typically a 10p increase per hour.

4.4.7.2 The current charging system is considered similar or slightly cheaper than in neighbouring towns. There are however, considerable variations in charges and strategies making it difficult to carry out an exact comparison.

Budget Title / Ref:	Car Parks Tariffs
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	60,000 2015/16 Increase car parking charges typically 10p per hour. Additional income per annum or reduced depending on when increased charges are introduced. Previous increases were Summer 2010 and April 2007. The majority of tickets sold are for 1-2 hrs in the short stay car parks and daily tickets in the long stay car parks. The proposal is to increase the charges by the following amounts: Additional 10p for a 1 hour ticket Additional 20p for a 2 hour ticket Additional 30p for a 3 hour ticket Additional 40p for a 4 hour ticket Additional 50p for a daily ticket
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	None. Implementation costs of approximately £15k None.
Estimated Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation:	Town and community councils, community partnerships, members and the public are not statutory consultees but will be considered in accordance with the Council's Constitution.
Statutory Process:	Notice of variation.
Estimated Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	Budgets cuts would be required elsewhere to services likely to be of a higher impact. NOTE: In light of the recent High Court case decision against Barnett Council over its parking charges, there is some uncertainty whether or not this could be challenged legally or future car parking charges increases can be progressed and that the income can be used outside that of delivering the car park service.
Not Achieving Timeframe:	None anticipated (excluding any legal challenge).
Estimated Employment Effects	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	None. None. None.
Other Issues	

5. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are a number of Equalities implications to some of the options listed in Section 4 that must be recognised in order for a full and proper consideration of the options to be made. It is likely that despite these issues, difficult decision will have to be made due to the current need to make such significant savings, however these implications must be recognised and understood as part of the process.
- 5.2 Firstly, any risk assessments undertaken will have to take into consideration the greater risks associated with being in minority groups in the community as service reductions could potentially increase these groups' sense of isolation and vulnerability, by reducing their ability to live independently, or increasing their fear of crime.
- 5.3 In terms of street lighting, dimming or switching off of street lights could have a significantly greater negative impact on people with certain types of visual impairment compared with the majority of the population. It will also significantly affect older people for both reasons of eyesight and feelings of vulnerability.
- 5.4 In terms of the School Crossing Patrol service, withdrawing the service could potentially have a significantly greater negative impact on pupils and their parents or carers, who have visual, hearing or mobility issues. In terms of staff, there a significantly higher numbers of female SCPs than male and many are also older in age.
- 5.5 In terms of the Public Transport Options, section 4.3.2. previously notes the potentially negative impacts on more isolated communities but this is not merely a geographic issue of isolation but also one that covers age, disability and lone women for example travelling anywhere in the county borough. Reduction in Sunday travel could also affect people's attendance at churches or chapels.
- 5.6 In terms of the resurfacing works, the issue is greater in terms of footpaths for individuals who come under the list of protected characteristics than carriageways, as well-maintained footpaths allow older people, people with disabilities or mobility issues greater access to parts of the county borough.
- 5.7 In terms of Concessionary Passes, the greater impact on certain groups has been recognised as these groups would need to be fully consulted with before changes are made.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 This report contains financial references and implications throughout. The consequences of not agreeing any proposals here is that to meet the council's overall savings targets, then choices will have to be made elsewhere.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The implication notes highlight the potential for options to affect staff. Human Resource officers have provided comment and this has been incorporated in the report as appropriate. Should options be considered to be taken further and these require consultation with staff and trade unions, this will be undertaken.

8. CONSULTATIONS

- 8.1 All comments received from the consultees listed have been incorporated in the report.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.1 For Members to consider the report content and advise of their comments, support or otherwise to the suggested proposals therein.

10. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.1 To allow the Engineering Services Division to contribute to the council's Medium Term financial Plan process.

11. STATUTORY POWER

- 11.1 Local Government Acts 1998 and 2003.

Author: Terry Shaw, Head of Engineering Services
Consultees: Cllr Tom Williams, Cabinet Member for Highways, Transportation and Engineering
Cllr D T Davies, Chair of Regeneration and Environment Committee
Cllr Mrs E M Aldworth, Vice Chair of Regeneration and Environment Committee
Stuart Rosser, Interim Chief Executive
Sandra Aspinall, Acting Deputy Chief Executive
Nicole Scammell, Acting Director of Corporate Services and Section 151 Officer
Stephen Harris, Acting Head of Corporate Finance
Mike Eedy, Finance Manager
John Rogers, Principal Solicitor
David A Thomas, Senior Policy Officer (Equalities and Welsh Language)
Sian Phillips, HR Manager
Clive Campbell, Transportation Engineering Manager
Marcus Lloyd, Highway Operations Group Manager

Background Papers:

Cabinet report 29th January 2014 (Budget Proposals 2014-15 and MTFS 2014-17)
Cabinet report 16 April 2014 (Next Stages of MTFP – 2015/16 and 2016/17)

Appendices:

Appendix 1 List of Possible Savings Options for 2016/17