



#plymcabinet

Democratic and Member Support

Chief Executive's Department
Plymouth City Council
Ballard House
Plymouth PL1 3BJ

Please ask for Gemma Pearce
T 01752 398443
E gemma.pearce@plymouth.gov.uk
www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy
Published 30 November 2015

CABINET

Tuesday 8 December 2015
2.00 pm
Council House, Plymouth

Members:

Councillor Evans, Chair

Councillor Smith, Vice Chair

Councillors Coker, Philippa Davey, Lowry, McDonald, Penberthy, Jon Taylor, Tuffin and Vincent.

Members are invited to attend the above meeting to consider the items of business overleaf.

This agenda acts as notice that Cabinet will be considering business in private if items are included in Part II of the agenda.

This meeting will be broadcast live to the internet and will be capable of subsequent repeated viewing. By entering the Warspite Room and during the course of the meeting, Councillors are consenting to being filmed and to the use of those recordings for webcasting.

The Council is a data controller under the Data Protection Act. Data collected during this webcast will be retained in accordance with authority's published policy.

For further information on webcasting, attending Council meetings and how to engage in the democratic process please follow this link <http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/accesstomeetings>

Tracey Lee

Chief Executive

CABINET

AGENDA

PART I (PUBLIC MEETING)

1. APOLOGIES

To receive apologies for absence submitted by Cabinet Members.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Pages 1 - 2)

Cabinet Members will be asked to make any declarations of interest in respect of items on this agenda. A flowchart providing guidance on interests is attached to assist councillors.

3. MINUTES (Pages 3 - 10)

To sign and confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2015.

4. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

To receive questions from the public in accordance with the Constitution.

Questions, of no longer than 50 words, can be submitted to the Democratic Support Unit, Plymouth City Council, Ballard House, Plymouth, PL1 3BJ, or email to democraticsupport@plymouth.gov.uk. Any questions must be received at least five clear working days before the date of the meeting.

5. CHAIR'S URGENT BUSINESS

To receive reports on business which, in the opinion of the Chair, should be brought forward for urgent consideration.

6. APPOINTMENT TO THE PLYMOUTH WATERFRONT PARTNERSHIP ADVISORY BOARD (Pages 11 - 12)

Giles Perritt (Assistant Chief Executive) will submit a report seeking ratification of the Cabinet appointments to committees, outside bodies and advisory groups to Cabinet submitted to the Annual Meeting of the City Council for 2015/16.

7. LIVING STREETS SCRUTINY REVIEW (Pages 13 - 26)

Councillor Ricketts (Chair of the Working Plymouth Scrutiny Panel Co-operative Review Group) has been invited to attend to present the recommendations in the report of the Working Plymouth Scrutiny Panel following a co-operative review into Living Streets.

Anthony Payne (Strategic Director for Place) will submit a report responding to the recommendations in the scrutiny report.

8. INDICATIVE 2016/17 REVENUE BUDGET AND FINANCIAL FORECAST 2016/17 - 2019/2020 CAPITAL PROGRAMME (TO FOLLOW)

The Chief Executive will submit a report on the Indicative 2016/17 Revenue Budget plus the two year financial forecast 2016/17 – 2019/20 Capital Programme.

9. EXEMPT BUSINESS

To consider passing a resolution under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the press and public from the meeting for the following item(s) of business on the grounds that it (they) involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act, as amended by the Freedom of Information Act 2000. At the time this agenda is published no representations have been made that this part of the meeting should be in public.

(Members of the public to note that, if agreed, you will be asked to leave the meeting).

PART II (PRIVATE MEETING)

AGENDA

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO NOTE

that under the law, members are entitled to consider certain items in private. Members of the public will be asked to leave the meeting when such items are discussed.

Nil

This page is intentionally left blank

DECLARING INTERESTS – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

What matters are being discussed?



D
P
I

Does the business relate to or is it likely to affect a disclosable pecuniary interest (DPI)? This will include the interests of a spouse or civil partner (and co-habitees):

- any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation that they carry on for profit or gain
- any sponsorship that they receive including contributions to their expenses as a councillor or the councillor’s election expenses from a Trade Union
- any land licence or tenancy they have in Plymouth
- any current contracts leases or tenancies between the Council and them
- any current contracts leases or tenancies between the Council and any organisation with land in Plymouth in they are a partner, a paid Director, or have a relevant interest in its shares and securities
- any organisation which has land or a place of business in Plymouth and in which they have a relevant interest in its shares or its securities

No

Yes



Declare interest and leave (or obtain a dispensation)





P
r
i
v
a
t
e

I
n
t
e
r
e
s
t

Does the business affect the well-being or financial position of (or relate to the approval, consent, licence or permission) for:



- a member of your family or
- any person with whom you have a close association; or
- any organisation of which you are a member or are involved in its management (whether or not appointed to that body by the council). This would include membership of a secret society and other similar organisations.

Yes No  You can speak and vote



Will it confer an advantage or disadvantage on your family, close associate or an organisation where you have a private interest more than it affects other people living or working in the ward?

Yes No

Declare the interest and speak and vote

Speak to Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting to avoid risk of allegations of corruption or bias

C
a
b
i
n
e
t

Cabinet members must declare and give brief details about any conflict of interest* relating to the matter to be decided and leave the room when the matter is being considered. Cabinet members may apply to the Monitoring Officer for a dispensation in respect of any conflict of interest.

*A conflict of interest is a situation in which a councillor’s responsibility to act and take decisions impartially, fairly and on merit without bias may conflict with his/her personal interest in the situation or where s/he may profit personally from the decisions that s/he is about to take.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet

Tuesday 10 November 2015

PRESENT:

Councillor Smith, Vice Chair in the Chair.

Councillor Lowry, Vice Chair for the meeting.

Councillors Philippa Davey, McDonald, Penberthy, Jon Taylor, Tuffin and Vincent.

Also in attendance: Tracey Lee (Chief Executive), Lesa Annear (Strategic Director for Transformation and Change), David Draffan (Assistant Director for Economic Development), Kelechi Nnoaham (Director of Public Health), and Nicola Kirby (Senior Democratic Support Officer (Cabinet)).

For part of the meeting: Mark Brunsdon (Head of Strategic Development Projects), Jerry Clough (Managing Director Western Locality, NEW Devon Clinical Commissioning Group), Jonathan Dean (Director, Roney Sharman Project Consultants Limited), Darin Halifax (City of Service Chief Officer), Peter Honeywell (Transformation Programmes Manager), Craig McArdle (Assistant Director for Strategic Co-operative Commissioning), Andy Netherton (Service Manager, Public Protection Service) and Chris Randall (Head of Finance Operations).

Apologies for absence: Councillor Evans (Leader), Carole Burgoyne (Strategic Director for People) and Anthony Payne (Strategic Director for Place).

The meeting started at 2.00 pm and finished at 3.30 pm.

Note: At a future meeting, the Cabinet will consider the accuracy of these draft minutes, so they may be subject to change. Please check the minutes of that meeting to confirm whether these minutes have been amended.

44. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were made by councillors in accordance with the code of conduct in respect of items under consideration at this meeting –

Name	Minute Number	Reason	Interest
Councillor Coker	Minute 48 – Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Licensing Policy	Licensee of a public house	Disclosable Pecuniary Interest
Councillor Jon Taylor	Minute 49 - Integrated Commissioning Strategies	Employee of the Clinical Commissioning Group	Private

45. **MINUTES**

Agreed the minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2015.

46. **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

One question was submitted by a member of the public for this meeting, in accordance with Part B, paragraph 11 of the Constitution. Councillor Casey attended the meeting and asked the following question. Councillor Smith responded on behalf of the Leader as set out below

Question No	Question By	Cabinet Member	Subject
3 (15/16)	Ms A Casey	Councillor Evans, Leader	Responses to public questions
<p>Asking, receiving and responding to questions takes up time, energy and other resources of the electorate, officers and cabinet members. Why then do most of the questions receive a statement by way of an answer and even then the answers do not always fit the thrust of the questions submitted?</p>			
<p>Response: Cabinet Members respond in the most appropriate manner to questions submitted.</p>			

CHAIR'S URGENT BUSINESS

47. **Order of Business**

Agreed that the order of the agenda is changed as reflected by these minutes.

48. **GAMBLING ACT 2005 STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY**

Kelechi Nnoaham (Director of Public Health) submitted a report providing details of the three year review of the City Council's Gambling Act Statement of Licensing Policy together with a draft policy to commence from 31 January 2016.

Councillor Philippa Davey (Cabinet Member for Safer and Stronger Communities) introduced the proposals and reported that following approval of the draft policy, a further review would be undertaken during the following 9 to 12 months to take account of local area profiles.

Andy Netherton (Service Manager, Public Protection Service) attended the meeting for this item.

Alternative options considered and reasons for the decision –

As set out in the report.

The City Council is Recommended to adopt the Gambling Act Statement of Licensing Policy contained in Appendix A with effect from 31 January 2016.

(Councillor Coker having declared an interest, withdrew from the meeting for this item).

49. **INTEGRATED COMMISSIONING STRATEGIES**

Carole Burgoyne (Strategic Director for People) submitted a report seeking approval of the four Integrated Commissioning Strategies which would drive commissioning activity across Plymouth City Council and the Western Locality of NHS Northern, Western and Eastern Devon Clinical Commissioning Group (NEW Devon CCG) over the next five years. The following documents were appended to the report –

- (1) Commissioning an Integrated System for Population Health and Wellbeing (overview);
- (2) Draft Wellbeing Commissioning Strategy;
- (3) Draft Community Based Care Commissioning Strategy;
- (4) Draft Children and Young People's Commissioning Strategy;
- (5) Draft Enhanced and Specialised Care Commissioning Strategy.

Councillor Tuffin (Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Social Care) and Councillor McDonald (Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Public Health) introduced the proposals.

Jerry Clough (Managing Director Western Locality, NEW Devon Clinical Commissioning Group) and Craig McArdle (Assistant Director for Strategic Co-operative Commissioning) attended the meeting for this item and addressed Cabinet. Cabinet was advised that the work involved to deliver the strategies would be immense and that the proposals were another significant step towards driving change and integration. Jerry Clough welcomed the opportunity to continue to work with the Council.

Kelechi Nnoaham also reported.

Cabinet Members thanked all the staff for their work on achieving this significant milestone.

Alternative options considered and reasons for the decision –

As set out in the report.

Agreed that the following Integrated Commissioning Strategies are approved –

- (1) Wellbeing Commissioning Strategy;
- (2) Community Based Care Commissioning Strategy;
- (3) Children and Young People's Commissioning Strategy;

- (4) Enhanced and Specialised Care Commissioning Strategy.

(Councillor Jon Taylor declared an interest in the above item).

50. **BRETONSIDE UPDATE**

Councillor Lowry (Cabinet Member for Finance) -

- (a) informed Cabinet Members that the Bretonside development was progressing to delivery on the ground which would provide an exciting landmark leisure scheme including a 4D cinema and restaurants;
- (b) welcomed the £42m investment in the city by the British Land Company;
- (c) reported that when completed the city would receive an annual business rate of £700k from the scheme;
- (d) advised Cabinet Members that the latest projections were for the scheme to commence in August 2016 with completion in July 2018;
- (e) welcomed Jonathan Dean (Director, Rowney Sharman Project Consultants Limited) to the meeting and invited him to update Cabinet Members on scheme.

Jonathan Dean (Director, Rowney Sharman Project Consultants Limited) –

- (f) gave apologies from David Pollock (Retail Development Director, The British Land Company PLC) who had intended to be present but had been taken ill;
- (g) presented a video of the proposals;
- (h) thanked the officers in the planning and economic development teams for their assistance;
- (i) reported that the British Land Company had an environmental and sustainability policy which incorporated measurable targets for engaging with the community with targets for local procurement, jobs and materials.

Mark Brunson (Head of Strategic Development Projects) attended the meeting for this item and also addressed Cabinet Members.

Tracey Lee (Chief Executive) and Cabinet Members -

- (j) thanked the British Land Company for investing in city;

- (k) welcomed the high quality development which would create jobs and businesses;
- (l) welcomed the work on the public realm which would enhance the gateway to the city and Barbican;
- (m) thanked everyone who had worked extremely hard to achieve this outcome.

The progress report was noted.

(Councillors Philippa Davey and McDonald left for the remainder of the meeting)

51. **CORPORATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: CORPORATE PLAN QUARTER TWO AND PLEDGES UPDATE**

Tracey Lee (Chief Executive) submitted the Quarter Two, 2015/16, Corporate Performance monitoring report which provided a summarised evaluation and assessment of progress towards the Council's ambitions as a brilliant co-operative council, using revised key actions (and their milestones) and revised performance indicators. The report also provided an update on the pledges as at 16 October 2015.

Councillor Smith (Deputy Leader) introduced the report.

Peter Honeywell (Transformation Programmes Manager) attended the meeting for this item and reported that 6 of the 10 priority areas had now been completed.

Councillor Lowry reported that –

- (a) that although the Council had achieved many successes, he would not be signing off pledge 2 (beginning to deliver the new plan for the City Centre to attract shoppers and visitors) until a solution had been found for the Colin Campbell Court development;
- (b) since the introduction of Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) previous bad behaviour in his ward no longer existed and he expressed concern about the potential removal of the officers and also the impact of changes to the working family tax credits.

Alternative options considered and reasons for the decision –

As set out in the report.

Agreed that –

- (l) the summarised evaluation and assessment of progress towards the Council's ambitions as a brilliant co-operative council are endorsed and that the significant achievements delivered under the Corporate Plan are noted;

- (2) the progress of pledges to date is noted;
- (3) the officers investigate the impact of the potential loss of Police Community Support Officers across the city and any changes to the working family tax credits which could impact on the Council's budget in future years.

52. **CAPITAL AND REVENUE MONITORING REPORT 2015/16 SECOND QUARTER**

The Corporate Management Team submitted a report on the Council's finance monitoring position as at the end of September 2015, detailing how the Council was delivering against its financial measures using its capital and revenue resources, seeking approval of relevant budget variations and virements, reporting new schemes in the capital programme and proposing increases to the capital financing envelope.

Councillor Lowry (Cabinet Member for Finance) introduced the proposals.

Cabinet Members were advised that -

- (a) an additional borrowing requirement of £10m was being sought for regeneration initiatives;
- (b) it was anticipated that 170 people would be leaving the Council under the Enhanced Voluntary Release Scheme this year and that since April 2012 the headcount had been reduced from 4158 to 2781 as at October 2015, of which 764 staff had transferred to other undertakings under the TUPE provisions;
- (b) Councillor Lowry hoped to recommend a freeze of the Council tax for 2016/17 to Cabinet but that the recommendation would depend on the Autumn Statement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer;
- (c) there were concerns about -
 - the impact of any changes to the working family tax credit which could increase both support required under the Council Tax Support Scheme and Council tax arrears;
 - the loss of Police Community Support Officers and the impact on anti-social behaviour and vandalism which could put further pressures on the Council's resources.

Chris Randall (Head of Finance Operations) attended the meeting for this item.

Alternative options considered and reasons for the decision –

As set out in the report.

Agreed –

- (1) that the current revenue monitoring position and action plans in place to reduce/mitigate shortfalls are noted;
- (2) the non-delegated revenue budget virements (shown in Table 4);
- (3) that the new schemes added to the Capital Programme totalling £1.063m are noted (as shown in Table 6);
- (4) further to recommendation (3) in minute 51 above, the investigations to include the impact of the proposals on communities and also consider any changes of the working family tax credits having regard to other welfare reform cuts with the outcome to be reported as part of the draft budget report.

The City Council is Recommended to increase the Capital Programme 2015 - 2020 to £287m (as shown in table 5).

53. **CITIES OF SERVICE UPDATE**

Tracey Lee (Chief Executive) submitted a report on the progress of the current Cities of Service projects since the local launch of the scheme in October 2014 and the future plans for the programme.

Councillor Penberthy (Cabinet Member for Co-operatives and Housing) –

- (a) introduced the progress report;
- (b) reported on two further projects planned to be launched in November 2015: Right to Read and Pledge Plymouth and undertook to consider a suggestion that primary school children taking part in the Right to Read Scheme should be encouraged to join a library;
- (c) the funding for the Cities of Service Chief Service Officer post would cease on 31 May 2016 and that to date there had been no indication of future funding;
- (d) thanked members of Cabinet, One Plymouth, partners, funders, volunteers for their work and support and Darin Halifax for his passion which had made the initiative such a success.

Cabinet Members were advised that a further report would be made to Cabinet at the end of the campaigns.

Darin Halifax (City of Service Chief Officer) attended the meeting for this item and reported examples of the impact of the scheme.

Cabinet paid tribute to Darin Halifax and Councillor Penberthy and stated that funding needed to be identified to support the projects.

Councillor Coker also paid tribute to Sandie Morrison who had unexpectedly passed away and had worked tirelessly for the Keyham Community.

Agreed that -

- (1) the report is noted;
- (2) the Cabinet Member for Co-operatives and Housing writes to the Prime Minister expressing concerns about the lack of a commitment on future funding for the Cities of Service Chief Officer posts.

CABINET APPOINTMENTS 2015/16

Cabinet: 8 December 2015



Report of Giles Perritt, Assistant Chief Executive

Cabinet Member: Councillor Evans

Cabinet are recommended to confirm the following appointment –

	Organisation	Members 2015/16
I	Plymouth Waterfront Partnership Advisory Board	Three ward councillors from the St Peter and the Waterfront and Sutton and Mount Gould Wards Councillor Penberthy to come off Councillor Tuffin to replace

This page is intentionally left blank

PLYMOUTH CITY COUNCIL

Subject: Living Street Scrutiny Review
Committee: Cabinet
Date: 8 December 2015
Cabinet Member: Councillor Mark Coker
CMT Member: Anthony Payne - Director for Place
Author: Adrian Trim, Head of Highways, Parking and Marine Services
Contact details Tel: 01752
Email: Adrian.Trim@plymouth.gov.uk
Ref:
Key Decision: No
Part: I

Purpose of the report:

The Cooperative Scrutiny Board set up a review of the Living Streets at the request of Working Plymouth Scrutiny Panel. The review meeting took place 2nd September 2015.

The view followed an earlier scrutiny meeting where officers welcomed the review to make improvements to what was initially introduced by the Highways Partnership as a pilot scheme

This report is to advise Cabinet on each of the recommendations which came from this review.

The Brilliant Co-operative Council Corporate Plan 2013/14 -2016/17:

Your Plymouth:

Growing Plymouth:

**Implications for Medium Term Financial Plan and Resource Implications:
Including finance, human, IT and land**

The recommendations as presented in this report do not pose any financial impact to existing budgets and will result in greater value for money as perceived by residents

Other Implications: e.g. Child Poverty, Community Safety, Health and Safety and Risk Management:

N/A

Equality and Diversity

Has an Equality Impact Assessment been undertaken? No

Recommendations and Reasons for recommended action:

Cabinet is recommended to make the following decisions for each of the Scrutiny recommendations:

- Recommendation 1 – Accept
- Recommendation 2 – Accept
- Recommendation 3 – Accept
- Recommendation 4 – Accept (except with modifications to (p))

Reason: n/a

Alternative options considered and rejected:

Not responding to the conclusions of the Working Plymouth Co-operative Review Scrutiny Group would mean that the evidence identified through the review would be ignored resulting in a potentially missed opportunity to deliver improvements and/or budget savings.

Published work / information:

Living Streets Scrutiny Review: Minutes of the Living Streets Scrutiny Review meeting – attached.

Background papers:

None

Sign off:

Fin	PC.PlanceF TC131 4 004.23 0114	Leg	JAR /194 06A /Jan 14	Mon Off	19 40 0/ DV S	HR		Assets		IT		Strat Proc	NA/SP U/346/ CP/01 14
Originating SMT Member Paul Barnard													
Has the Cabinet Member(s) agreed the contents of the report? Yes													

1.0 Introduction

At the Working Plymouth business meeting on 8 July 2015, the panel raised a number of concerns about the current process and performance of the Living Streets Scheme. Members requested improvements be made in the visibility of costs and timings of works and with Members having ownership and control over the residents requests.

A Co-operative Review was requested and agreed.

The Review panel were pleased to hear that the previous scrutiny meeting had already started to have an impact on the process, with the following improvements in place;

- (a) Cultural shift. An acknowledgement that the costing estimates undertaken by Amey's commercial team (quantity surveyors) were resulting in higher than necessary figures due to the inclusion of potential risk items. These estimates will now be undertaken by Amey's operations team, with site visits with supervisors. It should be noted that in accordance with the current Contract, the Council is only charged the actual costs of works undertaken, irrespective of the amount estimated up front.
- (b) all new requests from residents will be discussed with Members first before any response (other than a holding response) is sent;
- (c) Ward Packs have been amended to include more detail;

Although the panel welcomed the measures taken to date, after considerable scrutiny at the review meeting, Members recommended that a package of further improvements and actions be put forward to the Co-operative Scrutiny Board.

Recommendation 1: Communications with Members:

- (d) Officers to send updated Ward Packs to Members and arrange a Ward meeting as soon as possible to go through the historical requests on the spreadsheet;
- (e) Officers to ensure more proactive contact with Members and arrange for monthly on site meetings;
- (f) Officers to work with Members to explain what is regarded as in scope for Living Streets rather than classified as day to day highways maintenance;

Response: Accept

- (d) The updated ward packs will be sent to ward members on a monthly basis and will include a breakdown of the yearly ward budget. Ward packs are currently being updated during the ward review meetings to remove any historical schemes that may have been added at the inception of the Living Streets initiative but which do not meet the requirements.
- (e) An invitation to arrange a ward review meeting will be sent with the ward pack and weekly reminders will be sent. Officers will also be available on the morning before Full Council meetings and during the interval to give every opportunity for ward members to meet with officers.
- (f) Ward packs are currently being updated during the ward review meetings to ensure only in scope schemes remain.

Recommendation 2 : Cost of Schemes

- (g) Officers to provide some examples of the impact of the costing regime from Commercial team to Operations team, comparing some past and present estimates;
- (h) Officers to ensure that the actual end cost of works is notified to them and added to the Ward Pack spreadsheet;
- (i) Officers to ensure that at site meetings, options are considered to reduce costs and achieve greater value for money e.g. shrubs instead of bollards to prevent pavement and verge parking;

Response: Accept

- (g) Examples of like for like schemes which have been budget estimated by either the commercial team or the operations team are included with this report. It should be noted that the final out turn cost will be the same regardless of the method used to produce the budget estimate.
- (h) A column has been added to the ward pack spreadsheet for the inclusion of the final out turn cost of the scheme. For ease of comparison and reference it is adjacent to the budget estimate column.
- (i) Value engineering will be undertaken on every scheme and the long term maintenance cost implications of options will be highlighted to ward members. In instances where options impact other department's budgets and programmes they will be consulted and included in discussions with ward members.

Recommendation 3: Traffic Regulation Orders

- (j) Officers to challenge the media advertising rates to ensure that they are getting the best deal possible as it is difficult to defend the costs of a scheme to residents;
- (k) Officers to investigate reasons for delays and implement continuous improvement through lessons learned;

Response: Accept

- (j) Advertising costs were scrutinised in some depth approximately 18 months ago. The results and recommendations from that scrutiny will be reviewed and challenged to ensure that the best deal is achieved. The council's procurement department will be included in the exercise to ensure the advertising needs of the whole council are included to improve any economies of scale that may be available.
- (k) Regular weekly meetings are held between PCC and Amey officers to monitor and evaluate the progress of schemes. Best practice learning is identified and incorporated in future working practices.

Recommendation 4: Reporting and Accountability

- (l) all ward Councillors to receive their updated ward pack and arrange to meet to go through the historical requests at the next meeting;
- (m) the Ward pack to be amended to include columns for actual costs, actual approval dates, target completion dates and actual completion dates;
- (n) Amey's Ward Pack to give explanation for approved schemes not being completed by target dates with follow up discussion with PCC Officers around accountability;
- (o) if Amey made any mistakes during the Living Streets process they would be rectified by them at no cost to PCC;
- (p) a penalty charge would be incurred if Amey did not complete approved schemes by the completion date agreed with Ward Councillors and Officers;
- (q) a progress report be reviewed by Working Plymouth at its March 2016 meeting to track progress made against all these recommendations and actions.

Response: Accept. (except with modifications to (p))

- (l) This process has been implemented with a number of ward meetings completed and ward packs updated. Further invitations for ward meetings have been sent to elected members and officers will ensure that every effort is made to accommodate member's timeframes.
- (m) The ward packs have been updated to include the requested columns and data.
- (n) A comments column has been added to provide a record of the detail of any delays to schemes. Ward members will also be advised by email as soon as any potential delays become apparent.
- (o) Where clear and unambiguous requests have been made and agreed by all ward councillors and there are subsequent errors made by the Amey team, the cost of rectifying such errors will be borne by Amey. In the case where agreed works are delayed to allow inclusion within maintenance programmes to reduce costs these delays will be subject to discussion with all ward members and PCC officers and recorded within the ward pack spreadsheet. Ref: recommendation 2 (i)
- (p) Failure to meet the date agreed with ward members due to circumstances within Amey's control i.e. not weather or safety related etc., then the issue will be reviewed by the Head of Highways and a briefing will be sent to the affected members and Portfolio Holder.
- (q) A progress report will be provided for the March 2016 Working Plymouth meeting to track and review progress made against all these recommendations and actions.

This page is intentionally left blank

Scrutiny - Cooperative Scrutiny Reviews

Wednesday 2 September 2015

PRESENT:

Councillor Ricketts, in the Chair.
Councillors Deacon, Murphy and Storer.

Apologies for absence: Councillors Martin Leaves.

Also in attendance: Paul Anderson (Accounts Manager – Amey), Victoria Hutchins (Watchman in Chief – Amey), Gill Peele (Lead Officer), Helen Rickman (Democratic Support Officer), Daniel Sharpe (Planner – Amey) and Adrian Trim (Heads of Highways, PARKING AND

The meeting started at 1.30 pm and finished at 3.00 pm.

Note: At a future meeting, the Panel will consider the accuracy of these draft minutes, so they may be subject to change. Please check the minutes of that meeting to confirm whether these minutes have been amended.

1. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest in accordance with the code of conduct.

2. **CHAIR'S URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of Chair's Urgent Business.

3. **CO-OPERATIVE SCRUTINY REVIEW - LIVING STREETS**

(i) Background Information

Adrian Trim (Head of Highways, Parking and Marine Services), Daniel Sharpe (Planner - Amey), Victoria Hutchins (Watchman in Chief - Amey) and Paul Anderson (Accounts Manager – Amey) provided Members with a brief overview of the Living Streets Programme.

Members were advised that –

- (a) the Living Streets programme was started in 2013 as a pilot project to give Ward Councillors greater involvement in local highways improvements; funding relating to general neighbourhood schemes, safer school journeys and disabled driver parking spaces was previously managed by officers of the Council however it was considered that Members had a better awareness of work required relating to the schemes in their own wards. The budget was ring-fenced aimed at highways

work involving safety, sustainable travel and quality of life interventions;

- (b) the Living Streets budget was shared equally with each ward being allocated £4000; the safer school journeys funding was added to the Living Streets money and was allocated based on the size and number of schools in each ward;
- (c) it had previously been brought to the attention of Officers that there was a limited amount of funding for the Living Streets programme and as a result Officers introduced the ability to roll-over funding so that bigger projects, within the remit of the programme, could be undertaken;
- (d) lessons had been learned as a result of the Living Streets pilot whereby Officer engagement had increased along with an improved record of information sharing;
- (e) an update on Living Streets was provided to Members of the Working Plymouth scrutiny panel in July 2015; as a result of concerns raised by Members at the meeting, Officers had taken several steps to improve the process. Information provided to Ward Members would now be in an updated format whereby more information was detailed on specific projects including final costings, remaining balances and a financial summary. The process for undertaking estimates was also now the responsibility of the Operations Team other than the Commercial Team and the difference between original estimates and final costs seemed to have reduced as a result of this change;
- (f) Officers were aware of the financial pressures facing local authorities as well as the difficulty in justifying costs for projects within the Living Streets scheme to their constituents however confirmed that they were committed to value for money and the requirement to 'deliver more for less'.

In response to questions raised it was reported that –

- (g) the price of some of the Living Street's projects could initially seem to be costly however other factors needed to be considered with each project including the cost of materials, implementation, advertising (if required) and maintenance. With a particular focus upon the cost for installing a new grit bin estimated at £550, Members were advised that the cost linked to the price of the bin itself, for the bin to be filled three times, for seasonal checks and installation. Grit bins were reviewed on an annual basis and would be re-filled by the Council, as part of the highways maintenance budget, for as long as they were considered to serve a purpose;

- (h) Amey was a large company and had the ability of economy of scale on purchases however did not cost compare contracts as it was considered that best value was achieved;
- (i) the change of procedure for estimating Living Street project costs being undertaken by Amey's Operations Team other than the Commercial Team was realised as a result of concerns raised by Members at the Working Plymouth scrutiny panel in July 2015. It was highlighted that estimates originally provided to Members were significantly different than the actual cost of the project and this made it difficult for Members to plan future projects as it was not known how much funding was available. Costings were now considered to be more accurate and the Operations Team were more empowered because of the responsibility involved. It was now the role of the Supervisor to assess the work to be undertaken, plan how many operatives would be required, to ensure the correct materials were available and to meet with local residents and Ward Councillors to discuss requirements;
- (j) when undertaking projects Amey worked hard to reduce the amount of disruption to local residents by working more considerately; Amey undertake 'wet-cuts' to reduce the built up of dust and residue and always undertake a desk-study to check for service cables/ pipes within the area they are working. Amey also worked to reduce costs by trying to fit work in when convenient however understood that this may have an effect upon timescales;
- (k) the information provided to Members in the costings chart would be colour coded to enable Councillors to easily identify estimated costs, timescales, final costs, the start and completion dates and remaining funding available;
- (l) Amey valued regular meetings with Ward Councillors to go through projects related to their ward and discuss new requests and budgets; an email would be sent out to all Councillors requesting that they contact Amey to arrange monthly ward meetings to discuss the Living Streets project list;
- (m) it was expected that the funding available to Councillors for the Living Streets programme would continue next year however this was dependent upon support for the scheme;
- (n) the list provided to Members for Living Streets was 'historical' and contained some projects which would instead be supported by the Highways budget including the painting of double yellow lines to allow refuse vehicle access; all Ward Councillors would receive an updated list;

- (o) Officers Living Streets weekly review meetings had taken place since the beginning of the financial year in which a variety of people from Amey and Plymouth City Council would attend the discuss issues, costs and priorities;
- (p) it was expected that the process for requesting, advertising and implementing a TRO (Traffic Regulation Order) was approximately 4-6 months from start to finish; this timescale included the statutory requirement to advertise the TRO twice for a specific number of days and get the decision signed by the appropriate Cabinet Member and sealed by the Council. Advertising TROs was a costly requirement with a single advert in the local paper expecting to cost £500; Amey tried to batch TROs together to reduce advertising costs however this delayed the implementation of schemes;
- (q) the further £500 charged by Amey for TROs included the cost for operatives to go out and measure the site, draw up plans, to write the TRO, manage the advertisement process, write the report on consultation, for an executive decision to be written for the appropriate Cabinet Member, to undertake meetings with Ward Councillors, for the TRO decision to be sealed by the Council and then for the TRO to be installed;
- (r) Officers were unaware of the specific issues, raised at the meeting, that Councillors had with TROs in their respective wards however accepted that cost and time were the two main areas of concern. This was attributed to the costs associated with advertising and the influx of Living Street project applications received nearing the end of the financial year;
- (s) Officers were unaware of double yellow lines being painted in the incorrect street in the Efford and Lipson ward and advised Members that the delay in painting the lines in the correct street was due to the TRO being incorrectly advertised; a new TRO would need to be raised;
- (t) with regards to the problems associated with the TRO in the Drake ward, Officers were unaware that yellow lines had been incorrectly painted;
- (u) Officers had previously supported a proposal to eradicate the necessity of publishing TROs in the local newspaper however this was not supported by the Department for Transport therefore the requirement remained. Officers had previously negotiated costs with the local newspaper however were in a difficult position as there was only one local newspaper reducing the competition. Officers had also undertaken a

benchmarking exercise to establish costs for advertising TROs and Plymouth was considered mid-range. It was agreed that Officers would review the TRO process to try to streamline the process and start cost re-negotiations;

- (v) TROs were only required to be re-advertised if a change increasing restrictions to the highway was received after the original advert had been placed; this would incur further costs to re-advertise. In the Honicknowle ward Amey negotiated with residents and Councillors to plant shrubs instead of introducing bollards to act as a physical barrier. This was a much cheaper solution, was more aesthetically pleasing and avoided any possible problems with service cables installed under where the bollards were initially required;
- (w) Officers would provide Members with numerous examples of when a job had been delivered for less than originally costed;
- (x) a further column would be added to the Councillors Ward Pack Living Streets Information Sheet detailing the final outturn cost of each project completed;
- (y) the Safer School Journeys funding allocation was reviewed every three years to account for new schools being added to the system; a review was due to be undertaken this year.

Members raised the following concerns with the Living Streets programme:

- (z) that the cost of projects, specifically including TROs, was expensive and difficult to justify to members of the public;
- (aa) the time it takes to request, advertise and implement TROs was too lengthy;
- (bb) mistakes had been made by Amey however it was hoped that the monthly ward councillor meetings would help with this issue; it was not known who would pay for mistakes, Amey or Ward Councillors out of the Living Streets budget?
- (cc) the cost of advertising TROs, which was a statutory process, was expensive and more negotiations needed to be undertaken;
- (dd) processes for administering Living Streets initially lacked detail however information packs were being amended to include relevant information regarding cost, timescales and progress.

The Chair thanked Officers for their attendance at the meeting.

- (ii) Co-operative Review Request Form

Members noted the Co-operative Review Request Form.

4. **Summary and Review**

At the Working Plymouth business meeting on 8 July 2015, the panel raised a number of concerns about the current process and performance of the Living Streets Scheme. Members requested improvements be made in the visibility of costs and timings of works and with Members having ownership and control over the residents requests.

A Co-operative Review was requested and agreed.

The Review panel were pleased to hear that the previous scrutiny meeting had already started to have an impact on the process, with the following improvements in place;

- (a) cultural shift. An acknowledgement that the costing estimates undertaken by Amey's Commercial team(quantity surveyors) were resulting in higher than necessary figures. These will now be undertaken by Amey's Operations team, with site visits with supervisors;
- (b) all new requests from residents will be discussed with Members first before any response (other than a holding response) is sent;
- (c) Ward Packs have been amended to include more detail;

Although the panel welcomed the measures taken to date, after considerable scrutiny at the review meeting, Members recommend that a package of further improvements and actions be put forward to the Co-operative Scrutiny Board.

Communications with Members:

- (d) Officers to send updated Ward Packs to Members and arrange a Ward meeting as soon as possible to go through the historical requests on the spreadsheet;
- (e) Officers to ensure more proactive contact with Members and arrange for monthly on site meetings;
- (f) Officers to work with Members to explain what is regarded as in scope for Living Streets rather than classified as day to day highways maintenance;

Cost of Schemes

- (g) Officers to provide some examples of the impact of the costing regime from Commercial team to Operations team, comparing some past and present estimates;
- (h) Officers to ensure that the actual end cost of works is notified to them and

added to the Ward Pack spreadsheet;

- (i) Officers to ensure that at site meetings, options are considered to reduce costs and achieve greater value for money e.g. shrubs instead of bollards to prevent pavement and verge parking;

Traffic Regulation Orders

- (j) Officers to challenge the media advertising rates to ensure that they are getting the best deal possible as it is difficult to defend the costs of a scheme to residents;
- (k) Officers to investigate reasons for delays and implement continuous improvement through lessons learned;

Reporting and Accountability

- (l) all ward Councillors to receive their updated ward pack and arrange to meet to go through the historical requests at the next meeting;
- (m) the Ward pack to be amended to include columns for actual costs, actual approval dates, target completion dates and actual completion dates;
- (n) Amey's Ward Pack to give explanation for approved schemes not being completed by target dates with follow up discussion with PCC Officers around accountability;
- (o) if Amey made any mistakes during the Living Streets process they would be rectified by them at no cost to PCC;
- (p) a penalty charge would be incurred if Amey did not complete approved schemes by the completion date agreed with Ward Councillors and Officers;
- (q) a progress report be reviewed by Working Plymouth at its March 2016 meeting to track progress made against all these recommendations and actions.

5. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

There were no items of exempt business.

This page is intentionally left blank