

CITY OF PLYMOUTH



Overview and Scrutiny Commission

Woodford Traffic Calming Scheme

Consultation and Procurement Processes

December 2004

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Preface | 4 |
| 1.0 SUMMARY | 5 |
| 2.0 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS | 6 |
| 3.1 Overview and Scrutiny Commission | 8 |
| 3.2 Terms of Reference | 8 |
| 3.3 Method of Investigation..... | 9 |
| 4.0 FINDINGS..... | 9 |
| 4.1 Traffic Calming Scheme | 9 |
| 4.2 Site Visit..... | 10 |
| 4.3 How much did the scheme cost?..... | 10 |
| 4.4 Was the scheme deliverable within the original budget figure?..... | 10 |
| 4.5 What were the reasons for the additional costs?..... | 11 |
| 4.6 What were the reasons for variations to the scheme?..... | 12 |
| 4.7 What management decisions were taken in relation to variations to the scheme and to the costs? | 12 |
| 4.8 What consultation was undertaken?..... | 12 |
| 5.0 PROCUREMENT OF HIGHWAYS WORKS | 13 |
| 5.1 Present Procurement Methods | 13 |
| 5.2 Future Plans for Procuring Highways Works | 14 |
| 6.0 OMBUDSMAN REPORT ON WHITSONCROSS TRAFFIC CALMING SCHEME | 15 |
| 7.0 CONCLUSIONS | 15 |
| 7.1 General..... | 15 |
| 7.2 Consultation Process..... | 16 |
| 7.3 Procurement | 16 |
| 8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS | 17 |
| 9.0 MONITORING | 17 |
| Appendix 1 – Reference Materials | 18 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Appendix 2 – Contributors..... | 20 |
| Appendix 3 – Timeline..... | 21 |
| Appendix 4 – Consultation Review..... | 22 |
| Appendix 5 – Scope Change Register | 23 |

Preface



The following scrutiny report on the procurement and consultation processes for the Woodford Traffic Calming Scheme was undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission. It focussed on the processes in particular because of the need to learn from this experience and improve for the future.

The Commission recognised at the outset that there appeared to be continued dissatisfaction with the traffic calming scheme and it is the responsibility of the Cabinet Member to consider any amendments to the scheme weighed up against competing priorities of other schemes.

It is important to note that this was one of the first schemes undertaken under new partnership arrangements established with Pell Frischmann.

The significant increase in the outturn of the cost of the scheme is of concern to Councillors especially in the light of increasing Government pressure to improve budgetary controls and monitoring procedures.

During the course of the scrutiny we found that many good steps had already been taken to improve procurement procedures generally and particularly with regard to highway schemes. Our report sets out ways in which consultation could be improved giving residents better quality information in ways in which it can be understood and interpreted.

It also recommends that contractors in partnership arrangements should be better supported to improve relationships and promote trust between partners.

Councillor Mary Aspinall

Chair, Overview and Scrutiny Commission

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This review focussed on the procurement and consultation processes adopted for the development and implementation of the Woodford Traffic Calming Scheme and improvements that could be made to provide better consultation and procurement with regard to traffic calming schemes.
- 1.2 The outcome of this would be to achieve greater public satisfaction, better budgetary control and value for money.
- 1.3 Woodford Traffic Calming Scheme was one of the first schemes undertaken following the establishment of partnering arrangements.
- 1.4 A budget of £250,000 was allocated for the scheme that rose to £270,000 following a delegated decision, even though Pell Frischmann had submitted a Feasibility Study indicating costs of £291,000 (excluding certain items).
- 1.5 At the design stage, the response from residents was good and in favour of the scheme, however, as the build progressed the level of issues increased and further consultation was necessary to address these matters.
- 1.6 Increased costs were attributed to further consultation, redesign, supervision and contractor's costs.
- 1.7 During the process Pell Frischmann was in regular contact with a nominated Officer within Transport Services although at that time reporting and decision making arrangements may not have been clearly defined.
- 1.8 Steps have been taken to review Contract Standing Orders and the Council is moving towards a qualitative procurement strategy.
- 1.9 A number of steps have been identified to improve future consultation exercises.

2.0 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 In making their recommendations the Commission would emphasise that the Woodford Traffic Calming Scheme was the first traffic calming scheme undertaken under the new partnering arrangement for Design Services, the first of its kind for the Authority and was undertaken at a time when the City Council was undergoing major changes to its democratic structure through the Modernisation of Local Government process, including experimentation with Area Committees for which Plympton was the pilot.

2.2 Recommendations

2.2.1 The scheme be evaluated by the Cabinet Member to establish whether it has met the original objectives and required outcomes.

2.2.2 That once an issue has been agreed for scrutiny, the matter should be left solely to the consideration of the Panel dealing with it, without being prejudiced or influenced in any way and the Standards Committee be invited as part of their work programme to review this recommendation and take whatever action they deem fit such as re-emphasising the importance of the independence of the scrutiny process from the Executive.

2.2.3 Whilst recognising that no evidence of Executive Member influence was substantiated during the scrutiny process, it is felt important that a Leader of the Council should not use his position to influence or Chair an Area Committee and emphasise that Executive Members should be mindful of the Code of Conduct when playing any part in the decision making process where issues relate to his/her ward and the Constitutional Affairs Committee be asked to consider this in relation to Part 5 of the Constitution relating to Area Committees.

2.2.4 A corporate policy for the retention of and archiving documents relating to contracts be introduced to include timeframes.

2.2.5 The procurement of building contracts on Egan principles* (Rethinking Construction) be supported to replace the current sequential lowest cost tendering process

2.2.6 With regard to future design and implementation of traffic calming schemes –

- ❑ clear and precise criteria for eligibility be established with safety being first and foremost;
- ❑ a Project Manager be clearly identified to the contractor at the outset and a list of names provided in respect of who they can take instructions from;
- ❑ the design and scoping exercise should be more rigorous to ensure that all aspects of the scheme are included prior to costings;
- ❑ consultation guidance, in accordance with that published nationally, be developed in conjunction with Plymouth City Council's Corporate Consultation Officer –

in order that sufficient time is allowed to ensure that everyone affected can contribute;

to ensure that a consultation programme is drawn up and realistic estimates included within the scheme's costings;

- ❑ Ward Councillors be fully briefed on proposed traffic calming schemes.
- ❑ A map, background information and a questionnaire be distributed with any letter drop advising of public exhibitions to enable those unable to attend to respond adequately.
- ❑ all issues (both positive and negative) should be made clear to residents;
- ❑ the method of describing schemes be reviewed, and more informative ways, such as the use of Computer Aided Design to demonstrate a virtual scheme, be explored.
- ❑ Plymouth City Council/Contractor representation at public meetings be reviewed to ensure that sufficient persons are present to respond to all queries raised.
- ❑ Once a scheme has been approved, the budget for that scheme should not be varied without prior consent of the relevant Cabinet Member.
- ❑ Consideration be given to the implementation of area-wide schemes in a phased approach with consultation at each stage to ensure residents understand the true impact of the scheme.
- ❑ Sufficient information be provided if revisions to schemes are proposed, highlighting additions and including a map with a letter drop;
- ❑ Accurate and detailed records of all forms of communication during the course of a contract be kept with verbal instructions being discouraged and, if absolutely necessary, at least recorded in print;
- ❑ Cabinet Members be asked to implement a system to ensure that they are briefed by Heads of Service on amendments to schemes and consequential budgetary implications.

3.0 INTRODUCTION

3.1 Overview and Scrutiny Commission

3.1.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Commission considered a call in of a delegated decision TE&SS 88 03/04 taken by the Cabinet Member for Transport, Environment and Street Services relating to the requirement for an increase of £170,000 in the budget allocation for the Woodford Traffic Calming Scheme i.e. from £270,000 to £440,000 arising from contractual obligations associated both with the construction of the works and the partnering arrangements.

3.1.2 The call in submitted by Councillors Nicky and Tom Wildy requested a review of the decision particularly with regard to the significant increase in the budget and to consider what changes, if any, needed to be made to procurement procedures to prevent this from occurring in the future.

3.1.3 The Commission heard the call-in in May 2004 confirmed the delegated decision and agreed to undertake a review of the procurement and consultation procedures carried out on the scheme with a view to preventing similar circumstances occurring in the future.

3.1.4 The Commission began its work in May 2004 and whilst some Members were unable to participate because of holiday arrangements or had been involved in the decision making process, the Members undertaking the review were –

- ❑ Councillor Mary Aspinall (Chair)
- ❑ Councillor Andy Kerswell (Vice Chair)
- ❑ Councillor Ken Foster
- ❑ Councillor Ted Fry
- ❑ Councillor Brian Vincent

3.1.5 Throughout the review the Commission was supported by a small team of Officers, Chris Sane (Interim Transportation, Infrastructure and Engineering Manager) who acted as Lead Officer for the review, David Shepperd (Head of Legal Services), John Cremins (Head of Strategic Procurement) and Nicola Kirby (Scrutiny Manager).

3.1.6 Legal advice was received with regard to participation by Chris Sane (Transportation, Infrastructure & Engineering Manager) and the Commission having heard from the Transportation, Infrastructure & Engineering Manager, was satisfied that he had taken no part in the decision making process on or in the delivery of the traffic calming scheme.

3.1.7 Councillor Fry declared an interest as a former Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission in his then capacity to sign urgent delegated decisions.

3.2 Terms of Reference

3.2.1 The Commission being aware of continuing public dissatisfaction with the existing traffic calming scheme, focussed on examination of the procurement and consultation processes undertaken for the scheme with a view to establishing improved practices for future schemes.

- 3.2.2 The examination in particular sought to answer the following questions –
- ❑ How much did the scheme cost?
 - ❑ Was the scheme deliverable within the original budget figure?
 - ❑ What were the reasons for the additional costs?
 - ❑ What were the reasons for variations to the scheme?
 - ❑ What management decisions were taken in relation to variations to the scheme and to the costs?
 - ❑ What consultation was undertaken?

3.2.3 As part of the investigation Members also wished to make an assessment of the views of local residents on the existing scheme

3.3 Method of Investigation

3.3.1 At the beginning of the Commission's work, Members made a site visit to Woodford by bus to view the traffic calming measures (Members were accompanied by Councillor Mrs Pengelly).

3.3.2 The Commission was then briefed on the process for the implementation of the scheme with a view to drawing a time line. This is shown in Appendix 3.

3.3.3 The Commission then invited a number of Councillors, Officers and former Officers to give evidence. Four evidence taking sessions were held, hearing views from –

- ❑ three Ward Representatives;
- ❑ three former Portfolio Holders;
- ❑ two former Leaders;
- ❑ three Officers;
- ❑ one former Officer;
- ❑ the Consultant

3.3.4 Appendix 2 shows all the people who appeared as witnesses before the Commission.

3.3.5 In order to assess the views of local residents on the existing scheme, the Commission considered summaries of letters received.

4.0 FINDINGS

4.1 Traffic Calming Scheme

4.1.1 Woodford had been identified as a proposed 20 mph zone at least since 1992 and the scheme had moved up the rankings within the transport capital programme as other schemes were implemented.

4.1.2 Because of issues with in house capacity at that time, approval was given to the design of the Woodford Traffic Calming Scheme by an outside consultant by the Development and Transport Committee in January 2001. Partnership arrangements were established with Pell Frischmann for civil engineering design,

transportation and investigation services in June 2001 to support Plymouth City Council on a wide range of projects. One of the projects was Woodford Traffic Calming Scheme.

4.2 Site Visit

4.2.1 A site visit around the Woodford area provided an opportunity for Members to see the various traffic calming measures and to assess the extent of the scheme.

4.2.2 The journey by bus was uncomfortable due to the number of speed cushions and the impact of the traffic calming measures were exacerbated by unsympathetic parking by some drivers.

4.3 How much did the scheme cost?

4.3.1 The project financial summary is set out below –

| Item | Original Estimate £ | Final Outturn £ |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Feasibility / preliminary design | 7,500.00 | 7,691.85 |
| Detail design | 12,500.00 | 13,590.20 |
| Consultations | 9,869.00 | 50,353.94 |
| Supervision | 18,750.00 | 28,124.36 |
| Contractor | 208,467.85 | 290,636.02 |
| Street lighting / signs | 41,000.00 | 42,000.00 |
| TOTAL | 298,086.85 | 432,396.37 |

4.4 Was the scheme deliverable within the original budget figure?

4.4.1 The Feasibility Study and Design Brief submitted by Pell Frischmann in December 2001 referred to the scheme covering the primary routes (Plymbridge Road, Larkham Lane, Stonebarton Road, Seymour Road, St Margaret's Road and Woodford Avenue) and the original budget was based on those routes. At that time, the estimated cost highlighted in the report was £291,560 (see table in para 4.4.2), including a limited number of additional routes and excluding the cost of street lighting although the exclusion of the street lighting costs was not highlighted in the feasibility report. Street lighting and signing were designed and commissioned by the Council and at that time there was no estimate of the costs available.

4.4.2 The costs detailed in the feasibility study and design brief were –

| Work | Estimated Cost £ |
|--|---------------------|
| Estimated construction cost on original scheme | 187,500 |
| Construction risk / Prelims | 22,600 |
| Identified other works that may be necessary | 38,000 |
| Feasibility / Design/ Supervision | 38,000 |
| Traffic Regulation Orders | 1,000 |
| Allowance for service diversions | <u>4,460</u> |
| Total | £291,560 |
| Excluding Street lighting | £41,000 |

4.5 What were the reasons for the additional costs?

4.5.1 The significant additional costs arose from the following items –

| Item | Original Estimate £ | Additional Costs | Final Outturn £ |
|---|------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Consultations | 9,869 | | |
| redesign | | 19,480 | |
| additional consultation | | 16,476 | |
| other | | 4,529 | |
| Final outturn of consultancy fees | | | 50,354 |
| Supervision | 18,750 | | |
| Additional costs | | 9,374 | |
| Final outturn of consultancy fees | | | 28,124 |
| Contractor | 208,468 | | |
| Remeasured works | | 17,358 | |
| Additional measured works (site instructed) | | 14,193 | |
| Day works / traffic management etc. | | 7,970 | |
| Works in relation to SEC / WPD | | 25,597 | |
| Works on new bus boarders | | 17,051 | |
| Contract total | | | 290,637 |
| Street lighting / signs | | 42,000 | 42,000 |
| TOTAL | 237087 | | 411,115 |
| SIGNIFICANT ADDITIONAL COSTS | | 174,028 | |

4.5.2 The additional consultation was detailed in a scope change register (shown at Appendix 5) that was submitted to the Council periodically and discussed at regular monthly meetings with Transport Services. The register was not formally agreed with the Council. Having regard to the overall cost of the scheme and the size of the scheme, the professional view of Officers was that the consultancy fees were considered to be reasonable.

4.5.3 The need to redesign was considered by the Head of Strategic Procurement to be a reasonable reaction in response to complaints.

4.5.4 The increased supervision costs were agreed with the City Council as a compensation event under the contract.

4.5.5 The additional costs relating to the contractor arose from various requests by the City Council for variations, for example, for the installation of bus boarders.

4.5.6 At the time of the preparation of the cost of the scheme, no estimate was available for the cost of street lighting and signing which included illuminated signs and bollards. The scheme was designed and commissioned by the City Council and the costs included when known.

4.6 What were the reasons for variations to the scheme?

- 4.6.1 The variations were detailed in the scope change register (shown at Appendix 5) and were made as a result of consultation with residents, Councillors and Officers.
- 4.6.2 Further routes were added at the request of residents to prevent 'rat running' as a consequence of traffic calming measures on primary routes.
- 4.6.3 Specific instructions had been received from Transport Services not to include bus boarders in the original proposals because the boarders were not suitable for buses using the routes. Those instructions were later changed and 6 sites for boarders were identified of which 4 were built as a variation.
- 4.6.4 Objections received in response to the advertisement of the Traffic Regulation Orders were considered by the Plympton Area Committee in July 2002 and actions were taken to address those objections. At that meeting, the Area Committee noted the Officer's report.
- 4.6.5 Following a safety inspection of on-site works, some variations were requested and the Commission was advised that all safety issues associated with the construction works were addressed by the contractor.

4.7 What management decisions were taken in relation to variations to the scheme and to the costs?

- 4.7.1 Councillor Wigen, as former Portfolio Holder for Development and Transport, did not recall considering any variations to the approved scheme. He was unaware of increasing costs until the very end of his administration.
- 4.7.2 Councillor Nicholson, as former Chair of the Area Committee, advised that no budget issues had been raised with him at any time by either Pell Frischmann or Transport Services.
- 4.7.3 Hannon Young had originally submitted a programme of works based on a street by street basis. This programme was not adhered to as Hannon Young had sub-contracted a large proportion of labour. The failings relating to the implementation of the programme were brought to the attention of Hannon Young by Pell Frischmann but Pell Frischmann were unable to instruct sub-contractors direct.
- 4.7.4 The Council had a duty to provide support to Pell Frischmann who was acting as the Council's representative. Very little support had been given in this instance compared with other contracts under partnership arrangements.

4.8 What consultation was undertaken?

- 4.8.1 The consultation undertaken with residents is set out in Appendix 4 and the key issues identified from this process are as follows.
- 4.8.2 The scheme was under severe time pressure, which resulted in insufficient time being allowed for thorough consultation.
- 4.8.3 It does not appear that the full impact of the scheme was made clear to residents or understood by them. The benefits of the scheme were emphasized (e.g. traffic speed reduction, safety etc.) but it does not appear that the drawbacks

were. It was not made clear to residents that although there were benefits, it would also mean that they may have to travel over quite a large number of road bumps to get to and from home.

- 4.8.4 At the second letter drop stage the addition of certain roads to the scheme was not well highlighted.
- 4.8.5 In hindsight the questionnaire could be improved. It was noted however that the questionnaire was very similar to ones used by Pell Frischmann on other projects and this was the first time they encountered such problems.
- 4.8.6 There appears to have been a distinct lack of guidance and assistance from the City Council. Although the venture was a partnership, it seems that the City Council let Pell Frischmann deal with all the consultation queries.
- 4.8.7 Information was sought from Devon and Cornwall Police, the Westcountry Ambulance Service and the Fire Officer on their involvement in the consultation exercise and seeking their views on the outcome. Devon and Cornwall Police responded indicating their role in the consultation in the exercise. No responses were received from the Westcountry Ambulance Trust or the Fire Officer.
- 4.8.8 The Commission considered summaries of complaints / comments received from residents –
- ❑ following the implementation of the scheme and prior to the scrutiny review;
 - ❑ submitted by Councillor Nicholson from residents following the implementation of the scheme and prior to the scrutiny review;
 - ❑ by the Chair during the scrutiny process following the distribution of a letter by Councillor Nicholson to residents.

5.0 PROCUREMENT OF HIGHWAYS WORKS

5.1 Present Procurement Methods

- 5.1.1 The traditional method of procurement is sequential lowest cost tendering where the concept is that designers should design, constructors construct and maintainers maintain. A free market will drive efficiency and suppliers will not offer what they cannot afford.
- 5.1.2 Relationships in the traditional model are typified by low bids win where suppliers are encouraged to bid low. Low bid prices are unsustainable and suppliers have to increase prices. The result is adversarial behaviour.
- 5.1.3 The issues from sequential lowest cost tendering are –
- ❑ Winners misunderstand the project
 - ❑ Make wrong assumptions
 - ❑ Make mistakes
 - ❑ See an opportunity to exploit change
 - ❑ Do not price items they consider 'others'
 - ❑ Make 'commercial decisions'
 - ❑ Risk takers win

Most significantly the client is unaware of what is excluded until it is too late.

5.2 Future Plans for Procuring Highways Works

5.2.1 The Corporate Plan 2004-2007 has the objective that all building contracts are procured on Egan¹ principles by December 2005. The Head of Strategic Procurement indicated that the new Procurement Strategy would aim to meet the principles and aims set out in paragraphs 5.2.2 to 5.2.5.

5.2.2 The principles of partnering to achieve cost, time and quality improvement are –

- Early involvement of suppliers in design, costing, planning, often with contractors taking the lead.
- Long term relationships between client, designers, contractors and key suppliers.
- A detailed understanding of cost and other aspects of performance and targets set for improvement from project to project.
- Collaborative contracts that accept at the start that contractors should make a reasonable profit.
- Collaborative behaviour with everyone incentivised to deliver for the client.

5.2.3 The City Council in Year 1 will aim to –

- Understand current levels of performance – cost, time and quality and customer satisfaction.
- Procure partners to 5 year frameworks for key areas of spend.
- Establish single client gateway for the management of all projects.

5.2.4 The City Council in Year 2 will aim to –

- Reduce costs by 10%.
- Set targets for delivery improvement within frameworks.

5.2.5 The City Council in Year 5 will aim to –

- Reduce scheme costs by 30%.
- 95% projects delivered on time.
- 95% projects delivered to budget.
- customer satisfaction targets set and achieved.
- achieve top quartile performance.

5.2.6 This concept is currently being employed by Rethinking Construction Beacon Councils including Barnsley, Middlesborough, Norfolk County Council, Stockton on Tees, Mid-Devon District Council and St Helen's.

¹ Report by Sir John Egan entitled "Rethinking Construction" can be located at the web site:
<http://www.dti.gov.uk/construction/rethink/report/index.htm>

6.0 OMBUDSMAN REPORT ON WHITSONCROSS TRAFFIC CALMING SCHEME

6.1 In reaching his conclusion of maladministration on a complaint concerning the implementation of a traffic calming scheme at Whitsoncross, the Ombudsman drew the Council's attention to Government advice that made it clear that highways and planning departments should integrate their activities and that in developing any highways scheme, regard should be had to any historic environment. In the consultation process on Whitsoncross Traffic Calming Scheme, the Planning Department were involved too late to have any influence on the basic scheme design.

6.2 The Ombudsman went on to say that the public consultation arranged by the Transport Department was limited. Only the agreed scheme was displayed so that the public were not able to comment on any other options; and the full impact of it did not include details of lighting and street furniture which would make a significant contribution to the impact of the scheme. Those failings were maladministration.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS

7.1 General

7.1.1 The scheme was undertaken at a time of great change within the local authority with the introduction of Executive arrangements. At this time reporting and decision making arrangements may not have been clearly defined for Officers or Members.

7.1.2 The extent of on street parking in the Woodford Area had not been taken into consideration in the design of the scheme and had exacerbated the impact of the traffic calming measures. It is clear that local residents did not understand the scale of the scheme or the impact that the scheme would have on them.

7.1.3 The cost of this scheme and subsequent amendments had not been monitored and there appeared to be no reporting mechanisms in place to the Cabinet Member.

7.1.4 The Commission considered it should be noted that Members of the Executive should ensure that appropriate decision-making walls are identified and maintained when Executive decisions and Ward interests conflict. To this end, Officers can assist in this process through appropriate advice to Members.

7.1.5 It was unhelpful and misleading for Ward Councillors to distribute a letter to lobby local residents during the scrutiny process. As a result of correspondence sent out to local residents after the review commenced the Commission felt that it would be difficult to obtain independent views of the residents and as a direct consequence, a decision for the Commission to meet in the Ward was withdrawn.

7.1.6 During this investigation a number of relevant documents requested could not be produced and it was noted that there appeared to be no corporate policy on the retention and archiving of documentation.

7.2 Consultation Process

- 7.2.1 A significant amount of consultation was undertaken by Pell Frischmann and a good response rate was achieved from the public exhibitions for which they should be commended.
- 7.2.2 The quality of consultation was restricted as the scheme was under severe time pressure, which resulted in insufficient time being allowed for thorough consultation.
- 7.2.3 Good consultation relies on the fact that consultees are sufficiently informed of all the issues to give an informed view. If people do not know or understand the full facts then it is not possible for them to respond well. It is clear that local residents did not understand the scale of the scheme nor appreciate how its full impact would effect them.
- 7.2.4 The Committee acknowledges that at the time the consultation was being carried out on this scheme the City Council did not have its own Corporate Consultation Officer. The subsequent appointment of Sandy Teske and the growth of the consultation team was both welcomed and supported.
- 7.2.5 There appears to have been a distinct lack of guidance and assistance from the City Council on this scheme. Had the City Council assisted Pell Frischmann by dealing with all the consultation queries, the City Council would not have been charged for the work and this would have been reflected in the charges. There would however have been the cost of Officers' time in dealing with these matters. Equally it was felt that the impact of working within the democratic process had not been appreciated by the Consultants and allowances had not been made within the original costings for the scheme.
- 7.2.6 116 letters have been received from residents in response to a letter circulated by Councillor Nicholson at the commencement of the scrutiny process that did not accurately reflect the purpose of this scrutiny review. In view of the perceived level of concern relating to the existing scheme, the Commission was surprised at the lack of attendance at meetings by residents.

7.3 Procurement

- 7.3.1 The procurement process of the lowest bid wins provides for no qualitative aspect in the tender process.
- 7.3.2 Pell Frischmann had recognised that Hannon Young, Contractors, were under resourced and struggled with the programme resulting in performance issues. There was an increasing public reaction during the build process with works being undertaken simultaneously on various sites throughout the area. Pell Frischmann were unable to address these issues as works had been subcontracted.
- 7.3.3 The lack of support by the City Council to Pell Frischmann appeared to be as a result of the Council's intention at the outset, to compare in house provision with that provided by external consultants.
- 7.3.4 The Committee welcomed the appointment of John Cremins, Head of Strategic Procurement, and the introduction of a Procurement Strategy.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 There are a number of recommendations set out at Section 2 of the report.

9.0 MONITORING

9.1 The Commission will review the matter at its meeting on 21st April 2005 and the Cabinet Member is requested to attend and report on progress.

Appendix 1 – Reference Materials

1. Call in return form SC 162 03/04
2. Delegated decision TE&SS 88 03/04
3. Minute 224 of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission of 6th May 2004
4. Minute 146 of the Joint Highways Committee of 29th January 1998 on the priority lists review
5. Minute 296 of the Transport Committee of 4th February 1999 and report T241 98/99
6. Minute 252 of the Transport Committee of 27th January 2000 and report T162 99/00
7. Minute 126 of the Development and Transport Committee of 28th September 2000 and report D&T 92 00/01
8. Minutes of the Development and Transport Committee of 23rd November 2000 (noting the decision to use external contractors for the scheme) and 25th January 2001 (approving the scheme)
9. Minute 282 of the Development and Transport Committee of 25th January 2001 and report D&T 194 00/01
10. Minute of the Development and Transport Committee of 26th April 2001 and report D&T 289 00/01
11. Delegated decision D&T 66 01/02
12. Proposal brief for Stage 1 Traffic Calming Proposals for Woodford July 2001
13. Delegated decision D&T 234 (01/02)
14. Delegated decision THRR 158 (02/03)
15. Minutes and reports of the Plympton Area Committee from 26th October 2000 to 14th July 2003 on the scheme
16. Presentation by Plymouth City Council/ Pell Frischmann Partnership to Plympton Area Committee 17 September 2001
17. Progress report by Pell Frischmann to Plympton Area Committee 29 July 2002
18. Presentation by Plymouth City Council/ Pell Frischmann Partnership to Public meeting 10 March 2003
19. Report to the Plympton Area Committee of 11th March 2002 on design proposals for approval.
20. Various correspondence and reports submitted by the Transportation, Infrastructure & Engineering Manager from which the timeline was drawn.
21. Plymouth City Council Consultation and Participation Strategy 2004

22. Standing Orders and Delegations relating to contracts for works, supplies and services amended as at 28/1/99
23. Standards Committee minute 8 (99/00) relating to employee attendance at meetings
24. Terms of reference of the Plympton Area Committee
25. Contract documents
26. Summaries of complaints received
27. Response from Devon and Cornwall Police on consultation undertaken.
28. Ombudsman report on complaint relating to Whitsoncross Traffic Calming Scheme
29. Presentation slides from Pell Frischmann.
30. Presentation slides from John Cremins.
31. Presentation slides from Sandy Teske.
32. Benchmarking information on in-house and external contract provision.

Appendix 2 – Contributors

The Panel would like to express their sincere thanks to all those who provided information and advice:

- Paul Barnard (former Head of Transport and Planning Services)
- Ray Bentley (former Head of Transport)
- Richard Colby (Project Manager, Pell Frischmann)
- John Cremins (Head of Strategic Procurement)
- PC Tanner (Devon and Cornwall Police)
- Sandy Teske (Corporate Consultation Officer)
- Councillor Mrs Ford (Ward Representative, Plympton St Mary Ward)
- Councillor James (Ward Representative, Plympton St Mary Ward)
- Councillor Nicholson (Ward Representative, Plympton St Mary Ward, Former Leader of the City Council, Former Chair of the Plympton Area Committee)
- Councillor Wheeler (former Portfolio Holder for Transport, Environment and Street Services)
- Councillor Wiggins (former Leader of the City Council)

Appendix 3 – Timeline

WOODFORD TRAFFIC CALMING STAGE 1

| Date | Action |
|------------------------------|---|
| 25 th January 01 | Approval to the Woodford Scheme being designed by outside consultant was given by Development & Transport Committee (minute 282) |
| 1 st July 01 | Pell Frischmann were appointed as the PCC's Engineering Consultancy partner |
| 2 nd August 01 | The Head of Transport in Consultation with the Executive Committee Member for D&T decided to utilise Pell Frischmann (PF) for the design of the Woodford Scheme |
| 10 th August 01 | Brief issued to Pell Frischmann by Transport Services to price |
| 30 th August 01 | PF submitted a fee proposal for the brief totalling £36,582 but highlighted additional works which were not included in this fee. The basic fee proposal was in accordance with the Partnership Contract and PF were asked to provide details / justification for matters not covered |
| 12 th November 01 | PF presented progress report with details of public consultation to Plympton Area Committee |
| December 01 | Submission of Feasibility study |
| 18 th December 01 | Transport Services instructed PF to proceed to detailed design |
| 11 th March 02 | PF presented a progress report to Plympton Area Committee presenting detailed design for approval |
| 29 th July 02 | Transport & Planning Manager reported on objections to traffic orders to Plympton Area Committee |
| 19 th August 02 | PF supplied with details of four contractors drawn from PCC's Standing List of Tenderers as prepared tender list |
| Sept 02 | Tenders invited by PF for return to PCC Legal and Democratic Services |
| 4 th October 02 | Tenders opened in Legal and Democratic Services |
| 16 th October 02 | PF reported on tender analysis |
| 7 th November 02 | PF wrote to Legal and Democratic Services asking them to prepare contracts for signing |
| 12 th December 02 | Legal and Democratic Services confirmed to PF that contracts were signed |
| 8 th July 03 | PF submitted scope change register and costs |
| 14 th July 03 | Transport & Planning Manager report to Plympton Area Committee updating committee |
| 2 nd September 03 | PF submitted priced scope change register to Transport Services |
| 12 th March 04 | PF submitted revised scope change register |

Appendix 4 – Consultation Review

WOODFORD TRAFFIC CALMING STAGE 1

Method

Consultation took place as follows -

Residents

- 17th September 2001 presentation to Plympton Area Committee
- 2nd October 2001 - letter drop to every household adjoining and within the boundary of the Scheme to advise of the scheme and invite residents to one of two exhibitions within the boundary area.
- 15th and 17th October 2001 - exhibitions consisted of various posters including maps of the area indicating the roads that had been designated for traffic calming measures. Visitors to the exhibition were given a questionnaire to complete for comment and many completed the questionnaire before they left, in total 239 completed questionnaires were received.
- 15th and 17th October 2001 - supplementary questionnaire was handed out at the exhibitions and 34 of these were completed and returned.
- October / November 2001 - questionnaire was also distributed at Hele's School to year 7 – 11 pupils and approx 55 of these were completed and returned.
- The feedback was analysed and the plans amended to include additional streets in the scheme.
- Further leaflet drop to the same households inviting residents to two further exhibitions to view the final plans.
- 11th and 13th February 2002 –second exhibitions of final plans– comments sheets.
- 11th March Report to Plympton Area Committee
- May/June 2002 Advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders
- 29th July report to Plympton Area Committee

Others

- Local Business
- Emergency Services
- Article in Herald
- Interview on Plymouth Sound
- Residents survey by Ward Representative
- 2 public meetings held by Ward Councillors

Appendix 5 – Scope Change Register

| Project Title | PF Project Number | LAFIS Code | PF Project Manager |
|--|-------------------|------------|--------------------|
| Woodford Traffic Calming Consultation Work | D02603 CBA | | RJ Colby |

| Record Number | Description and Cause | Requested by | PF fee estimate (£) | Agreed (By and Date) |
|---------------|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 2603/SC001 | Redesign of Dingle Road one way system and further consultation with Mr Jennings as a result of his objections to the Traffic Orders | PCC following Area Committee | 1348 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC002 | Incorporation of Vicarage Road, Molesworth Road, Lynwood Avenue, Back Lane and Braddens Hill at the request of the Plympton Area Committee on 11 th March 2002 Cllr Nicholson and N. Lean | PCC Area Committee, N. Lean | 4315 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC003 | Design of scheme to protect footway between Molesworth Road and Back Lane | PCC N. Lean letter 29.7.02 | 997 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC004 | Liaison with Mrs Lackey and Mr Ley of 40 and 42 Larkham Lane regarding redesign of mini roundabout to incorporate requirements for their private access | PCC Area Committee and residents | 2920 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC005 | Revision to proposed parking scheme / waiting restrictions in Seymour Road and liaison with residents and shop owners | PCC Area Committee and Mrs Miller | 951 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC006 | Addition of refuge island in Plymbridge Gardens and negotiation with Mr Rumbolt | Mr Rumbolt and Cllr Nicholson | 1125 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC007 | Liaison with landowners regarding various planning applications adjacent to Larkham Lane and amendments to scheme to suit | PCC N Lean | 615 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC008 | Revision to specification on site to incorporate change to bollard specification requested by PCC | PCC A Germain | 300 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC009 | Revision to signage on Larkham Lane chicane islands post construction | PCC A O'Hagan | 310 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC0010 | Additional sections of new footway construction liaison with residents and design outside Nos. 38 and 67 Larkham Lane | PCC A Germain | 385 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |

| Record Number | Description and Cause | Requested by | PF fee estimate (£) | Agreed (By and Date) |
|---------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 2603/SC0011 | Amendment to installed kerbline on Courtland Crescent mini roundabout, redesign and instruct contractor, set out and liaise with residents | PCC Cllr Nicholson and resident | 875 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC0012 | Instruct contractor and design location for new bollards in response to request from resident | PCC Cllr Nicholson and resident | 135 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC0013 | Review of Traffic Orders and supply of further information in light of information from Ruth Mount that PCC had not completed re advertisement of final traffic orders as originally requested | PCC Ruth Mount, N. Lean | 510 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC0014 | Site surveys, liaison with bus access officer, detail design, cost estimates and contract supervision of 4 bus access boarders | PCC N Lean | 3450 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC0015 | Preparation for and attendance of two staff at two evening public meetings requested by Cllr Nicholson | PCC Cllr Nicholson, N Lean | 1340 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC0016 | Review of questionnaires issued by Cllr Nicholson and reporting on analysis of results | PCC Cllr Nicholson | 415 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC0017 | Writing replies to members of the public and attending meetings on site as a result of issues raised at public meetings in February 2003 | PCC Cllr Nicholson | 2984 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC0018 | Ongoing liaison with members of the public, site meetings and responses to letters and e mails during the period May to August 2003 including specific issues in Seymour Road, Back Lane, Dingle Road and Greenway Avenue | | 4710 | N. Lean 29.8.03 |
| 2603/SC0019 | Meetings with Tree Officer regarding resident requests for pruning and removal of trees at three locations | | 210 | |
| 2603/SC0020 | Liaison with Plymouth City Council Cleansing Department regarding concerns about vehicles negotiating Dingle Road. Department satisfied following site test. | | 128 | |
| 2603/SC0021 | Further meetings with fire, police and ambulance services following request at public meeting | | 390 | |
| 2603/SC0022 | Liaison and correspondence in connection with insurance claims from motorists and residents where these relate to overall scheme issues rather than site or construction issues | | 1926 | |
| 2603/SC0023 | Site visits and liaison with Plymouth City Council staff and resident regarding parking issue and 'keep clear' proposals adjacent to | | 142 | |

| | | | | |
|-------------|--|--|------|--|
| | shops in Plymbridge Road | | | |
| 2603/SC0024 | Ongoing liaison and correspondence regarding location of speed cushion in Larkham Lane | | 1317 | |
| 2603/SC0025 | Ongoing liaison and site meetings with elderly resident regarding location of speed cushions and risk of flooding to his property. Design review and omitting one cushion | | 477 | |
| 2603/SC0026 | Liaison with residents in Dingle Road regarding drive access and possible obstruction to buildout. Site meetings and production of Autotrack plots to prove case for scheme to remain as built | | 515 | |
| 2603/SC0027 | Consultation and liaison with resident at Larkham Lane regarding the provision of 'keep clear' markings | | 277 | |
| 2603/SC0028 | Meetings with resident regarding widening of crossing point on Courtland Crescent to allow for vehicle crossover on tactile paving | | 493 | |
| 2603/SC0029 | Meeting with shop owners, discussions with Member and officers and handling petition from shop owners requesting revision to parking provision following installation of agreed scheme | | 422 | |
| 2603/SC0030 | Redesign of gateway feature on Plymbridge Road including incorporation of new signs and buildouts, production of drawings | | 1431 | |
| 2603/SC0031 | Liaison with Road Safety Officers and police on construction completion and overall speed monitoring in the Plympton area | | 277 | |
| 2603/SC0032 | Ongoing public liaison duties, phone calls etc. regarding scheme issues including review and response to letters in the period September 2003 to February 2004 inclusive | | 1653 | |
| 2603/SC0033 | Production of Stage 3 audit exception report and full review with road safety team | | 1480 | |
| 2603/SC0034 | Detailed site survey of four completed mini roundabouts and production of drawings for road safety team to review. Decision taken not to make changes to design | | 1385 | |
| 2603/SC0035 | Liaison with resident in Dingle Road regarding relocation of street lighting | | 254 | |
| 2603/SC0036 | Liaison with residents, attendance at site meetings and design review regarding bus boarder locations and final extent of bus clearways | | 517 | |
| 2603/SC0037 | Relocation of private church direction signs and meeting to resolve | | 165 | |
| 2603/SC0038 | Consultation with resident regarding wheelchair access to property | | 323 | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|----------------|--|
| | off Back Lane. Relocation of speed cushion and liaison with Plymouth City Council regarding revisions to local gully position | | | |
| | SCOPE CHANGE REGISTER TOTAL | | £51,337 | |